

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

**Review PIF 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

**Agenices**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

7/31/2019

**Review completed by PM**

9/25/2019

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The STAR allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Project/Program taxonomy

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

Part II – Project Justification

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**



**Agency Response**

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## **Agency Response**

### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## **Agency Response**

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## **Agency Response**

### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### **Agency Response**

#### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### **Agency Response**

**18/09/2019:**

PPG Request completed by UNEP after the transfer of the proposal from the WBG to UNEP as Implementing Agency.

**14/10/2019:**

The agency received further clarification on the issue of the rejected request. The wrong completion of Table A of PPG seems to be the reason for rejection. The table A is now corrected, Programming of Funds now indicates for BD DRC Star Allocation.

UNEP thanks the reviewer for helping to correct the wrong completion of the table.

#### **Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of**

generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**2 August 2019:**

The PPG request is rejected as per the Program Lead guidance, because of the transfer of the proposal from the WBG to UNEP as Implementing Agency.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 10/7/2019 - In the column Programming of Funds, BD Focal Area should be charged under BD STAR Allocation, not to IP SFM Congo Set-Aside. Please revise accordingly and resubmit.

GEFSEC, 10/21/2019 - The review item above has been addressed and this PPG request is cleared.

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		