

Integrated transboundary water resources management in the Corubal basin between Guinea and Guinea-Bissau

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10508

Countries

Regional (Guinea, Guinea-Bissau)

Project Name

Integrated transboundary water resources management in the Corubal basin between Guinea and Guinea-Bissau

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

3/31/2022

Review completed by PM

5/18/2023

Program Manager

Astrid Hillers

Focal Area

International Waters

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

(4/25/2022) yes, the overall project is within the type of projects typically funded under IW.

(see later though on lack of detail provided)

(2/14/23)

1. Please add Rio Markers for LD and BD as applicable (and given the core indicators one could expect one or both would be rated as 1)

(4/28/2023)

2. Addressed.

Cleared.

Agency Response

14th April 2023

Addressed, see the CEO Endorsement at pages 1 & 2. Noted that Rio Markers for LD & BD will financially be covered by the co-financing funds.

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

(4/25/2022)

1. PDO: Please explain and provide a clear map of the entire Corubal basin and the Kaliba-Corubal - unless used synonymously. Please use consistently across the entire document.
2. Outcome 1: Please be explicit and unambiguous re. the SAP signature and please substitute "signature on ministerial level" with signature by at least one Minister from each country.
3. Please spell out acronyms when used for the first time.
4. Output 1.3.2: "Innovative funding mechanism incl. private sector ... created to stimulate the restoration and improvement of land management practices in the basin": what are the funds allocated to this? It is unclear across the document what the nature, implementation, size, or funding criteria of this funding mechanism are. See comments in part II
5. Outcome 2: Please formulate a clear outcome statement for component 2 that also clearly states the transboundary relevance of the proposed pilots (here and in the description of the alternative/the project)
6. Clear and very specific results are provided for the core indicator results which leads to believe that the areas of interventions must be known at this stage (e.g. 26562 ha of land 'recovered'), yet no description on the location or implementation is given.
7. Outcome 3; output 3.2.3: "Knowledge appreciation for strengthening national and local capacities for natural and water resources management". Please reformulate to make more clear what is meant.
8. Output 3.2.4: Please respond in part II, question 3 or here (i.e. no need to duplicate): How was this long list of guidelines developed?; who requested this and who will own and implement these? On what level: regional, national, local? The detail, content and format will differ by target audience.

9. The PMC is to the \$ at 5 %. Please provide a budget breakdown of PMC (not here but in the project budget and the GEF budget template to be annexed).

(2/14/23)

1. - 3. Addressed.

4. Thanks for explaining and commented further in Part II.

5. Outcome 2.2. is an additional indicator to 2.1. and not a separate outcome. Please revise.

6. - 9. Addressed for table B and additional discussion in Part II of the PIF/review sheet.

(4/28/2023)

Comments addressed.

Agency Response

14th April 2023

1-3. OK

4. For more details, please refer to part II of this document

5. Agree with the comment. Revised, please see the CEO Endorsement at pages 3 and 108 and the PRODOC at pages 17 and 153. Note that finally the component 2 has 1 Outcome and 5 Outputs

6-9. addressed also, please see the CEO Endorsement from page 2 and the PRODOC at pages 7 and 145.

Feb 2, 2023

1. Koliba and Corubal are two names for the same watershed. Indeed, in the Guinean part of the river, the river is known as Koliba and in the Guinean Bissau part of the watershed, it is known as Corubal. For geopolitical and diplomatic reasons, the name Koliba-Corubal was retained by mutual agreement between the two parties during both the inception workshop and the PRODOC validation workshop. We also introduced in the CEO Endorsement

document and the PRODOC document different types of Maps to present and facilitate the localisation of the Koliba-Corubal river basin.

2. We have clarified the approach and substituted signing by at least one key ministry in each country. The signing will be done between ministries in charge of water resources. Please see in the CEO Endorsement document at page 2 and in the PRODOC at page 10.
3. Done in the PRODOC and the CEO Endorsement Document.
4. Innovative financing mechanisms focus on mobilising the private sector to contribute to the protection and/or restoration of the environment through the promotion of sustainable practices or the payment of compensation funds to enable the conservation and restoration of ecosystems degraded by their practices. For example, the mining sector. On the other hand, the aim is to create local economic initiatives that sustainably value ecosystem services and generate income for conservation. Examples include the promotion of ecotourism, the generation of added value for non-timber forest products.

As far as the funds allocated to this activity are concerned, on the one hand there is co-financing from OMVG and the Bioguin? Foundation, which will be used to compensate for the losses and/or degradation of the ecosystems caused by the mining companies, and on the other hand the valorisation of the natural capital, notably non-timber forest services, ecotourism.

5. Done
6. The targets to be reached are known, but the intervention areas will be confirmed at the start of the project after the TDA has been carried out, which will confirm the degraded areas and facilitate the intervention. The indicator are been calculated
7. Done, now the output is entitled "*The project contributes to the GEF IW-Learn platform (1% of the project)*", see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC.
8. See the answer in the part II, question 3.
9. Done, see the part consecrated to the budget.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

(4/25/2022) No.

1. While the co-finance has increased, please explain the nature of the investment mobilized grants via OMVG, AWF, and the EU.
2. Please attach letters of co-finance.

(2/14/23)

1. Please file the letters of co-finance in the portal and link letters of co-finance under the "evidence" column in table C .
2. Please provide informal English translations for any letters not provided in English. There is no need to have this done by an official translator but can be done by IUCN in house.
3. Please under "safeguards" provide explanation of the background and legal base of the compensation fund for the Kaleta Hydropower interconnection project (which is part of the co-finance) to provide evidence that the use for the sub-projects under component is an eligible use of these funds.

(4/28/2023)

1. Only the letter for Guinee is linked in the "evidence" column of table C.
2. See above
3. Noted.

(5/18/2023)

1. Letters of co-finance are still missing (except for Guinea). Please upload and link to the "evidence" column in table C.

2. Please make sure to attach in table C and provide an informal english translation for any of the letters that are not provided in english.

3. Notably there also does not appear to be any co-finance letter by IUCN despite the in kind contribution noted in the discussion on vehicle finance.

(5/30/2023)

Comments addressed. Thanks for the explanation on the investment mobilized portion of the co-finance under the table.

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

1. All letters have now been uploaded via the Table C 'evidence' tab. Please note that in the portal from an agency submitter account, the upload is done through the Table C, and the document appears in the RoadMap. Please note the additional co-financing and letter from IUCN, and that the Table C and Prodoc have been updated accordingly.

2. All letters have been submitted via the Table C. when submitting on the portal, this means that they appear in the RoadMap. Only one letter is in French and an English translation was provided in the previous submission, added via the Table C evidence tab, which shows up in the RoadMap.

3. Please note the co-financing and accompanying letter from IUCN, and that the Table C and Prodoc have been updated accordingly.

12 May 2023

1. The letter for Guinea is linked to the co-financing table C. The other letters have not yet been submitted and therefore were not attached in the previous submission. Please note the CEO endorsement table C has now been updated with a revised co-financing list and amount. Relevant changes have also been made to Table A and table B based on this revised co-financing number. Please note the IUCN co-financing has been removed since the project PREE closed during the PPG of this project.

2. We did provide the English translation of the letter and did upload it to the portal. However, there is only space to upload one co-financing letter per entry in table C. you will still be able to find the letter in the RoadMap section.

14th April 2023

1. Addressed, see the portal.
2. All letters of co-finance have been translated, please see the portal and annex
3. In protected areas, the Kaleta Hydropower Interconnection project is working with national institutions in charge of the PA governance and is giving compensation of degraded areas. These kinds of measures have legal basis in that the environmental safeguards laws provide such compensation measures for any investment that has an impact on ecosystems, and in the case of the Kaleta project, the interconnection line is obtained from the clearing of several hundred hectares of forest. For example, in Guinea Bissau, IBAP get compensation from OMVG to restored degraded areas affected by interconnection line of hydro-electric. Please refer to page 5 of the CEO Endorsement.

Feb 2, 2023

1. Addressed, please see the CEO Endorsement at page 5 and the PRODOC
2. Attached

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

/25/2022) The endorsement request at this point lacks sufficient detail to assess the adequateness of resources and a cost-effective design. This question will be addressed when the ER will be resubmitted.

(2/14/23)

1. Please confirm that the AWF funds are on budget/blended with the project activities and will provide direct co-finance of staff, TA and certain activities as explained under table C.

Budget and Annex E:

2. Please attach the TORs for key staff which then can be related to the budget table. It is well noted that the PM and admin staff are in fact budgeted via the PMC. Will there be co-

finance to cover these positions as e.g. the total budgeted for the project manager is only 115.2 K for the entire project duration.

3. Please show where other M&E activities besides the MTR and TE are budgeted. These would expect to appear in component 3.

4. Please cover any audit costs within the PMC or is this covered by co-finance ?

5. Please consider to increase the budget and anticipate the need for more - and potentially many more - meetings to revise the 1978 agreement (component 1).. Explanation is noted. Addressed. Please track co-finance to be able to report on it at MTR and TE.

(4/28/2023)

1. Addressed. Please track co-finance during implementation to be able to report on this at MTR and TE.

2. OMVG co-finance in terms of staff costs is excellent to see and demonstrating their interest in the project.

YET, it looks as if there are other positions added that should be included in the PMC. As shown in yellow the Admin and Finance Associate (PMU) should be covered by PMC. Similarly, the national coordinator in Guinea (PMU) should be either covered by PMC and/or co-finance. **Please address.**

3. **Not addressed.** The M&E total in the project budget template is 70 K. The M&E column does not capture any other M&E costs.

Also, please list \$ figures for M&E tasks in the budgeted M&E plan in the last column titled "Budget (GEF funds)" (section 9. of the ER - see below). These figures and the total should be consistent with the project budget in Annex E.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

M&E activity	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
Inception Workshop (IW)	No later than three months after validation of the project	OMVG /PMU/IUCN	PMU, OMVG & IUCN contr actual task
Project Inception Report	No later than one-month post IW	PMU	PMU task
Development of an M&E system and Baseline assessment	Within 6 months of project start up Within 6 months of project start up	PMU External consultants	PMU, OMVG & IUCN contr actual task

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

M&E activity	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
Inception Workshop (IW)	No later than three months after validation of the project	OMVG /PMU/IUCN	PMU, OMVG & IUCN contr actual task
Project Inception Report	No later than one-month post IW	PMU	PMU task
Development of an M&E system and Baseline assessment	Within 6 months of project start up Within 6 months of project start up	PMU External consultants	PMU, OMVG & IUCN contr actual task

4. Audit costs: Comment addressed.

5. Addressed.

(5/18/2023)

1. Addressed previously.

2. These positions are now charged to PMC. Addressed.

3. NOT addressed and agency response unclear. The last column of the "budgeted M&E table" in section 9 called "**Budget (GEF funded)**" should list USD/\$ figures for all M&E

activities. These \$ (!) figures should add up to the then modified total in the M&E column of the budget table. The M&E activities of the project (output 3.1.1) surely should have been costed and included in the budget and are beyond the MTR and TE only. The project e.g. has an M&E specialist. **Please address.**

4. and 5. Previously addressed.

(5/30/2023)

Addressed.

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

3. Please note the budgeted M&E table has been amended based on the feedback in both the portal and the Prodoc. The adjusted M&E costs now total USD 200,000. Please note that this has been updated in the Budget Annex E, indicating the M&E costs for the project.

12 May 2023

1. This is noted and we will ensure that the co-finance is monitored during project implementation. Some projects that can constitute additional co-financing are under elaboration or will be launched shortly. This is the case of the WACA project funded by WB (already validated) and the project for fishing governance under preparation and to be funded by EU.

2. Some positions, namely those related to national IWRM experts will be cover at 80% by the project and 20% by OMVG. In addition, OMVG will contribute in-kind to the implementation of the project. For example, the project management unit and staff will be housed directly in the OMVG offices, which will contribute to the cost of rent, electricity and water. Finally, OMVG's co-financing will allow the financing of a number of activities such as the TDA, the PAS, the 1978 agreement, the innovative finance mechanism, and the pilot demonstration projects. Logistically, OMVG's rolling stock will be used for the implementation of activities in the field as the two envisaged vehicles will not be sufficient to cover the entire river basin.

3. The separated out M&E costs for the MTR and TE total 70K. The rest of the M&E related activities are covered under PMU and in Components and this is now reflected in the revised M&E Plan in both the portal and Prodoc.

14th April 2023

1. AWF funding are conformed to activities to be implemented by the project. The funds will contribute to realise the TDA and the SAP by mobilising its experts and by providing the project with all the available data and logistics in the intervention area. It is important to note that the staff to be paid in the project will only be AWF staff who will contribute to the implementation of certain project activities.
2. TORs have been provided and attached. Regarding to project coordinator, we will negotiate with the OMVG to cover part of PM salary as part of the co-financing. This strategy is envisaged for all staff positions where the available budget is low. Therefore, OMVG may recruit internally and use the project funds to pay part of the salaries. OMVG co-financing is supposed to cover part of the salary PM & Admin Staff of the project.
3. Other M&E activities are budgeted in component 3. It concerns activities Activity 3.1.1.1; 3.1.1.2; 3.2.1.1; 3.2.1.2. please refer to budget file.
4. Audit cost is under GEF funding and are now included in the PMC cost
5. Revised, please see the budget

Feb 2, 2023

Important changes have been made both in the CEO Endorsement and in the PRODOC. Please have a look in the both reviewed documents.

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
(4/25/2022) Please attach. It does not appear to be included.

(2/14/23)

Annex C is provided. The total PPG grant (excluding the 18 K fee) spent plus amount committed should add up to 200 K (or 218 K if PPG fee is added in). This is not the case. Please address.

(4/28/2023)

Addressed.

Agency Response

14th April 2023

Addressed, see the CEO Endorsement at page 132 and the PRODOC at page 178.

Feb 2, 2023

Reported, the annex is included in the CEO Endorsement

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

(4/25/2022)

1. PIF targets have been provided. Please update/enter the indicators for the endorsement stage and upload the core indicator worksheet.

(2/14/23)

1. Comment addressed. Please update at MTR.
2. Core indicators 1, 3, and 4 are not mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A. Core Indicators targets need to be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A. The targets under outcome 2.1 are not consistent with targets reported under core indicators 1 and 3.
3. METT scores need to be provided for core indicator 1 at CEO Endorsement.

(4/28/2023)

Re. 2. Please add in the Results Framework in parenthesis when a core indicator or sub-indicator target is added to make tracking easier (including for indicator 7 and sub-indicators). For Example, output 1 lists an end of project target of **At least 40% of 20000 ha under improved management of the River basin show increases on biodiversity in all river basin.** In this case this is then 4000 ha. This makes it not easy to correlate to the right core indicator and assuring the numbers add up correctly.

3. Addressed.

(5/30/2023) Indicators can now be found in the RF within the respective relevant components. Addressed.

Agency Response

12 May 2023

2. We have now indicated where the Core Indicators have been added in the RF to make it clearer as requested.

14th April 2023

1. Addressed
2. Addressed, please see the annex A on the PRODOC at page 145
3. METT scores provided in core Indicator 1 of the CEO Endorsement, please refer on page 102. Note that to achieve this indicator, Capacities of OMVG and national institutions working on water resources governance will be strengthened.

feb 2, 2023

Done, see the document and annex from page 132 in the CEO Endorsement.

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

(4/25/2022)

1. Please describe the environmental threats more specific to the basin and underpin with some facts and figures. In the moment much of the text reads quite general.

- Provide information on major water uses (please provide data if you can) and pollutions sources and type of pollution in each country and what are resulting cross-sector trade-offs and/or transboundary dimensions? Please be specific.

- What are the root causes and barriers related to these (include governance and policy dimensions; interests of groups; ...)

2. Please also mention any large infrastructure and development plans that have or will have transboundary impacts.

3. Please clarify what the key transboundary dimensions are in the basin - threats and opportunities - that cannot be addressed on national level. Why is cooperation and/or coordination needed to address these key threats and/or opportunities? Why is cooperation needed to address which threats and opportunities in the basin? Note: Many of the issues mentioned could very well be initiated on national level.

4. Climate change, variability and extreme events: these are not synonymous terms but seem to be equated in the document. What is the natural variability in the region - across and within years - and what on the other hand are climate predictions ? What have been the development of patters of extreme floods and/or droughts over the last decades ?

(2/14/23)

Comments addressed in the prodoc and ER.

Agency Response

Feb 2, 2023

1. Part reviewed, see CEO Endorsement and PRODOC. In the CEO Endorsement, these descriptions rise from page 9 to page 20. In the PRODOC, they rise from page 25 to page 37. Environmental contexts
2. Mentioned in Baseline scenario, see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC. It concerns namely the project of construction of hydroelectric dam in Saltinho Station in Guinea Bissau. Also, project of electric connection line in the framework of the Kaleta Hydro-electric dam have impact in the river basin due to deforestation for the construction of the electric line.
3. Mentioned in Baseline scenario, see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC. However, the decrease of water resources, deforestation, pollution due to agricultural and mining activities, the decrease of soil fertility, the lack of financial resources, the insufficiency of the legal framework, the lack of coordination between the two countries, the unexploited hydroelectric and agricultural potential, etc. are among the transboundary challenges and opportunities linked to the watershed and which can only be solved within a transboundary framework.
4. Reviewed, refer to CEO Endorsement in page 9 and 12 and the PRODOC in pages 26 to 29. Furthermore, climate change in the region has led to variability from year to year, resulting in either droughts or floods. The long-term climatic trend in the region remains characterised by an increase in temperature and a general decrease in rainfall. However, years of high rainfall are also expected.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022)

1. The list of lessons from the baseline is appreciated.
2. Please describe related ongoing initiatives in the countries (as there is little action on the transboundary level). Please include GEF and non-GEF funded efforts that address the threats listed (e.g. incl efforts in the Fouta Djallon Highlands; IUCN coordinated efforts under WACA at the coast; etc.).
3. The endorsement request refers to the agency prodoc, yet this does not appear in the portal list . Please upload together with the ER resubmission.

(2/14/23)

Comments addressed.

Agency Response

Feb 2, 2023

1. Ok
2. Related ongoing and past project described, please see the CEO Endorsement from page 27 to 40 and the Prodoc from page 58 to 75.
3. PRODOC is developed and Included in the portal

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

(4/25/2022)

Overall, the GEF alternative (and related sections) is for the most part not clear enough about what is being done, where and by whom. Especially component 3 which covers about half of the GEF grant is not elaborated at all.

Component 1:

1. Please refer to the TDA and SAP GEF tools available via the [IW:Learn](#) website and outlining the process for their development, including processes of forming Intersectoral Committees, national consultations, development of a Shared Vision for cooperation etc. Supplementing with the listed IUCN tools will provide for a solid base for this process.
2. The text says that the "sustainable management of the KCRB include a TDA, SAP, *and appropriate policies, laws, and governance institutions*". (i) Please outline what national reforms are targeted and include this as an output. (ii) on Transboundary level: is there a longer term role for OMVG envisioned? (iii) Please outline the process of revising (drafting and negotiating) the 1978 agreement on the Corubal and outline and budget for this process (output 1.2...) (iv.) please clarify what you mean by "establishing the commission" - what steps are expected to go into this via the project ?
3. Please do not imply a GEF follow-up project in the outline. This is not automatically guaranteed and hence has no place in this project ER.

4. Please provide some detail on the innovative financing mechanism envisioned. What is the type and purpose of it ? Will it be a grant and loan vehicle? Who is envisioned to administer and to govern it? What are even draft eligibility criteria ? What project funds are allocated to it and how much other funds are required to materialize this financing vehicle ? Is it an endowment, revolving or sinking fund? Who will be able to access it? What is the innovative angle envisioned ?

5. Component 2: More detail is needed on the demonstration pilots: How were they selected (4 are mentioned by topic and with specific targets) ? Who will implement these on the ground ? Who has been consulted in the local governments and civil society etc. ? What are innovative aspects and how can these be replicated and have significance beyond the local scale ?

6. Income generation is targeted /mentioned but not included in the results framework indicators (and baseline).

7. Component 3: Please clarify who will do these activities and is partnering to produce the range of outputs? Who is the target audience for the various outputs (communication, knowledge dissemination, information sharing (what information?), and how does "knowledge appreciation" "strengthen local capacities" ?

8 . Guidelines: Please highlight who prioritized this long list of guidelines ? Will these stay on regional level or envisioned to be adopted by agencies on national level? (see earlier comment)

9. Please include a Theory of Change narrative and diagram.

10. None of the components mention gender, disadvantaged or vulnerable groups, and how these will be included in project implementation, including the pilots.

11. The Results Framework require refinement to have relevant and quantifiable indicators across many entries as well as component specific assumptions. Please feel free to ask for a call to specify this further.

12. One assumption across several rows is "socio-political stability" , yet there is little mention in the background and certainly not detail of this and its consideration in the project design and implementation in the context and rationale, baseline, or risk sections nor on the consultation and stakeholder outline. Please address.

////

(2/14/23)

1. I do not see comment 1 addressed. IUCN tools are mentioned (pg. 82 of prodoc) but no reference is made to the TDA and SAP guidance which are provided on the [IW:Learn](#) website.
2. Process has been detailed in the prodoc. Comment addressed.
3. Noted/Addressed.
4. The questions raised are not addressed. While the aim to establish an innovative finance mechanisms to fund the SAP priorities is mentioned frequently in the prodoc not even basic details are provided. Please address.
5. Addressed. << Please attach who has been consulted when and where (see also stakeholder section) below; no need to repeat here>>
6. Please include indicator in the results framework in order to assess progress during the duration (i.e. no target is expected but tracking what is key to the success of the interventions).
7. Please confirm that IUCN is performing the listed functions solely in its role as implementing agency and will not execute any of GEF project funds. Please be Please also list the activities with regards to IW_learn which are expected and budgeted for (incl. participation in IWCs and regional meetings, a website, project newsletter or results notes). Please list anticipated deliverables on communications and KM more clearly in the Results Framework. The current formulation is too vague: "One communications activity for each stakeholder every six months".
8. Noted.
9. Please provide a clearer narrative to explain the project logic, assumptions and alternatives considered. The diagram is somewhat a restatement of the project framework /table B.
10. Please elaborate with the component descriptions - specifically in component 2 - how women and men will be targeted adequately and what efforts will be made to assure access of women to finance and to be able to fully participate in the demonstration projects as well as benefit from them.
11. Addressed overall (please note specific comments to still be addressed listed above).
12. Addressed./
13. **On the budget:**
 - i. Administrative & Finance Associate (PMU), National coordinator Guinea (PMU) are charged to project component but

not PMC. Also, these should be categorized as staff costs but not other operating costs.

ii. All personnel positions are to be categorized as staff costs or consultants as relevant.

iii. Legal specialist should not be categorized as Works, but should be either consultants or contractual services as relevant.

iv. Please fill out Responsible parties column completely for all activities in the budget table.

v. The project budget include two vehicle purchase of \$80,000. Vehicle purchase is not encouraged from GEF funding. Please explore other funding sources to finance this item.

Just a comment: It is noted that in general the detail in the prodoc is well beyond the ER (as it should be) and some cross-reference from the ER to the prodoc details could therefore be very helpful.

(4/28/2023)

1. Please point me to the paras where this was addressed. In checking both the clean and TC revised prodoc I could not find the reference to the TDA/SAP guidance.

2./3 previously addressed.

4. Not addressed. This is the only text provided in the ER under the component description: "*Output 1.3.2 An innovative financing mechanism including private sector partners in the sectors identified in the SAP is created to stimulate the restoration and improvement of land management practices in the basin.*". What is envisioned in broad terms (some sort of PES scheme ?) and what funds are set aside to design and implement this in the budget?

5. and 6. addressed

7.

> IUCN role and explanation noted. Yet, if IUCN is executing the MTR and TE than that needs to be clear in the M&E plan and in the Annex E budget, where for now OMVG is listed in the column (Responsible Entity).

> **IW:Learn:** Please in the RF expand the indicator wording as it lists for three items "at least (2) without noting "(2) of what"?"

At least two (2)

At least two (2)

At least two (2)

Also: ? Good management of the project

That is a strange assumption and should be part of the project design and supervision. It is a prerequisite of the entire project.

> Please address previous comment on communications: "Please list anticipated deliverables on communications and KM more clearly in the Results Framework. The current formulation is too vague: "One communications activity for each stakeholder every six months ".

8. nothing to add

9. Expansion on the gap analysis and TOC noted. Please explicitly address link to the degradation of the highland forests as these serve as water tower for a number of rivers. Specifically, include to address and mention the submitted PFD for the Guinean Forest/the Fouta Djallon mountains (GEF ID 11142) and its protection of these areas (including addressing it in the section on coordination and cooperation) .

10. Addressed.

11./12. Addressed

13. Budget:

- i. - iii. The regional coordinator, Guinea-Bissau national coordinator and the finance, admin and procurement manager are charged to PMC.

- PMC is now slightly exceeding the regular 5 %. Please provide a justification and request for approval from GEFSEC in the next agency response in the resubmission. Please explore the investment mobilized co-finance to see if their could be cost-sharing arrangements e.g. on the admin side.

- Please also note that the OMC in table is shown as 300 K while the budget lists it as 330K. Please address.

- re IV. Responsible party column: addressed, but please see comment re. M&E costs and especially clarification on the budget holder/responsible party for the MTR and TE.

re. V. Cars: i) have you explored co-finance /cost sharing via the listed sources of investment mobilized co-finance ? ii) referring to your agency response: It is not allowable for GEF grants to pay for IUCN staff vehicle and transport costs (Please see your response: "... OMVG **and the IUCN** and will concern the specific activities of **these partners**, in particular the regional coordination of the project.).

(5/18/2023)

1. - 3. comments addressed.

4. Addressed. It is noted that the project will be based on this finance the design of this mechanism; no seed funds are envisioned in the project..

5 and 6. Previously addressed.

7.

(i) Please annotate the roles of the PMU, OMVG and IUCN in the budgeted M&E table in section 9:

For example (but please modify as applicable to this ! project):

OMVG - budget holder; contracts consultants

PMU - ... (insert role; e.g. drafting of TOR for MTR and TE)

IUCN - Oversight: Approves TOR; NO Objection to consultant selection

(ii) [IW:Learn](#): Please add: participation in bi- annual International Waters Conferences

(iii) Communications products: This seems very indicative. Please include the design of communications product targeted and in language and format appropriate for the specific stakeholder group in the communications strategy development, including timelines and targets. Please provide an indication of the anticipated/indicative timeline/delivery for the development of the communications strategy.

8. addressed previously.

9. Addressed.

10. - 12. previously addressed.

13. Thank you for the explanations including the usage of cars and motorbikes provided via co-finance by OMVG and IUCN. This also can be counted as part of co-finance by IUCN and listed in a IUCN letter of co-finance. The two cars from project budget are approved. Addressed.

In Sum: Please address remaining simple comments in comment 7.

(5/30/2023) Addressed.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

7.

-please note that the budgeted M&E table has now been annotated to include the roles of the PMU, OMVG and IUCN in the prodoc and in the portal.

-participation in International Water Conferences has been updated in the Prodoc under output 3.1.1 on p.98 and section 15 on communications and knowledge management. It has also been updated in the portal under the Knowledge management section as well as updated in the budget files under component 3, highlighted in yellow for ease of review.

-the prodoc on p.99 under Outcome 3.2, has been updated to provide more information about the design of the communication products to ensure they are tailored to a variety of stakeholders. We have also included an indicative timeline for development of the communications and knowledge management strategy.

Please note that we have amended the logframe and Table B in the CEO Endorsement to align correctly with the rest of the design of the project, by shifting the output 3.1.2 on the development of a communications strategy and placing it instead under the more relevant output 3.2.1. Please note we have also updated the Results framework to reflect this as well as aligned language in the budget file.

12 May 2023

1. Please note we have now included specific mention of the TDA and SAP guidance on the IW:LEARN website and that this will be followed and used during the project implementation. Please see p. 78 & p. 83 & p.85 of the Prodoc for the updated text.

1. In the detailed budget sheet under Output 1.3.2, there is dedicated budget allocated to hiring two consultants to design a funding mechanism and convene stakeholder workshops with private sector to mobilise implementation. Please also see p 48 & 49 in the CEO endorsement and p 90, 91 & 127 in the Prodoc where clarifications have been made.

7. The MTR and TE budget for external consultants sits within the execution budget and under the responsibility of OMVG ? as noted in the budget file summary in Annex E. Clarifications in the Prodoc (p.132) have been added to outline that OMVG is the responsible

entity but with IUCN as GEF agency in oversight of the process. Apologies for the lack of clarity in previous iterations.

IW:LEARN related indicators in the RF now updated under component 3 to provide details of the wording ?at least (2)? and wording regarding ?good project management? has been removed.

Communications deliverables in the RF have been updated to provide more detail and now include: including relevant posters/brochures/ training manuals/summary flyers from the TDA/SAP process.

9. We have added as requested information on deforestation in the highlands of Fouta Djallon is having a negative impact on all the rivers that originate there. The headwaters of the springs have been severely degraded and contribute further to the decrease in runoff and threaten the sustainability of the hydrographic system that originates in these highlands. IUCN as Implementing agency will ensure the necessary link between this project and other initiatives in the region, such under the GEF 8 Guinean Forest Biome IP to make coordination and cooperation to address environmental impact issues. *Please, see more details at pages 38&39 of the PRODOC* and updated in the portal CEO Endorsement entry.

13.

-The PMC does not exceed 5% in the resubmitted budget. The 300,000 amount is correct and the budget in annex E which has been adjusted.

-As noted above, responsibility for the execution budget for MTR and TE is under the OMVG, with oversight support from IUCN as GEF agency. This has been clarified in the Prodoc and is correct in the Annex E.

- To correctly implement the project covering a vast surface and to achieve its project objectives, it is necessary to have sufficient vehicles in good condition, given the state of the roads and the relief of the river basin. In reality, it is important to have a minimum of 6 cars, three per country, in order to cover the whole catchment area and to closely monitor the implementation of activities on the field. IUCN will provide the project with one car in each

country and OMVG will do the same. There will be a gap of 2 vehicles which will be covered by the project funds. In addition, it should be noted that additional means of transport are needed to particularly reach the most isolated areas of the river basin and where cars cannot reach during the rainy season. OMVG will provide the project with motorbikes as part of its co-financing.

14 April 2023

1. This comment is addressed in the prodoc, all steps to achieve it is described in pages 76, 81 and 82. Nevertheless, complements are provided in page 82 and 83. Please see the PRODOC.
2. OK
3. OK
4. Addressed, see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC
5. List of persons consulted attached, please see the PRODOC
6. Addressed, please the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC
7. IUCN, as implementing agency will not act as executing one and to implement directly activities in the field. All budget will be use to execute activities and achieve project objectives by executing partner. Nevertheless, part of budget affected to MTR and Final evaluation will be executed by IUCN.
8. ok
9. revised, please refer to the CEO Endorsement from page 44 to page 47 and to the PRODOC from page 76 to 78. Noted also the revision of the diagram based on the elaborated theory of change of the project.
10. Addressed, please refer to the PRODOC from page 89 to 94. For each activity dealing with women or vulnerable groups, description of how it will be implemented is given and the place of women in these process clarified.
11. Addressed above
12. Ok
- 13.

Yes, we charge this to position in project component because the amount allocated to the PMC is not sufficient and does not cover all the positions planned for the project. Also, we have categorized these positions as staff as you can see in the budget file on the first sheet.

This is corrected, all positions are now categorized as staff, please see the first sheet of the budget file.

Corrected, it's considered as consultant, please refer to first sheet of budget file.

Done, see the first sheet of budget file.

We have envisaged two cars to facilitate the implementation of the activities in the field, on the basis of one car per country. Considering the extent of the intervention area and the difficulties of mobility, it is imperative to have means of transport to facilitate the monitoring of activities in the field. It should also be noted that the cars of the stakeholders in the implementation of the project will be mobilized, in particular those of the OMVG and the IUCN and will concern the specific activities of these partners, in particular the regional coordination of the project. The \$80,000 for the cars is for coordination in each country and also maintenance.

Feb 2, 2023

The GEF alternative has been revised and completed, please refer to the CEO Endorsement and PRODOC

1. Addressed, please refer to the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC in pages 80 & 81.
2. Addressed, please refer to the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC
3. Ok

4. Addressed, please refer to the CEO Endorsement from 59 to 62 and the PRODOC from page 122.

5. For more details in this component, please refer to the PRODOC from page 88 to 93. The implementation of this component will be done by relevant national institutions, national NGO and local communities. During the PPG process, the governorates, specialised technical services (fisheries, agriculture, tourism, planning, land use, water and forestry, livestock, water and sanitation) were consulted as well as civil society organisations, the local private sector and the beneficiary populations.

The component 2 will focus on the capacity of stakeholders to change and adopt new behaviour related to their manner they use land and also improve the stakeholders capacities to conserve and/or restore biodiversity in the basin, to implement sustainable development initiatives through the basin, to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders to achieve food security, strengthen adaptation to climate change and to address international targets related to land restoration and biodiversity. The purpose of this component is to adopt new paradigm in land and ecological service used around the river basin. The main activities with strong impacts in the biodiversity and water resources governance are selected and will be applicated new way of doing with particular focus on women.

6. Addressed, please refer to the PRODOC at page 17 and the CEO Endorsement from page 101.

7. This component has two outcomes, the first is aimed at generating experience and lessons on key issues of the transboundary basin, and the second is intended at capturing and disseminating the project results, lessons and experience. This task will be the particular responsibility of the project executing agency (OMVG) and the implementing agency (IUCN). The two entities will be in charge during the project cycle of capturing, grouping, synthesising good practices, technical itineraries, successes and documenting them in the form of reports, posters, videos, brochures or papers to then disseminate and share them with state institutions linked to water and natural resources management, development partners, decentralised local authorities, populations of the river basin, research and higher education institutions, public and private communication media Concerning the communication organs, the emphasis will be much more on iconographic productions such as posters, videos etc. A major constraint for a sustainable management of the basin is the lack of knowledge about its functioning, products and services, and internal and external factors affecting it. For more details, please see the PRODOC from page 93 to 97.

8. This part is reviewed and now changed.

9. Introduce and develop. The envisaged theory of change is based on the triptych (a) if the improvement of water governance (e.g. multi-level dialogue) is done, (b) if legal and policy cooperation mechanisms and instruments are co-elaborated and adopted, (c) if pilot projects for good governance and improvement of resources use are adopted, then the quality and quantity of water and natural resources in the Koliba-Corubal river basin will be improved for the sustainable development and adaptation to climate change. Please see more details in the page 77 of the prodoc.

10. The gender issue is mainly addressed in component 2 and component 3 of the project. In component 2 of the project, the gender issue will be taken into account through the increase in the income of women who constitute the most vulnerable strata. This will consist in Support the implementation of sustainable Income Generating Activities (Improved beekeeping, Valuation of non-timber forest products, vegetable gardening), "Promote energy saving technologies (improved stoves, ovens, etc) etc.

For component 3, the gender dimension is addressed and will consist in setting up initiatives that will enable the implementation of *A gender equity, women's empowerment and mainstreaming plan*.

Furthermore, it should be noted that vulnerable groups, such as young people, will also be taken into account in the implementation of the project. Their involvement (youth and women) will be through direct implementation of some of the project activities, consultations in the various studies and development of strategic documents for the river basin (SAP, TDA, mobilisation strategy).

11. Done, see the PRODOC in pages 8 & 144 and CEO Endorsement in page 101. Besides the four main indicators, other indicators are also defined with the means of verification and the timeline to achieve them.

12. Reviewed, see the annex related to others contexts, in particular socioeconomic, institutional and political context. In fact, the sudden political changes that emanate from the forced changes in the democratic order also cause changes in the operational institutional framework and resource persons at the level of the project implementing partner institutions. For example, just one month after the launching workshop of the project formulation in the Republic of Guinea, a coup d'état occurred and led to the change of the main institutional interlocutors of the project formulation, starting with the operational focal point of the GEF. These changes are also observed in Guinea Bissau after the aborted coup d'état of February 1, 2022.

The issue is also addressed in barrier 5 (page 25 of the CEO Endorsement and page 41 of the PRODOC), in the stakeholder analysis on page 42 of the PRODOC and page 60 of the CEO

Endorsement. The section RISK analysis from page 76 to 84 of the CEO Endorsement and from page 97 to 104 of the PRODOC analysed it. Finally, the section on institutional arrangement also addresses this issue on page 127 of the PRODOC and page 85-88 of the CEO Endorsement.

See barrier 5, annexe, stakeholders analysis section and risk section, institutionnal arrangement section at page 128.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022) Yes. There is also reference to specific sections of the BD strategy, yet no BD funds designated by countries. Are these co-benefits ? There is also recognition of mitigation co-benefits with regards to improved land management. These should be quantified and listed among the core indicators.

(2/17/23) What about an estimate of GHG benefits ?

(4/28/2023)

Not addressed. See above: please contact Omid if you need support to estimate GHG benefits from land restauration.

(5/18/2023)

Comment addressed.

Agency Response

12 May 2023

The EX-ACT tool has been used to calculate GHG and submitted as annex and results recorded and updated in the core indicators and the RF. However, please note based on the assumptions in the tool, the mitigation potential is quite high. During the project inception, this calculation will be reviewed again with partners at the inception workshop to ensure the estimations are as accurate as possible.

Feb 2, 2023

Addressed: BD funds are co-benefits and will be drawn from co-financing to support ecosystem and habitat conservation and restoration actions.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022) No, see earlier comments. Section to be revised in re-submission.

1. Please also describe the OMVG co-finance (in kind). Will this contribute to PMC costs ?
2. This section (as well as elsewhere in the document) there is mention of refining details *during the PPG phase*. This needs to be updated from PIF stage. e.g. para v. states that "this (financing) mechanism *will be designed in the PPG phase including establishing criteria ...*". It does not seem to have taken place (see earlier comments). Please outline this in the resubmission.

(2/17/23) Section has been revised.

1. Agency response noted.
2. The formulation of "during the PPG phase" still appears. Please do a text search. For the funding mechanism: see earlier comment in question 3 to provide some basic information, including overall funding criteria.

(4/28/2023)

O.k. / Addressed.

Agency Response

14th April 2023

1. OK
2. Formulation substituted, please see the PRODOC on page 121 and in annex B on pages 171 and 174

Feb 2, 2023

The section is revised, you can find more details from page 49 to page 53 of the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC from page 117 to page 122. The additionality of this GEF

project will address all the gaps inherent in sustainable governance of natural and water resources in the Koliba-Corubal catchment area.

1. OMVG co-finance will contribute to activities implementation and PMC costs, more particularly missions? costs, DSA complement. Please see page 5-6 and pages 49-53 of the CEO Endorsement and pages 117-122 of the PRODOC.

2. Please refer to the CEO Endorsement from page 55 to 56 and the PRODOC from page 123 to 125. See Component 1 activities where there is more detail. We have included a funding mechanism to make analyses to see the best mechanism with structures and criteria; we have defined the structure of the innovative financial mechanism and will define the criteria during the project design

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

(4/25/2022) Yes (but details to be provided as per earlier comments).

(2/17/23) Addressed.

Agency Response

Feb 2, 2023

Done, see the CEO Endorsement from page 57 to page 58.

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

(4/25/2022) This will be reviewed in more detail in the resubmission. Please also address the following:

- Please provide a more substantive outline of the institutional sustainability (see heading) of the project and what is envisioned.

- Describe the innovative aspects e.g. of the financing mechanism and of the demonstration projects.

(2/17/23) Overall addressed. Please *during implementation* pay attention to address the long term financing including country contributions to maintain a governance mechanism for the Corubal.

Agency Response

14th April 2023

This issue will be discussed earlier during the inception workshop when the project will be launched. It's expected that countries, through the decentralized territories will contribute to the sustainable governance of water resources of the Koliba-Corubal by implementing development project in the river basin. Otherwise, decentralized territories (regions) have been given the power to mainstream natural resource and environment in the territory of their jurisdiction and state still the main actor of conservation and durability. In the specific case of the Koliba-Corubal, institution such as IBAP, Bio Guin?, G?nie Rural etc. constitute actors of durability of the governance mechanism of the Corubal.

Feb 2, 2023

Addressed, please see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC for more details.

- Addressed, please see the CEO Endorsement 60-61 and the PRODOC 123-124.

Addressed also, see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC. The main innovation of this GEF project is the establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism for the governance of natural and water resources in Koliba-Corubal. This innovative financing mechanism in the Koliba-Corubal watershed consists of four central pillars: (a) Polluter-Payers, (b) Beneficiary-Payers, (c) financial contribution from decentralised territorial entities, (d) payment for ecosystem services through carbon sequestration. For more details of this innovative financing mechanism, please refer to the PRODOC from page 122 to 123

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

(4/25/2022) Yes. Please clarify if all of the Corubal basin is addressed. The maps are not entirely clear to show the delineation of the watershed.

(2/17/23) Addressed.

Agency Response

Feb 2, 2023

Addressed, please see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC. The project will cover the entire river basin, even if for the demonstration projects/activities, only 30 villages, 15 for each country will be concerned. For politic, juridical and technical issues, the project will address gap for the entire river basin.

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

NA

Agency Response

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

(4/25/2022)

The stakeholder engagement plan should be specific for each stakeholder type/group listed:

- Please list the "national institutions responsible for the execution of the project" by name for each country.

- Please outline the specific role in the project activities for stakeholders. There seem to be a lot of repetitive entries which do not always pertain to the group or task, see e.g. the row on the role of National Civil Society.

- under the table is a summary of the "main stakeholders in the project" not all of which appear to be well described and/or obvious in the project design (e.g. specific local actors or the list of private sector players; please be specific with regard to both)

Please refine this section in the resubmission.

(2/17/23)

1. Please list who as well as when and where stakeholders were consulted during project design/ppg (annex a list of participants and dates/location of the meetings).

2. Please list specific stakeholders in engagement plan and do not just refer to other sections of the prodoc. - see earlier comment.

3. Please revise not only to add the type of local authorities and how they will be involved (row 2 of the table page 135 in the prodoc), but also revise the frequency. Now says **all** of: 'Often', 'when necessary', and 'once a year'.

4. Please list some of the key private sector entities relevant to the project and likely to be involved. What is nature of the envisioned MoUs? How are conflicts of interest avoided ?

5. UNDP, FAO, and IFAD are listed in the stakeholder table as providing parallel co-finance yet do not appear in table D (no letters provided). *Just for consideration:* it often makes sense to invite closely related projects as observers to PSC meetings to assure coordination or hold scheduled regular coordination meetings during project implementation.

6. Please note that Core Indicator 11 should be listed in the RF.

(4/28/2023)

1. Addressed in the word document of the ER, but please make sure this information is transferred into the portal.

2. Same as above - listed in the word document but does not seem to have been transferred to the ER in the portal.

3. Addressed (table starting on pg 137 of prodoc) but please enhance and refine during inception workshop)

4. Question/comment addressed in the comments on the private sector below.

5. Can you please expand on your answer. I am not sure I understand what "done" means in this context. .

6. Noted. Please see though also the earlier comment to explicitly "label" where core indicators are addressed i.e. add core indicator or sub-indicator number in brackets where their targets are in the RF.

(5/18/2023) for comment 6 - see question on results framework. Comments on stakeholders addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

30 May 2023

Noted and RF comment has been addressed

12 May 2023

1. The list in annex G,H and I of the Prodoc contains who as well as when and where stakeholders were consulted during project design/ppg. We have lists in the annexes as possible in the portal but are limited by technical issues uploading and the length of the tables. In any case, they can be all found in the Prodoc Annex G, H and I which we believe is sufficient.

2. Stakeholders engagement plan now updated and references to refer to prodoc have been removed.

5. The text on the purpose of engagement of these institutions has now been revised and consists now of complementarities and synergies with the present project. These complementarities and synergies do not need necessarily need a formal engagement as co-finance but can serve as added value during the implementation of the project. If relevant co-financing options become available during the project implementation this will be monitored and included. We are currently experimenting such an approach where several institutions,

grouped in the PLANTA platform, are mutualising their resources to elaborate together the law on mangroves in the framework of the GEF project ID: 9521. These complementarities and synergies will be discussed during specific meetings or steering committees.

6. This is well noted and the RF has been updated to clarify the core indicators.

14 April 2023

1. Comment addressed, please see the table annexed in the PRODOC & CEO Endorsement
2. Comment addressed, see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC
3. Revised, see the PRODOC at page 135 & 136.
4. Done, see the PRODOC at page 136.
5. Done,
6. Done

Feb 2, 2023

Reviewed, see the CEO Endorsement plan. For more details regarding stakeholder's engagement in the project, specifically the participation and role of each stakeholder, please refer to the PRODOC from page 131 to 137 and CEO Endorsement from 63-69

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
(4/25/2022)

1. Please upload the Gender Action Plan.

2. Please show that gender considerations have been taken into account in the project itself, i.e. in the component design.
3. Please also reflect this - as appropriate - in the Results Framework.
4. There is mention of microcredits to women, which does not seem to appear in the project description or results framework
5. How is the project addressing enforcement of existing laws on domestic violence and FGM - both of which are listed in this section?
6. The table titled :Gender Action Plan" is full of N/As. Please revise.

(2/17/23)

1. The Gender Action Plan in the ER in the portal is noted. To make this actionable part of the project, please annex and refer to it in the prodoc as well. Women's participation in Component 2 - all on the ground action - is not clear as the Gender Action Plan only describes women as indirect beneficiaries of the improvement resulting from investments but does not appear to see women - and/or other often neglected groups - as active partners in the implementation of the demonstration pilots. Please address.
2. There is no mention of attention to gender and assuring adequate and active participation of women in the project activities throughout component 2 - see earlier comment. Gender aspects should be mainstreamed and targets set. Given this it is entirely unclear how so many more women than men are DIRECT beneficiaries of the project. Please address.
3. Please mainstream gender throughout relevant project sub-components and activities and list targets for their involvement.
4. See earlier comments. Involvement and specific targeting of women in project activities needs to be made more clear and tracked via component /sub-component level indicators.
5. Noted. Please include/mention this in the gender action plan.
6. In addition, considering the noted issues related to women's access, participation and decision making in water governance it is unclear what proactive measures the projects plans to address these barriers. The gender action plan incorporates some indicators but has set low targets on women's participation (i.e. 30%). Please review/reconsider these targets and measures to ensure greater participation of women. Specifically considering that 62% of project beneficiaries are estimated to be female (indicator 11)

(4/28/2023)

Comments addressed.

Agency Response

14th April 2023

1. Addressed, please see the PRODOC at pages 89, 90, 91 93 & 94. In each activity, women and neglected groups such as young or people living with disability are considered and their interests considered.
2. Comment addressed, please refer to former answer.
3. Addressed, see previous responses
4. Done
5. Done
6. Revised, please see the CEO Endorsement from page 74.

Feb 2, 2023

1. Reviewed, see the CEO Endorsement from page 70 to 75.
2. Gender considerations have been considered in the project design. Output 3.2.3 in component 3 is exclusively dedicated to women empowerment. Output 2.2.2. Output 2.1.3, Output 2.1.2 and Output 2.1.1 contribute to strengthen women conditions of life and to improve their economic situation. So, in this project, two objectives related to women situation are targeted: firstly, the aim is to contribute to improve women condition of life and, secondly, the objective is to strengthen women economic situation and knowledge and to contribute to their empowerment.
3. Done, the results framework in the PRODOC and the CEO Endorsement
4. The micro-credit mention is removed, now the strategy is to support activities that will facilitate the women economic empowerment. This will be done in the 30 targeted villages and will consist to implement socioeconomic activities rising from lowland development and cultivation, "Supporting the value chain of cereal and market garden products, Development of sustainable vegetable gardening for women, Development of sustainable honey production and access to the market to development of non-timber forest product in the river basin. Please, refer in the PRODOC from page 88 to page 98;

5. A Gender and Community Development Expert will be recruited at full time and will work with all stakeholders to strengthen their capacities in gender issues, particularly women right and interest defence, and also will propose a timeline for the addressing gaps with regard women right.

6. Reviewed, please see the CEO Endorsement from page 73 to 75.

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

(4/25/2022) The role of the private sector is not clear , including how the private sector will "take over the financing of the GEF" focused on "... " see list. Also, please be more specific on the vast term "private sector" and focus on what are the key sectors and actors targeted by THIS project.

(2/17/23)

1. The stakeholder engagement session lists "private Stakeholders" in general as well as "Mining companies". Please provide more detail on both (who are these?) and the reasoning of nature of their engagement.
2. Please clarify what the content and aim of the intended MoUs with these entities is envisioned to address.
3. Please be more specific on who are key companies (by name and location) or small scale user groups (SMEs and/or their representatives) who have been identified during the PPG as key to be involved in the project incl. those consulted during the PPG phase.

(4/28/2023)

Comments addressed.

Agency Response

14th April 2023

1. Private stakeholders are composed here of big agriculture farming, mining companies such as BISTENE, ARESKI, Bauxite Angola in Guinea Bissau and Compagnie des Bauxites de Guinée (CBG), Compagnie des Bauxites de Kindia (CBK), Guinea Alumina Corporation, Alcoa/Rio Tinto, China Power Investment and the Société Minière de Boké (SMB) in Guinea Republic. Their engagement will consist on :

? Implement actions and activities aimed at promoting good practices in the mining sector and positively influencing mining and extractive activities to achieve inclusive socio-economic development, environmental safeguarding and sustainable development of Koliba-Corubal river basin (mining sites in particular).

? Participate in the construction of a sustainable local development process.

? Participate in the tripartite dialogue between the State, communities and mining companies in order to meet the challenges linked to the sustainability, profitability and transparency of the mining and natural resources sector, to improve the management of mining and natural resources towards greater transparency and responsibility, while respecting the rights of the population and taking into account the economic, social and environmental impacts through the establishment of a legal and regulatory framework guaranteeing the proper management of mining and natural resources.

2. Based on exposed up, the MoUs will consist on a compromise of sustainability and a commitment of private companies to adopt sustainable resource exploitation mechanisms and their commitment to contribute to the rehabilitation or restoration of resource extraction and exploitation sites after they cease their activity. These MoUs will be developed within existing legal frameworks, including environmental assessment laws.

3. Please refer to answer 1 of this section.

Feb 2, 2023

Reviewed, see the CEO Endorsement from page 76.

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
can(4/25/2022)

- Many of the risks have not been updated since PIF

- Please describe risks specific to the project and how the design addresses these or how the project creates adaptive management strategies.
- Please describe implementation risks in more detail
- Please update how the project addresses pandemic related challenges. PIF and endorsement text are similar which suggests that there has not been much attention to this.
- Socio-political stability is an assumption for many outputs in the Results Framework. What are design modifications to react to this?
- See earlier comments on climate risks; please address and update, including reference of what "will be done in the PPG phase". Clearly updating this section was missed.

(2/17/23)

1. The updated and elaborated risk section is noted including acknowledging risk of conflict arising during project implementation. This includes measures to brief and prepare staff during the inception phase.
2. Environmental risks - please clarify who (which board) will review environmental impact studies for infrastructure and mining. We assume this is done by the governments not the project (?).
3. The climate risks assessment still refers to what will be done during the PPG phase. Please revise this wording. How is the project design responding to these risks and future changes ? The risk sections lists a whole range of management options of which many are not reflected in the project design and results framework. Please be clear what was considered versus what the project design has now incorporated and/or where design is flexible to adopt a number of additional strategies during implementation.

(4/28/2023)

1. ok and important to put in place solid measures to protect staff safety.
2. The risk table still just mentions "the board" ("*In particular, environmental impact studies will be reviewed within the board.*") and further down (next row or so) talks about the "Project Board". This keeps ambiguity. The distinction of the roles of government institutions and the project need to be made clearer here and based on the agency response given.
3. Please be clearer both on the magnitude and timelines of expected impacts from CC as known. The also, please be clearer what the project will and will not/is beyond its scope to address on mitigating the impacts of floods and droughts. Pilots can surely only be a small stepping stone.

(5/18/2023) Comments addressed.

Agency Response

12 May 2023

2. We have now updated the risk table to refer to the project board only. There is no separated board, this was an omission of the word project. Please, see at page 87 of the CEO Endorsement and page 104 of the PRODOC

3. Magnitude of CC are significant and its impacts important as we can see in pages 31 & 32 of the PRODOC and pages 12 & 13 of the CEO Endorsement. With regard to timelines of the CC, it's difficult to determine it given the high variability of these phenomena in time and space. With regard mitigation in large scale, the project will implement environmental education to inform, prepare and give alternatives to people. In this was the pilot projects provide demonstration for replication and scaling at basin scale.

14 April 2023

1. OK

2. Yes, this will be done by government competent institutions. In Guinea Bissau, the AAAC (Alta Autoridade de Avalia??o Ambiental Competente or Competent High Authority of Environmental Evaluation) who elaborate the mining code and natural resource exploitation code will lead the process. In Guinea Republic, the Direction G?n?rale du Bureau Guin?en d'Etudes et d'Evaluation will lead the process.

3. Addressed, please see the PRODOC from page 100 to 105.

Feb 2, 2023

Risk updated and more described. For more details, please have a look at the PRODOC from page 97 to page 104, and in the CEO Endorsement from page 76 to page 84.

During project implementation, difficulties and conflicts may impede project implementation due to institutional problems, conflicts between stakeholders, or technical and operational

limitations of the project implementation unit. The project will be implemented by OMVG in collaboration with experienced national institutions related to natural and water resources. OMVG's project implementation will reduce the risks associated with project implementation and the mobilization of all stakeholders in both countries

The recruitment process for the project management unit at regional and national level should be rigorous and the most suitable profiles should be selected to minimise the risks associated with managing complex projects.

At the same time, during the Inception workshop, the executing and implementing agencies should conduct a risk seminar and brief all stakeholders on their roles in project implementation, synergies and complementarities and possible conflicts.

With regard socio-political stability, its note that Guinea and Guinea Bissau are characterised by unstable, fluctuating and uncertain political situations. Periods of political stability alternate with sudden and relatively long periods of instability and uncertainty. This was verified in Guinea in September 2021 and in Guinea Bissau in February 2022. To mitigate socio (political risk, the choice of OMVG, an independent organisation as executing agency is necessary

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
(4/25/2022). No.

1. Please outline the role of OMVG in the project and in the long term.
2. As per earlier comments, outline to some detail the implementation structure and budget for the innovative financial mechanism to be established. Where will it be housed and governed ?
3. Please outline the institutional structures to be involved in the demonstration projects in each country. What local government and civil society structures and initiatives will this (likely) build on ? How will these efforts be sustained post project.
4. Please outline the cooperation and/or coordination opportunities with relevant relevant GEF or non-GEF financed projects.

(2/17/23)

1. The execution roles of OMVG is noted. The question was on any long-term role but that will only be known during negotiating the revised 1978 governance framework.
2. See earlier comments to provide more clarity on the innovative funding mechanism to assure GEF alignment and sound governance and management of resources.
3. Answer noted but what about the local level activities which cannot be overseen by central government agencies e.g. outputs and activities under 2.2 ?
4. Addressed. During implementation, please also take note of upcoming GEF 8 projects and the West Africa Critical Forest Biome Integrated Program.

(4/28/2023)

1. o.k.
2. Innovative financing: Aim for innovative finance is appreciated and needed. Yet, is still too unspecified/unclear as noted in previous comments.
3. Please explain the role of IUCN as IUCN is not an executing entity. Is this role via IUCN in-kind co-finance ? Also, are local government mechanisms including extensions agents part of the supervision and project execution? If not, why not.
4. Ok. Please again take note, mention in the ER and reach out from beginning to the child projects under the GEF#11142 Guinean Forest PFD which aims at protecting the ecosystems services of this major water water of the Fouta Djallon highlands.

(5/18/2023) Comments addressed.

Agency Response

12 May 2023

2. We have now provided more details on the innovative financing mechanism, on page 60 in the CEO Endorsement and 127 in the PRODOC.

3. IUCN will act as the IA, providing oversight and general supervision of the project EA and activities. IUCN's contribution in the form of co-financing will be in-kind and in staff time.

Some pilot demonstration activities will require the strong involvement of decentralised state agents agents. This will be noted in the implementation of the activities 2.1.1.1 ; 2.1.1.2 ; 2.1.1.3 ; 2.1.2.1 ; 2.1.2.2 ; 2.1.3.1 ; 2.1.3.2 ; 2.1.4.1. ; 2.1.4.2 etc.

4. We have included text on reaching out to the GEF#11142 Guinean Forest PFD ? see response in earlier comments

14 April 2023

1. Yes, this issue will be deepened during the 1978 agreement revision and adoption. So, role of all stakeholder, particularly regional organisations of integration like OMVG or State institutions will be clarified. Nevertheless, OMVG will keep its position of leader and neutral institution for the interest and durability of shared resources, in particular water. Please, see the page 129 of the PRODOC.

2. Innovative financing is aligned with GEF financing because if we take the example of carbon sales and then the transfer of revenues to environmental conservation and/or restoration, we can see that the funds to be collected derive from GEF financing, which they will take over from.

3. These activities will be directly supervised by the PMU, the executing agency, the implementing agency and other non-state implementing partners such as NGOs. Central government institutions will nevertheless be informed of the implementation of these activities and will be invited to take part in the implementation of these activities on an ad hoc basis due to their technical expertise. For example, we have experimented such an approach in the context of the development of horticultural perimeters within the framework of the TRI GEF 6 Guinea Bissau project, where the General Directorate of Water Resources serves as a monitoring and validation agent for drilling and well-digging works. These central government institutions will also be briefed during the project steering committees.

4. Note, the project, will also during its implementation strengthen synergies will ongoing project in the field or coming initiatives in the region.

Feb 2, 2023

1. Reviewed, see the CEO Endorsement and PRODOC. OMVG is the executing agency (EA) and will, therefore, have the overall responsibility for the implementation of the project as a whole including all technical and financial matters. As EA, it will also be ultimately responsible for the achievement of all project expected achievements. This will be in accordance with the content of the project document as approved by the countries, IUCN, and the GEF, and the terms and conditions of agreements signed with IUCN. OMVG will ensure effective and efficient use of project resources in accordance with its own procedures, and those of IUCN and GEF.

2. Reviewed, see more details in the PRODOC on **Activity 1.3.2.2 description** at page 87. Concerning budget for this activity, USD **769 400** are allocated and included also the SAP process. One part of the innovative funding mechanism will be built in experiences accumulated by the Foundation Bio Guin? in fundraising and carbon market. So, the aim is to have this fund managed by the Bio Guin? foundation and its Guinean counterpart.

3. Reviewed, see the CEO Endorsement and PRODOC. At the institutional level, the ministries of agriculture, hydraulics and water resources, livestock, land use planning, fisheries, and the environment with their respective General Directorates will be involved. Each pilot demonstration project will be led by the relevant ministry or general directorate. For example, with regard to the valorisation of non-timber forest products, the Ministry of Agriculture and Environment through the General Directorate of Forestry will be the main actors in the implementation. As regards the development of sustainable fisheries plans, the Directorates-General for Inland Fisheries will implement the action with a USD 250 000 budget. For the promotion of agroforestry, the General Directorates of Water and Forests will be the main partners with a budget of USD 213,000.

4. Please refer to the PRODOC on pages 65 to 71 and in the CEO Endorsement from page 33

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

(4/25/2022) Yes. Please revise as/if needed as more detail is included in the project resubmission.

(2/17/23) Addressed

Cleared.

Agency Response

Feb 2, 2023

Done, see the PRODOC 104 to 113 and CEO Endorsement at pages 88 to 98.

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

(4/25/2022) Please address earlier comments. Please include an approximate timeline of deliverables under component 3 and sequencing of project activities.

(2/17/23)

1. Please add to mention that the project will fund to participate in the biannual International Waters Conferences and in certain regional and thematic knowledge exchanges (virtual or in person).
2. The project document includes a set of knowledge management and learning activities throughout, especially as part of its 3rd component and related outputs, including development of KM and communications strategy and products, knowledge sharing and dissemination of lessons and good practice, guidelines, training, workshops, etc. as well as participation in IW:Learn. The project document includes a budget for certain KM activities mentioned under various components and the project's results framework lists targeted KM deliverables. However, a timeline for implementing listed knowledge management activities/products has not been included. Also, it is not clear when the Communications Strategy will be developed and what its timeline will be. Please **provide a timeline for implementing listed knowledge management and communication activities/products.**

(4/28/2023) Please point on in which section and especially the timeline for KM and communication activities and products is included in the prodoc and ER. Thank you.

(5/18/2023) Comment addressed.

Agency Response

12 May 2023

The timeline for KM and communication activities and products is now included in the prodoc and portal CEO endorsement - please see the CEO Endorsement in page 105 and the PRODOC in page 131. The dissemination of results will start at the end of the first year of implementation and will continue throughout the implementation of the project. The final results will be disseminated one year after implementation and will focus on the valorisation

of PhD theses and key research. 10 main results will be disseminated and published during five years.

14 April 2023

1. effectively, the project will fund participation of the PMU in biannual International Waters Conferences and regional water events. The budget for this activity is 15 000 dollars

2. Comment addressed, please see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC

Feb 2, 2023

Done, please see the attached timeline per component on annexed documents.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022) Please provide approved and finalized safeguards documentation incl. an ESMF for the demonstration activities.

(2/17/23) Understood. Please provide in the resubmission.

(4/28/2023) Please provide in the resubmission.

(5/18/2023) Thanks for submitting. Please show approval by the safeguards coordinator within IUCN.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

Please kindly note that the ESMF for this project has gone through the IUCN internal Project Appraisal and Approval Process (PAAS). Only documents approved by the IUCN ESMS Coordinator are cleared for sharing and submitting externally to the GEF.

12 May 2023

The ESMF has now been included in the resubmission.

14th April

To be finalised

Feb 2, 2023

Draft to be finalised

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

(4/25/2022) Yes, there is an M&E plan.

- Please allow the budget to add up to the total listed and align with the project budget.
- Please assure that IUCN is not executing grant funds or request an exception for certain activities (such as the TE).
- Please allow cross-referencing to the project budget.

(2/17/23)

Responses noted. Only the MTR and TER which are done by external consultants here. Other M&E tasks are part of component 3 budgets.

(4/28/2023)

NOT addressed. Please see earlier comments on the same issue.

(5/18/2023) See earlier comments on the M&E plan budget.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

Earlier comments addressed.

12 May 2023

This has now been addressed through earlier comments.

Feb 2, 2023

Addressed

IUCN is not executing grant funds in this project but will collaborate with OMVG and executing partners to achieve project targeted objectives

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

(4/25/2022) Please provide more detail in the resubmission.

(2/17/23) Will there be any baseline household surveys for the demonstration pilots to assess and show projects impacts. Please make sure this is done.

(4/28/2023) The response is unclear and does not respond to the question. Please address in resubmission.

(5/18/2023) Response noted. Addressed.

Agency Response

12 May 2023

Addressed, please see the CEO Endorsement at pages 107 and 108. Noted that social and economic benefits are funded by the project budget and consist on supporting local communities in the river basin village to strengthen their condition of life and autonomy.

A survey on the impact of the pilot demonstration projects will be conducted in the second year of implementation and at the end of implementation. At the start of the project and during the implementation of the activities 3.1.1.1 ; 3.1.1.2.

14th April

This is well noted.

Feb 2, 2023

Done, please see the CEO Endorsement from page 100. Studies to be conducted on TDA and others relevant diagnosis studies, will allow to better known social conditions and to design strategies for the empowerment of the more vulnerable social categories (women for example) or strategies to adopt to the climate change.

Also, economic activities to be develop in the case of pilot demonstrative projects will facilitate the implementation of economic activities and add value for local communities.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022) No.

1. Please provide a detailed project budget detailing what is spent by whom on what.
2. Please also provide the summary GEF budget format in the portal endorsement request.
3. Please attach the terms of reference of staff fully and partially funded by the project and/or co-finance. Please clarify any split of technical and project management tasks in the TORs (in substance and % of work) to allow separation of technical and coordination (PMC).
4. Please attach gender action plan, completed safeguards documentation and stakeholder analysis and involvement plans.

(2/17/23)

1. and 2. attached- please see earlier more detailed comments.
3. Please provide in the next resubmission.
4. Final Safeguards documents still to be provided (as you mentioned above).

(4/28/2023)

- 1 and 2 addressed.
3. Annex noted. **Please add a list of annexes** to the Table of Contents of the 242 page prodoc.
 4. Please include in resubmission.

(5/18/2023) TORs in Annex of prodoc noted. Please - as mentioned earlier - add the IUCN approval of the ESMF.

(5/30/2023) Noted. Addressed.

Agency Response
30 May 2023

Please kindly note that the ESMF for this project has gone through the IUCN internal Project Appraisal and Approval Process (PAAS). Only documents approved by the IUCN ESMS Coordinator are cleared for sharing and submitting externally to the GEF.

12 May 2023

3. The list of annexes is now included in the prodoc
4. the ESMF is now included in the submission.

14th April 2023

1. Revisions are made in these 2 annexes
2. Same
3. Annex provides
4. To be finalized

Feb 2, 2023

1. Done, please see it attached
2. Done, please see it attached
3. To be done, ok

4. Done, see the CEO Endorsement from pages 70 to 75 for Gender Action plan and pages 62 to 64 for Stakeholders Analysis and Engagement plan. For Stakeholders analysis more details can be found in the PRODOC from page 40 to page 56.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022) Please see comments under question 3 above.

(2/17/23)

1. Please take another look though the RF and make sure that adequate and SMART indicators are used across all components. For example (only):

- 1.2. number and skills of (governance) structures is being measured by 'count' which is not a way to maeausre capacities/skills

- 1.1 Knowledge of degradation and Level of known threats are all measured in terms of percent (?). What is the meaning of that measure?

2. Please translate all fields into english

(4/28/2023) Comments addressed.

(5/18/2023) Please include the newly added CI 6 on GHGs in the Results Framework.

(5/30/2023) Addressed.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

The CI 6 is included in the RF under the component 2, Outcome 2.1.

14 April 2023

1. Revised, please see the CEO Endorsement at page 102 and the PRODOC at pages 8 and 145. Some indicators are added and other reformulated.

Translation made, see the CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC.

Feb 2, 2023

noted.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022) The project design requires more detail before technical recommendation for endorsement. The GEFSEC IW team will be available to schedule a call to clarify the comments provided.

(2/21/2023) This submission is substantially improved. Comments are provided in the review sheet.

(4/28/2023) Comments are provided in the review sheet. **Please do NOT duplicate the review sheet in Annex B.** The review sheet will be available on the GEF website.

(5/18/2023) The remaining comments are indicated in the review sheet.

Cleared

Agency Response

12 May 2023

This is well noted and the GEF Sec comments and agency responses have been removed from the Annex B. Please note that we originally included them as this has been requested for other submissions.

Feb 2, 2023

Project design reviewed, please see CEO Endorsement and PRODOC, and also all annex attached.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

(4/25/2022) Please address the council comments (Germany) in Annex B.

(2/17/23)

There may be some drafting mix up. The prodoc Annex B lists PIF Level GEFSEC comments and responses while the ER provides STAP GEFSEC PIF level comments and responses. Neither includes the Council member comments. Please address and make sure STAP and Council comments and responses are included in the ER.

(4/28/2023)

German Council member comments:

1. The request for showing greater national and sub-national ownership by relevant national and district/subnational institutions/agencies and extension services is crucial for sustainability and up-scaling. This is commented on and asked for your comment earlier in the review sheet. Please address in the resubmission in the prodoc and ER and update the answer to the German Council member accordingly.
2. EIAs are not within the mandate of the GEF and the project. Common practice of e.g. MDBs requires this to be done by the governments and the funds being provided for any such large infrastructure (incl. TORs for these).

(5/28/2023)

Comment 2 not addressed.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

Apologies for any confusion caused in our previous response to the council comment. To clarify, the project provides knowledge that government has then draw upon to develop TORs to undertake an EIA, if they choose to. It is not envisaged that the project would actually develop TORs for a EIA. The response to the Germany Council comments has been amended to clarify this.

12 May 2023

The issue of ownership of the project by the relevant actors is considered. Indeed, during the project design phase, all relevant actors were consulted, ranging from the target populations (especially in the pilot demonstration project sites) to the various governmental institutions (all the national directorates dealing with the issue of water resources governance, the issue of ecosystems and the environment, rural development, land use planning etc.). Their involvement since inception and their contribution to the identification of the pilot development project demonstrates their interest in the project and their future participation in the implementation. For more details, please see the stakeholder analysis on page 139 to page 145.

14 April 2023

Revised and now aligned, please refer to CEO Endorsement and the PRODOC

Feb 2, 2023

Done, please refer to the annex B in the PRODOC and the CEO Endorsement

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(4/25/2022) Please respond to STAP comments (Annex B).

(2/17/23) See earlier comment. Please include as there seems a mix up of Council and STAP comments.

(4/28/2023) STAP comments not included and responded to.

(5/18/2023) Please address the STAP comments listed below dated 11/22/2020:

1. Summary of STAP's views of the project

STAP welcomes this project from IUCN to support integrated, transboundary water resources management in the Corubal basin.

The project addresses a clear gap in transboundary basin governance. It provides a good analysis of the weak institutional and legal framework for transboundary cooperation. The approach is typical for TDA-SAP projects in the IW portfolio, but the context of a defunct legacy transboundary agreement can provide lessons for the revitalization of governance cooperation in similar transboundary contexts, amidst considerable capacity constraints.

There is a very good visual representation of theory of change, showing interconnections among actions and outcomes. Before CEO endorsement, STAP recommends specifying assumptions and mechanisms to enable adaptation in implementation plans.

Specific gender barriers (e.g., related to land tenure, management decision making, income opportunities, benefits sharing, etc.) remain to be identified.

The initial description of the project's knowledge management (KM) approach is very general. Specific objectives and mechanisms, as well as processes for adaptive learning, should be specified prior to CEO endorsement. Metrics for KM performance should also be provided.

(5/30/2023) Addressed.

Agency Response

30 May 2023

Please note the STAP comment has now been included in Annex B in the portal and a response is provided.

12 May 2023

The STAP comments and agency responses have now been included. Our apologies for this omission previously.

14 April

To be finalised

Feb 2, 2023

Done see, the annex B in the PRODOC from page 158 and the CEO Endorsement from page 111.

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

(4/25/2022) Please provide detail.

(2/17/23)

1. Provided in Annex C, but please separate the agency fee from PPG.
2. Please then make sure the PPG spent plus committed adds up to the 200K total.

(4/28/2023) Done/addressed.

Agency Response

14 April 2023

1. Agency fee separated to the PPG, please see the annex C in the CEO Endorsement at page 135 and in the PRDOC at page 178.
2. Now all the PPG amount spent is 200K

Feb 2, 2023

Done, see annex in the CEO Endorsement 126 and in the PRODOC at page 175.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
(4/25/2022) See earlier comment.

(2/17/23)Done, see earlier question.

cleared

Agency Response

Feb 2, 2023

Done, see CEO Endorsement at pages 8, 9, 14, 15, 18, 63, 131, 132 and PRODOC at pages 23, 24, 29, 30, 32.

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

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

(4/25/2022) The project design requires more detail before technical recommendation for endorsement. The GEFSEC IW team will be available to schedule a call to clarify the comments provided.

(3/8/23) The current submission is a step change to the previous version. Please address the comments provided and resubmit. Please be in touch for any clarifications as needed.

(4/28/2023) No, please address remaining comments. As not all comments from the last review have been addressed and to save time , the submission is returned after GPU review only. PPO comments had been included in the previous review sheet but have not all been addressed. Please resubmit as soon as possible and keeping in mind the June cancelation deadline.

(5/18/2023) Please address the remaining comments and resubmit.

(5/30/2023) Comments have all been addressed and the project is recommended for endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/25/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/17/2023	

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/1/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Background

The Corubal or Koliba is a transboundary freshwater river basin shared between Guinea and Guinea Bissau. Approximately 2.5 million people live in the river basin, of which a very large proportion resides in the Republic of Guinea. Koliba-Corubal hosts a valuable biodiversity stemming from different eco-geographical zones: humid Sudanian, Guinean and humid tropical zones. It houses a whole range of animal and plant species in critical conservation status. Water resources and biodiversity are threatened by natural and anthropogenic factors including land-use change due to cash crop expansion and plantations, pollution related to the use of pesticides and their run-off and pollutions from mining operations. The river basin is also affected by massive illegal exploitation of forest resources causing negative impacts on water resources and biodiversity. Insufficient and inadequate land and natural resources management and the lack of shared water resources governance mechanisms and instruments have over time contributed to the deterioration of water resources and biodiversity in several areas of the river basin.

Project Interventions

This IUCN implemented project will focus on the establishment of shared water resources governance instruments and mechanisms, which, given their absence, are the main cause of threats to the sustainability of the river basin affecting flows and water quality. The project will be a catalyst that will contribute to: (i) establishing a common vision guiding shared and integrated water resources management; (ii) revising the 1978 cooperation agreement on the Corubal river to current needs; (iii) ministerial level signature of a joint action plan to guide future actions at binational, national and local levels, and (iv) mobilize and involve key national and regional stakeholders in integrated transboundary management, (iv) implement demonstrative projects for future governance and sustainable management of Corubal's water resources including to define strategies for mobilizing financial resources post project closure.

Scale-up, sustainability and policy coherence

The project is build on the awareness of significant cross-sectoral and cross-national impacts that unilateral national planning and investments in water and natural resources already have on the shared basin. It will therefore aim to improve governance and cross-sector relevant guidelines on national as well as regional levels. Sustainability in the long-run requires integrated planning and governance across administrative and sectoral boundaries. The project will build on the experiences of the Gambia Basin Authority (OMVG) which will host and provide co-finance to the project. The project and the basin resources will also benefit

from coordination and cooperation of the expected GEF 8 Guinea forest Integrated Program aiming to protect the uplands and water of the Corubal and other West African rivers.

The project aims to improve management of 51700 ha, restore 26562 ha of land and bring 150000 ha under improved practices across the basin as well as improve capacities and knowledge exchange with other river basin organizations through IW:LEARN.