

Promoting the Effective Management of Salonga National Park through Creation of Community Forests and Improving the Well-being of Local Communities

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9802

Countries

Congo DR

Project Name

Promoting the Effective Management of Salonga National Park through Creation of Community Forests and Improving the Well-being of Local Communities

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

5/30/2019

Review completed by PM

12/5/2019

Program Manager

Jaime Cavelier

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-16-19

Yes. Top of Part-II Project Justification in Portal.

Below there are entries related to the GEB, and on series of issues related to co-financing.

8-28-29

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-15-19

The project has two complementary components that should deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground.

The description of the proposed interventions is rather lengthy: 19 pages (p.65-83 of Project Document). The GEF kindly requests to reduce the descriptive text that does not contribute to the understanding of the proposed activities listed under Outputs. The text should clearly and succinctly articulate the proposed interventions funded by the GEF. As currently presented that information is diluted in information that is not necessary to have there. The GEF request to substantially reduce the text that goes before the list of activities and beef-up the text in the activities to fully understand the proposed activities.

Page 66. It says: *Those communities put most pressure on biodiversity because they are confined to a limited space, insufficient for them to practice their traditional subsistence activities, with the consequence that they practice hunting, fishing and the collection of NTFPs within the Park limits.* How is this project going to resolve these pressures if people put pressure on SNP because they are *"are confined to a limited space,"*?

COMPONENT 1.

Output 1.1. 1) Why 75,000 ha when the rest of the project targets an area of 90,000 ha + another 90,000 for activities in WWF's area? 2) Are these "community forests" (i.e. forest concessions) going to be sufficiently large to allow Sustainable Forest Management? What is the approximate size of these community forests and how many household/people will have access to these areas? A measure of density would help understand the issue of access and capacity to sustain the proposed activities.

Output 1.3. It is not clear how these *"multi-resource Simple Management Plans that will include the designation, delimitation and mapping of the various land uses such as agriculture, hunting and fishing, collection of NTFPs, fuelwood collection, timber harvesting (if applicable), and conservation area"* will work, when the issue is that there is not enough space as mentioned before. What is the area (ha) that each household will have in the forest concessions to carry-out these activities?

Output 1.4. 1) What are the "forest enterprises" this output is referring to? Logging and the other activities listed under No. 2 here? 2) It is not clear how the development of communal activities like *"tree nurseries, the production of energy wood, artisanal logging, the value-added processing of NTFPs, sustainable fishing"* generate income. Isn't that what they do already anyway? 3) The weak capacity locally is flagged twice in this output, but with very little in terms of interventions to address this serious issue except to *"transport allowances to enable their regular attendance at annual meetings of the Community Assembly"* and *"any activity around the set-up of timber harvesting would need to be considered a pilot, and closely supported to ensure its sustainability"*. The project is suggesting creating forest concessions in 90,000 ha. but apparently without the technical support the local communities, except by *"Activity 1.4.3 Strengthening the local forest administration to control the implementation of Simple Management Plans"*. This appears insufficient. Could financial resources be redirected to provide direct technical assistance to the local communities and not to delegate the responsibility to the Local Forest Administration?

Output 1.4. The projects states that *"WWF had registered 123 Local Development and Conservation Committees (LDCCs) throughout the Salonga landscape, which are tasked with community development and resource management in their territories or micro-zones, including in most of the villages in the Monkoto Corridor. Those committees will be restructured under PARCCS as most of them are not operational"* (GEF's underline). Why are most of the LCDs not operational and what is being planned to make them operational?

Output 1.5. While awareness is important, it is not clear how *"delivering gender-sensitive awareness building modules on the importance of wildlife and fish protection, habitat and forest conservation, and the risks of poaching and bushmeat consumption"* in an area of 180,000 ha. will resolve the need for going after fish and bush-meat because these are the sources of protein and income. What are the true alternatives the project is offering to the demand for fish and bushmeat?

Output 1.6. It is good to hear that *"The training of 12 persons has led to concrete results with five poachers arrested, and the confiscation of 10 to 15 packages of elephant meat, two weapons with ammunition, and traps (cables)"*. The GEF support the use of funds for this initiative. Is the EAGLE network going to participate as Executing Partner? The GEF strongly support funding their direct involvement in the project. Please confirm.

Output 1.7. It is not clear how the project intends to achieve this output with 15 participants and bi-monthly monitoring missions. The man and women power and frequency of these interventions need to be revisited and adjusted.

This activity therefore involves the creation of a committee with some 15 participants issued from the communities supported by the project to perform bi-monthly monitoring missions, following the methodology developed by ICCN, who will deliver training and support to the committee. The objective of this activity is to better understand the rate at which large mammals frequent elephant baths. At the same time, the presence of the monitoring teams is a good deterrent to poachers that illegally set up their camps around the baths.

COMPONENT 2

Outcome 2.: The project states: *"The incremental value of the GEF investment under Component 2 will be to strengthen existing value chains and traded products that are not reaching their full potential because of low productivity, poor quality and inaccessibility of markets"*. What are the crops and products that this project will invest in, and what is the status of the *existing value chains* that will be strengthen?

Paragraph 163. Not relevant to the proposed outcome. Concentrate the efforts in making explicit the proposed interventions under the outcome.

In addition to honey and caterpillars, are there other NTFPs going to be targeted?

Output 2.1. Please clarify what are the *"alternative income-generating activities"* that will be pursue in this output.

Output 2.2. 1) What are the "*services by the project and aggregate products for sale*" that this output is referring to? Please list them. under Activity 2.2.2. 2) What is the suggested "*financial mechanism to support product aggregation*"

In addition to honey and caterpillars, are there other NTFPs going to be targeted (see below graph with the list of NTFPs)

Activity 2.2.1. Will the project be able to provide technical assistance to all the local communities in the 180,000 ha that is planning on using for the participatory rural appraisals? Do the Executive Partners have the man- and women power to do so?

Activity 2.2.5. What is the suggested "*financial mechanism to support product aggregation*"?

Output 2.3. In the proposed implementation of sustainable and productivity-enhancing agricultural practices, the target is that at least 50% of the farmers are women. What is percentage baseline? By the way, there is continued reference to the percentage of women to take part in the different activities but the inclusion of that percentage reads as an afterthought. Please provide the estimated baseline or at least sense of how marginalized woman are in the different activities proposed in this project.

Output 2.6. This should be covered by co-financing from the Government, not the GEF.

8-28-29

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

[25-07-19]

Secretariat: The description of the proposed interventions is rather lengthy: 19 pages (p.65-83 of Project Document). The GEF kindly requests to reduce the descriptive text that does not contribute to the understanding of the proposed activities listed under Outputs. The text should clearly and succinctly articulate the proposed interventions funded by the GEF. As currently presented that information is diluted in the information that is not necessary to have there. The GEF request to substantially reduce the text that goes before the list of activities and beef-up the text in the activities to fully understand the proposed activities.

Project response: Activities have been described one by one and any descriptive text that was not directly contributing to the understanding of activities removed.

Reference: Para 127 to 159 of the Project Document

Secretariat: Page 66. It says: Those communities put most pressure on biodiversity because they are confined to a limited space, insufficient for them to practice their traditional subsistence activities, with the consequence that they practice hunting, fishing and the collection of NTFPs within the Park limits. How is this project going to resolve these pressures if people put pressure on SNP because they are "are confined to a limited space,"?

And the related comment by the Secretariat: Output 1.3. It is not clear how these "multi-resource Simple Management Plans that will include the designation, delimitation and mapping of the various land uses such as agriculture, hunting and fishing, collection of NTFPs, fuelwood collection, timber harvesting (if applicable), and conservation area" will work, when the issue is that there is not enough space as mentioned before. What is the area (ha) that each household will have in the forest concessions to carry-out these activities?

Project response: It is correct that the populations located within the Corridor, who have been relocated from within the Park at the time of its creation, are now confined to the space they were attributed. But the project's objective is not to find space for this confined population. Instead, the project's approach, also documented in the project's theory of change, is to protect biodiversity in Salonga National Park by making communities respect Park boundaries (Component 1) and by providing alternative sources of income to illegal hunting and fishing (Component 2). Economic alternatives to illegal hunting and fishing reduce the dependency from forest products. In fact, those economic alternatives such as higher-yielding, sedentary agriculture, livestock rearing or fish farming can create more output on less space than traditional activities such as hunting and fishing. While improving livelihoods, those economic alternatives will help reduce man-made pressure on the Park because of the existence of alternative, but also because of increased awareness about the importance of forests and wildlife, and a greater motivation to protect them. In fact, communities' participation in conservation activities, and benefits derived from them, will be a motivating factor to respect Park limits. Reference para. 142 of Project Document

Secretariat: Output 1.1 1) Why 75,000 ha when the rest of the project targets an area of 90,000 ha + another 90,000 for activities in WWF's area?

Project response: The target for the registration of community forests in Output 1.1 is 75,000 ha. An additional community forest, the Ntomba Group, to date supported by WWF through the registration step, will be supported in Outputs 1.2 and 1.3, adding up to a total of 90,000 ha. This is explained in paragraph 128.

Secretariat: Output 1.1 2) Are these "community forests" (i.e. forest concessions) going to be sufficiently large to allow Sustainable Forest Management? What is the approximate size of these community forests and how many household/people will have access to these areas? A measure of density would help understand the issue of access and capacity to sustain the proposed activities.

Response: The law foresees multiple possible uses of community-managed forests including artisanal logging, conservation, ecotourism, etc. Sustainable Forest Management can be economically attractive on forests as small as 5,000 ha, as shown in Cameroon, where the maximum size of allowable community forests is 5,000 ha. The estimated size of the community forests to be registered in this project is 15,000 ha while the maximum allowable size in the DRC is 50,000 ha. The population of those targeted community forests varies in size but can be estimated at 7,000 inhabitants, corresponding to the average population of a group of villages (groupement).

Secretariat: Output 1.4. 1) What are the "forest enterprises" this output is referring to? Logging and the other activities listed under No. 2 here? 2) It is not clear how the development of communal activities like "tree nurseries, the production of energy wood, artisanal logging, the value-added processing of NTFPs, sustainable fishing" generate income. Isn't that what they do already anyway? 3) The weak capacity locally is flagged twice in this output, but with very little in terms of interventions to address this serious issue except to "transport allowances to enable their regular attendance at annual meetings of the Community Assembly" and "any activity around the set-up of timber harvesting would need to be considered a pilot, and closely supported to ensure its sustainability". The project is suggesting creating forest concessions in 90,000 ha. but apparently without the technical support the local communities, except by "Activity 1.4.3 Strengthening the local forest administration to control the implementation of Simple Management Plans". This appears insufficient. Could financial resources be redirected to provide direct technical assistance to the local communities and not to delegate the responsibility to the Local Forest Administration?

Project response: Changed "run forest enterprises" that Output 1.4 is referring to "manage and operate forest concessions" to clarify what is meant.

Collective activities such as hunting and fishing may already be practiced, but those are not based on sustainable levels of resource extraction and compliance with the law and rules for the protection of wildlife and fish. Other economic activities, if at all, are practiced on a very small scale for lack of capacity, access to equipment/inputs, the high cost of transport to markets and the lack of buyers.

Interventions to address the weak capacity of the local administration are focused on building the capacity and operational support as now described in greater detail in Activity 1.4.3. It is also further clarified that technical support to communities will be delivered as part of activities planned in Component 2 as outlined in Activity 1.4.1.

Secretariat: Output 1.4. The projects states that "WWF had registered 123 Local Development and Conservation Committees (LDCCs) throughout the Salonga landscape, which are tasked with community development and resource management in their territories or micro-zones, including in most of the villages in the

Monkoto Corridor. Those committees will be restructured under PARCCS as most of them are not operational (GEF's underline). Why are most of the LCDCs not operational and what is being planned to make them operational?

Project response: The baseline study conducted as part of project preparation has shown that most Local Conservation and Development Committees (LDCCs) established by WWF in the Corridor were not operational because of the absence of community based activities to bring together members of the, making the LDCCs figurative bodies without an actual agenda to pursue. The project will support the operationalization of community forestry and participatory land management, both processes require full involvement of local communities organized under the LDCCs. As the forest concessions become operational, rights and permits will be attributed for the economic valorization of forest resources (artisanal timber exploitation, NTFP harvesting and processing, ecotourism etc.) generating more monitoring activities for the LDCCs and revenue for the Community Development Fund. These activities to operationalized the LCDCs are more detailed now under the description of output 1.4. Para. 131 and others related para. .

Secretariat: Output 1.5. While awareness is important, it is not clear how " delivering gender-sensitive awareness building modules on the importance of wildlife and fish protection, habitat and forest conservation, and the risks of poaching and bushmeat consumption" in an area of 180,000 ha. will resolve the need for going after fish and bushmeat because these are the sources of protein and income. What are the true alternatives the project is offering to the demand for fish and bushmeat?

Project response: This project does not attempt to change communities' consumption of bushmeat and fish, which is legal, but rather the trade of bushmeat (by communities), which is illegal. Awareness building has for objective to increase the awareness about the importance of forest protection and wildlife conservation. The change in behavior, however, is expected to come from the creation of economic alternatives to illegal and excessive hunting and fishing. Reference Para. 134 of Project Document

Secretariat: Output 1.6. It is good to hear that "The training of 12 persons has led to concrete results with five poachers arrested, and the confiscation of 10 to 15 packages of elephant meat, two weapons with ammunition, and traps (cables)". The GEF support the use of funds for this initiative. Is the EAGLE network going to participate as Executing Partner? The GEF strongly support funding their direct involvement in the project. Please confirm.

Project response: Upon the recommendation by UN Environment to seek a partnership with the EAGLE Network and the GEF's support to the use of funds for this initiative, this project has had initial exchanges with the EAGLE Network's co-founder, Luc Mathot. Luc however expressed that the EAGLE Network is unable to support this activity as their approach relies on the fighting of wildlife trafficking in urban centres through law enforcement and media attention. On the other hand, a direct exchange with the Salonga Park Manager has confirmed the ability of ICCN, who is responsible for the deployment and training of ecoguards, to support this activity.

Secretariat: Output 1.7. It is not clear how the project intends to achieve this output with 15 participants and bi-monthly monitoring missions. The man and women power and frequency of these interventions need to be revisited and adjusted.

Project response: Based on further exchange with partners, who will be involved in this activity, the size of the network and the frequency of interventions has been revisited and adjusted to comprise teams of 5 participants in each community, with 2 lead representatives each, that will perform monthly missions. Additionally, larger teams of 15 participants will be appointed for occasional monitoring transects. The revised Output 1.7 is to be found on page 76 of the Project Document.

Secretariat: Outcome 2: What are the crops and products that this project will invest in, and what is the status of the existing value chains that will be strengthen?

Project response: This project will support the sustainable and higher yielding production of food crops (cassava, beans and rice), vegetable gardening, cash crops (palm, cocoa and coffee to be confirmed), livestock (poultry and pigs), fish from fish farming as well as honey and caterpillars. Agricultural products are almost exclusively sold on local markets within the Corridor with producers making the trip to the markets themselves. Bushmeat and fish are also mostly sold locally, but then transported and sold in urban centers outside the Corridor as far as Kinshasa. More detailed information on the value chains and their constraints is provided in section 2.6 of the Project Document (par. 67 for agricultural products, par. 70 for livestock, par. 73 for bushmeat, par. 77 for fish and par. 83 for NTFPs). These explanations were added in par. 143 and 144 for more clarity.

Secretariat: Paragraph 163. Not relevant to the proposed outcome. Concentrate the efforts in making explicit the proposed interventions under the outcome

Project response: Paragraph removed.

Secretariat: In addition to honey and caterpillars, are there other NTFPs going to be targeted?

Project response: Only honey and caterpillars will be the focus of assistance to all of the project-supported communities. However, producer associations can decide to develop/strengthen other NTFPs as part of micro-enterprise development, especially if requiring initial investments. This could include equipment for value-added processing or for example the development of by-products such as beeswax and propolis from honeycombs.

Secretariat: Output 2.1. Please clarify what are the "alternative income-generating activities" that will be pursued in this output.

Project response: Alternative income-generating activities are all of the economic activities that represent alternatives to illegal hunting and fishing, i.e. they are activities that can generate monetary income. They include all economic activities promoted as part of Component 2, i.e. sustainable, higher-yielding agriculture for food crops, cash crops, livestock, fish farming, NTFPs, micro-enterprises. This is now further clarified in par. 142.

Secretariat: Output 2.2. 1) What are the "services by the project and aggregate products for sale" that this output is referring to? Please list them under Activity 2.2.2. 2) What is the suggested "financial mechanism to support product aggregation"?

Project response: The “services by the project” are producer trainings, support in contract negotiation, support in the organization of grouped sales, etc. For more clarity, Output 2.2 has been reformulated to “Output 2.2: 20 producer groups of varying degrees of formality with at least 50% of members that are women efficiently deliver services to their members and aggregate products for sale”. Those services have further been listed in Activity 2.2.2 as suggested. “Aggregate products for sale” makes reference to grouped sales by producers. The "financial mechanism to support product aggregation" is a mechanism to be developed together with the communities, foreseen as a revolving fund for the purchase of goods from producers, and further detailed in Activity 2.2.5. Additionally, the development of a community savings mechanism will contribute to providing a solution to households’ immediate cash needs.

Secretariat: Activity 2.2.1. Will the project be able to provide technical assistance to all the local communities in the 180,000 ha that is planning on using for the participatory rural appraisals? Do the Executive Partners have the man- and women power to do so?

Project response: The project's local implementation partner, AASD, will have two-full time rural development technicians to assist the delivery of planned activities in the project-supported communities. Those will further be assisted by the following project staff in Component 2: an agronomist, a fish farming expert and a zootechnician.

Secretariat: Output 2.3. In the proposed implementation of sustainable and productivity-enhancing agricultural practices, the target is that at least 50% of the farmers are women. What is percentage baseline? By the way, there is continued reference to the percentage of women to take part in the different activities but the inclusion of that percentage reads as an afterthought. Please provide the estimated baseline or at least sense of how marginalized woman are in the different activities proposed in this project.

Project response: Baseline percentages and detailed targets have been added in the CEO Endorsement's section A.4. on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment and the Project Document's section 5.6 on Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Further clarified in paragraph 143 is the fact that support to women's associations will be sought for vegetable gardening, poultry farming and caterpillars in particular.

Secretariat: Output 2.6. This should be covered by co-financing from the Government, not the GEF.

Project response: In response to the Secretariat's comment, this project undertook further exchanges with the Salonga National Park Management Unit, the project's local implementation partner, AASD, and the GEF Agency. These exchanges resulted in the revision of the activity to organize communities in targeted project locations, providing capacity building, and give access to tools needed for maintenance work. This will enable community organization for the maintenance of secondary agricultural roads used to access markets or embarkation points. Road maintenance will be performed with local labor only. Material support by the project will include needed tools and initial support in the provision of a small participation fee for meals. The revised activity significantly reduces the needed budget, not requiring engineers or external experts. The benefit of this approach is that it makes communities responsible for collective management while motivating them for conservation efforts. As the first activity under this Output, and with the support of UN Environment and AASD, it is planned that the project will advocate for a

commitment by the provincial government to contribute to road rehabilitation as well as forest control. The cost the activity was halved from an initial 395k to 208k (corresponding to an overall budget for Output 2.6 of 531k inclusive of personnel and operational costs). The cost savings of 187k have been reallocated as follows: 99k to double the number of micro-enterprises supported, 33k for a subgrant with a national NGO to support fish farming in the Corridor, 24k for the purchase of communally managed carts for the transport of goods, and 31k to strengthen the project's resources for communication and outreach. The description of Output 2.6 and its activities was revised accordingly, as was the budget.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-15-19

The project needs to reconsider its viability as currently stated because of outstanding issues related to co-financing.

Please provide a budget of the GEF funds to be invested in the different Output.

Please clarify the purpose and the budget allocation for Travel on official business (lines 1601 to 1606). Modify as necessary.

To:	Jun-24				
UNEP Budget Line		Comp 1 CBRNM	Comp 2 Livelihood	Comp 3 PMC	Total
1600 Travel on official business					
1601 Kinshasa-based staff		16,730	28,682	-	45,413
1602 Monkoto-based staff		37,716	64,659	-	102,375
1603 Participation in conferences in Central Africa		24,340	-	-	24,340
1604 Car rental allowance		33,387	57,238	-	90,625
1605 Kinshasa-Monkoto light aircraft 4-seater		23,597	40,453	-	64,050
1606 Kinshasa-Monkoto light aircraft 9-seater		33,571	57,554	-	91,125
1699 Sub-total		169,340	248,587	-	417,927

Line 2106 should be covered by the Government. What is the "Revolving Fund for NTFP purchase and how does it relate to the funds to be allocated to micro-enterprises?

Jun-24		Comp 1 CBRNM	Comp 2 Livelihood	Comp 3 PMC	Total
get Line					
2106	2.6 Road rehabilitation & maintenance (ISCO, ADECO, CCD)		395,600		395,600
2107	2.2.5 Revolving fund for NTFP purchase		106,250		106,250

8-28-29

Cleared

REQUESTS ADDED AFTER 8-28-19

- 1- The detailed project budget show project national finance and admin staff is charged to component 1 and 2, while international finance and admin staff is charged to PMC:

ANNEX F-1 - RECONCILIATION BETWEEN GEF ACTIVITY BASED BUDGET AND UNEP BUDGET LINE (GEF FUNDS ONLY US\$)												
Project title:		Promoting the effective management of Salonga National Park by creating community forests and improving the well-being of local communities										
Project number:		9802										
Project executing partner:		MEDD, Rainforest Alliance, AASD										
Project implementation period:		Expenditure by project component/activity (provide)										
From:	Jul-19	Add additional components/activities as required										
To:	Jun-24	Expenditure by calendar year										
UNEP Budget Line		Comp 1 CBRNM	Comp 2 Livelihood	Comp 3 PMC	Total	2019 Jul-Dec	2020 Jan-Dec	2021 Jan-Dec	2022 Jan-Dec	2023 Jan-Dec	2024 Jan-Jun	Total
1300	Administrative Support											
1301	Project Finance & Administration (National)	49,863	116,346	-	166,209	15,743	31,907	32,768	33,663	34,594	17,534	166,209
1302	Project Finance & Administration (International)	-	-	109,928	109,928	13,143	26,587	23,247	19,932	18,574	8,445	109,928
1399	Sub-total	49,863	116,346	109,928	276,137	28,885	58,495	56,015	53,595	53,168	25,979	276,137
1600	Travel on official business											
1601	Local travel in Kinshasa (car rental allowance)	37,101	53,524	-	90,625	9,063	18,125	18,125	18,125	18,125	9,063	90,625
1602	National travel: Air travel between Kinshasa and	60,503	87,285	-	147,788	15,644	30,206	29,125	29,125	29,125	14,563	147,788
1603	National travel: Air travel between Kinshasa and	63,527	91,648	-	155,175	19,788	34,238	28,900	28,900	28,900	14,450	155,175
1604	Regional travel: Participation in conferences	24,340	-	-	24,340	2,434	4,868	4,868	4,868	4,868	2,434	24,340
1699	Sub-total	185,471	232,456	-	417,927	46,928	87,437	81,018	81,018	81,018	40,509	417,927
1999	Component total	955,892	1,212,549	109,928	2,278,370	212,848	404,157	461,004	479,715	429,723	290,922	2,278,370

The project staff (either national or international) needs to be charged to the PMC – please note that this project has enough PMC (from GEF and co-financiers) to assume this.

1-7-20

There are a number of issues related to the budget that need to be addressed:

- 1- In the budget, the item “Project Finance and Administration” is not a person – instead, it seems to be a cost that the Agency is charging as Administrative cost. Please remove. Similarly, Project Coordinator and Knowledge Management and Institutional Communications Coordinator are part of the project’s staff – both have to be charged to the Project Management Costs (PMC). The GEF kindly request to use the co-financing portion of the PMC (\$1,088,606) to co-pay for the cost of executing the project, not only the GEF Portion of the PMC (\$271,178).

Project executing partner		MEDO, Rainforest Alliance, AASO				Expenditure by project component/activity provide								Insert actual year			
Project implementation period		Add additional components/activities as required				Add additional years as required								Expenditure by calendar year			
From	To	Comp 1	Comp 2	PMC	Total	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total	2021	2022	2023	2024	Total
Jul-19	Jun-24	CBRSM	Level att			Jul-Dec	Jan-Dec	Jan-Dec	Jan-Dec	Jan-Dec	Jan-Jun		Jan-Dec	Jan-Dec	Jan-Dec	Jan-Jun	
UNEP Budget Line																	
10 PERSONNEL COMPONENT																	
1100	Project personnel																
1101	Project Coordinator	205,538	295,519	-	502,057	47,145	95,761	98,760	101,879	105,123	53,388	502,057					
1102	Knowledge Management and Institutional Co	68,743	99,173	-	167,916	-	-	27,098	55,073	56,660	28,885	167,916					
1199	Sub-total	274,281	395,692	-	669,974	47,145	95,761	125,858	156,952	161,783	82,274	669,974					
1200	Consultants national																
1201	1.1.1 Evaluation of conservation value, anthr	1,665	-	-	1,665	833	833	-	-	-	-	1,665					
1202	1.1.2 Setting up community assemblies	1,550	-	-	1,550	775	775	-	-	-	-	1,550					
1203	1.1.4 Participatory mapping	5,334	-	-	5,334	1,333	2,667	1,333	-	-	-	5,334					
1205	1.3.1 Performing socio-economic analyses	18,528	-	-	18,528	-	-	9,264	9,264	-	-	18,528					
1206	1.3.3 Tools for the negotiation of rules for na	5,334	-	-	5,334	-	-	1,333	2,667	1,333	-	5,334					
1207	1.3.4 GIS mapping of micro-zones	31,548	-	-	31,548	-	-	7,887	15,774	7,887	-	31,548					
1210	1.4.2 Participatory development of a commu	5,334	-	-	5,334	-	-	2,667	2,667	-	-	5,334					
1211	1.6.1 Developing a data collection system on	15,108	-	-	15,108	-	-	3,777	7,554	3,777	-	15,108					
1215	2.2.1 Participatory rural appraisals	-	10,194	-	10,194	5,097	5,097	-	-	-	-	10,194					
1217	2.2.4 Development of quality control standar	-	3,994	-	3,994	-	-	-	1,997	1,997	-	3,994					
1218	2.2.5 Evaluation of financial solutions to sup	-	9,219	-	9,219	-	-	4,609	4,609	-	-	9,219					
1220	2.1.5 Plantations diagnostics and action plan	-	10,329	-	10,329	5,164	5,164	-	-	-	-	10,329					
1221	CBRSM Technical and Management Advisor	127,134	183,395	-	310,519	38,003	74,797	72,378	57,419	44,878	23,044	310,519					
1224	Community Forestry Technical Advisor	139,304	-	-	139,304	15,289	14,421	13,566	13,936	15,529	66,564	139,304					
1225	Monitoring & Evaluation Technical Advisor	66,285	-	-	66,285	7,273	5,005	7,592	5,336	7,936	33,143	66,285					
1226	Agricultural Training Technical Advisor	137,717	-	-	137,717	13,140	28,660	29,781	28,652	25,932	11,346	137,717					
1299	Sub-total	417,112	354,847	-	771,958	86,913	137,619	151,821	149,874	111,936	134,096	771,958					
1300	Administrative Support																
1301	Project Finance & Administration	-	-	-	178,679	178,679	19,654	39,785	36,801	33,856	32,884	178,679					
1399	Sub-total	-	-	-	178,679	178,679	19,654	39,785	36,801	33,856	32,884	178,679					

- 2- All monitoring activities need to be charged to the M&E Plan, not to the Components or PMC. Please amend accordingly.

20 SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT																	
2100	Sub-contracts (MOUs/LOAs for cooperating agencies)																
2101	AASO	711,650	1,808,512	-	2,520,162	199,771	692,659	588,165	486,304	390,920	162,343	2,520,162					
2102	1.3.2 Multi-resource forest inventories	-	-	-	242,505	-	-	60,805	121,253	60,448	-	242,505					
2103	2.5.2 et 2.5.4 Elaboration des plans de developpement de	126,750	-	-	126,750	-	-	21,125	42,250	42,250	21,125	126,750					
2104	2.2.5 Revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural and i	106,250	-	-	106,250	-	-	53,125	53,125	-	-	106,250					
2105	Project Monitoring by MEDO	15,352	22,148	-	37,500	3,750	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	3,750	37,500					Moved all project monitoring activities from PMC to Components 1 and 2
5500	Evaluation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
5501	Annual audit of AASO	-	31,250	-	31,250	3,125	6,250	6,250	6,250	6,250	3,125	31,250					
5502	RA annual audit	-	-	-	12,500	1,250	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	1,250	12,500					
5503	External Mid Term Review/Evaluation	-	-	-	30,000	30,000	-	-	15,000	15,000	-	30,000					
5504	External Terminal Evaluation	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	-	-	-	-	25,000	50,000					
5599	Sub-total	-	31,250	-	92,500	123,750	4,375	8,750	23,750	23,750	33,750	123,750					

- 3- Audits have to be charged to the PMC, not to the components. Please amend accordingly.

5500	Evaluation	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-					
5501	Annual audit of AASO	-	31,250	-	31,250	3,125	6,250	6,250	6,250	6,250	3,125	31,250					
5502	RA annual audit	-	-	-	12,500	1,250	2,500	2,500	2,500	2,500	1,250	12,500					
5503	External Mid Term Review/Evaluation	-	-	-	30,000	30,000	-	-	15,000	15,000	-	30,000					
5504	External Terminal Evaluation	-	-	-	50,000	50,000	-	-	-	-	25,000	50,000					

Continuous on item 4 (Not enough space in this window).

3-4-20

Regarding the responses to the questions above.

1) The total funding for Component 1 for the Coordinator and KM was not changed from the previous re-submission (\$669,974). There was only a reshuffling of the funding requested for the different years and for the two positions. In this regard, how is it possible that only 15% of the salary (assume 15% of the time) for the

Project Coordinator will come from the PMC? That balance suggests that the Coordinator is being paid with funds from Component 1 rather than from PM as it should be.

2) The Agency is using only the GEF portion of the PMC (\$271,179) to pay for the costs of the execution (see below). Co-financing funds should also be used to cover these costs.

1399	Administrative Support				
1301	Project Finance & Administration			178,879	178,879
1399	Sub-total			178,879	178,879
5499	Sub-total				
5500	Evaluation				
5501	Annual audit (f AAIS)	31,250		31,250	
5502	RA annual audit		12,500	12,500	
5503	External Mid Term Review/Evaluation		30,000	30,000	
5504	External Terminal Evaluation		30,000	30,000	
5599	Sub-total	31,250	92,500	123,750	
1099	Component total	35,932	25,500	161,836	
19	GRAND TOTAL	1,879,931	3,448,829	271,179	5,694,749

What I see is that the portion of the PMC that the Agency uses to charge the project's staff is the GEF portion (\$271,179) – however they don't utilize the co-financing portion of the PMC (\$1,088,606)

	Sub Total (\$)	\$403,571	21,772,154
Project Management Cost (PMC)			
	GEF	271,179	1,088,606
	Sub Total(\$)	271,179	1,088,606
Total Project Cost(\$)		\$694,749	22,860,710

Please note that \$18.4 million out of the \$22.8 million of the co-financing (80%) is represented in grants – hence, it is possible to use the co-financing part of PMC to cover the project's staff and other associated execution costs. Please ask the Agency to amend accordingly.

3) Why was the co-financing portion of the PMC reduced from \$1,088,606 to \$258,836?

4-30-20\

1. Line 2102 is \$215,503 and not \$425,503 as in the Response. Please address.

Agency response: Changes were made to the project budget in response to GEF comments as follows: The position of Project coordinator (line 1101) is now funded with 30% by GEF and 77% co-funding by the Rainforest Alliance. The amount of \$ 425 503 previously affected to project coordinator under component 1&2, is now affected to subgrants (line 2102) in order to support the community forestry and sustainable agriculture production processes.

2. The sum of lines 3208,3209,3210,4101 and 4102 is \$237,432 and not \$ 167,916 as in the Response. Please address.

6-11-20

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

[25-07-19]

Secretariat: The project needs to reconsider its viability as currently stated because of outstanding issues related to co-financing.

Project response: While the level of co-financing stated in the Excel budget and Portal has been reduced to 28,555,459, the commitment from co-finance partners to invest in the Corridor as stated in co-finance letters has not changed. Exact amounts contributed by USAID and KfW will be confirmed upon project start.

Secretariat: Please provide a budget of the GEF funds to be invested in the different Output.

Project response: A budget of GEF funds broken down by output is now provided in Table B “PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY” of the CEO Endorsement

Secretariat: Please clarify the purpose and the budget allocation for Travel on official business (lines 1601 to 1606). Modify as necessary.

Project response: Good to recall that the project is operating in area where accessibility is difficult and only Aircraft can grantee movements. Grouped lines 1601 to 1606 by local, national and regional travel for more clarity and clarified the purpose and budget allocation within Annex F1 and Appendix E to the Project Document.

Secretariat: Line 2106 should be covered by the Government.

Project response: Please see above response regarding Output 2.6.

Secretariat: What is the "Revolving Fund for NTFP purchase and how does it relate to the funds to be allocated to micro-enterprises?"

Project response: The revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural and forestry products allows collection centers to purchase goods from the producers, store and commercialize them in bulk when the prices are more favorable for the producers. This solution attempts to address the issue that grouped product sales are only possible if a solution is found to producers' liquidity issues. The collection centers, which manage the revolving funds, will, in turn, be managed by the producer association/cooperative. This is further explained in the project document's paragraph 169 describing Output 2.2. The mention of “Revolving Fund for NTFP purchase” in Annex F1 was corrected to “Revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural and forestry products”.

25 November 2019:

Secretariat:

REQUESTS ADDED AFTER 8-28-19: The detailed project budget show project national finance and admin staff is charged to component 1 and 2, while international finance and admin staff is charged to PMC: The project staff (either national or international) needs to be charged to the PMC – please note that this project has enough PMC (from GEF and co-financers) to assume this.

Agency response:

All project national and international finance and administration is now charged to PMC as per the updated Annex F1 to the Project Document.

The modification suggested triggered slight changes in:

- Table B, budget by output and component of CEO endorsement request
- Document Annex E. A UNEP Project. Consultant to be hired
- Section A 1.4) Incremental cost matrix of CEO endorsement

03 February 2020:

GEF Secretariat comment on 1-7-20: There are a number of issues related to the budget that need to be addressed:

1. In the budget, the item “Project Finance and Administration” is not a person – instead, it seems to be a cost that the agency is charging as Administrative cost. Please remove. Similarly, Project Coordinator and Knowledge Management and Institutional Communications Coordinator are part of the project staff – both have to be charged to the Project Management Cost (PMC). The GEF kindly requests to use the co-financing portion of the PMC (\$1,088,606) to co-pay for the cost of executing the project, not only the GEF portion of the PMC (\$271,178).

- The item “Project Finance and Administration” was renamed to Finance & Administration Expert, which is indeed a project staff based in Kinshasa.

- Knowledge management is planned in project framework as output and budgeted for in the project’s output 1.8 “Knowledge management system in place, and key project learning and communication products on operationalizing community-based management of protected areas are synthesized and disseminated within and beyond the GEF partnership”. As such, the cost of the Knowledge Management and Institutional Communications Expert is attributed in full to component 1. This was corrected.

- The Project Coordinator is a full-time role funded by the project. Its budget allocation was updated to better reflect the division of his/her time: (i) providing technical assistance including delivering pieces of training and facilitating workshops, budgeted for in components 1 and 2; (ii) executing activities attributed to the Project Coordinator as per the project’s costed M&E plan, budgeted for in component 3 on M&E; and (iii) performing/overseeing project management tasks as attributed to the Project Management Unit, budgeted for in PMC. Tasks attributed to the Project Management Unit are further listed in the Project Document’s section 4.2 on Implementation Arrangements.

- The co-financing portion of the PMC to co-pay for the cost of executing the project was lowered from \$1,088,606, originally calculated as 5% of total co-financing, to \$258,836, now reflecting project management support by the project executing partners RA and AASD that is budgeted for from non-GEF funding sources. Support funded by the respective organizations include personnel based in Kinshasa that will be providing management support to the project but that is not the Project Coordinator.

2. GEF comment: All monitoring activities need to be charged to the M&E Plan, not to the components or PMC. Please amend accordingly.

Response: To address this the issue, a component 3 on “M&E” was created in the project budget in which all monitoring activities detailed in the project document’s Annex G1 Costed M&E Plan was included. Table B in the CEO endorsement has also been updated to include component 3.

3. Audits have to be charged to the PMC, not to the components. Please amend accordingly.

Costs related to the annual audit of AASD was included in PMC.

4. The GEF budget codes don't match with the co-financing budget codes (see below). Please amend accordingly.

Co-financing budget codes have been updated to match GEF budget codes.

21 April 2020

Responding to GEF Secretariat comments dated 3-4-20:

Comments received: 1) The total funding for Component 1 for the Coordinator and KM was not changed from the previous re-submission (\$669,974). There was only a reshuffling of the funding requested for the different years and for the two positions. In this regard, how is it possible that only 15% of the salary (assume 15% of the time) for the Project Coordinator will come from the PMC? That balance suggests that the Coordinator is being paid with funds from Component 1 rather than from PM as it should be.

Agency response: Changes were made to the project budget in response to GEF comments as follows: The position of Project coordinator (line 1101) is now funded with 30% by GEF and 77% co-funding by the Rainforest Alliance. The amount of \$ 425 503 previously affected to project coordinator under component 1&2, is now affected to subgrants (line 2102) in order to support the community forestry and sustainable agriculture production processes.

The position of Knowledge Management and Institutional Communications Expert is now removed, and the assigned tasks will be conducted on ad hoc basis through short time consultancies as necessary. The amount of \$ 167 916 previously affected to that position is now added to the training component (lines 3208, 3209 and 3210) and to equipment of farmers to improve the processing processes of agricultural products (lines 4101 & 4102)

Comments received: 2) The Agency is using only the GEF portion of the PMC (\$271,179) to pay for the costs of the execution (see below). Co-financing funds should also be used to cover these costs. 3) Why was the co-financing portion of the PMC reduced from \$1,088,606 to \$258,836?

Agency responses: The project executing partners Rainforest Alliance and AASD have increased their PMC co-financing contributions to \$564,236 (Project Document’s Annex F2 budget lines 1101, 1301 and 2101). With additional contributions from co-finance partner WWF for costs of project execution for a total of \$600.083, the new total co-financing portion of the PMC has been increased to \$1.164.319.

15 May 2020

Responding to GEF Secretariat comments dated 4-30-20:

NB: No change was done on previously sent projects documents including Annexes. The current response is only on the review sheet which clarifies some elements previously provided.

Comment received: 1. Line 2102 is \$215,503 and not \$425,503 as in the Response. Please address.

Agency response: Changes were made to the project budget in response to GEF comments as follows: The position of Project coordinator (line 1101) is now funded with 23% by GEF and 77% co-funding by the Rainforest Alliance. The amount of \$ 425,503 previously affected to the project coordinator under components 1&2 is now affected to subgrants on support to community forestry processes (\$215,503 in line 2102) and sustainable agriculture production (\$210,000 in line 2103).

Comment received: 2. The sum of lines 3208,3209,3210,4101 and 4102 is \$237,432 and not \$ 167,916 as in the Response. Please address.

Agency response: The new total GEF budget attributed to lines 3208, 3209, 3210, 4101 and 4102 is \$273,432 (not \$237,432 as indicated by review), representing an increase by \$167,916 coming from the Knowledge Management and Institutional Communications Expert, which was removed.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-15-19

Yes. Risks, Levels and Mitigation Risks described in A.5.Risks in Portal.

Roads: The GEF understand the need to rehabilitate roads, if the investments suggested under Component 2 are to be successful in the long term. Without access, any investment in sustainable livelihood activities dependent on access to markets (vs. local consumption) are likely to fail. By the same token, opening access to previously isolated places, is likely to generate an influx of people in search for opportunities and to accelerate the extraction of resources. Please elaborate on the experiences in DRC opening roads and the mechanisms that have been successful to address the associated risks. The proposed mitigation factors described in the project appear to be too soft to counteract the risks

Land-use planning and the increased economic value of forests to local communities will incentivize conservation as well as forest and wildlife monitoring even as trade in and out of the landscape grows. The establishment of functional community governance structures will be important in safeguarding the integrity of the Corridor's forests. A community intelligence network will support Park management in keeping poachers out.

What could be done to address this very real threat?

8-28-29

Cleared

1-7-20

Continuation on issues raised on item 3 above

4- The GEF budget codes doesn't match with the co-financing budget codes (see below). Please amend accordingly. |

- GEF budget codes:

UNEP Budget Line		CBNRM	Liveli. alt.	PMC	Total
10	PERSONNEL COMPONENT				
1100	Project personnel				
1101	Project Coordinator	205,538	296,519	-	502,057
1102	Knowledge Management and Institutional Co	68,743	99,173	-	167,916
1199	Sub-total	274,281	395,692	-	669,974
1200	Consultants National				
1201	1.1.1 Evaluation of conservation value, anthr	1,665	-	-	1,665
1202	1.1.2 Setting up community assemblies	1,550	-	-	1,550
1203	1.1.4 Participatory mapping	5,334	-	-	5,334
1205	1.3.1 Performing socio-economic analyses	18,528	-	-	18,528
1206	1.3.3 Tools for the negotiation of rules for na	5,334	-	-	5,334
1207	1.3.4 GIS mapping of micro-zones	31,548	-	-	31,548
1210	1.4.2 Participatory development of a commur	5,334	-	-	5,334
1211	1.6.1 Developing a data collection system on	15,108	-	-	15,108
1215	2.2.1 Participatory rural appraisals	-	10,194	-	10,194
1217	2.2.4 Development of quality control standar	-	3,994	-	3,994
1218	2.2.5 Evaluation of financial solutions to supp	-	9,219	-	9,219
	Consultants International				-
1220	2.1.5 Plantations diagnostics and action plan	-	10,329	-	10,329
1223	CBNRM Technical and Management Advisor	127,124	183,395	-	310,519
1224	Community Forestry Technical Advisor	139,304	-	-	139,304
1225	Monitoring & Evaluation Technical Advisor	66,285	-	-	66,285
1226	Agricultural Training Technical Advisor	-	137,717	-	137,717
1299	Sub-total	417,112	354,847	-	771,958
1300	Administrative Support				
1301	Project Finance & Administration			178,679	178,679

1. The first part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as $t \rightarrow \infty$. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are bounded and tend to zero as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if the matrix A is stable. The second part of the paper is devoted to the study of the asymptotic behavior of the solutions of the system (1) as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if the matrix A is not stable. It is shown that the solutions of the system (1) are unbounded and tend to infinity as $t \rightarrow \infty$ if the matrix A is not stable.

No response was provided to the issue raised on 1-7-20

Cleared

[25-07-19]

Regarding the risks associated with the rehabilitation of roads including the facilitation of poaching, it is important to remind that no new roads will be created. Instead, maintenance will be performed on existing rural roads/tracks. In addition, statistics and studies show that poachers do not use the road for their activities, but the river (e.g. Luile, Momboyo, Lokoro, Salonga, Lomela ...). Nevertheless, additional control measures will be put in place including intelligence networks by ecoguards and communities (including in this project's Output 1.6), the definition of rules for the use of forest products (including in this project's Output 1.3), and the presence of permanent control teams, at strategic junctions, including for the crossing of the Luile and Salonga rivers. Provincial authorities have also committed to improving road monitoring through an agreement with the Park Management Unit (information received from direct exchange with the Park Manager in response to the concerns raised by the GEF Secretariat). It is important to emphasize that rehabilitated tracks will also allow ecoguards to move around more easily, which will

improve the effectiveness of forest control. The description of mitigation measures in the project document and CEO endorsement has been updated to reflect above suggested mechanisms to address associated risks.

21 April 2020

Agency Response: F2 budget codes now adjusted and harmonized with GEF budget

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-16-19

KfW: The activities to be co-finance by KfW will contribute to 5 of 9 of their programs (1,2,5,6, and 9). The other programs (3,4,7, and 8) are not relevant to the GEF-UNEP project. Although in the Budget in the Excel Table there is a footnote (KfW: The share of the EUR 20M budget destined to Salonga National Park will be confirmed at project inception), it is not appropriate to add a co-financing from KfW for this project in the amount of \$22,737,200. Please include the best estimate of the co-financing that is pertinent to the GEF project only and request a new LoC. If not possible, simply removed and add a note as done for USAID (A letter for \$50,00,000) but \$0 in Portal and in Excel Budget.

REDD: This co-financing is set for two provinces surrounding the corridor: Mai-Ndombe and Tshuapa. Please clarify what provinces the corridor belong to, and what investments will be made inside the corridor by REDD. Adjust budget and co-financing in Portal and in LoC as appropriate.

	In-kind E	FAO		USAID**		FONAREDD	
		Cash F	In-kind G	Cash H	In-kind I	Cash J	In-kind K
t Line							
ICCN							
PIREDD Mai-Ndombe						20,000,000	
PIREDD Tshuapa						3,372,180	

The \$20,000,000 in the LoC relates to the territory of d'Oshwe, that is hundreds of kilometers away from the Corridor. This couldn't not be considered as co-financing. The co-financing appears to be \$7,000,000 + \$3,000,000 as stated at the bottom of the LoC. Please adjust as the entry in the Portal is for \$27,000,000 + \$3,000,000.

DRC Government: The LoC makes reference to \$3.5 million but no separation between \$2.0M in Grant Funds and \$1.5M in-Kind as in the Portal. Please adjust and request new LoC as needed.

RFA: The co-financing in LoC is set at \$600,000, but at \$1,000,000 in Portal. Please adjust.

8-28-29

1. Please remove the Co-financing from KfW and USAID from the Portal. Resubmit the LoC that correspond to the entries in the portal.
2. Could not locate the Letter of Co-financing from MEDD in the amount of \$1,250,000.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Amount(\$)	Evidence
CSO	AASD	In-kind	200,000	
CSO	FAO (EU Actions SAINES Program)	Grant	598,836	
Donor Agency	FONAREDD-DRC	Grant	7,000,000	
Donor Agency	FONAREDD-DRC	In-kind	3,000,000	
Donor Agency	KfW (PBF IV)*	Grant		
Government	MEDD	In-kind	1,250,000	
CSO	RA	Grant	600,000	
Donor Agency	USAID (Environment Partnership Program)**	Grant		
CSO	WWF (EU PARCCS Program)	Grant	10,211,874	
Total Co-Financing(\$)			22,860,710	

NOTES ADDED AFTER REVIEW OF 8-28-19

2- Some of the co-financing letters are in French (see attached file) – we need all of them translated into English (the Agency can do the translation – no need of official translation).

12-5-19

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

[25-07-19]

Secretariat: The activities to be co-finance by KfW will contribute to 5 of 9 of their programs (1,2,5,6, and 9). The other programs (3,4,7, and 8) are not relevant to the GEF-UNEP project. Although in the Budget in the Excel Table there is a footnote (KfW: The share of the EUR 20M budget destined to Salonga National Park will be confirmed at project inception), it is not appropriate to add a co-financing from KfW for this project in the amount of \$22,737,200. Please include the best estimate of the co-financing that is pertinent to the GEF project only and request a new LoC. If not possible, simply removed and add a note as done for USAID (A letter for \$50,00,000) but \$0 in Portal and in Excel Budget.

Project response: KfW has confirmed that the amount to be allocated to Salonga under PBF IV is not yet final, so they would be unable to be more specific and update the co-finance letter at this point. We have therefore followed the GEF's recommendation, which is to set the co-financing amount to zero in Portal and Excel budget, as done for USAID, and added an explanatory note in Table C of the CEO Endorsement. Further, it is true that only KfW's programs #1,2,5,6, and 9 are relevant to the GEF project, but with those making up an estimated 97% of funding provided to Salonga, we can expect that nearly the entire amount allocated to Salonga can be counted as co-financing to this project. (The ratio of 97% is based on the funding needs in the various programs as per Salonga National Park's Business Plan 2016-2025).

Secretariat: This co-financing is set for two provinces surrounding the corridor: Mai-Ndombe and Tshuapa. Please clarify what provinces the corridor belong to, and what investments will be made inside the corridor by REDD. Adjust budget and co-financing in Portal and in LoC as appropriate. The \$20,000,000 in the LoC relates to the territory of d'Oshwe, that is hundreds of kilometers away from the Corridor. This couldn't not be considered as co-financing. The co-financing appears to be \$7,000,000 + \$3,000,000 as stated at the bottom of the LoC. Please adjust as the entry in the Portal is for \$27,000,000 + \$3,000,000.

Project response: The Corridor is located in the Tshuapa province. However, the Salonga landscape spans four provinces, including Tshuapa and Mai-Ndombe. Co-financing from the integrated REDD+ project in Mai Ndombe was included because there is a strong influx of poachers to Salonga National Park from the Mai Ndombe province. As such, the REDD+ project helps increase the efficiency in the management of Salonga National Park. But because there are no investments inside the corridor, we have followed the GEF's recommendation to remove co-financing by the Mai Ndombe project. The new total co-financing total is then \$10M including a new REDD+ project in Tshuapa province building upon investments of the GEF project (\$7M) and technical contributions from other REDD+ projects and sectorial programs (\$3M).

Secretariat: DRC government: The LoC makes reference to \$3.5 million but no separation between \$2.0M in Grant Funds and \$1.5M in-Kind as in the Portal. Please adjust and request new LoC as needed.

Project response: A new letter of co-finance was requested and adjusted to include the in-kind amount only.

Secretariat: RFA: The co-financing in LoC is set at \$600,000, but at \$1,000,000 in Portal. Please adjust.

Project response: The Excel budget and Portal were updated to reflect the correct figure of \$600,000.

Response: 03 September 2019:

Secretariat Comment:

1. Please remove the Co-financing from KfW and USAID from the Portal. Resubmit the LoC that correspond to the entries in the portal.

Agency Response: Done. KFW and USAID Co-financing have been removed from the portal and their letters of co-financing expunged from the letters of co-financing batch.

Secretariat Comment:

2. Could not locate the Letter of Co-financing from MEDD in the amount of \$1,250,000.

Agency Response: The LoC from MEDD reflecting \$1,250,000 is now included in the letters of co-financing batch.

25 November 2019:

Secretariat: REQUESTS ADDED AFTER REVIEW OF 8-28-19:

Some of the co-financing letters are in French (see attached file) – we need all of them translated into English (the Agency can do the translation – no need of official translation).

Agency Response:

All co-financing letters are now available in English as per updated Annex L to the Project Document.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-16-19

Indicator 1. The project is claiming the entire area of SNP (\$3,600,000 ha) when there is no investment in the Park. This needs to be removed. Claims should only be made to the areas that will be the subject of investments (180,000 ha) as listed under Indicator 4.1 and 4.3.

8-28-29

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

[25-07-19]

The contribution to indicator 1 was removed as per the Secretariat's recommendation.

Targets related to Core indicator 11 "Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment" was corrected downwards to count direct beneficiaries only once in the lifetime of the project rather than once per fiscal year of support received from the project.

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-15-19

The Agency, Government and Executing partners are aware of other projects and investments in the region. Please list the institutions mentioned under Coordination with other GEF and non-GEF interventions that were consulted during PPG and are aware of the proposed interventions.

8-28-29

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

[25-07-19]

As documented in the Project Document's section 5 on stakeholder participation, the following agencies and international NGOs participated in the launch workshop for the project preparation phase: African Development Bank (ADB), Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), and World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). WWF also participated and presented the baseline on community forestry in the Corridor at the validation workshop for the project preparation phase, which took place in Monkoto. In September 2018, the project participated in the 3rd Steering Committee meeting of Salonga National Park and consulted financial and technical partners, representatives of the Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation (ICCN) as well as other committee members on the planned project activities. Direct exchanges were further sought with the German Development Bank (KfW), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the National REDD+ Fund (FONAREDD) and the international NGO Catholic Relief Services (CRS). The project's local implementation partner AASD participated in the most recent Provincial Roundtable on Community Forestry that took place in February 2019 in Boende, the capital of the Tshuapa province, which had for objective to strengthen awareness of the politico-administrative authorities, customary leaders and civil society organizations on the community forestry process. The project further consulted Rainforest Foundation UK, which facilitates the work of the various roundtables that have been created at the national and provincial levels, on the need for support to the implementation of the community forestry process, leading to the formulation of Activity 1.8.1.

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-15-19

Yes. Annex G-1: Costed M&E plan in Project Document.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-15-19

Yes. Output 1.8 in Project Document.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-16-19

Yes. Annex B in Portal.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-16-19

Yes. Annex B in Portal.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-16-19

Yes. Germany, Norway and UK. Annex B in Portal.

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

6-16-19

No. Please address outstanding issues.

8-28-29

No. Please address issue under item 5 (Co-financing). Thanks

9-18-19

No. Please address issues under item 3 (Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?) and 5 (Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?)

12-5-19

Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.

3-4-20

No. Please address outstanding issues raised under items 3&4. Please take care of these issues once and for all to avoid repeated back and forth of the CEO Endorsement

4-30-20

Please address items under Window 3

6-11-20

Yes. This CEO Endorsement is recommended.

Response to Secretariat comments

Response: 03 September 2019

The highlighted issues under item 5 (Co-financing) have been addressed. Thanks.

03 February 2020:

GEF Secretariat comment on 1-7-20: There are a number of issues related to the budget that need to be addressed:

1. In the budget, the item “Project Finance and Administration” is not a person – instead, it seems to be a cost that the agency is charging as Administrative cost. Please remove. Similarly, Project Coordinator and Knowledge Management and Institutional Communications Coordinator are part of the project staff – both have to be charged to the Project Management Cost (PMC). The GEF kindly requests to use the co-financing portion of the PMC (\$1,088,606) to co-pay for the cost of executing the project, not only the GEF portion of the PMC (\$271,178).

- The item “Project Finance and Administration” was renamed to Finance & Administration Expert, which is indeed a project staff based in Kinshasa.

- Knowledge management is planned in the project framework as a output and budgeted for in the project’s output 1.8 “Knowledge management system in place, and key project learning and communication products on operationalizing community-based management of protected areas are synthesized and disseminated within and beyond the GEF partnership”. As such, the cost of the Knowledge Management and Institutional Communications Expert is attributed in full to component 1. This was corrected.

- The Project Coordinator is a full-time role funded by the project. Its budget allocation was updated to better reflect the division of his/her time: (i) providing technical assistance including delivering pieces of training and facilitating workshops, budgeted for in components 1 and 2; (ii) executing activities attributed to the Project Coordinator as per the project’s costed M&E plan, budgeted for in component 3 on M&E; and (iii) performing/overseeing project management tasks as attributed to the Project Management Unit, budgeted for in PMC. Tasks attributed to the Project Management Unit are further listed in the Project Document’s section 4.2 on Implementation Arrangements.

- The co-financing portion of the PMC to co-pay for the cost of executing the project was lowered from \$1,088,606, originally calculated as 5% of total co-financing, to \$258,836, now reflecting project management support by the project executing partners RA and AASD that is budgeted for from non-GEF funding sources. Support funded by the respective organizations includes personnel based in Kinshasa that will be providing management support to the project but that are not the Project Coordinator.

2. GEF comment: All monitoring activities need to be charged to the M&E Plan, not to the components or PMC. Please amend accordingly.

Response : To address this issue, a component 3 on “M&E” was created in the project budget in which all monitoring activities detailed in the project document’s Annex G1 Costed M&E Plan were included. Table B in the CEO endorsement has also been updated to include component 3.

3. Audits have to be charged to the PMC, not to the components. Please amend accordingly.

Costs related to the annual audit of AASD were included in PMC.

4. The GEF budget codes doesn't match with the co-financing budget codes (see below). Please amend accordingly.

Co-financing budget codes have been updated to match GEF budget codes.

21 April 2020

Comments under 3 and 4 have been addressed.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

CONTEXT: 1. The Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is the second largest country on the African continent and home to the second largest contiguous block of tropical forest in the world, fertile lands and enormous hydroelectric potential. Ten percent of its territory is part of a national network of protected areas, with Salonga National Park being Africa's largest tropical rainforest park (3,600,000 ha), and the second largest area of protected forest in the world. Salonga stands out for the intactness of its forest ecosystem of enormous ecological importance. The Salonga National Park in DRC is composed of two blocks (North and South) separated by the "Monkoto Corridor". In this corridor, there are local communities that depend on slash-and-burn agriculture, and unsustainable trade of bushmeat and fish. These economic activities have impact not only on the corridor but leak into the National Park. While investments have been made within the Park to protect the forests and wildlife, there is a consensus that conservation objectives cannot be met unless local communities engaged in the process. Since these local communities are concerned with immediate needs of food and shelter rather than long term conservation of the environment that supports their livelihoods, it is imperative to assist them finding alternatives to unsustainable practices. The project will enhance the conservation of biodiversity in the Monkoto Corridor and Salonga National Park through community-based management of forests and the development of sustainable economic alternatives for local communities.

THE PROJECT: Under component 1, the project will lay the foundations for community-based natural resource management. It will provide technical assistance for communities to submit legal requests for attribution of forest concessions on a targeted area of 90,000 ha. The project will further support the implementation of previously drafted natural resource management plans on an additional 90,000 ha, resulting in support to landscapes under improved practices on 180,000 ha. The project will address threats to wildlife and forest habitats by creating a community intelligence network that reports illegal activities to Park authorities. It will set up an elephant monitoring network to gather important information on the movements of this endangered species while deterring poachers. Under its component 2, the project will develop economic alternatives to the unsustainable trade of bushmeat and fish. Support to 1,500 households in the Monkoto Corridor, selected by the local governance committees, will be delivered through strengthened local NGOs and producer groups. The project will promote sustainable and sedentary agriculture, the value-added commercialization of non-timber forest products as well as the creation of micro-enterprises around priority activities identified by the communities.

INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, SCALE-UP: This project proposes a shift in the approach to conservation of the Salonga National from one that is focused on strict protection with minimal investment in local economic development "alternatives" to one that focuses on community-based territorial planning and productive management of forests and agricultural landscapes, maximizing community ownership and benefits. The participatory model put forward by this project promotes sustainability as local community members and civil society will be empowered and their capacity will be built to implement and monitor conservation efforts. The increased participation of communities, local authorities and conservation partners in Park management will be further formalized as part of the Salonga foundation and other landscape-wide coordination committees. The potential to scale up the project interventions is considerable given the size of the Salonga landscape and the fact that several national parks in the DRC are facing similar issues around land-use conflicts.

CO-FINANCING: The project will be co-financed by the Government, FONARED-DRC, a bilateral institution (EU), Conservation NGOs (WWF), and CSOs (ASSD, RA).