



# Protection of wildlife in the Folonigb? reserve through participatory and integrated management

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11155

**Countries**

Guinea

**Project Name**

Protection of wildlife in the Folonigb? reserve through participatory and integrated management

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

2/7/2025

**Review completed by PM**

3/7/2025

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## **CEO**

### **Part I - General Project Information**

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 5, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 5, 2025**

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

**2. Project Summary.**

**a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

**c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 5, 2025**

a) The description of the problems is quite general on the degradation of the FNR. Please be more specific about the problems and barriers in the context of the GWP so that the objective and the project components are a clear and directly respond to the problems and barriers.

b) The expected Global Environment Benefits (GEF core indicators) are missing. Please include them at the end of the summary.

c) No, the link with the GWP is missing. Please make reference to the GWP and mention briefly how this project will work with the global platform.

## Agency Response

### 3. Project Description Overview

a) **Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**

b) **[If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**

c) **Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

d) **Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**

e) **Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**

f) **Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### b) March 5, 2025

a) The "participatory and integrated management approach" is vague and could apply to many different projects. Please be more specific about the proposed approach in the objective statement.

b) Partially. The TOC is not well aligned with the overall program. Please see and address the comment below on the TOC.

c)

c.1. In the Project Description Overview, each Component should be included in one section, rather than having each Outcome have its own section. Please revise for clarity.

c.2. The Project Description Overview is not enough developed with a limited number of outputs (especially when there is only 1 output for 1 outcome), which in addition are formulated as outcomes. As a result, the table is unclear and lack information. Please complete the table as needed to reflect all the elements of the project that contribute to achieve the objectives of the project.

c.3. There should be a clear inclusion of GWP global coordination project engagement in KM component 4. Please complete accordingly.

d)

d.1. The gender consideration should be more mainstreamed. In the Project Description Overview, only the outcomes 2.1 and 3.1 mention gender consideration whereas we learn in the project description that "women and young people will co-decide and be closely involved in all activities". Please complete for each relevant output/outcome.

d.2. The knowledge management seems very limited and needs to be strengthened.

e) The Co-Financing contributions to PMC (6%) is a bit higher than the GEF Project Financing (5%). Cleared.

f) Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

### 4. Project Outline

#### A. Project Rationale

**a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**

**b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**

**c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 5, 2025**

a)

a.1. The description of the current situation is not well structured with repetitions that undermine the clarity and logical pathways of the TOC. Please elaborate with different sections on the problems, key drivers and barriers. The section on barriers should not be limited to a list of barriers but also briefly describe how these barriers hinder the possibility of implementing solutions.

a.2. The description mentions 53 PAs covering a total area of 36,879 km<sup>2</sup>, representing 15% of the national territory, whereas the PA network area is only 8%. Please clarify what the difference is between the 53 PAs covering 15% and the PA network covering 8%.

a.3. The 4 paragraphs "In order to alleviate the barriers... despite changing socio-economic and environmental dynamics." refer to the project description and not the current situation. Please move and merge these paragraphs in the section "B. Child Project Description".

b) Yes, cleared.

c) N/A

## Agency Response

### 5 B. Project Description

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**

**c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?**

**d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**

**f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**

**k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 6, 2025

a)

a.1. A clear TOC for this project, including the causal pathways providing a clear picture of what is planned and why, and what will result is required and currently lacking. Please revise the TOC so that it is based on a strong situational analysis to identify the key leverage points to address the drivers and threats to wildlife.

a.2. Please provide a legible TOC graphic (it is currently illegible) and a suitable narrative based on the analysis and including clear pathways linking outputs, outcomes and results.

b) Partially. Please address the comments above.

c)

c.1. Some initiatives are identified as potentially co-financiers of the project. Please note that the co-financing should be determined at this stage of CEO endorsement and remove all references to potential future cofinancing.

c.2. The "World Bank GWP Coordination team" is part of the Program. It is not another different initiative. Please remove it as ongoing initiatives and projects.

c.3. For each identified initiative, clarify how the project will benefit from and/or articulate with. For instance, with the EU Natura Guine, the statement of "the project could benefit from ongoing activities..." is very vague: which activities and how?

c.4. Aren't there any lessons and experience the project can build on? Please clarify.

d)

d.1. The activity 1.1.2.8 is not aligned nor eligible for GEF financing. Please fund this activity with co-finance and remove.

d.2. The Output 1.1.1 is not clear. Please clarify.

d.3. The output 1.1.3: It is not clear whether activities that will result in the restoration of the targeted hectares are included. The activities listed don't seem like that is the case. Please clarify.

d.4. For the outcome 1.2, who is paying salaries of this new FNR staff? How has the workforce needs been assessed and has the sustainability of this activity been considered after the project? Please clarify.

d.5. The outcome 1.3, the outputs 1.3.1 and output 1.3.2 seem to mix Human Wildlife Conflict prevention and mitigation with zoonotic spillover risk monitoring and reduction. These are not the same and the issues are likely not directly related. Please revise and clarify this entire outcome, and potentially splitting into two and clarify what is planned, what is the expected result and why? It is unclear what is planned on the zoonotic and one health front and how it relates to the project TOC.

d.6. the outcome 1.4 and Output 1.4.1 need to be applied and actionable for conservation result. It is unclear how they will be. Please explain what is expected to result out of this investment (e.g. how will this research be applied/used for improved management, planning, conservation action?). The activity 1.4.1.5, in particular support to master's degrees and "other scientific research", is not well aligned with GWP nor eligible for GEF funding through this project. Please revise accordingly.

- d.7. Under the outcome 2.1, has wildlife trafficking been identified as a threat? It is unclear if this is being included just because it is a potential entry point under the GWP (though not required?). Please clarify.
- d.8. On the output 2.1.2 ?dismantle illegal environmental trafficking?, is this wildlife trafficking? Please clarify and revise if yes.
- d.9. The outcome 2.2 needs to be refined as it is much too broad. The Output 2.2.1 and indicator are vague and seemingly unrelated. Please revise to be clearly aimed at contributing to the TOC with a robust outcome, directly related output and indicator(s) designed to measure the result.
- d.10. Much of outcome 3.1 is not well explained, justified, aligned nor eligible under GWP. This needs to be reworked entirely based on clear causal pathways and logic with clear contributions to the stated outcomes of GWP.
- d.11. The outcome 3.1 is focused on wildlife-based economies, whereas the output 3.1.2 and related indicator is focused on improved cookstoves. It is unclear how these pieces fit together, and what is their ultimate result/contribution to the goal. Please revise and/or clarify this outcome.
- d.12. The output 3.1.1 is lacking articulation of causal pathway assumed between this component/Outputs and conservation of wildlife and habitat. How will activities and beneficiaries be identified? How will this have a positive impact on the biodiversity targets? How will these be alternative sources of sustainable livelihood rather than supplementary? How will this be monitored? Please clarify.
- d.13. The Output 3.1.2. doesn't have any description. Please complete.
- d.14. The outcome 3.1 and 3.2 look similar. Both include the development of economic activities but they are formulated differently. This is confusing. Please clarify.
- d.15. The title of the output 3.2.1 is about ecotourism but the description of this output is about firewood and charcoal. This is not consistent. Please revise.
- d.16. The outputs 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 should be revised to be more concrete (e.g. ?explored and supported? is not a solid output and clearly aligned with the TOC and project goal.
- d.17. Under the output 3.2.2, the carbon credits are not eligible for funding, please redact. In fact, this output is not clearly aligned with the scope of GWP. Please either redesign or redact the Output all together.
- d.18. For the outcome 4.1, it is unclear how this outcome and output are related to project management or scaling results. The activities are not well aligned or clearly contributing to the objective of this project. Please revise.
- d.19. The component 4 includes the "Activity 4.2.1.1. Set up a project monitoring, reporting and evaluation system". This is very confusing as the component 5 is about monitoring and evaluation.
- d.20. We learn in the risk section that the project will work with WB-led project or other international donors to develop endowment funds dedicated to conservation that will cover recurring operating cost of the protected area. We don't find this activity in the project description. Please clarify.
- d.21. Caution against using zoonotic risk messaging to reduce wild meat consumption in subsistence-dependent rural areas, should instead prioritize nutritional needs and One Health partnerships instead. Please address and revise.

e) The incremental/additional cost reasoning of GEF investment is unclear. Please clarify how this project will build on and articulate with the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects and clarify the additionality of this project.

f) The project description does include activities enabling the improvement of livelihoods but the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project is not clearly described. Please elaborate clearly and further on that aspect for each category of relevant beneficiaries.

g) Please see the comments below on the budget.

h) Yes, cleared.

i) The project description is much focussed on what the project will provide, which is normal, but the role of the involved stakeholders in the project activities is not clearly presented. Please elaborate further on this aspect in the description of the components (it doesn't need to be long, one sentence per kind of stakeholder and per output can suffice).

j) Partially. We do find important consideration of women under component 3 but not in the other component. Please clarify further how the results of the gender analysis is reflected in the relevant activities (restoration work, capacity building, governance, monitoring...). In particular, please integrate the activities and gender-specific indicators developed in the Gender Action Plan into the project description and Results Framework. (e.g. in Output 1.1.1, Output 1.1.2, Outcome 1.4, Output 2.1.1, Output 2.2.1, Output 5.1.1).

k)

k.1. The component 4 includes elements to capture and disseminate knowledge but it is unclear how it will also contribute to learning. Please clarify.

k.2. As mentioned above, a specific output on the articulation of the project with the Global Platform of the GWP is missing. This output should include specific activities. Please complete.

l) We do note the involvement of different key national stakeholders including the ministries of environment and livestock, the National Agency for Aquaculture, the National Tourist Office and the National Agency for Financing of collectivities but policy coherence is not mentioned in the project description. Please clarify how the project will contribute to improve policy coherence especially in activities related to governance, land use planning and management, and investments.

m) Innovation is not mentioned. Please clarify what is the innovation provided by the project.

## Agency Response

### **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

**a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**

**b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in**



support of the request?

**c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

**d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

a) Yes, cleared.

b) The executing role of UNDP is unclear. We learn that the National Project Manager will be recruited using the applicable procedures under NIM modality. Nevertheless, we see in the budget table that the responsible entity (receiving the funds from the GEF) is the Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves under the MEDD. Does it mean that UNDP will execute more activities than those identified in the budget table and related to reporting and spot checks? We don't find any request to UNDP and the GEF from the OFP to implement this project through the NIM modality. Please clarify who will be the GEF Executing Agency receiving and disbursing the funds, noting that dual function of implementing and executing is very exceptional, should be justified and requested to the GEF who will finally make a decision based on the justification provided.

c) As mentioned above, most of the identified initiatives are presented as potential co-financiers and the information on how they will coordinate and cooperate with the project is missing. Please clarify this important aspect.

d) The coordination and collaboration with the overall program is missing under component 4. Please create a specific outcome and describe how the project will coordinate and collaboration with GWP.

Agency Response

**5.3 Core indicators**

**a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

a)

a.1. Currently zero hectares are targeted under Core Indicator 1.2. Please correct

a.2. Under CI.1.2, please correct the METT score entered in error and provide the WDPA ID and IUCN Category.

b) Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

### 5.4 Risks

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

a) The climate risk is not enough analyzed. At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts related to this specific project are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please briefly outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios and list key potential hazards for this specific project that are related to these climate scenarios. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.

b) and c) Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

## Agency Response

### 6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

a) We don't find how the project adequately aligns with Focal Area objectives. What about Climate Change Mitigation and Land degradation FA? Please elaborate.

b) The latest National One Health Strategic Plan should be included in the alignment section and the project team should ensure familiarity with the strategic plan and clearly describe how this project can support the implementation of this strategy and how elements of the strategy can contribute to meeting project objectives. Please address and revise.

Agency Response

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Please identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes and explain how.

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

To the question about the private sector "has its role been described and justified in section B "Child project description?" the response is No. Please explain why.

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestM/A

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

C

Agency Response

**8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

1. The co-financing letter from the National Agency for Financing of collectivities (ANAFIC) for the amount of \$2,500,000 is missing. Please provide this letter or remove it from the cofinancing table if not confirmed.

2. ?In-kind? is ?recurrent expenditures? normally. Please revise the ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for National Tourist Office as that ?type of co-financing? is indicated as ?in-kind?.

Agency Response

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, the endorsement letter was approved at PFD and the endorsed amounts are consistent with the amounts included in the Portal. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

**e) [If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

a) The Mandatory Indicators 2: "terrestrial protected areas under improved management (GEF core indicator 1.2)" should be in hectares and not a score. Please correct.

b)

b.1. The output 4.1.1 is under component 1. This is confusing. Please correct.

b.2. There is no indicator for the Output 4.1.1. Please complete.

b.3. The monitoring target for 9.b. is vague ? what is meant by ?mechanism to monitor zoonotic risks?? How is a zoonotic risk defined? And what metrics will be used to determine the mechanism is ?effective?? Consider having rangers track wildlife health events instead. Please address and revise.

c) Relevant sex disaggregated indicators for component 1 and 2 are missing. Please complete.

d) Yes, cleared.

e) The required GWP indicators need to be selected and included in results framework for GWP program-level contributions. Please complete.

#### Agency Response

##### **Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### **Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

**8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response

##### **Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**



Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 6, 2025

a)

a.1. We would kindly request the agency to change the way they have described the activities of the project in the budget table. Please have one line for each activity/expenditure/position so one can assess the reasonability of these to be charged to the project components / M&E / PMC. Per the resubmission we will assess the budget table again and provide comments as appropriate.

a.2. The budget table is 34 pages long ? the Agency may want to consider presenting the budget per component instead of per outcome, so the fields will be smaller and the length shorter.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component 1				Component 2		Component 3		Component 4	Sub Total	M&E
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 1.2	Outcome 1.3	Outcome 1.4	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 3.1	Outcome 3.2	Outcome 4.1		
Contractual services- Company	- Building of Women House (A3.1.1.2) @USD50,000 in Y2.Subtotal = USD50,000- Hiring of a firm to conduct capacity building of ANPROCA (A3.1.1.4) @USD15,000/year over 5 years.Subtotal = USD75,000- Contract for local products processing (A3.1.1.4/A3.1.1.5) @40,000/year over 5 years.Subtotal = USD200,000Climate smart agriculture implementation (A3.1.1.5/A3.1.1.6) @USD186,255 in Y2 and @USD150,000 in Y3.Subtotal = USD336,255- Contract for aquaculture & fish farming development (A3.1.1.8) @USD200,000/unit in Y3 and Y4 (16 units).Subtotal = USD320,000- Fishing equipment, purchase of fry and feed @USD40,000/unit in Y2 and Y3.Subtotal = USD80,000- Firm to carry out a feasibility study for the implementation of silvopastoralism @USD25,000 in Y1.Subtotal = USD25,000- Constructing and equipping of 4 processing units for women @USD55,000/unit in Y2 and Y3.Subtotal = USD220,000- Improved cooking stove for household (A3.1.2.2) @USD15/unit for 2,700 unit in Y2.Subtotal = USD40,500TOTAL = USD1,346,755							1,346,755		1,346,755		

b)

b.1. While specific comments on the budget table will be provided whenever the changes above are done, we can mention that the Chief Technical Advisor is charged to the components. Per the guidelines of the project and program cycle, the costs associated with the project's execution must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. When the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds), some project's staff could be charged to the project's components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). Please clarify in the budget table and in the TORs.

Contractual services- Individual	Salary for Expert in conservation and combating illegal trade in zoonotic wildlife species to charge of the "Coexistence between man and wildlife" component @USD120,000/month for 60 months).TOTAL = USD120,000Chief Technical Advisor @USD7,000/month for 18 months @50% the salary @USD3,500/month for 36 months).Subtotal = 50% * (USD7,000*36) = USD126,0004 Drivers, 100% USD 400/month for 60 months).Subtotal = 4*USD400*60 = USD96,0003 Field Assistants, 100% @USD1,000/month for 60 months in Component 2.Subtotal = USD1,000*60*3 = USD180,0002 Counters field, 100% @USD400/month for 60 months).Subtotal = USD400*60*2 = USD48,000TOTAL = USD960,000				570,000					570,000		Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (OGPNRF) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)
Contractual services- Individual	Salary for Expert in Human-Wildlife Relations to charge of the "Coexistence between humans and wildlife" component @USD120,000/month for 60 months).TOTAL = USD120,000		120,000							120,000		Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (OGPNRF) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)
Contractual services- Individual	Salary for Expert in Sustainable Livelihoods and Wildlife Coexistence Human-Wildlife Relations to charge of component 3 Wildlife for prosperity @USD2,000/month for 60 months).Subtotal = USD120,000Chief Technical Advisor @USD7,000/month for 18 months @50% the salary @USD3,500/month for 36 months).Subtotal = 50% * (USD7,000*36) = USD126,000Regards and Gender Expert, @USD2,000/month for 60 months).Subtotal = USD120,000TOTAL = USD966,000					366,000				366,000		Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (OGPNRF) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)

b.2. The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles/motorbikes must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project, and approved by the GEF Sec. Please amend the budget accordingly of provide a strong justification.

vent	48 individual surveillance kit for ranger @USD1,250/unit in Y1 (A1.2.1.2). Subtotal = USD60,000.00 field equipment kit for rangers @USD500/unit in Y1 and Y4. Subtotal = USD10,000.00 motorbikes @USD2,500/unit in Y1 (A1.2.1.3). Subtotal = USD62,500.00 books for permits @USD20,000/unit in Y1 (A1.2.1.3). Subtotal = USD40,000.00 Furniture and equipment for Dossu HQ @USD70,000 in Y1 (A1.2.1.4). Subtotal = USD70,000.00 TOTAL = USD242,500									242,500				242,500			242,500	Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (OGPNRF) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)
Equipment	Motorbike for transhumance mediators @2,500/unit for 10 unit in Y2. TOTAL = USD25,000										25,000			25,000			25,000	Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (OGPNRF) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)
Equipment	Office furniture and accessories (solar backups, etc.) @USD5,000 in Y1. TOTAL = USD5,000									5,000				5,000			5,000	Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (OGPNRF) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)
Equipment	Purchase of awnings, sleeping bags, first aid kits, GPS, VHF/UHF radio and solar kits @USD20,242 in Y1 (A2.1.1.4). Subtotal = USD20,242.00 motorbikes @USD2,500/unit in Y1 (A2.1.4). Subtotal = USD25,000.00 individual equipment kit @USD1,000/unit in Y1 (A2.1.1.4). Subtotal = USD20,000.00 small equipment and field furniture @USD20,000 for the project in Y1 (A2.1.1.4). Subtotal = USD20,000.00 Investigation and legal monitoring equipment @USD40,000 in Y1. Subtotal = USD40,000.00 TOTAL = USD105,242												125,242				125,242	Guinean Office of National Parks and Wildlife Reserves (OGPNRF) of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)

b.3. Under "Equipment", the office furnitures should be charged to the PMC. Please amend the budget accordingly.

b.4. Under "Other Operating Costs", please clarify what "other" includes as we need to check all the expenses are eligible.

b.5. We find support for beekeeping in the budget whereas we don't find such activity in the project description. Please clarify.

b.6. The GWP global coordination project engagement should be included in the budget. Please complete.

b.7 Please see the comment above about the need to clarify the executing role of UNDP and clarify.

c) Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

### Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

**8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 6, 2025**

Not yet. The project needs a complete redesign. Currently it lacks a coherent theory of change or articulation of the situation, drivers and how the project proposes to address those issues for wildlife and landscape gain. Please address the comments raised above.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>3/14/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		