

Community-based forested landscape management in the Grand Kivu and Lake Tele-Tumba

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10314

Countries

Congo DR

Project Name

Community-based forested landscape management in the Grand Kivu and Lake Tele-Tumba

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

5/10/2021

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/12/2021- Action requested: Please only mention Congo IP objectives and remove BD and LD Focal Area Objectives and focus the text on the eligibility under the Congo IP (refer to the PFD objective and components); remove the justification under the BD and LD focal areas.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

16 April 2021

The table A of Focal Area/non-Focal Area elements and Table D TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS of the CEO ER now review and the mention of Focal Areas is removed.

The linkage of the project to Focal areas is also removed in the section 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or impact program strategies in the CEO ER

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/13/2021 - More information requested. Please refer to the below:

- Indicators and expected results should be added to Table B
- In component 2 in Table B, it is unclear whether the priority conservation areas that are considered cover an area of 400,000 ha (outcome) of 600,000 ha (outputs).
- Component 2 and 3 are referred as ?TA?. As investments on the ground are expected, please consider referring them as ?Investment?.
- Outcome 4.1 is missing

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 -

- OK

- OK

- OK

- OK

-All are cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

- The indicators have been added to corresponding Outcomes in Table B. However, the targets were not included at that point to avoid making the table cumbersome. The normal practice is that targets are include in the Logframe Annex A, which is done.
- 400,000 ha refer to the amount of conservation areas (other than national PAs) that will be supported to have efficient management to ensure the protection of the habitat of vulnerable species, the promotion of ecosystem services and the improvement of their connectivity. 600 000 ha on the other hand refers to the amount of priority conservation areas (other than national PA) that will be integrated under provincial and land use plans. This means that the 600 000 ha can cover both the 400 000 ha, and additional 200

000 ha that may not have benefited from management improvement (perhaps because the management may not need further improvement).

- In Components 2 and 3 where referred as 'TA' has been replaced with 'Investment'?
- Outcome 4.1. seems to be present. It reads: 'Outcome 4.1. Three DRC provinces have the capacity to monitor wildlife trafficking, land use change, SDG progress in priority areas.'

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/13/2020 -

- All the letters are in French (except from the WB); they need to be translated in English.
- There is a mistake in the WB number which is slightly different between the Portal and in the letter.
- The co-financing from the REPALF is referenced as grant/IM in the Portal while it is in-kind in the letter.
- There is the need to check whether the co-financing is in-kind or not as it is not clear in some letters.
- Please provide further justification on exactly how those labeled as Investment Mobilized are actually such

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021,

- OK, cleared

- Cleared

- OK

- OK Cleared

Agency Response

16-04-2021

- The letters are now translated in French (See translated letters file)
- With regard to WB letter, the figures are corrected in portal
- The co-financing from the REPALF is indicated as 'en espee' which means cash if translated to English. We therefore kept the cofinancing as cash.
- The labelled as Investment Mobilized is actually correct : The investments are project funding mobilised to cover baseline activities by different partners. These activities if conducted will generate both environmental and social benefits, therefore can be adequately qualified as investments

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 1/14/2021 -
Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 1/14/2021 - More information requested. Please provide a list studies and assessments financed under the PPG.

•GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

These below is the list of studies (currently in French Version) undertaken by local consultants as part of the PPG. These studies have been cited throughout the document:

1. S?bastien MALELE MBALA (2020). Rapport sur la Gestion Communautaire des Ressources Naturelles. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.
2. Jo?l Bernardin KIYULU N?YANGA - NZO (2020) Rapport d?Etude sur la Thematique Populations Autochtones et Communautes Locales (Report on the thematic related to Indigenous People and Local Communities) . Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.
3. Boniface Mush?ayuma et Ida Mangala (2020) Strategie de Communication Projet ONUE-FEM. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.
4. LILAKAKO MALIKUKA et Felix Credo (2020) Analyse des opportunit?s de prise en compte de la dimension genre. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.
5. Jean Claude BOMBULA MALASSAY (2020) Rapport d?Etude Relative aux Activit?s de Suivi-Evaluation. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.
6. Michel Disonama. Etude sur la Planification de l?Utilisation des Terres. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?.

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/13/2021 - Clarifications requested. The anticipated start year of accounting for 6.1 is missing and the GHG emission mitigation target seems relatively low considering the total investment (including co-financing linked to REDD+ process), especially considering that one component is particularly focused on this GEB (component 2). In addition, the calculation for this core indicator needs to be provided.

Notably, in addition, the estimates provided do not match the EOI, please advise on the discrepancies on the below:

- 4 million ha of PA under improved management (and several PAs mentioned in the EOI are absent in the proposal/core indicators - Maiko, Lomako-Yokokala, Kabobo-Luama are not listed in the CER) vs. 2.7 million ha in the core indicators in the CER.
- 1.9 million ha of of landscapes under improved management target at EOI, vs 700,000 ha in the CER,
- An estimated 15 MtCO₂ avoided in Grand Kivu and 6 MtCO₂ in the Lake Tele-Lake Tumba landscape, vs 8 MtCO_{2e} estimated in the CER.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 -

- OK, Prodoc has been uploaded - cleared
- OK
- OK, cleared

Agency Response

16-04-2021

We take note that the inclusion of the UNEP Project Document as Annex 1 in the same document as the CEO ER has not enable the reviewers to note that most of the information requested are in fact in the project document which is now uploaded in the portal as a separate document.

It is worth to note that the EOI has evolved to the approved PIF in which the Kabobo-Luama and the mentioned of the 4 million were dropped after analysis of the situation and the project rendered more focus. The actual figures are considered more realistic given the current situation of the project landscape and taken into account baseline data collected during the PPG.

With regard to the comment related to "More clarity is needed with regards to the mismatch referred to in "4 million ha of PA under improved management (and several PAs mentioned in the EOI are absent in the proposal/core indicators - Maiko, Lomako-Yokokala, Kabobo-Luama are not listed in the CER) vs. 2.7 million ha in the core indicators in the CER."

In the project document, Lomako-Yokokala is identified as one of the ICCAS to benefit from improved measures to manage biodiversity through participatory processes. (See Output 2.1.1 in the project document).

Maiko is identified in the project document as one of the areas of intervention of the project. It is identified as one of the protected areas in Grand Kivu (see "Project Locations" in Section 2.1); identified as one of the areas with key global environmental benefits (Section 3.1); and it will also benefit from the effective measure offered in Output 2.1.1 described above. Output 2.1.1 reads "In the Eastern DRC, local communities in the Maiko-Tayna-Kahuzi Biega Landscape have been supported in establishing two gazetted community-managed nature reserve (Tayna Nature Reserves and Kisimba "Ikobo) and two CBNRM areas officially recognized as Community Forest Concessions (Mukingiti-Kingombe and Punia Community Forest Concessions). The process for gazettement of three other forest concession projects is ongoing. This Output will support the development of effective measures and type of priority conservation areas to meet biodiversity conservation national priorities using participatory approaches. "

The sources of data used for the calculating the carbon emissions avoided, the assumptions made and the results are detailed in the "Appendix 10 - Carbon savings calculation" (attached).

Part II " Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/13/2020 - More information requested. There does not seem to be climate projects or futures scenarios or data/information; no information on climate impacts or risk hazard, risk/exposure, and capacity. Please provide some additional information in line with STAP climate risk screening requests. Please refer to STAP guidance on this topic here: [Additional Guidance on climate risk screening with examples by GEF Focal Area](#).

Additionally, how will the barriers of land tenure and rights be overcome? This should be addressed both in this section and throughout the document, as land rights is

mentioned throughout the document but not addressed in a cohesive way through the proposal.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - These items are cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

? Climate impacts and information is provided in several areas of the project document: (a) climate change implications as a challenge in the DRC and the Congo Basin (Section 2.1); (b) conservation of the huge amount of carbon stored in the Congo peatlands as important project goal with global significance (in Section 2.2); as one of the root causes of problems in the project region (Section 2.3).

? A number of climate projects are examined as baselines in the project document. These include among others: (a) Projects of the International Climate Initiative (IKI); and (b) the Climate-Water-Migration-Conflicts nexus - Addressing climate and water driven migration and conflicts interlinkages to build community resilience in the Congo Basin project.

? Section 3.5 of the project document has been amended to include ?Climatic vulnerability challenges for the project locations? where climate impacts or risk hazard is discussed based on the STAP guidance on climate risk screening (2019), as well as using the hazards analysis and management engine developed by the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR).

Output 1.1.1 of the project document outlines how barriers of land tenure and rights be overcome. ? A systematic application of principles of free, prior, informed consent (FPIC) will guide the implementation of a land use and tenure arrangements at the local and regional levels. Specifically, a FPIC Implementation Plan be developed during the early days of the project that will integrate a conceptual framework for land tenure assessment and an analysis of the land tenure and land titling situation in the project area, as prerequisites for designing future land use plans with the indigenous communities (see Output 1.1.1 of the project document).

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/13/2021 - Some issues below:

- The baseline description seems to be exclusively focused on international cooperation projects. It would be appreciated if the role of the relevant institutions, policies, national programs and enabling regulatory framework are added.

- Several co-financing timelines are not compatible with the project ? as they are expected to reach completion in 2020, 2021, or just saying ?current.? Please confirm the implementation timelines of any initiatives providing co-financing are in fact compatible with this proposed intervention or provide further justification here.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Not cleared.

- First comment: Should be reflected in portal, not just prodoc. For important points that are pertinent to the project scope, it's important that the information is easily accessible in the portal in case donors or outside stakeholders may have similar questions or concerns.

- Second comment, please delete co-financing which cannot be confirmed with correct and verifiable timelines. The agency is welcome to add those as parallel financing as they develop.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

- In Section 2.4 of the project document, a comprehensive analysis is given on the ?Alignment with national policy or environmental and developmental targets?, as well as on the ?Alignment with multilateral environmental agreements or global targets.?

- On cofinancing timelines: We take note of the remark related to the timeline of the cofinancing projects. While around 1/2 of cofinancing timeline is aligned with the project time frame, it has to be noted that due to the political situation which prevailed partners have been reluctant to long time planning in the country after 2019. However, with the positive evolution currently observed, it is expected that more investment will happen in country in coming years. These will compensate the 2021 and 2023 planned cofinancing and the project will ensure reporting as parallel funding.

26-04-2021

-Input addressing the first comment is now reflected in the Portal, in Section 1.b

-The cofinancing ? letters from Local Government of Equateur has now been removed as per the guidance. All the other letters have timelines indicated either in the Project identified as cofinancing or in statement in the letter which indicates that the

cofinancing is over the whole project period. The cofinancing figures are updated and also include their translations.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 1/13/2020 - Please see below:

(i) The description of the alternative scenario is not clear in terms of concrete activities supported by the project (it is much about context and baseline). From the description it is difficult to ascertain what the GEF will pay for. Under this section, the project outputs and activities must be much clearly presented (particularly in components 1 and 2).

(ii) As this project is in a conflict prone area, please provide some description here regarding any conflict analysis conducted to ensure all activities are conflict sensitive. Donors often ask about this and seems feasible to be delivered under component 1 as part of IULP.

(iii) The NTFPs are very important in the project (and the Congo IP in general). Nevertheless, the description in component 3 remain vague on how such products and their value chain will be developed and with which relevant partner(s). Please elaborate further.

(iv) In Component 1, it is unclear what 'indicative' zoning plans mean. Does it mean they may not be applied as they are only indicative? - In component 2 in Table B, it is unclear whether the priority conservation areas that are considered cover an area of 400,000 ha (outcome) of 600,000 ha (outputs).

(v) How will the restoration of forest lands be achieved? We don't see it in the alternative scenario.

(vi) Please also refer to the comment on land rights, as this should be clearly addressed through this section as well.

(vii) The transboundary work with the Republic of Congo is vaguely presented currently and should be further elaborated.

(viii) Please elaborate on the capacity building strategy for local, territorial, and provincial authorities. While it is clear that there are consultancies for planning, studies?. But the way the local authorities are going to use, implement, and monitor these plans and approaches (FPIC, IP?) is not clear. Please clarify.

(ix) This is flagged in the results framework section, but would be appreciated if some concise information is provided here in the alternative section regarding how this project is structured around a coordinated approach between UNEP's Regional project as well as the RoC project -- these are both mentioned in the individual components, but a more comprehensive description of the approach would be appreciated.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 -

(i) Cleared

(ii) Cleared

(iii) This information is important, but please emphasize this in the portal, in case others may have similar questions after reading the portal submission.

(v) Cleared

(vi) Cleared

(viii) Would appreciate if this is elaborated clearly in the portal for above reason of (iii)

(ix) Point taken, appreciated and cleared.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2021 - Thank you, cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

(i) Concrete activities have been added to the alternative scenario in both the project document (Section 3.7: Incremental Cost) and the CEO endorsement document (Section 3).

(ii) A section on the analysis of the conflict in the Eastern DRC has been added as an elaboration of the risks associated with the project. This is placed just below the table analyzing project risks in Section 3.5 of the project document, and Section 5 of the CEO Endorsement document.

(iii) In the project document, the role of NTFPs, requirements for their value-chain addition, and implementation of this are all elaborated. The headings under which these are discussed are: ?Improving income generation through sustainable practices?; ?Adding value to Non-timber forest products (NTFPs)?; and ?Implementation on the ground?. See Output 3.1.1 of the project document.

(iv) The word ?indicative? has been removed to show that they will be applied, as is the objective for Output 1.1.3.

In Component 2, 400,000 ha refers to the amount of conservation areas (other than national PAs) that will be supported to have efficient management to ensure the protection of the habitat of vulnerable species, the promotion of ecosystem services and the improvement of their connectivity. 600 000 ha on the other hand refers to the amount of priority conservation areas (other than national PA) that will be integrated under provincial and land use plans. This means that the 600 000 ha can cover both the 400 000 ha, and additional 200 000 ha that may not have benefited from management improvement (perhaps because the management may not need further improvement).

(v) The restoration of forest lands (including biodiversity corridors) has been added to the alternative scenario in both the project document (Section 3.7) and the CEO endorsement document (Section 3).

(vi) And tenure and resources access rights have been added to the alternative scenario in both the project document (Section 3.7) and the CEO endorsement document (Section 3).

(vii) Information has been added under Section 1b of the CEO endorsement document and Section 3.1 of the project document describing the links between two major transboundary landscapes in the Congo Basin IP (the Lac T?!, and the Lac Tumba landscapes of the Republic of Congo and the DRC). This is accompanied by a map.

(viii) Three training programs will be implemented and the consideration of the local, regional and national authorities in these trainings is now emphasized. One will train local, indigenous communities together with local, regional and national authorities on participatory-co-management models of natural resources and landscapes ? targeting production landscapes (open forests where local people use for the collection of livelihood products) (See project document Output 1.1.3 workplan). The other will build capacity for local stakeholders including local, regional and national authorities on natural resources co-management approaches based on community-based natural resources management, and targeting protected areas and biodiversity (see project document workplan Output 2.1.1).

The other capacity building in Output 3.1.3 will facilitate the ability for indigenous peoples, local, regional and national authorities to adopt and implement climate-smart best practices in integrated landscape management, biodiversity protection, sustainable peatlands management, and enhanced benefits sharing, this project will train at least 400 people at the local level in the Lac Tumba Landscape, and at least 450 people in the North Kivu project area (local community members, small-scale fishermen, including women, owners of agricultural farms and cattle ranches, municipal authorities, among others). Training objectives will also be in line with the management plans developed in Component 1. Training modules and materials for knowledge transfer will be designed related to the topics mentioned and considering the training needs of each group of stakeholders, including ecological community leaders. Thematic studies supporting the

development of this project identified some capacity gaps that could be addressed by this project.

Table 12. Identified capacity gaps and training to address these gaps.

Capacity gaps	Capacity to be enhanced
Lack of community leaders to understand and represent community perspectives and needs	Community leadership training
Limited knowledge on CBNRM techniques, SFM and SLM	Training in community-based management of natural resources, sustainable land and forest management ? tools and methods
Advocacy and lobbying	Advocacy and lobbying skills training
Economic resilience	Training in basic management and marketing skills for food crops, cash crops, and environmentally friendly value chains development (such as NTFPs, honey, caterpillars etc.)
Socio-cultural resilience and conflict prevention	Conflict prevention, resolution and peaceful societal transformation
Aquaculture production	Aquaculture production and marketing techniques
Access to PES	Training in carbon credits and access to PES (processes, mechanisms, available provincial, national, project-based and regional support institutions and resources)
Valuation of ICCAs	Indigenous protected areas and socio-cultural development
Valorisation of NTFPs	Techniques for economic development of natural resources

(ix) The alignment of the current project has been extensively demonstrated in both the project document and the CEO endorsement. A section has been added in the alternative scenarios to re-emphasize this. Pointers have been included to section of the documents where more detailed analysis have been done. This is to avoid repetition. See Section 3 of the CEO endorsement document, and Section 3.7 of the project document.

26-04-2021

- The information under comment iii above has been included in the portal as advised, please find it in the section on benefits.
- The comment under xiii above is now elaborated in the portal in the section describing component 4.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/12/2021 - This is not clear at the moment. Please refer to item 3.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

The incremental cost-reasoning table 15 and Appendix 3 of the project document have been revised to accommodate the restoration of forestlands, land and natural resources access rights, increment resulting from the transboundary nature of the project design, and the implications of the capacity building strategy for local, territorial, and provincial authorities.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - Yes, this is clear, however some further clarification is requested on the core indicators and overall impacts. Please refer to the item on core indicators.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

Contributions to global environmental benefits have been revised to indicate some of the key indicators that will be used to monitor progress in identified benefits. See Section 3.1 of the project document and Section 6 of the CEO endorsement request.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - More information requested. The information on different types of sustainability is appreciated, however the sustainability of the project itself is called into question due to a heavy reliance on consultants, which has been flagged in other sections of this review. Please consider and justify this, particularly in the context of COVID-19, wherein travel restrictions and other limitations may continue to come into play.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

We note with thanks the comment on heavy project reliance on consultants. This has now been amended. 11 previously planned consultancies are now embedded in sub-contracts with locally represented institution with recognised expertise.

?Corona Virus Disease 2019 (Covid-19) risk assessment? has been elaborated as one of the risks associated with the project implementation. This elaboration complements the entry on the Corona virus 19 risk identified on the risk table.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - More information requested. The geo-referenced information is missing, and more detail is requested on the maps - i.e. settlements, peatlands, PAs etc. Currently, only the administrative limits are provided.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

There are many georeferenced datasets that have been developed for this document. That in the CEO endorsement document is used to locate the project zones. In the description of the project locations, a relevant geospatial datasets have been used

(showing protected areas, hydrology, peatlands, the transboundary nature of the projects in both the RoC and the DRC, etc.). See Figures 5, 6, 7

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/12/2021 - Yes, the rationale of its support for the achievements of the overall program objectives of the CBSL are apparent, though will be finetuned under the other items of this review.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

The contribution of this project to the overall program impact is widely discussed in Section 2.7 of the project document ?Anchor with the four Components of the Congo IP?; Section 3.1 ?Alignment with The Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (Congo IP)?; and ?Links between two major transboundary landscapes in the Congo Basin IP?; as we as in many other sections of the project document.

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/2/2021 -

On strategic partners: the comparative advantage of selected partners must be demonstrated. We acknowledge the selection of REPALEAC, WWF, and university of Kinshasa. However, Jane Goodall Institute seems absent of the partners while they have been at the heart of the development of management plans for Great Apes and main national parks in the Kivu+ region. Please, explain if they were associated.

- Same comment about WCS ? We understood that WCS is the lead for Lake Tele and Lake Tumba landscape in the peatland area. . However this leadership is not reflected in the proposed project where WWF is preferred. Please, clarify.
- REPALEAC is the regional organization. For DRC, the contact may be the REPALDEF. Please, clarify. How are you anticipating the financing management of \$968,881 by the REPALEAC/REPALDEF? Based on precedent GEF and WB projects, it seems that a third partner (COMIFAC, IPAF/IFAD, or CARITAS) may be recommended. Please, clarify.
- Several private companies, including logging companies, are mentioned. Please, confirm reputation risks have been reviewed and assessed. Please, confirm the GEF project does not help to open new forests to logging and concessions.
- The only 2 identified stakeholders from the private sector under the PS engagement section are logging companies: aren't there any other private stakeholders involved in the project sectors such as agriculture, livestock and NTFPs? Does the project include the development of logging activities and how?

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021,

- OK, but it does not seem the Jane Goodall Institute has been added to as a partner to the portal - pls add
- Noted, thank you for the clarification
- OK
- OK
- OK

GEFSEC, 4/29/2021 - OK for now. Please consider including this information in future PIRs and M&E documents following the inception workshop on how the partnership with the Jane Goodall Institute will unfold. Thank you.

Agency Response 16-04-2021

The absence of Jane Goodall Institute is an oversight. We thank the review for reminding us on this important partner. There was communication with the institute who expresses interest in the project. However, the COVID 19 situation has not allowed continued discussion with Jane Goodall Institute. However, due to the important role it can play in the project and the entire Congo Basin Landscape, the Institute is now

included as a key partner which will support the delivery of some outputs. Further discussion with the Institute will be done before and during the inception of the project.

Discussion with WCS have been focusing on Republic of Congo and did not find interest of that partner to engage in DRC project. However, the discussion with WCS will be conducted to agree on possible involvement in the project and the role it can play.

The discussion with the Regional Coordinator of REPALÉAC has created some confusion. However, during the validation process of the project the local representation of REPALÉAC has come fully on board and this can be materialised by the cofinancing letter provided by REPALÉF.

Not sure if we understood the comment related to How are we anticipating the financing management of \$968,881 by the REPALÉAC/REPALÉF?. REPALÉF has many CSO members of the network and very active in project areas. They are well known partners for working with indigenous people in DRC. The project will be sub-contracting some of these local partners to implement activities.

The engagement with private sector including logging companies have been an active process in the PPG phase during which we find it interesting to see some private enterprises committed for sustainability and investment in green job. The project plans to use this momentum for a huge private sector engagement and impactful approach for the entire Congo Basin Landscape. UNEP and the project will ensure that there will no reputational risk and that the partnership will be used as opportunities to push private sector engagement for sustainability.

The context of COVID 19 did not make it easy to engage more private sector in the discussion and participation. The project inception and implementation phase will be used as opportunities to identify and engage with more private sector from different areas as suggested in the review.

26-04-2021

Unfortunately, it is not possible at this stage, to add the Jane Goodall Institute as an additional executing partner in the portal where only the Ministry is currently reflected.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/12/2020 - There is a gender action plan. There is indeed a list of seven principles announced in the chapter 3) Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. However, it is not clear how this plan and these principles are mainstreamed into the result framework and the project.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - OK.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

Where Outputs involve activities with potential outcomes for individuals and groups, the indicators have been designed to ensure that the gender safeguards in the action plan are adhered to. For example:

Project indicator: Number of institutional staff members having strengthened capacities with regard to in-situ conservation and sustainable use of peatlands, forest and biodiversity (30% women)

Outcome 1.2 indicator: Gender-responsive measures in place for conservation, sustainable use, and equitable access to and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems

Outcome 2 indicator: Improved understanding among key stakeholder groups of the value of peatlands and forest, and the importance of in-situ conservation, as indicated by results of knowledge, attitude and practices (KAP) surveys (disaggregated by women and youth), among the following stakeholder groups.

Outcome 3 indicators: (a) Number of climate-smart production and land use best practices adopted by local communities and indigenous peoples (disaggregated by gender, individual or common initiative group, and indigenous or non-indigenous group). (b) Number of farmers engaged in climate-smart land use practices (disaggregated by gender)

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - Yes this information is provided in the stakeholders section.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/12/2021 -

- Please include a more detailed risk analysis on the COVID-19 situation, accompanied by an opportunity analysis.

- DRC is a LDC and the Kivu+ area is in a context of Conflict, Fragility, and Violence. To be included in the risk analysis and the mitigation measures (the selection of executing partners, strategic partnerships on the ground should be part of the solutions).

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

The risks of climate vulnerability; the conflict situation in the Eastern DRC in general and Grand Kivu in particular; and that of the Corona Virus Disease 2019 (Covid-19)

have been elaborated under the risk table. This is in Section 3.5 in the project document, and Section 5 of the CEO endorsement request document.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - How is each component is connected with the two other UNEP-implemented projects in the RoC and the Regional project and what is the coordination mechanism? Please, provide a matrix highlighting the connections of this DRC project with the two other UNEP projects under each component of the Congo IP (1) land-use planning, 2) conservation, 3) stakeholders (Indigenous People, Private sector), 4) KM and coordination. Please also refer to comments on coordination with critical key stakeholders, such as the Jane Goodall Institute, mentioned in the Stakeholders section.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

The connection between the current project and other UNEP-implemented projects in the RoC and the Regional project have been elaborated throughout the documents.

Examples:

? When defining the project locations, care is taken to clarify the relationship between project initiatives in the DRC and those of the RoC. This is further illustrated with a map of the peatlands area shared by the two countries (title: Shared peatlands showing project locations in both RoC and DRC), see Section 2.1 of the project document. A matrix further describes ?Common macro-level biodiversity, ecosystem and landscape threats in project locations - Cause and effect?

? At the beginning of each Component, the relationships between the component and related Congo IP components and initiatives are defined.

In Section 2.7 of the project document, a subsection is dedicated to elaborating the relationship between the current project and the other UNEP-implemented projects in the RoC and the Regional project. It is titled: ?Anchor with the four Components of the Congo IP?. Furthermore, Appendix 11 is now included in the project document which

provide links between the 4 UNEP implemented initiatives (CBSL Regional Project, RoC Child Project, DRC Child Project and IKI project)

? In Section 3.1, there is a subsection ?Alignment with the GEF-7 Focal Area Priority Programming Areas? where the Alignment of this project with The Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (Congo IP) is further elucidated. With regards to the transboundary nature of the project, there is a subsection ?Links between two major transboundary landscapes in the Congo Basin IP? under the same section that discusses this.

? The general methodology throughout the documents continuously treat and embed this project within the context of related country projects, and within the Congo IP program.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - Yes, this project is aligned with relevant national strategies and plans.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - More information requested. There does not seem to be any KM timeline or milestones available, please provide.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

Budgeted KM activities are now more explicit (Budget lines 5201 et 5303) . The section 8. KM of CEO endorsement has now been updated.

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - Yes, this is included.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - More information requested. Is there any quantifiable information regarding the tangible economic benefits estimated as a result of the delivery of this project?

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Thank you and cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

Section 10 of the CEO endorsement document has been revised to include some quantifiable benefits that the project stands to bring.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - No responses to STAP and Council comments seem to be missing, please provide. Further details for Annex C on PPG funds utilization has also been flagged.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Thank you for the Council comments, but STAP comments are not there, please advise.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

STAP and Council comments are included as Annex B of the CEO Endorsement document

Thematic Studies and Reports of PPG are attached as separate file.

26-04-2021

The STAP comments are done at Regional Project level, but we agree with the review that since the child project contribute to the regional project, the STAP comments also applied. Response to STAP comments are now included in Annex B.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - How is each component is connected with the two other UNEP-implemented projects in the RoC and the Regional project?

- On output 3.1.2: pilot PES are welcome in the project, however we would like to know if co-financing from government is included in these operations and if sustainability aspects are addressed for post project closure.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - OK

Agency Response

16-04-2021

The connection between the current project and other UNEP-implemented projects in the RoC and the Regional project have been elaborated throughout the documents.

Examples:

? When defining the project locations, care is taken to clarify the relationship between project initiatives in the DRC and those of the RoC. This is further illustrated with a map of the peatlands area shared by the two countries (title: Shared peatlands showing project locations in both RoC and DRC), see Section 2.1 of the project document. A matrix further describes ?Common macro-level biodiversity, ecosystem and landscape threats in project locations - Cause and effect?

? At the beginning of each Component, the relationships between the component and related Congo IP components and initiatives are defined.

In Section 2.7 of the project document, a subsection is dedicated to elaborating the relationship between the current project and the other UNEP-implemented projects in the RoC and the Regional project. It is titled: "Anchor with the four Components of the Congo IP".

In Section 3.1, there is a subsection "Alignment with the GEF-7 Focal Area Priority Programming Areas" where the Alignment of this project with The Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (Congo IP) is further elucidated. With regards to the transboundary nature of the project, there is a subsection "Links between two major transboundary landscapes in the Congo Basin IP" under the same section that discusses this.

The general methodology throughout the documents continuously treat and embed this project within the context of related country projects, and within the Congo IP program.

Yes, co-financing from government is included in these operations. This co-financing covers government interventions in the project locations for the period 2021-2025.

Also good to note that WWF US will be the strategic partner in the implementation of the PES. As such it will help to put a PES system with international standards including the issue of sustainability.

See section 1.a.7 on Sustainability in CEO ER and Section 3.8. Sustainability in the Project Document.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - In process.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - Please provide the responses to Council comments

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - Cleared

Agency Response

14-04-2021

Responses to Council comments are included as Annex B of the CEO Endorsement document.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - Please provide the responses to STAP comments, even if they were made at PFD level

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - STAP comments are not included in Annex B - oversight or are we missing something?

GEFSEC,4/27/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

14-04-2021

STAP and Council comments are included as Annex B of the CEO Endorsement document

26-04-2021

It was an oversight ? The Response to STAP comments are now included in Annex B.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - More information requested. Please provide a list studies and assessments financed under the PPG.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

16-04-2021

These below is the list of studies undertaken by local consultants as part of the PPG. They have been cited throughout the document. The following studies are included in CEO ER Package as Appendix 11.

1. SEBASTIEN MALELE MBALA, Study on ? Gestion de Ressources Naturelles ?. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.

2. Jo?l Bernardin KIYULU N?YANGA - NZO (2020) Rapport d?Etude sur la Thematique Populations Autochtones et Communautes Locales. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.

3. Boniface Mush?ayuma et Ida Mangala (2020) Strategie de Communication Projet ONU-FEM. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.

4. LILAKAKO MALIKUKA et Felix Credo (2020) Analyse des opportunit?s de prise en compte de la dimension genre. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.

5. Jean Claude BOMBULA MALASSAY (2020) Rapport d?Etude Relative aux Activit?s de Suivi-Evaluation. Pour le projet ?Gestion Communautaire des Paysages Forestiers du Grand Kivu et des Lacs T?l?-Tumba segment de la RDC?. FEM-7 Programme ? Impact sur les Paysages Durables de Bassin du Congo. Ministere de l?Environnement et de Developpement Durable (MEDD), Kinshasa, RDC.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/15/2021 - More information requested. The geo-referenced information is missing, and more detail is requested on the maps - i.e. settlements, peatlands, PAs etc. Currently, only the administrative limits are provided.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - This was addressed in an above item.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

16-04-2021

There are many georeferenced datasets that have been developed for this document. That in the CEO endorsement document is used to locate the project zones. In the description of the project locations, a relevant geospatial datasets have been used (showing protected areas, hydrology, peatlands, the transboundary nature of the projects in both the RoC and the DRC, etc.). See Figures 5, 6, 7 in the Project Document

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/12/2021 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit.

Additionally, please refer to the below comments on:

Budget

- Justify and provide further explanation about the amount of \$3.597 million for consultants. Especially in LDC and FVC, we suggest looking at existing partners on the ground (CSO, Universities, various agencies). Currently, the project is allocating 3.6m for consultants, which seems very high for consultants and invites questions regarding the sustainability of each component. Please clarify. The Secretariat would like to encourage less money to be allocated toward consultants and additional resources focused on building and maintaining local partnerships. **Cleared, budget has been revised.**
- Item #5102: Please justify the purchase of two vehicles and describe how co-financing is contributing? The GEF Secretariat strongly prefers the purchase of vehicles to come from the co-financing, but if an exception is to be made, it will come from the PMC. Please modify and provide justifications. **Vehicles have been removed, this is confirmed via email.**
- #5502 and #5503: There seems to be some ineligible M&E expenses mapped to the PMC. Please rectify
Mid-term and Terminal Evaluation: please confirm the amounts (\$80,000 in component 3 and \$92,500 in PMC). **Revised, OK**
- Please justify why there is a car rental allowance IN ADDITION to vehicle purchase? Please clarify? **Car purchase removed, cleared**
- Please clarify what the "project monitoring by MEDD" will be utilized for under component 4 for \$50,000? **OK**
- #2109 and #2110 are not reported in the vertical total column and the overall GEF investment while they represent significant investment with the communities on the ground. Please correct. **We do not see a response for this, despite correspondence over email saying it has been responded to on the review sheet? You can place the response in the comment box above or in another box, just please refer to which box.**

- As per GEF guidance GEF/C.59/Inf.03 from July 20, 2020, the GEF Budget Template should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement as an annex in the Portal. - Email response noted, but please do not send by email - please upload onto the portal. Seems to have been uploaded since this review sheet was sent back.

- \$968,881 is assigned to a partnership with the REPALEAC. We are very supportive of strong role of the REPALEAC and its national representatives as REPALEF in the proposed project. However, have you assess and review the financing management standards of REPALEAC - OK, cleared

Documents

- There is no prodoc uploaded onto the portal. Please provide. - OK

Implementation Start Date:

- It does not seem likely that this project will start implementation on the date indicated. Please revise. - OK

Rio Marker

- Should be 2 for mitigation. - OK

GEFSEC, 4/22/2021 - There are a few minor outstanding issues, please address and resubmit for consideration for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 4/29/2021 - This submission is being recommended for technical clearance. One note - please consider including this information in future PIRs and M&E docuemtns following the inception workshop on how the partnership with the Jane Goodall Institute will unfold. Thank you.

GEFSEC, 5/10/2021 -

- 1- Table A ? Focal Area outcomes are missing, please amend.
- 2- The PFD?s table D doesn?t match Table D of the child project ? we understand this child project was transferred from WB to UNEP, but the break-down between BD STAR and IP SFM Congo Set-Aside has to be the same in the child project?s table D as in the PFD?s table D. Please amend.
3. On Project Information: Kindly note that the duration should be corrected to 72 months.

4. On the Budget:

- i. Please upload the table in portal. Kindly note that the budget does not show in the ProDoc either but has been uploaded as a separate excel sheet. As per

paragraph 2 ? page 42 of the Guidelines, ?The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal. ?The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?.

ii. Procurement Specialist should be charged to the PMC ? same for office furniture and equipment and desktop equipment and accessories (as long as they are for the project?s management unit).

iii. There seems to be some confusion in the budget regarding M&E and PMC. As you will be able to see below the MTR and TE have been charged to Component 3 (Component 3: Promoting effective sustainable land use in priority landscape). Nevertheless when we looked at the M&E Budget in the Portal, the total amount there (\$654,000) matches the total of the PMC in the budget. Many expenses that are related to M&E have been charged to the PMC. Please amend.

5. On co-financing:

- Co-financing from the World Bank should be classified as ?donor Agency? (not ?other?)

- Co-financing from FAO should be classified as ?donor Agency? (not ?other?)

- Co-financing from WWF-DRC should be classified as ?CSO? (not ?other?)

- Co-financing from local provinces should be classified as ?recipient country government? (not ?other?)

6. On Gender: The gender analysis in the lacks certain level of details. It is indicated that a gender analysis will carried out during the first year of implementation. The GEF Policy on Gender requires that a gender analysis is completed prior to CEO endorsement. In addition, the submission does not include a detailed plan of action on gender. The submission includes high level principles to address gender issues and the results framework includes a number of sex-disaggregated indicator. Please provide further explanation on the reasons why a gender analysis has been delayed and provide a more detailed gender action plan.

7. On Environmental and social safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is identified as moderate, and UNEP attached Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). We also understand that during the inception workshop for the current project, a FPIC Implementation Plan will be developed to guide all project activities that relate to indigenous communities and local populations (ProDoc, page 89). However, in the Section 2 of SRIF, Safeguards Risk Summary mentioned about SS4 Community Health, Safety and Security risk as moderate, but there is no screening information on this risk. ProDoc said that ?Contingency plans will be put in place in the early days of the project to ensure that project resources are secure and staff can be safe in the case of such insecurities. Field operations will assess and factor in potential risks associated with the security situation in their quarterly plans (page 118).? But, there is no further detailed of the Contingency plans. Please

clarify regarding the SS4 Community Health, Safety and Security risk and plans to mitigate and manage this risk.

5/10/2021 - OK for all

GEFSEC, 5/11/2021 -

There are some not yet addressed:

? On co-financing:

- Co-financing from the World Bank should be classified as ?donor Agency? (not ?other?) now ?GEF Agency? which is incorrect since the World Bank is not the GEF Agency for this project.

- Co-financing from FAO should be classified as ?donor Agency? (not ?other?) now ?GEF Agency? which is incorrect since the World Bank is not the GEF Agency for this project.

? On budget: still the FULL budget in not included in Portal -- Please include in Annex E as well

Even if the budget is not in Portal, we reviewed the file in documents and still there is1 issue to be address:

(ii) KM related with the project still is charged to PMC ? it must be charged to component 4 ? only KM plan management can be charged to PMC - NOT documents and other issues -- considering there is a full KM component, all of these items must be charged to the component. This is the whole reason for having a budget with clear sources, which is meant to increase transparency.

GEFSEC, 5/11/2021 - These items are cleared. The item on stakeholder consultation has been removed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/12/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

5/10/2021

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations