



Guinea Water and Sanitation Project

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11575

Countries

Guinea

Project Name

Guinea Water and Sanitation Project

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

3/22/2024

Review completed by PM

4/15/2024

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

5/3/2024:

Cleared

4/27/2024:

Please provide references for specific data points included, including for climate information and particularly on page 5.

We note that a specific tool is being developed to contain the runoff water, via technical assistance and subsidies. In the CER and prior to CER endorsement, it will be important to describe this tool in detail and how it will be used.

For future revised submissions of PIFs or CER's, please either highlight all new additions made or provide a tracked changes version in the documents upload section. This would help ensure all changes are clearly noticed when conducting reviews.

4/11/2024:

(i) Only limited information is provided about current and anticipated changes of climate hazards, and how the LDCF funds will be used to directly address the defined climate impact problem. Please provide more specific information about the current and anticipated climate hazards, and their expected impacts on livelihoods and life for the target population, so as to define how the proposed solutions will address this climate problem.

- For example, we note the indication that "a gradual increase in temperature at an average rate of 0.13 °C per decade", but no further information is provided about current and anticipated temperature changes that are needed to adapt to. Please provide information for a range of future climate scenarios related to temperature, ideally using RCP 4.5 and 8.5 or SSP equivalent for 30 years ahead.

- With regards to temperature, we note the indication that "the largest 1-day and 5-day precipitation events are projected to increase further by 2050 under the major climate scenarios (i.e., SSP1-2.6, SSP2-4.8, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5), potentially reaching maximum values of 90 mm and 175 mm, respectively (scenario SSP3-7.0)". The project interventions would benefit from a clear understanding of the range of anticipated changes in rainfall (both as a general trend and variability) for optimistic and pessimistic scenarios, ideally RCP 4.5 and 8.5 or SSP equivalent for 30 years ahead.

(ii) The PIF indicates the main challenges to degradation of the water supply and runoff are not primarily climate related. Given this, please strengthen articulation of how the project interventions will directly focus on the impacts from the range of anticipated climatic changes and their interplay with broader development challenges. For example, we note the indication that the degradation of the water resources in the Baneeh damn resource is "predominantly attributed to deforestation, a consequence of escalating human activities, including bauxite mines". Given the runoff is "primarily attributed to heightened anthropic pressure and deforestation, the main challenge is not climate related. It follows that the anthropic pressure and deforestation will need to be addressed for investment in addressing climate impacts to be successful. Please indicate more explicitly how the project finance will cover the cost of addressing the deforestation and anthropic pressure, and the LDCF finance will cover specific climate risks.

(iii) A similar logic holds for addressing the legal and illegal mining practices in order for the climate change adaptation and residence efforts to be effective.

(iv) We also note the indication that "Water security may overall not be at risk, but this will be confirmed through a climate risk assessment, which will identify the risks linked to the exposure of project locations to climate hazards and possible impacts on the project's physical infrastructure". Please expand on the climate risk assessment. For example, what sort of assessment has been conducted prior to PIF submission? What specifically will be assessed and when, and how will this define the project activities?

(v) Please clarify what is referred to by "administrative customers". Is this referring to public institutions, businesses, or something else?

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) Comments well noted. The PCN has been updated accordingly.

(ii) Comments well noted. The PCN has been updated accordingly.

The landscape within the Baneah dam basin is a well-documented concern among water management professionals, displaying a visible deterioration predominantly attributed to deforestation, a consequence of escalating human activities, including bauxite mines, and further compounded by the increasing intensity and frequency of rainfall events associated with climatic changes. This degradation exerts two primary and interrelated impacts on the sustainability of the water resource: (1) The heightened anthropic pressure and deforestation have led to increased runoff, a phenomenon further exacerbated by changes in rainfall patterns associated with climate change. This, in turn, intensifies the transportation of solid materials, ultimately augmenting sedimentation in the Baneah dam. The result is a gradual reduction in the dam's storage capacity, impairing its longterm resource delivery. (2) The amplified runoff also results in reduced water infiltration into the ground. This diminished infiltration decreases the baseflow of the Samou river and subsequently curtails the replenishment of the main reservoir during periods outside of flood events.

To address these impacts, IDA-funded interventions include: At Baneah, replacing the hydromechanical equipment of the spillway; upgrading the monitoring system; and some minor maintenance works on the concrete structure of the spillway. At Grandes Chutes, a complete refurbishment of the hydro-mechanical equipment of the spillway, upgrade of the monitoring system and minor civil works to ensure it can pass severe and extreme floods in a safe manner, thus preventing the risk of dam overtopping and failure.

LDCF finance will primarily focus on implementing NBS measures designed to arrest landscape degradation within the upper basin; specifically, promoting soil stabilization in response to the increase in rainfall events, which in turn helps prevent sedimentation in the dam.

(iii) Comments well noted. The PCN has been updated accordingly.

Climate change exacerbates human activities; in the case of mining practices, more flooding events leads to more runoff/overflow. Since mining facilities fail to contain the contaminated water, runoff from excessive rainfall carrying the contaminated water flows to the reservoir much more often than in a scenario without climate change. As rainfall continues to increase, if no mitigating actions are in place, contaminated runoff will also continue increasing.

This Project aims to support these facilities to contain the runoff water, via technical assistance and subsidies. The specific tool to do so is in the process of being determined with client.

(iv) A World Bank Climate and Disaster Risk Screening will be conducted during PAD preparation.

Water security in the context of this Project is understood as the long-term availability of freshwater resource and the ability to provide safe drinking water supply to more people. The outcome of LDCF-funded components is to secure water resources, whereas the outcome of IDA-funded components is to assist in the distribution of water. Climate risks to achieving these outcomes will be assessed.

(v) The term administrative customers refers to public institutions.

Response to comments from 4/27/2024:

Thank you.

References included in PCN

PCN was adjusted to clarify that the specific tools/infrastructures to be implemented at the mining sites are not dedicated to containing runoff, but rather to serve as retention instruments to prevent accidental water contamination. Its mostly relates to retention devices installed below fuel reservoir, or wastewater collection pounds to prevent contaminated water to reach the river course.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

During project preparation, and prior to endorsement of the CER, it will be necessary to gain greater clarity on the extent to which soil stability is currently related to climate change vis-?-vis deforestation, and how this is anticipated to change under a range of climate scenarios in the future. Also in the CER and prior to CER endorsement, it will be necessary to specify the set of nature based solutions that will be deployed and why they were selected.

4/11/2024:

(i) Please note that sub elements of a component should be referred to as an 'outcome' (rather than a component), and sub elements of an outcome should be referred to as an 'output' (component, outcome, output). Please refine accordingly.

(ii) Please provide one or more outputs for each outcome, particularly for component 2 which is seeking the bulk of LDCF funding.

(iii) Components 1 and 3: Will these components be fully funded by co-finance? If so, please state this more explicitly. It is not sufficiently clear how these components, and their corresponding outcomes and outputs will help the target population adapt to and become more resilient to current and anticipated climate change impacts, as it is not clear that the problem is due to climate change. Therefore, unless these components are revised, they will need to be fully funded by co-finance.

(iv) Component 2: The PIF states earlier that the soil stabilization is not primarily related to climate change, but rather to deforestation. However, the PIF requests this component to be fully funded by LDCF. Therefore, it is not sufficiently clear how this component and its corresponding outcomes and outputs are focused on addressing climate change. Please address this.

(v) Importantly, please ensure the project is designed to ensure the LDCF finance will impact all components of the project, and not just component 2 which is funded by LDCF. Please ensure design of specific project elements to ensure the LDCF finance strengthens adaptation and resilience to specific current and anticipated climate impacts for the who project, including components 1 and 2. With the current articulation, it is not sufficiently clear how LDCF finance will impact the full project, including components 1 and 2. Please further articulate these linkages.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) & (ii) Components, Outcomes, and outputs updated in the GEF Datasheet and the PCN.

(iii) Components 1 and 3 are fully funded by IDA. Additional information on both components updated in the PCN

(iv) Soil stabilization is related to both deforestation and climate change, as increases in rainfall leads to more runoff. Yes, this component will be 80% LDCF-financed. The team wishes to reach 100%, given it is entirely climate related.

(v) The component 2 funded by LDCF is dedicated to strengthening the resilience of the water source for the Greater Conakry water supply system. This resilience directly impacts the durability of the investments operated under component 1: (1) investments in the new treatment facility and the new main pipe from the treatment facility to the

distribution area are directly depending on the capacity of the water source to sustainably produced the expected additional 200,000 m³/day; (2) investments in connecting new water users also depends on the water source (in quantity and quality), as they will be useless if no water or low quality water is produced.

Investments in institutional arrangements and on the financial capacity of the water utility (component 3) are also directly depending on the capacity of the utility to have enough high-quality water to distribute and sell.

Response to comments from 4/27/2024:

The intervention will cover less than 10% of basin and contemplates different types of NBS, including terracing, reforestation, and contour bunding. The share of each type (i.e., number of hectares) will be determined during project preparation phase. A ToR is currently being prepared to hire an STC/Consulting firm to diagnose the level of land degradation and the corresponding type of NBS best suited for the different terrains.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024

Please note that during project preparation and prior to CER endorsement, it will be necessary to specify how the project will ensure women's meaningful participation in water governance and related decision-making processes, as well as how women's and gender experts' views and contributions are factored in and reflected in the development of related policies and frameworks to ensure that these are gender-responsive.

4/11/2024:

(i) There is limited information provided on gender considerations. Please strengthen gender considerations in all the project components, and their corresponding outcomes and output.

(ii) With women comprising 65% of the beneficiaries of the project, please ensure that women's and gender experts' views and contributions are factored in and reflected in the development of related policies and frameworks to ensure that these are gender-responsive. Please ensure women's meaningful participation in water governance and related decision-making processes. Please ensure that under M&E, gender-specific actions are monitored and reported on, and that the GAP is budgeted. KM products developed should integrate gender dimensions.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) Specific gender-related activities are integrated here as in every World Bank project, including disaggregation of projects indicators to better monitor the diversity of the impacted population. PCN revised to include description on gender-oriented activities for SEG staff as discussed with SEG management.

(ii) this will be further developed in the GAP. All M&E and KM products will include gender dimensions. Gender-specific actions will be monitored in accordance to world bank requirements.

Response to comments from 4/27/2024:

Thank you. Comment well noted and will be included in CEO endorsement request. A brief update also provided in PCN.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

Cleared.

4/11/2024:

A) No. Please address the comments above for the question on section 2. Project overview, to clarify what the specific climate change problem is that the LDCF funds are being sought to address.

B) Yes.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A) PCN reviewed to include more clarity on the specific climate change problem. The specific climate change problem that the activities are being sought to address is the increasing intensity of the reduced annual precipitation and the increasing frequency and severity of heavy rainfall events resulting in more runoff and solid transport that exacerbate sedimentation in the Baneah Dam, thus reducing the volume of the reservoir. Both phenomena are increasing the risk of water shortage for the Greater Conakry water supply system.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

Cleared

4/11/2024:

A) Yes

B) Please address comments above for "2. Project Summary".

C) This section has not been completed. Please do so.

D) Some of the relevant stakeholders are identified, but their roles in the project are not described. Please briefly describe the role of each relevant stakeholder in the project.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A) Noted. Thank you.

B) Noted. addressed with comments above.

C) Section updated in portal

D) Noted. PCN stakeholder section updated to include more details on stakeholder roles.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

5/3/2024:

Cleared

4/27/2024:

Please include a set of key assumptions within the theory of change.

4/11/2024:

A) Please provide a concise theory of change, preferably using a diagram, that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathway, and the key assumptions underlying these.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Theory of change updated in PCN and project summary.

Response to comments from 4/27/2024.

Thank you. Theory pf change updated in the PCN

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

Cleared

4/11/2024:

Please address the comments above related to the questions on project design, components, outcomes, and outputs

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Noted. Addressed with comments above.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

Cleared

4/11/2024:

Please ensure elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Comment we noted. Under Component 4, the Project will support knowledge management and communication of project activities to different audiences. M&E will provide a tool for adaptive management and facilitate learning processes from experiences gained during project implementation. Knowledge management will be supported to facilitate the preparation and dissemination of supporting studies and lessons learned to inform future transport and coastal protection projects which will facilitate the further scaling-up following this project's lifetime.

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

5/3/2024:

Cleared

4/27/2024:

The level of ambition for the expected number of people trained is quite low. Please consider if this can be increased.

4/11/2024:

Please provide the number of people trained (core indicator 4), and number of project sector enterprises engaged (core indicator 5).

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Core indicators updated.

Core indicators 4 and 5 were calculated based on the information below:

People trained (minimum) during entire duration of project (50% women):

- SEG staff: 125 people;
- AGEE staff: 5 people;
- National Parks Agency (OGPNRF) staff: 10 people

Project Sector Enterprises Engaged:

- 1 major mining company, plus individual mining companies (approx. 20+);
- 1 or 2 agriculture companies for mangrove swamp rice cultivation.

Response to comments from 4/27/2024.

Thank you.

some updates provided to the number of people trained. total number is 235 people, with 50% women. Detailed are as follows:

- SEG: Limited by the number of staff employed at SEG - no change in number of people trained
- AGEE: Aim to expand to 10 staff (previously 5).
- National Parks Agency (OGPNRF): expanded to 100 (previously 10)

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments

5/3/2024:

Cleared

4/27/2024:

An initial indication of risk mitigation measures are required for each risk category identified, at the current stage of PIF submission/approval. Please address this comment.

4/11/2024:

i) We note the statement in the risks table that "Overall, the Greater Conakry area is not severely exposed to climate risks, other than to extreme heat and possibly wild fires.".

Given this, please clarify and justify the need for climate adaptation finance.

(ii) Given the political and governance risk is rated as high, please explain the corresponding risk mitigation measures.

(iii) We note the institutional and policy risk is rated high. Therefore, please describe these risks and the risk mitigation measures.

(iv) With regards to the execution capacity risk that is rated as substantial, please articulate risk mitigation measures beyond simply providing consultants, given the known sustainability and local capacity development limitations of simply providing consultants.

(v) Please ensure all risks have explicit risk mitigation strategies articulated, including for example the stated stakeholder risk.

(vi) Please ensure residual risks are accounted for.

(vii) We note that WB attached the Project Concept note including Environmental and Social Safeguards screening and rating for PIF stage submission and the overall ESS risk of the program is classified as substantial. However, it is not clear what kind of assessment, consultation and action plans will be developed as a part of risk mitigation measures including measures to address SEA/SH, violence against children, child labor, occupational health and safety, and client capacity. Please provide more information about potential risk mitigation measures including assessment and action plans to address potential risks.

(viii) Please provide any anticipated mitigation measures under the Fiduciary and Stakeholder risk categories.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Please note that the World Bank risk categories don't correspond 100% to those identified by the GEF. The team will be further developing an environmental and social risk assessment and a climate risk assessment as part of the PAD.

(i) Typo error: missing the word "directly" and missing the climate risks on the resource tapped outside of the area. Correct sentence is: "Overall, the Greater Conakry area is not directly severely exposed to climate risks other than to extreme heat and possibly wild fires, while the Samou basin providing the Greater Conakry water source is strongly impacted by the change in rainfall regime and the overall decrease of annual rainfall."

(ii) The project will support contracting arrangements for private sector participation for reducing non-revenue water (NRW) through Performance Contracts and will explore guarantee instruments, suitable payment structures and other forms of government support to reduce risks for prospective investors. In addition, steps will be taken to ensure that long-term sustainability of funded infrastructures via the sustainable management of the water source as a mitigation measure to political and governance risk.

(iii) This risk accounts for the limited technical and managerial capacity at SEG to supervise and implement large-scale projects and coordinate activities and at DNH to operationalize IWRM. Severe management and operational performance gaps remain at SEG and DNH. Mitigation: The project will build on the PIU of PUEG, which has proven to have adequate capacity to deliver World Bank-financed infrastructure projects. In addition, the technical expertise of a global technical assistance will be tapped to reinforce project preparation and implementation.

(iv) Similar to mitigation measures under "institutional and policy", the project will build on the PIU of PUEG, which has proven to have adequate capacity to deliver World Bank-financed infrastructure projects. In addition, the technical expertise of a global technical assistance will be tapped to reinforce project preparation and implementation.

(v) & (vi) all risks will be accounted for in the project. Further risk analysis will be conducted again at PAD and will include detailed mitigation measures

(vii) The WB conducted an assessment of the situation of violence against vulnerable people and sexual harassment in Guinea, which revealed that these risks are Substantial and need to be carefully addressed. Accordingly, as part of the Project preparation, a consulting firm has been recruited to develop a Labor Management Plan (LMP) and a plan for the management of violence against vulnerable people, including sexual harassment as well as the development of a Grievance Redress Mechanism for normal grievances and sensitive grievances. During project implementation, there will be close supervision by the World Bank of the implementation of these plans.

(viii) Extensive technical assistance will be provided to SEG (amounting to US\$5 million) to reinforce its institutional, fiduciary and technical capacity. This TA will also support DNH in stakeholder engagement in the IWRM process.

Response to comments from 4/27/2024

Thank you. Risk mitigation updated in the PCN and portal entry.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?
- c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

Cleared

4/11/2024:

Please briefly explain the potential for innovation and scale up.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Explanation added to project summary in GEF datasheet:

The project aims to address water deficit and sanitation challenges in the Greater Conakry area through a comprehensive and integrated approach. The project includes components for infrastructure investments, technical assistance, organizational transformation, and ecosystem restoration, as well as initiatives to address gender disparities and the impact of climate change on water resources.

The project's includes policy and institutional reforms, as well as its innovative approaches to water utility transformation, demonstrate potential for long-term impact and sustainability. Additionally, the project's emphasis on capacity building, knowledge transfer, and citizen engagement contributes to its potential for scale-up and replication in other regions or countries. Overall, the project has the opportunity for significant and lasting impact on water access and conservation in Guinea.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

Cleared.

4/11/2024:

Please address the comments above about articulating and focusing on and addressing climate adaptation priorities and impacts.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Comments above addressed in the GEF datasheet and PCN.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

5/3/2024:

Cleared

4/27/2024:

At this stage of PIF submission/approval, it is necessary to kindly provide a list of stakeholders consulting during PIF development, including dates or ranges of dates that the stakeholders were consulted.

4/11/2024:

No. Please provide a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

A stakeholder Engagement Plan is currently being developed for the project. This is part of IWRM framework, engaging with stakeholders is part of the project. To date, stakeholder engagement is only with institutional stakeholders which include all ministries in the country.

The key stakeholders of the project include government employees employed by the Ministry of Energy, Water and Hydrocarbons (MEHH) and the Ministry of Urban Planning and Habitat and Territorial Development (MINUHAT) as well as all the other ministries involved in the implementation of water infrastructure (like Environment, Health etc.), SEG, DATU, Guinea Agency for environment Evaluation (AGEE).

Response to comments from 4/27/2024.

Stakeholder section updated as follows:

Mission carried out 4/22 ? 4/26, which involved stakeholder consultations with the following entities:

? AGEE (Guinea Agency for Environment Evaluation)

? SEG (Guinea Water Company)

? OGPNRF (National Park Agency)

? Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development

? DNH (National Direction of Hydraulics)

? Representative of local community, including mayor of Massisse commune

? Rusal CBK Mining Company

Field visit with all of the above stakeholders was carried out on 4/20

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

No PPG grant is requested.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

4/27/2024:

Cleared

4/11/2024:

(i) Please explain the extenuating circumstances, if any, which resulted in the letter of endorsement being provided by the GEF OFP on April 3, 2024, although the deadline for PIF submission with the OfP endorsement letter was March 20, 2024. Please also explain if there are extenuative circumstances why the PIF resubmission with the OfP letter of endorsement was not submitted until April 11th, 2024. Please provide this explanation in the review sheet as well as the PIF.

(ii) Please reflect in the Portal entry and General Project Information section, the same designated executing entities as indicated in the OFP's LOE. Currently they are different.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

(i) the World Bank had been engaging with the country extensively, however the signing of the OFP endorsement letter was delayed due to unforeseen circumstances in the country. While the letter was signed on April 3rd, it was not received by the World Bank team to submit until April 11th.

(ii) Executing entity updated as per LOE.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's CommentsThank you.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

4/11/2024:

Yes

Agency's Comments Thank you.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

5/3/2024:

Recommended for technical clearance, pending any further comments from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

4/27/2024:

A reduced set of comments are still required to be addressed.

4/11/2024:

Not yet. Please address the comments.

Agency's Comments

Thank you.

Comments addressed above.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

(i) During project preparation, and prior to endorsement of the CER, it will be necessary to gain greater clarity on the extent to which soil stability is currently related to climate change vis-?-vis deforestation, and how this is anticipated to change under a range of climate scenarios in the future. Also in the CER and prior to CER endorsement, it will be necessary to specify the set of nature based solutions that will be deployed and why they were selected.

(ii) Please note that during project preparation and prior to CER endorsement, it will be necessary to specify how the project will ensure women's meaningful participation in water governance and related decision-making processes, as well as how women's and gender experts' views and contributions are factored in and reflected in the development of related policies and frameworks to ensure that these are gender-responsive.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/12/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		