Conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of a lowland forest mosaic landscape in Ogun, Edo, Delta and Ondo States

Basic Information

GEF ID
10990

Countries
Nigeria

Project Title
Conservation of biodiversity and sustainable use of a lowland forest mosaic landscape in Ogun, Edo, Delta and Ondo States

GEF Agency(ies)
FAO

Agency ID
FAO: 723042

GEF Focal Area(s)
Biodiversity

Program Manager
Jurgis Sapijanskas

PIF

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/10/2022 - Cleared, provided other comments in this review sheet are addressed.

JS 4/22/2022

No, a significant redesign is necessary:

1- The PIF significantly overlaps geographically and is duplicative content-wise with the Nigerian FOLUR child project (10481, FAO, Promoting Integrated Landscape Management and Sustainable Food Systems in the Niger Delta Region in Nigeria).

Out of the 4 components of this PIF, only component 2 ("*Implementation of conservation / restoration actions within protected areas of the landscape")* can be considered different from what is planned under FOLUR. All the rest (*Integrated landscape policy, planning and management*, *sustainable agricultural practices in productive parts of the landscape*; KM and M&E) could entirely fall under FOLUR, while lacking the cocoa and palm oil value-chain approach that is included in FOLUR and would seem necessary to tackle environmental degradation in the target landscape.

Geographically, the PIF targets a landscape cutting across parts of the Ondo and Edo States, with the part in the Ondo State already fully included in the FOLUR child project. In other terms, roughly 1/3 of the landscape of this PIF is to be addressed by FOLUR, and around half of FOLUR`s landscape is targeted by this PIF.

Yet, the FOLUR child project 10481 is not even mentioned in the PIF.

It also means that this project, which follows closely the FOLUR design, is more a BD-LD MFA than a BD project, when it is to be funded entirely through BD STAR.

Please redesign this PIF into a BD project that is truly complementary to 10481. This notably includes:

- fully integrating 10481 in the baseline and building coordination and synergies with it in the PIF design;

- removing all duplications, including reconsidering the target geography and removing interventions related to integrated land use planning and management in overlapping landscapes;

- fully demonstrating the added-value and increment provided by this PIF that would warrant a separate GEF-7 project in similar or adjacent landscape.

If the target landscape remains similar in the next version of the PIF, we suggest removing or at least drastically downscaling the agriculture focus, acknowledging and leveraging instead what the FOLUR project will be doing on this dimension, most notably on the cocoa and palm oil value chains, to focus on truly complementary BD interventions. This would likely involve greatly expanding and further defining what is currently only sketched under component 2.

2- Relative to the grant requested, the project is small in scale with no clear strategy for replication / up-scaling. Please embed in the design a strong replication / up-scaling with dedicated output(s), if not national-level interventions.

3- Please take also into account the high-level comments are provided in the rest of the review sheet in the redesigning of this PIF. Comment boxes left blank are to be revisited once the redesign has been made. If the target landscape remains similar, many section of the PIF, from stakeholder engagement to gender, risks or private sector, which are very generic at this stage, should be refined by leveraging the FOLUR PPG work and should further demonstrate added-value compared to the FOLUR project.

Agency Response

- 1. Noted with Thanks

  · The proposed project's baseline and alternatives have been revised to make it fully complementary to 10481.

  · FAO notes that Component 3 of the FOLUR project includes planning and other support to Idanre Local Government Areas (LGA) in Ondo State. This LGA includes several of the forest reserves identified in the submission. In order to avoid overlap between the projects, any support provided by the present project to Ondo State will be limited to these forest reserves and would not extend into the productive landscape in Ondo State. In addition, support to Ondo State forest reserves will be concentrated on addressing threats to biodiversity from illegal hunting and logging and will exclude support for restoration (which is being funded by FOLUR). The revised proposal identifies synergies with planning, forest restoration and value chain activities being supported by FOLUR in Ondo State, in so far as these activities will contribute to biodiversity conservation at scale.

  · In Edo and Delta states, the revised submission directly targets a landscape area that is contiguous with the FOLUR landscape, effectively extending that area with a second, connecting landscape, which would be important to ensuring the sustainability of biodiversity benefits from the FOLUR project via enhanced connectivity. In addition to areas identified in Edo State, the redrawn landscape will include contiguous lowland forest areas in lowland areas of Delta State.

  · The revised submission would recognize and leverage work being done by the FOLUR project on cocoa and palm oil value chains in Ondo State in order to inform its work in the productive landscape in Edo and Delta States, particularly in Okomu Forest Reserve, while emphasizing BD aspects, including coordinating with existing private sector commitments to conserve HCV forest as part of RSPO

emphasizing BD aspects, including coordinating with existing private sector commitments to conserve HCV forest as part of RSPO certification there.

Additional synergies will be captured with the FOLUR BD work through a broader, 3-state strategy aimed at conserving and connecting areas of lowland forest biodiversity, linking to the ILM plan being developed by FOLUR. The present project would liaise with the Ondo FOLUR team and stakeholders to make them a part of this broader effort, while simultaneously benefitting from their oil palm and cocoa-related experience and learning.

2. The revised submission includes an output under Component 4 (4.2) to support uptake in other contiguous states that continue to support Nigerian lowland forests. These additional states are: Okun, Ekiti and Oyo States. Thus, the project will have a strong identification with the eco-region as a whole, one of five eco-regions in Nigeria.

3. Noted with thanks. Further inputs were provided to the indicated sections.

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 5/10/2022

1- output 1.4: "A strategic biodiversity vision to help harmonize, guide and/or reflect efforts in the three within-state portions of the combined landscape". The vision should be for the full project landscape, i.e include all 4 states (Ogun, Edo, Delta and Ondo), not just the 3 states that are not included in FOLUR. Please correct.

2- Please correct the typo in the portal entry: output 1.4 was included within 1.3

1.3 Three harmonized landscape management plans for Ogun, Edo and Delta States==1.4 A strategic biodiversity vision to help harmonize, guide and/or reflect efforts in the three within-state portions of the combined landscape== (Note: This output connects with an ILM plan being developed under a separate, GEF FOLUR project covering a contiguous portion of Ondo state).

3- Component 3: Please modify the title of the component and some of its outputs to reflect the support that is planned, as described in the alternative scenario, to nature-based tourism. As currently formulated, component seems to focus only on agriculture and NTFPs. During PPG, please consider strengthening the project's contribution to the development of a sustainable wildlife-based economy to further enhance complementarity with FOLUR.

4 - output 3.4: In line with the revisions made to the project and its core indicators, please remove "agricultural and" in the output "Participatory restoration of degraded agricultural and community forests within the target landscape."

5- outputs 3.2, 3.3 and 4.2 are formulated as outcomes, not as outputs. Please revise to make clear what the outputs will deliver in concrete terms.

Agency Response

5/17/22

Noted. Output 1.4 has been corrected to reflect coverage of within-landscape portions of four states.

Noted. The typo in the portal has been corrected.

Noted with thanks. Component 3 and Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 were revised and now refer to nature-based tourism. Very well noted to further strengthen project's contribution to the development of a sustainable wildlife-based economy in complementarity with FOLUR.

Noted with thanks. Output title and description has been revised accordingly.

Noted. All three outputs wording has been revised

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 5/10/2022-

1- Please indicate under table C how all investment mobilized was identified, including from Okomu NP Services, Ogun and Delta States. Only the investment mobilized from Edo and Ondo State are mentioned under table C.

JS 4/22/2022

Please confirm that all co-financing reported here is distinct from the co-financing already reported for the FOLUR child project 10481.

Agency Response

Noted. This is confirmed. Additional sources of cofinancing, distinct from those reported under the FOLUR project, will be explored during the PPG phase.

5/17/22

Noted with thanks. Please see additional inputs inserted under Table C.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/22/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/22/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/22/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 4/22/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/19/2022 - All cleared.

JS 5/18/2022

1- 2-4 Cleared.

3- Thank you for the revisions. Please provide the updated EX-ACT spreadsheet.

1a- Cleared

JS 5/10/2022 -

1- Thank you for the response. However:

1a. the shift of the restoration focus to forests for connectivity mentioned in the response is not reflected in table F where there are still 5,000 ha under core indicator 3.1 (restoration of degraded agricultural land). Please correct table F.

1b. There are still 15,000 ha reported under core indicator 4.3 (sustainable land management in production system), which cannot be funded through the BD focal area. Please revise, including underlying interventions of component 3, to ensure that all area reported under core indicator 4 are reported under sub-indicators 4.1 and/or 4.2.

2- Please confirm that all restoration reported under core 3 is outside of the area reported in other core indicators, i.e. there is no double counting.

3- Thank you but the target still seems very ambitious. According to the EX-ACT calculations, most of the mitigation benefits are supposed to be derived from the avoided loss of 35,347 ha of tropical moist forest out of 321,833 ha of forest at the start of the project. It is thus assumed that the deforestation rate in the area without the project is around 11% over 20 years and the project would be able to halt it completely. While the deforestation rate seems comparable to Global Forest Watch data for Nigeria over the last 20 years, and even conservative compared to past trends in Edo and Ondo specifically, it seems overoptimistic that the project would be able to curb deforestation to such an extent. Please consider revising the estimate using significantly more conservative assumptions at this PIF stage, to be refined at PPG.

4- Thank you for the additions. But please add the main assumptions used for the EX-ACT calculation and for the estimation of the number of beneficiaries under table F.

During PPG, please consider adding a target under core indicator 4.4 (HCV forest loss avoided).

JS 4/22/2022 -

1- Several indicators included in this PIF are more related to the LD focal than the BD focal area (core indicators 3 and 4.3). In GEF-7, the BD focal area funds restoration in limited cases only, when it is demonstrated that it is necessary and cost effective to deliver global environmental benefits. While it seems the proposed 5,000 ha of forest restoration (3.2) could fall into that category, the 5,000 ha of agricultural land restored (3.1) is not. Please ensure alignement with the BD focal area upon resubmission.

2- Restoration seem to be planned within the protected areas reported under core indicator 1. Please make sure that there is no double counting, i.e. any restoration work in a protected are already included under core indicator 1 should be removed from core indicator 3.

3- Please provide the assumptions and EX-ACT calculation sheet for the mitigation benefits. Please note that the proposed total target (over 28 MtCO2eq) appears to be overambitious.

4- Please include under table F a narrative explaining how the targets were derived, including assumptions/methodology used for core

Agency Response

Noted. The revised proposal shifts 5,000 ha from Indicator 3.1(restoration of degraded agricultural land) to Indicator 3.2 (restoration of forest and forest land). The project will thus support 10,000 ha of forest restoration in areas likely to benefit biodiversity, enhance connectivity and improve habitat.

Noted with thanks.

Noted, please see the EX ACT Tool attached. The appropriate rate (2.3%) of deforestation based on Nigeria's First Nationally Determined Contribution– 2021 Update. We mistakenly considered 3.2% in the previous submission. The assumptions and calculation will be further reviewed and updated during the PPG phase.

Noted, inputs were provided as requested.

17/5/22

Noted, this was corrected accordingly.

Noted with thanks. All area reported under CI-4 (10,000 ha) is now reported under Indicator 4.1

This is confirmed.

Noted with many thanks. This was revised accordingly. The total carbon balance is – 4,344,013 tCO2-eq over 20 years (5 years of implementation and 15 years of capitalization) for a total area under analysis of 249,752 hectares.

The main assumptions are: The project will avoid 90% of the expected deforestation; The project will impact two drivers of deforestation: shifting agriculture and commodity driven deforestation. Please see the revised Ex Act tool. Estimations of the number of beneficiaries will be refined during the PPG phase.

Noted with thanks. The PPG will assess the feasibility of adding an HCV target under core indicator 4.4

18/5/22

Noted with thanks. The EX Act Tool was uploaded in the portal as well.

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Cleared.

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/19/2022 - All cleared.

JS 5/18/2022-

1- Cleared.

A- Please add in the PIF the justification and PPG plans provided below on the boundaries of the landscape.

JS 5/10/2022

1a-b: cleared, thank you for the revisions.

1c: barriers have not been refined and remain overly generic. The PPG work carried out by the FOLUR child project has not been leveraged, especially on gaps in capacity for integrated landscape management planning, coordination and implementation at state and local levels. Also, the complementary barriers related to BD the project will address compared to the FOLUR child project are not sufficiently highlighted. In particular, it seems unlikely that barriers to the poor enforcement of laws intended to prevent poaching are limited to that of ranger capacities. Please revise.

2- Thanks you for the correction to the status of *Syncerus caffer* to NT. However, please correct for *Cercopithecus erythrogaster*, which is EN.

A- Thank you for the revision of the target landscape. Please explain in the PIF how the boundaries of the new target landscape were set. Please also justify, from a biodiversity perspective, why it is key for this project to also intervene in the landscapes already covered by FOLUR.

JS 4/22/2022

1) The threats identified are mainly land use change, with a very quick reference to logging and hunting. There are no root causes identified and the barriers outlined are very generic. Given the work done by the Agency for the FOLUR child project 10481 that is also partly taking place in the Ondo state and in the target landscape, a stronger root cause, threat and barriers analysis is expected for this PIF if the landscape remains the same. Please:

-1a: provide a root cause analysis

-1b: elaborate on the threats that will not be addressed by FOLUR, most notably logging and hunting (which may require other responses in the PIF design, and which would be complementary to FOLUR`s)

-1c: please refine the barrier analysis, highlighting the barriers that will not be addressed by the FOLUR child project and being more precise and elaborate on the barriers to effective PA management that the project will address.

2- Please confirm *Loxodonta africana* is present in the landscape, as IUCN`s 2021 red list assessment indicates that it is not. Please also note *Cercopithecus erythrogaster* is EN, not VU, and Syncerus caffer is NT.

Agency Response

Noted. Analysis of underlying and root causes has been added / P10-11.

Noted. These threats have been elaborated upon, and will be responded to, in the context particularly of improving forest reserve management for biodiversity.

Noted. Clarifications regarding the complementarities with the FOLUR child project were provided as requested.

Noted with thanks. Corrected. Reference to Loxodonta at Okomu has been removed; indication of uncertainty re. persistence has been added to more general reference.

17/5/22

The description of capacity-related barriers has been expanded, with the benefit of the FOLUR project analysis. A more detailed analysis covering, *inter alia*, specifics of policy-related barriers and associated incentives, will be a priority for the PPG

Noted. This is now corrected

Noted. The boundaries of the targeted landscapes presented in the map were set in order to strengthen connectivity between forest reserves. For this same reason, the landscapes in Ondo state already covered by the FOLUR project were included to enable biodiversity corridors connecting various forest reserves across the 4 states. The proposed boundaries at PIF stage will be further refined and revisited during the PPG stage following field work and ground truthing missions.

18/5/22

Noted with thanks. This was inserted in the PIF under Fig2 showing the target landscapes

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/10/2022- Cleared

JS 4/22/2022

1- Please add relevant international projects in the baseline, most notably GEF-FAO ID 10481(Promoting Integrated Landscape Management and Sustainable Food Systems in the Niger Delta Region in Nigeria) and relevant baseline included therein.

Agency Response Noted. This is now included in the baseline.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/19/2022 - All cleared.

JS 5/18/2022

D- Thank you. However the addition of "(ii) threat removal strategies, including plans to address illegal hunting and logging, agricultural

Thank you. However the addition of "(ii) threat removal strategies, including plans to address illegal hunting and logging, agricultural encroachment and overharvesting of NTFPs", which was made in the alternative scenario, is not reflected in table B. Please correct:

2.2 Site-level management and action plans developed and implemented, including: i) biodiversity monitoring and species recovery plans; (ii) capacity building of protected area personnel, including for patrolling and reducing illegal logging and hunting; (iiii)

ecotourism infrastructure to enhance and capture non-consumptive use value of forest biodiversity, e.g. bird watching at Okomu National Park; (iv) ecosystem restoration, e.g. through naturally assisted regeneration; v) awareness raising / ecotourism marketing

plan in nearby urban areas, e.g. Benin City.

All the rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 5/10/2022

1- Thank you for the inclusion of the ToC and a narrative. However, the narrative provided is entirely generic. It could apply to any project and does not convey the theory of change of this project. Please remove the narrative, and, during PPG, please refine the ToC and develop an adequate narrative.

A: Relation to FOLUR: The clarification that the comprehensive assessment and planning exercise of the FOLUR child project in the Indanre forest cluster will not be duplicated in Ondo state through component 1 is well noted. The division of labor on restoration (component 2) and on component 3 are also clear. However, the articulation between this PIF and FOLUR remains to be clarified in the following aspects:

   A.1: Please clarify in the PIF how the "Multi-stakeholder mechanism" that this PIF would create would relate to the "unified FOLUR Multi-Stakeholder Platform" of the FOLUR child project. We understand that this PIF would create a single Multi-stakeholder mechanism for the full landscape across the four states.

   A.2: the FOLUR child project is also to work on policies, capacity building for ILM and for forest landscape restoration, livelihood diversification, and a strategy for sustainable financing of forest landscape restoration. Please clarify how this PIF's outputs 1.2, 1.6, 2.3 and 3.5 do not duplicate and rather build on and complement FOLUR's work.

B: As connectivity is presented as one of the main reasons for the PIF design, please clarify the project's approach to connectivity, including if it will also address functional (which we would recommend) and not just structural connectivity, what methods and data will be used to measure landscape connectivity and ensure it is strengthened through the ILM plans, taking into account planned anthropogenic development and climate change?

C: Component 1:

C1. Strategic biodiversity vision: Please explain the added value compared to the harmonized land use plans this PIF will develop, what range of stakeholders would be involved in the visioning exercise and the anticipated status of the final document (endorsed? by what political level?).

C2. "Multi-stakeholder mechanism": Please clarify its anticipated (i) mandate (advisory only?), (ii) composition, (iii) institutional

arrangements, and (iv) how it will be set-up to persist beyond the project's lifetime.

D. Component 2 remains embryonic and significant work will be needed during PPG to identify precisely the most salient barriers and design appropriate responses. At this stage, please include a stronger response to poaching and illegal logging (which are now highlighted as a significant threat but are currently addressed only through capacity building for patrolling as a sub-sub activity within output 2.2). Please also increase the budget allocation of component 2 relative to component 3, especially as the target PA area is now close to 600,000 ha in 4 States, when component 3 will be rolled out in 3 States only and will benefit from the FOLUR baseline interventions.

E. output 2.3 and 3.5 : While it is welcomed, the project should go beyond piloting discrete financing solutions. The project should in addition deliver a financial sustainability plan for at least the Okomu National Park and contribute to its implementation. Coordination with FOLUR's work on sustainable financing of forest landscape restoration should be clarified and planned for in the PIF, and further refined during PPG.

F: Please remove "support services for ecosystem restoration, including seed and seedling production" from component 3 as this is, in our understanding, well covered by FOLUR.

G: output 3.3: Please explain what the project will do in concrete terms to improve the management of community forests for supply of wood products and other needs.

H: Please provide the number of hectares to be restored in the following para.:

- Participatory land and forest restoration: Based on skills, practices and value chains (e.g. for seedlings) developed under previous outputs, this output will support restoration of xx ha within identified priority areas, aimed at enhancing provision of ecosystem services and providing enhanced connective habitat for biodiversity.

I: The addition of output 4.2 is welcomed, but please explain how the project intends to support uptake/upscaling in practice. What will the output do in concrete terms?

During PPG, please:

- design all the capacity building activities so as to ensure institutionalization of trainings, and synergies with the capacity building provided by the FOLUR project.

JS 4/22/2022

1) Theory of change (ToC)

    1a- Please include the theory of change diagram in the portal entry upon resubmission. It is currently only in the uploaded word document.

    1b- The provided ToC diagram does not constitute an adequate ToC. While there remains diverse ways of presenting a ToC, the one provided lacks a narrative and does not outline causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance:

justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance:
https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer

Agency Response

Noted with thanks. The ToC is now included in the portal submission as well.

Noted. A narrative has been added, in line with STAP guidance. The ToC will be revisited and ~~updated~~ refined accordingly during the PPG phase.

17/5/22

Noted with thanks. The draft narrative has been removed. The theory of change will be revised, and a new narrative added, during the PPG.

Noted. The project would indeed create a single multi-stakeholder mechanism covering within-landscape portions of the four states. Working arrangements within Ondo State would need to be considered carefully in light of the planned unified FOLUR multi-stakeholder platform. For example, Ondo's participation in the multi-state platform could come under the overall aegis of the state's unified platform. This information has been added to the PIF, in the description of Output 4.1 (see footnote 28).

Noted. Output titles revised to specifically refer to the three states, along with a reference to linking to Ondo State FOLUR work. Output 2.4 (financing strategy) refers to complementarity with FOLUR project work

Noted with many thanks. This is a very important aspect indeed. The project will explore meaningful ways during the PPG phase to support functional connectivity between forest patches to support landscape corridors that facilitate movement between forest reserves. Methods and datasets to measure and monitor landscape connectedness will be identified during the PPG phase to assess wildlife movement across anthropogenic and climate-sensitive landscapes. Both structural and functional connectivity metrics for species conservation will be explored (i.e., distance to the nearest forest patch, habitat availability, observation of patch occupancy, travel between seasonal ranges, etc.).

Development and monitoring of implementation of the visioning exercise would take place under the auspices of a landscape-level, multi-stakeholder platform, possibly under a technical committee to be established for this purpose. Stakeholders would therefore include a cross section of state-level participants in the mechanism, to be nominated by the states themselves. The final vision document could be endorsed jointly by the Governors of the four participating states.

Noted with thanks. These issues will require further consultation to confirm but tentative answers are: (i) advisory, particularly at landscape level, but linked to enforceable state and LGA level policies and measures; (ii) broad-based composition (Governmental, non-governmental and civil society), with key sectors (conservation, forestry, agriculture) represented; (iii) to be determined; (iv) designed to last the period covered by the 'vision' (duration of which is TBD).

covered by the 'vision' (duration of which is TBD)

Noted. The response to illegal hunting and logging is now included explicitly under two components: Component 1, Outputs 1.3 and 1.4, specify these areas as priorities to be targeted and addressed through landscape-level strategic plans (1.3), as well as within the strategic visioning exercise (1.4), thus raising the political profile and visibility of these issues. In addition, a thematic area / sub-output for threat removal strategies has been added to Output 2.2. Of course, lessons learned under these components will be captured and disseminated under Component 4 as well, Finally, the budget has been revised, with $150,000 shifted from Component 3 to Component 2.

 Preparation of a financial sustainability plan for Okomu National Park has been included under Output 2.3. Coordination / linkage to the FOLUR financial sustainability strategy has been added to Output 3.4 description (note new numbering) and will be further elaborated during the PPG.

The outcome description has been revised to clarify that these and other actions under this Component will be undertaken only in the 3 other States non covered by FOLUR

Outputs 3.3. and 3.4, both related to management and restoration of community forests, have been combined and descriptions clarified.

Noted. 10,000 ha (corrected)

Noted. Text has been added to Output 4.2 description.

Point very well taken with thanks. This will be done during the PPG, as requested

18/5/22

Noted, this is now reflected in table B as well.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/10/2022 -

1- Table 1:

1a. Please add FOLUR interventions in the baseline scenario, and highlight the complementarity in the increment detailed in the other columns.

1b. The "With-project scenario" will have to be revised in line with comments on core indicators above.

Agency Response

17/5/22

Noted. References to the FOLUR project have been added to the baseline scenario and alternatives columns.

 Noted. Figures have been revised in the 'with-project scenario' column

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/19/2022 - All cleared.

JS 5/18/2022

-Please correct the typo in the following sentence, where 15,000 ha should be 10,000 ha according to table F and the incremental reasoning section:

- Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (15,000 Hectares) will be selected and implemented with similar concerns in mind

JS 5/10/2022-

1- Thank you, cleared.

A- The section will have to be revised in line with comments on core indicators in a previous comment box. Please also revise the PA area in this section:

- Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (==321,833 Hectares==)

JS 4/22/2022

1- Targets (less than 370,000 ha) are small overall for a $4 million project that is entirely focused on one landscape and benefits from a strong baseline. Please increase the project's ambition or thoroughly justify the apparent low-effectiveness of the project.

Agency Response

Noted. The redrawn draft landscape covers approximately 985,000 ha, including 599,457 of protected areas. To be clear, this area includes areas of forest reserves in Ondo State that are also covered by the FOLUR project; however, based on a review of the FOLUR Core indicators worksheet, there is no double counting of core indicators.

15/7/22

Noted. This has been corrected to show the correct # of hectares (599,457)

5/18/22

Noted with many thanks. The typo was corrected.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/10/2022-

2a - Cleared, to be addressed during PPG.

1- Please see comment on output 4.2. Output 4.2 should be referred to in this section of the PIF.

2b- It is still unclear what is the "multi-faceted exit strategy" is and how it relates to project outputs. Please elaborate here on how, in concrete terms, the design and existing outputs will contribute to lasting effects and what the project will do during PPG to ensure sustainability (e.g. efforts to institutionalize trainings, institutional set-up of the coordination mechanism 1.1 to ensure its persistence beyond the project) . Please remove all generic language that is not clearly linked to the project design or plans for PPG (e.g. consider deleting "*The project's combination of work at the grassroots level with initiatives at the science and policy level will contribute to lasting environmental benefits on a large scale*").

JS 4/22/2022 -

1) There is no clear strategy for replication / up-scaling. Please embed in the design a strong replication / up-scaling with dedicated output(s), if not national-level interventions.

2) Sustainability:

   2a - Please clarify the plans to institutionalize the trainings and capacity building interventions to be developed by the project.

   2b: A "multi-faceted exit strategy" is mentioned but does not appear in any output or in the alternative scenario. Please clarify what it is and make sure it is embedded in the design.

Agency Response

The revised submission expands on its goal of conserving biodiversity at the level of the Nigerian lowland forest ecoregion. This includes connecting BD elements of the integrated landscape planning work in Ondo State being undertaken by the FOLUR project with BD-focused strategic / planning work covering the present project's revised project landscape in Edo, Delta and Ogun States.

Trainings and capacity building interventions will be institutionalized with relevant governmental and non-governmental stakeholders, based on a strategy to be developed as part of the stakeholder participation plan during the PPG.

Support to sustainable financing and to institutionalization of capacity building (see 7.2a) will represent key elements of the exit strategy.

Additional elements will be devised during the PPG.

17/5/22

Output 4.2 is now described in this section, under 'Potential for replication.'

Noted. The section on sustainability has been rewritten to refer more specifically and concretely to project actions

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/10/2022- A map is provided. Please provide coordinates as text in the portal.

Agency Response

17/5/22

Noted. Coordinates were added as text as well, in addition to those embedded in the map provided

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/11/2022

1,2 Cleared.

3- Please add stakeholders related to the fight against poaching and illegal logging (enforcement, judicial, and prosecutorial institutions) and stakeholders related to the development of a wildlife-based economies (including tourism from public and private sector).

A- While we welcome the references to LDN and UNCCD-related frameworks, tools and methods, please ensure that CBD-related tools and approaches, including biodiversity mainstreaming, are included as well.

JS 4/22/2022 -

1-Please provide a short summary of consultations made to date to develop the PIF.

2- Please elaborate or add to the table the anticipated means of future engagement of identified stakeholders.

3- Most of the stakeholder list, while comprehensive, is overly generic. If the landscape remains the same, the FOLUR PPG work should be leveraged to refine the stakeholder analysis.

Agency Response

Noted. A short summary table is now provided.

Noted with thanks. Further inputs were provided as requested.

Noted, please see revised stakeholders' table. The stakeholder analysis and engagement approaches will be further refined and detailed during the PPG phase in line with the local contexts specific to each of the 4 targeted states.

17/5/22

Noted. Please see the stakeholders table with additional inputs.

Reference to CBD experience and tools has been added under 'Development Partners'

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/11/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/11/2022 - Please add the tourism sector.

Agency Response

17/5/22

Noted. Reference to the tourism sector was added, engagement will be explored during the PPG phase.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/10/2022

1- Cleared,

2- Please add the response in the portal entry to explain plans for PPG. However, the climate risk screening has not been updated. Please leverage the detailed climate risk screening already done for the FOLUR child project to provide an adequate PIF-stage screening.

3- Thank you but the risk that economic drivers and incentives for cocoa and oil palm plantations may override the project's interventions has not been addressed in the portal entry. Please correct.

JS 4/22/2022

1-Please note that the GEF expects all new PIFs and CEO Endorsements to demonstrate a strategy or action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic. This should include an analysis of emergent "risks" and "opportunities" relative to specific context for the project. Please refer to "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" (https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future) and revise the COVID risk analysis and/or other parts of the PIF accordingly. In particular, please include a more detailed elaboration on (i) risks to co-financing , (ii) the project contribution to a green recovery.

2- The climate risk screening is insufficient. Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and elaborate accordingly, which may include:

a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater acquirer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).

b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance

c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).

d.) Describing plans for climate change risk assessment and mitigation measures during PPG.

(https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf)

 3) Please address the risk that economic drivers and incentives for cocoa and oil palm plantations may override the project's interventions.

Agency Response

Noted with thanks, additional inputs were provided as requested.

Noted with thanks. An in-depth climate risk analysis will be conducted during the PPG phase. The Coordinated Regional Climate Downscaling Experiment (CORDEX) will be downloaded from the Earth System Grid Federation (ESGF) node and post-processed with the climate data operators (CDO) to interpolate rotated coordinates to regular latitude and longitude grids. GCM MPI-ESM will be used. Two future climate scenarios will be used, namely the RCP 4.5 and the RCP 8.5, ~550 and ~1000 CO_2 ppm by 2100 respectively. The different climatic variables (temperatures and precipitation) will be processed in R software to visualize average changes and climate extremes overtime, with a custom-made function allowing to compute 30-by-30-year averages for a specified climatic variable and time period.

Noted with thanks. Economic drivers associated with cocoa and oil palm plantations do indeed represent a significant risk for project interventions. In order to mitigate such risks, the project will build upon the work conducted through the FOLUR project, in order to contribute toa wider uptake within the target landscapes beyond Ondo state of BD-compatible productive practices.

17/5/22

Noted. A CR rational was provided.

Noted. This is now addressed in the portal entry

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?

Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/11/2022

1- Thank you but this part of the portal entry has not been updated. Please correct.

JS 4/22/2022

1- Please be specific on the relevant initiatives, including GEF-7 and GEF-6 projects, that the project intends to coordinate with. Please notably include the FOLUR child project.

Agency Response

Noted. Further clarifications were provided as requested.

17/5/22

Noted with thanks. References to FOLUR and other projects where relevant were included.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/10/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/18/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/11/2022 - Please refer to plans during PPG to coordinate with FOLUR's child project KM component.

Agency Response

17/5/22

Noted with thanks. A paragraph has been added to the section on Knowledge Management

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/10/2022 - Cleared.

JS 4/22/2022 -

1- The ESS risk analysis seems partial. Please notably clarify why no risks related to IPLC, (economic) displacement, have been identified?

2- Please provide supporting ESS document(s).

Agency Response

Noted. No risks related to IPLCs were identified at this stage. During the PPG phase, a full environmental and social impact assessment will be conducted and an ESM plan developed. In case safeguard 9 on indigenous peoples and cultural heritage is triggered following PPG consultations, FPIC Process will be conducted, an Indigenous Peoples' Plan developed, and project activities shall outline actions to address and mitigate any potential impacts.

Noted. ESS Screening Checklist is now provided.

art III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 4/22/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/19/2022 - The PIF is recommended for clearance.

JS 5/18/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments above and resubmit. Please also remove all highlights from the PIF.

JS 5/16/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 4/22/2022 - Not at this stage. Consulting with GEFSEC on the best way forward is recommended. Please contact jsapijanskas@thegef.org

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

During PPG, please pay special attention to:
- the project's approach to connectivity, and notably explore robust ways to support functional connectivity;
- refining the barrier analysis and corresponding project interventions related to illegal or unsustainable hunting and logging;
- the theory of change. Please refer to STAP's guidance: https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer.
- the complementarity and synergies with the FOLUR child project in Nigeria.
- strengthening the upscaling/replication strategy of the project to better foster uptake at the scale of the full Nigerian lowland forests eco-region.

Please also investigate the possibility of adding a target under core indicator 4.4 (avoided loss of HCV forest).

view Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval