

Strengthening the Sustainable and inclusive management of the marine protected area of Grand-Bereby, recognized as particularly important for the conservation of biodiversity in Cote d'Ivoire

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11007

Countries

Cote d'Ivoire

Project Name

Strengthening the Sustainable and inclusive management of the marine protected area of Grand-Bereby, recognized as particularly important for the conservation of biodiversity in Cote d'Ivoire

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/13/2022

Review completed by PM

6/17/2022

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/17/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/16/2022:

A- The execution agencies shown in the first page of the portal entry are different from the executing partners endorsed by the OFP in its LoE (?Ministry of Environment, Protection and Nature and Sustainable Development?). Please:

- either revert in the portal entry to the executing partners shown in the LoE. The execution will then be changed as necessary during PPG. A new LoE or an email from the OFP supporting new execution arrangements would have to be presented in the CEO approval package.

- or provide with the resubmission an email or new LoE from the OFP supporting the new execution arrangements presented in the PIF.

Part I: Project Information 

GEF ID 11007			Project Type MSP
Type of Trust Fund GET	CBIT/NGI CBIT No	NGI No	Project Title ⓘ Strengthening the Sustainable and inclusive management of the marine protected area of Grand-Bereby, recognized as particularly important for the conservation of biodiversity in Cote d'Ivoire
Countries Cote d'Ivoire			Agency(ies) UNEP
Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ Abidjan Convention in collaboration with OIPR/Ministry of Environment, Protection and Nature and Sustainable Development and National Coastal Environment Management Program (PNGEC)			Executing Partner Type Government

B- Given the project is primarily dedicated to the creation of a protected area, please use the BD-2-7 entry point in Table A instead of BD-1-1, as was the case in the previous submission.

JS 5/5/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response
17 June 2022

- A. ? The Executing Agency is now corrected to reflect what is in the OFP Endorsement Letter. If necessary relevant supporting documents will be provided at CEO endorsement to justify any change of the EA.
- B. BD 2-7 is now reflected in the portal

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 6/17/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/15/2022 -

A- There is no proportionality between GEF and co-financed PMC: GEF financed PMC represents 10% of GEF project financing, while only 5.2% of co-funding devoted to components is allocated to PMC. Please ensure proportionality by, for example, increasing the co-funding amount on PMC to \$905,000 instead of the current \$500,000. Ideally the the GEF contribution to PMC would be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC increased to reach proportionality. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented at CEO Approval stage.

	Sub Total (\$)	1,220,424.00	9,500,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)			
	GET	122,042.00	500,000.00
	Sub Total(\$)	122,042.00	500,000.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	1,342,466.00	10,000,000.00

B- GEF Project Financing amount requested in Portal (\$1,342,466) is higher than the amount included in the Letter of Endorsement (\$1,320,000) ? Please either change the amount requested in Portal to that in the LoE, or provide a new LoE.

During PPG, please:

- streamline output formulations, which are currently overloaded and blur the project logic

- strengthen the project contribution to long term MPA financial sustainability. The project should contribute to setting up the financial sustainability strategy, technical capacity and tools (e.g. conservation trust fund, PFP) with the full network in mind.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Please correct the syntax of of the project objective e.g., "To increase the management effectiveness of the Grand-B?r?by Marine Protected Area (MPA)".

2- Financial sustainability: the PIF must go beyond developing a business plan (sub-activity of output 1.1.2) to address long-term financial sustainability of the MPA through dedicated output(s). As the PIF states that the Grand-B?r?by MPA is the first in a series of MPAs to be created, we further recommended using this PIF to work on the financial sustainability of the full anticipated network of MPAs, and not just of the Grand-B?r?by MPA. The project should contribute to setting up the financial sustainability strategy, technical capacity and tools (e.g. conservation trust fund, PFP) with the full network in mind.

3 - Community involvement in MPA management: From table B or the description of the alternative scenario, it is unclear how the community is to be involved in MPA

management beyond the platform of output 1.1.1, e.g. in participatory monitoring, enforcement, or community contracts as mentioned in the baseline. Please clarify and make it explicit in table B and the alternative scenario as appropriate.

4- Barrier 1 mentions inadequate policy and regulatory framework, and several parts of PIF mention that the project would "strengthen the legal and institutional framework". However, from table B and the description of the alternative scenario, it is unclear how the project is to address inadequate policy and regulatory frameworks? While there are several references in the PIF to a contribution to the ICM masterplan, the project, as we understand it, will only work on the MPA and not the broader policy or regulatory framework. Please explain (linking to specific outputs) and revise table B and the alternative scenario as necessary, including deleting the reference to contribution to the ICM masterplan from the PIF or adding it explicitly in table B.

5- All project outputs seem to focus on activities within the MPA with no output to ensure coordination of MPA management with the larger landscape/seascape. Please either clarify table B and the alternative scenario if it is already planned, or consider including it in the project design, at a minimum in the mandate of the the platform 1.1.1.

6- There is no proportionality between GEF funding allocated to PMC and co-finance allocated to PMC. 10% of GEF project funding is allocated to PMC, when only 5.3% of project co-finance is allocated to it. Please revise to ensure proportionality.

Agency Response

17 June 2022

A. PMC and GEF grant have been adjusted in the PIF and portal to respect the proportionality between the GEF grant and co-financing.

B. The GEF amount has now been adjusted to be in line with the amount in LoE

At PPG:

- The project output will be streamlined at CEO endorsement
- The project contribution to long-term MPA financial sustainability including to set up the financial sustainability strategy, technical capacity, and tools (e.g. conservation trust fund, PFP) with the full network in mind, will be completed taking into consideration the outcome of the discussion with the Foundation of Parks and Reserves of Cote d'Ivoire

15 June 2022

1. The correction is done in the PIF document. Many thanks for drawing our attention to this, very well appreciated. Ref. Part II Table B.

2. Ivory Coast has since 2003 established in line with the law 2002-102 related to the management and financing of national parks and nature reserves, the Parks and Reserves Foundation of Cote d'Ivoire (FPRCI). During the PPG, discussions will be conducted with the Foundation on the possible options of a sustainable financing model for the MPAs network which the project will support with Grand-B?r?by MPA as a pilot. Output 1.1.2 has been revised to incorporate this suggestion.
3. As per the guidance, output 1.1.1 has been reformulated to expand community participation in MPA management. Ref: Table B and output 1.1.1 of Component 1 description.
4. Barrier 1 has now been amended to include the issues related to policies and legal framework. Furthermore, the component 1 output 1.1.1 description has been amended to include capitalization of the GEF 6 project for implementation of the recommendation in the current project.
5. Table B and components descriptions in the alternative scenarios have been amended to extend project activities to the entire Grand-B?r?by Landscape and Seascapes.

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 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/5/2022 - We note the 1:7.4 co-financing ratio with a very good level of investment mobilized. During PPG, please consolidate co-financing, exploring in particular private sector co-financing.

1- Grant are usually "investment mobilized" while in-kind co-financing are almost systematically recurrent expenditures. Please correct the lines highlighted below or justify the categorization:

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	800,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Ivorian Office of Parcs and Reserve (OIPR)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00
Donor Agency	Debt Swap Facility 3rd C2D3	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,000,000.00
Donor Agency	KfW-Germain Cooperation	Grant	Investment mobilized	5,000,000.00
GEF Agency	UNEP-Abidjan Convention Secretariat	In-kind	Investment mobilized	200,000.00
Donor Agency	UNDP- Cote d'Ivoire	Grant	Investment mobilized	500,000.00

2- Please correct the typo "Debt Swamp Facility".

3- Please explain below table how the investment mobilized have been identified.

Agency Response

15 June 2022

1. The co-financing category has now been corrected
2. The typo on 'Debt Swap' has now been corrected in the table.
3. How the investment is mobilized is now described under the co- financing table

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 5/5/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 5/5/2022 - Cleared

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 5/5/2022 - 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 6/17/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please reassess the target on core indicator 4 as only direct impacts resulting from the project should be included. In particular, the development of a plan without implementation support is not sufficient to report on core indicator 4.

JS 6/15/2022 -

A- core indicator 4: Please explain to what correspond the 260,000 ha on core indicator 4 and confirm that it does not include any PA. Core indicator 4 should capture the work the project will be doing on land around the MPA.

C- Core indicator 1 and 2: Since the PA has not yet been officially created (it is still awaiting its decree), please report the Grand B?r?by MPA under core indicator 1.1 and 2.1 (creation) instead of 1.2 and 2.2, which are restricted to MPAs that already exist.

B- core indicator 2: It seems that there was a typo and core indicator 2 should be corrected to 246,207 ha according to the map provided. Only a total of 38,192 ha are reported on core indicator 1 and 2, when the section on GEBs further down in the PIF states that the MPA encompasses 260,000 ha, and the map provided shows a surface area of 259,778 ha.

- Improved management of 1 protected areas (Grand Bereby) encompassing 260,000 ha, as measured by increases on METT scores of at least 20% over the baseline [to be defined during the PPG]

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- We note the Grand-B?r?by is not yet registered in the WDPA. Please ensure that the MPA is registered as part of PPG or, at the latest, project implementation.

2-Please break down the total area of the MPA into its land and marine area: the land area of the PA (13,571 ha according to the map provided in annex A) should be reported under core indicator 1.2 and only the marine area under core indicator 2.2 (24,6210 ha). Only one METT should be carried out and apply to both marine and land parts, as the METT is based on the management unit. That is, at CEO endorsement and during implementation, please report the same METT score under indicators 1.2 and 2.2 and only a single METT excel sheet/tracking tool.

3- Please clarify whether the project intends to have any direct impact outside of the MPA, and capture these impacts accordingly in core indicators 4 and 5.

4-Please add under table F an explanation on how the number of direct beneficiaries was derived.

Agency Response

17 June 2022

A. Core indicator 4 is now corrected and it reads 444,029 ha instead of 260,000 ha. During the PPG more precise mapping will be done and all the landscapes affected either as AMP or as surrounding landscapes impacting the AMP will be produced and precise information will be provided.

C - changes on core indicators 1.1 and 2.1 have been made in the portal

B ? Change to core indicator 2 has been adjusted to 246,207

15 June 2022

1. The guidance is very well noted. The process of registering GB PA in the World Data Base of Protected Area will be initiated during the PPG and if not completed will be pursued during the first years of the project implementation. During the PPG, all relevant information needed for registration will be collected and provided.
2. The Table F and Core Indicator worksheet are now amended to consider the guidance provided. At CEO endorsement, a METT Excel will be provided and updated at Middle Term and Terminal Evaluation.
3. While we recognize that there are no specific interventions with direct impacts outside the PA, it is good to note that whole component 2 is about the Income Generating Activities and valorization of value chains. However as indicated in component 2 description, there will be a feasibility study that will clarify all the concrete impactful activities within and outside the MPA landscape and seascapes. At CEO endorsement details of these activities will be provided including the anticipated impacts in relation to the core indicators. Ref: Component 2 description
4. A footnote is provided in Table F and in the GEB section to explain how the number of beneficiaries is obtained.

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 JS 5/5/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please:

- refine the root cause analysis, which should also be linked to marine-based threats identified in the PIF

- refine the barrier analysis, notably clearly separate and further specify the barriers related to policies from those related to institutions, and explore the barriers related to MPA sustainable financing.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Please revise the root cause analysis. Currently all root causes are related to land-based pressures and threats. They are not explicitly linked to the marine-based threats identified in the PIF, e.g. Unsustainable Fishing, Poaching of marine wildlife species.

2- Please refine the barrier analysis:

2a: Barrier 1: please separate barriers related to policies and institutions, from barriers related to capacity. In doing so, please be more specific on what are the institutional barriers the project will address, and consider breaking down the different capacity gaps to be addressed in a couple of barriers.

2b. Please revise barrier 2: the title is related to "weak opportunities" when the narrative elaborates on lack of awareness on opportunities and thus the need to communicate. Beyond lack of awareness, aren't there barriers related to technical and financial capacity to seize opportunities related to sustainable/nature-based livelihoods ?

2c : Please explain why no barrier related to finance for MPA management are identified.

Agency Response

17 June 2022

We took note and appreciate the guidance on the need to refine during PPG:

- The root cause analysis, which will also be linked to marine-based threats identified in the PIF
- The barrier analysis, notably to clearly separate and further specify the barriers related to policies from those related to institutions, and explore the barriers related to MPA sustainable financing.

15 June 2022

1. A paragraph is now included to highlight some of the root causes related to land-based pressure. More comprehensive root causes will be provided at CEO endorsement.
2.
 - a. Barrier 1 has been amended and will be finetuned during PPG
 - b. Barrier 2 has been amended as per guidance
 - c. As explained above, Cote d'Ivoire has the Foundation of Parks and Reserve whose role is to mobilize resources for investment in PA management. During the PPG, discussions will be conducted, and agree on the modalities for financing GB PA.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

At CEO approval request, please provide the Grand-B?r?by MPA creation decree and a detailed baseline of the MPA's operational status.

We note that PPG will conduct an analysis of past experiences with Community Conservation Agreements.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Grand-B?r?by MPA:

1a-Please clarify the legal and operational status of the MPA (creation decree, existing management board, management plan, infrastructure, staff, equipment, financial mechanism/budget line, community involvement, etc.) ?

1b- The ToC diagram seems to imply that the creation decree has not yet been signed when the rest of the text says it already exists. Please explain.

2- Please clarify to what extent community contracts mentioned in the PIF are used in practice in Côte d'Ivoire, and whether the project plans to do so. If so, please add it explicitly in table B and alternative scenario.

3- Given the potential for collaboration and synergies, please refine the description of GEF ID 10875 - IUCN - "Using Marine Spatial Planning in the Gulf of Guinea for the implementation of Payment for Ecosystem Services and Coastal Nature-based Solutions", which has now been Council approved.

4- Please add the following project to the baseline:

GEF ID 9911 - UNEP - Strengthening of the Enabling Environment, Ecosystem-based Management and Governance to Support Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem

5- Please correct the following typos:

The 3rd C2D Dept Swamp Program: The 15 billion CFA francs include 10 billion CFA francs in endowment funds for the Ehotilé Islands National Park and the nature reserves of Mabi-Yaya, Lamto, Haut Bandama and Mount Nimba and 5 billion CFA francs for the management, protection, development and enhancement of national parks

Agency Response

17 June 2022

We confirm that at the CEO approval request, the Grand-Bany MPA creation decree will be provided together with a detailed baseline of the MPA's operational status.

We also confirm that the analysis of past experiences with Community Conservation Agreements will be conducted.

15 June 2022

1. a. the status of the PA is now clarified
Ref: Baseline section
- b. The first indicator in the ToC diagram referred to the Adaption of the decree.
This is now supported in the text indicating the status of the MPA.
2. It is now clarified that the Community Contract is a provision of the Law establishing the Foundation of Parks and Reserves. During the PPG, an analysis of the experience of these communities' contracts and

recommendations will be considered for effective use in the implementation of the GB MPA.

3. Addressed
4. GEF ID 9911 ? now added
5. The typos are now corrected

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please:

-refine the ToC. While there remains diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the 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: <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

- prioritize as needed the set up of a functional, sustainably funded MPA with strong involvement of local communities. The response on the limited funding available is well noted. Previous review comments requesting clarification on project intervention related to larger scale connectivity and EBSAs should not be understood as a request to spread scarce resources even more thinly, on the contrary.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Please see comments on table B and address them in this section as needed.

2-

2a -As already commented on table B, it is not clear what the project intends to do in terms of "strengthened legal and institutional framework". Please clarify in the PIF.

2b - As all project interventions seem to be within the MPA, please also explain what the project would do in relation to EBSAs (especially the ones that are not overlapping with the MPA) and connectivity of marine corridors beyond the MPA's boundary. Please clarify, throughout the PIF, all the instances where there is a reference to connectivity, corridors or EBSAs accordingly:

This proposed project will be complementary to the above initiatives and projects, and specifically addressing barriers to the protection of the Cote d'Ivoire Coastal zone marine Biodiversity, through the setting up of a fully functional MPA, promotion of sustainable management of coastal resources and its associated biodiversity, supported by a strengthened legal and institutional framework, improved skills of the Ivorian Office National Parks and Reserves and other stakeholders to monitor and mitigate threats to Marine biodiversity, and promotion of a multi-sectoral approach to address the loss of marine biodiversity.

The planning efforts conducted by the Integrated Management of the Marine and Coastal Area of Abidjan to Assinie (GIAMAA) project to identify Ecologically or Biologically Significant marine Areas (EBSAs), as well as the Marine Spatial Planning tool apply by IUCN as outlined above will be complemented and expanded by the current project. It will build on these efforts to facilitate connectivity of marine corridors, identified EBSAs such as: Canyon and Sous-Marine de Tabou (50 km of coastline), the road of turtles and sardines (over 300 km), the Tropical breeding ground for Cote d'Ivoire tuna, the Abidjan-Assinie (220 km long), the Aire Marine d'Assinie (80 km), etc. to address ecosystem functionality, and promote transformational changes in marine biodiversity conservation, and put in place the basis for long term fisheries management in pilot site along the Cote d'Ivoire Coastal line.

The project objective is to increase the Effective conservation measures for Grand-Béréby Marine Protected Area (MPA). This will provide direct support for the operationalization of the Grand-Béréby MPA, and the conservation and management of biodiversity of international importance EBSAs and marine corridors in the Cote d'Ivoire portion of the Guinean Current large marine Ecosystem.

3- Please provide an accompanying narrative for the Theory of change (ToC) diagram, and please refine the ToC during PPG. While there remains diverse ways of presenting a ToC, key issues are to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the 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: <https://www.stagef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

4- Please elaborate on each output, giving an idea of their anticipated scope and underlying approach/method/activities. It notably includes:

- Output 1.1.1: Please clarify what would be the mandate (advisory only?) and institutional positioning of the platform vis-a-vis existing bodies, including the MPA management board.

- Output 1.1.3: Please clarify what type of agreements are foreseen for what added value.

- Output 1.1.4 : Please clarify how the trainings will be institutionalized for their sustainability beyond the project lifetime and replication in the other MPAs to be created.

- Output 2.1.2:

- Please clarify the approach that will be taken to ensure that the AIGA are truly alternative and provide BD benefits. The link between livelihood interventions and environmental benefits is indeed not automatic (see e.g. Roe, Dilys, et al. "Are alternative livelihood projects effective at reducing local threats to specified elements of biodiversity and/or improving or maintaining the conservation status of those elements?." Environmental Evidence 4.1 (2015): 22; or the USAID analysis

projects/measuring-impact/mi-project-resources/integrating-livelihood-and-conservation-goals-a-retrospective-analysis-of-world-bank-projects/at_download/file?subsite=biodiversityconservation-gateway). Please thus clarify the strategy or criteria that will be put in place to insure that the GEF incremental funding on the livelihood interventions of output 2.1.2 does contribute to the generation of global environmental benefits.

- Please clarify the approach that will be taken to ensure that the AIGA will be sustained beyond the project's lifetime.

Agency Response

17 June 2022

We take note and confirm that during the PPG, the ToC will be refined in order to communicate clearly, through a diagram and a narrative, the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect and the justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. This will be done taking into consideration of the STAP's guidance: <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>

The set-up of a functional, sustainably funded MPA will be prioritized as needed with strong involvement of local communities and the project intervention related to larger-scale connectivity and EBSAs with efficient use of resources in mind

15 June 2022

1. As indicated in the response to previous comments, Table B has been amended
2. a. As indicated above, the project will build on the recommendation from the study under Cote d'Ivoire GEF 6 project to design the institutional capacity-building activities in line with coastal environment management including the MOA.
b. Clarifications have been provided in the PIF in relation to connectivity, corridors, or EBSAs. The concrete specific actions will be detailed after the feasibility studies envisaged but also after the recommendation of the GEF 6 Ivory Coast Integrated Project. However, it should be understood that due to the limited funding envelope for this project the ambition will be realistic to consider what can be done within the project level of finance.
3. A narrative is now provided to accompany the ToC. The ToC diagram will be revised at PPG using the STAP's guidance: <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/theory-change-primer>.
4. More details are provided now for the referred output in the component description.

The reference to EBSAs and Marine corridors has been addressed as indicated

in response to previous comments.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/5/2022 - 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 6/15/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Please revise so that the baseline scenario reflects the contributions of the baseline projects, in particular GEF ID 10875 and 9911, and be more precise in the increment provided by this proposal compared to these two particular projects.

2- Please clarify to what part of the project corresponds the reference to EBSAs and Marine corridors, or remove:

With GEF support, direct support will be provided for the operationalization of the Grand-Béréby MPA, and the conservation and management of biodiversity of international importance, EBSAs and marine corridors in the Cote d'Ivoire portion of the Guinean Current large marine Ecosystem. By supporting the operationalization of the Grand Bereby MPA and expanding conservation efforts to include EBSAs and Marine corridors, the GEF investment will contribute to the protection and sustainable use of marine-coastal Biodiversity of global, national, and local importance. By capturing results of EBSAs and Marine corridors developed by Partners to design the ICM Master Plan, the project will further contribute to the protection of the Grand-Bereby MPA, as well as important areas for fish production, and large scale ecological processes. GEF support will

Agency Response

15 June 2022

1. Addressed in the incremental cost analysis section
2. The issues related to EBSAs and Marine corridors have been addressed in previous related comments.

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 5/5/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/16/2022 - Cleared.

During PPG, please pay specific attention to sustainability and fostering replicability for the 4 other planned PAs.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Sustainability: please see comment in previous comment boxes on financial sustainability, institutionalization of training/capacity building, community involvement, sustainability of alternative livelihood interventions. Current elaboration says it would achieve sustainability of some of these interventions but does not explain how the projects intends to do so.

2- Scaling-up: Please clarify which outputs will be of direct use or readily replicable for the other MPAs that are set be created in Cote d'Ivoire. Please notably see suggestion to address financial sustainability of the anticipated network of MPA, not just that of the Grand-B?r?by with this project.

Agency Response

17 June 2022

We take note and confirm that during PPG, specific attention will be given to sustainability and fostering replicability for the 4 other planned PAs.

15 June 2022

1. Addressed in the sustainability subsection.
2. Addressed the potential for scaling up sub-section

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 5/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- A map is provided. Please provide coordinates as text in the portal entry.

Agency Response

1. Addressed in the portal. The polygon with some reference points
7 degrees 10 W and 4 degrees 40N
6 degrees 30 N and 4 degrees 20 W
4 degrees 10 N and 7 degrees 0W
4 degrees 30N and 7 degrees 10W
6 degrees 50W and 4 degrees 40N

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 5/17/2022 - Cleared.

We note the additional documents upload as part of this submission.

During PPG please develop a stakeholder engagement plan in full alignment with the GEF policies on stakeholder engagement and on environmental and social safeguards.

JS 5/16/2022 -

It is well noted that the project has carried out some stakeholder analysis to identify key stakeholder groups and to define their potential role in project implementation. It is however unclear from the submission how and which stakeholders have been consulted during project identification stage.

A- Please provide additional details on the stakeholder consultation process to date and on plans to consult/engage stakeholders during the project development stage.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- A long table is provided with the header "the following stakeholders have participated in consultations during the project identification phase" but also includes for some groups "At the PPG phase, representatives from these groups will be consulted to identify strategies that could lead to partnership-building activities" . Please confirm that all stakeholders listed in the table have already been consulted, or provide a separate short summary of consultations carried out to date.

2- Please provide the anticipated means of future engagement for each stakeholder identified.

3. The table contains several reference to an output 2.2.6 which does not exist in table B. Please correct.

Agency Response

17 June 2022

An Annex is now provided which contains minutes of the consultation meeting and the AMP creation Commission Act

15 June 2022

1. Stakeholders are informed of the creation of the MPA. A communication was made in the Council of Ministers announcing the creation of the Grand Bereby MPA. For the decree creating the MPA, the ministerial institutions listed in table B must give a notice of no objection before it is signed by the President of the Republic. The field missions also made it possible to meet regularly with the communities of Grand Bereby on the MPA project.
2. A launch workshop will bring together all the stakeholders on the objectives of the MPA and the conservation issues. Then, exchanges will be initiated for each stakeholder group to define expectations with regard to MPA management objectives, negotiate management measures, facilitate the appointment of representatives, especially within communities, and train on the functioning and roles.
3. The correction is done. Output 2.2.6 is replaced by Component

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 6/22/2022 Cleared.

JS 6/22/2022 Cleared.

Some of the changes announced in the response have been made in the attached word document of the PIF uploaded with this submission, but not in the portal entry. Please add in the portal entry the following text in **red**:

i) in the stakeholder table, in the last row: *Gender-related government agencies/CSO **and gender experts***

ii) in section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, in the part where it refers to: "The project will incorporate gender responsiveness and will promote women empowerment by adopting the following strategic elements: [...]"

- *include women, **gender** and youth considerations / roles in designing Grand Bereby MPA Management plan and ICM strategies"*

JS 5/16/2022 -

The project is a great example of gender mainstreaming in all the project components. To further strengthen the consideration of gender equality, it is recommended to explicitly include gender experts. In this regard, please consider adding the following or similar text:

i) in the stakeholder table, in the last row: *Gender-related government agencies/CSO **and gender experts***

ii) add the following text in section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, in the part where it refers to: "The project will incorporate gender responsiveness and will promote women empowerment by adopting the following strategic elements:?"

- *have women, youth, **and gender experts** participate in community assessment and planning processes, including monitoring*

- *include women, **gender** and youth considerations / roles in designing Grand Bereby MPA Management plan and ICM strategies*

JS 5/5/2022 -

1. The elaboration contains a reference to an output 2.2.6 and to the ICM Master Plan design, which do not appear in table B. Please correct:

The Project will encourage women's participation by recognizing and understanding their roles in the ICM Master Plan design, Grand-Bereby MPA management, and activities to be implemented in Output 2.2.6. Local communitiel and partners entrepreneurial skills enhanced for the

- Include women and youth considerations / roles in designing Grand Bereby MPA Management plan and ICM strategies;

2- Please confirm in the PIF that a gender action plan or equivalent will be developed during PPG.

Agency Response

22 June 2022

The suggested amendment of the stakeholders' table and the text in section 3 have been updated.

17 June 2022

The suggested amendment of the stakeholders' table and the text in section 3 have been done. Thanks to the reviewer for the suggestion to strengthen this section

15 June 2022

1. Reference to output 2.2.6 is now removed
2. It is confirmed in the gender section that a gender action plan will be developed during the PPG

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/5/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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 5/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Please refine the risk analysis, and notably address the following risks:

- Stakeholder buy-in and conflicts with enforcement of new restrictions
- Political risks: Changes in political circumstances and government priorities
- Policies / activities / development in the surrounding landscapes/seascapes that are incompatible with the MPA's objectives

2- Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide an adequate climate risk screening. At a minimum, at PIF stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can 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>)

Agency Response

15 June 2022

1. The risk analysis table has been amended to include the recommended additional risks.
2. The climate change risk has now been added and analysis from GIZ/KfW has been identified. The analysis provides information on trends and impact by

section (https://www.pik-potsdam.de/en/institute/departments/climate-resilience/projects/project-pages/agrica/giz_climate-risk-profile-cote-d2019ivoire_en_final_2). During the PPG, that resource will be used to develop a comprehensive climate risk screening and adequate mitigation measures will be discussed with stakeholders and provided as part of the project activities.

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 6/17/2022 Cleared.

JS 6/16/2022

A- The execution arrangement in this section are different from the executing partners endorsed by the OFP in its LoE (?Ministry of Environment, Protection and Nature and Sustainable Development?). Please:

- either revert in the portal entry to the executing partners shown in the LoE. The execution can then be changed as necessary during PPG. A new LoE or an email from the OFP supporting new execution arrangements would have to be presented in the CEO approval package.

- or provide with the resubmission an email or new LoE from the OFP supporting the new execution arrangements presented in the PIF.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Please remove all projects that are already closed or will be closed by the start of this one from this section, as the project will not be able to coordinate with them. When relevant in terms of lessons learnt, please move them to the baseline section.

2- Please add in this section:

- GEF ID 10875 - IUCN - "Using Marine Spatial Planning in the Gulf of Guinea for the implementation of Payment for Ecosystem Services and Coastal Nature-based Solutions"

- GEF ID 9911 - UNEP - Strengthening of the Enabling Environment, Ecosystem-based Management and Governance to Support Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme of the Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystem

3- Please elaborate on the anticipated institutional structure of the project (Executing Agency, steering committee, project management unit, etc.).

Agency Response

17 June 2022

Change made where necessary to retain executing agency as reflected in the OFP LoE.

15 June 2015

1. Addressed
2. Addressed
3. Addressed

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 5/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 5/5/2022 -

1- Please elaborate in more details on alignment with the NSBAP and correct the typo:

- The National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) under UNCBD: and its Strategic Direction No 1 outlined as follows: Preservation of natural habitats, their function and services; and o will suggest alternative livelihood for producers to compensate for production reduction. By so doing the project will contribute to the Strategic Axe 1 and Objective 1 of the new NBSAP.

2- Please ensure that the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is referred to as a draft and not as an agreed document.

3- The elaboration contains a reference to the ICM Master Plan design, which do not appear in table B. Please correct:

- The Forestry policy adopted and revised in 2011 which recognized the strategic role of restoring vegetative national reforestation program. The project will contribute to this program as it may support agroforestry productivity as part of the ICM Master Plan.

Agency Response

15 June 2022

1. Addressed
2. Addressed
3. Addressed in previous comments.

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 5/5/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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 6/17/2022 Cleared.

We note the response provided.

Please ensure full alignment with GEF policies on environmental and social safeguards during PPG.

JS 5/16/2022 - We note the moderate risk rating and the attached SRIF.

In the SRIF, the Safeguard team recommended that the project team undertake the SRIF review during the PPG and build necessary risk mitigation measures. It is, however, not clear what kind of action that the project team will undertake during PPG.

A- Please clarify in the PIF what are the plans for further environmental and social assessment and environmental and social management planning during PPG, particularly in relation to indigenous peoples.

JS 5/5/2022 - Please remove the risk table provided in this section as it is duplicative of the other risk table and, for the most part, does not relate to ESS risks.

Agency Response

17 June 2022

In 2020, the Abidjan Convention has supported Cote d'Ivoire as one of its member states to conduct an Environment and Social Impact Assessment of the establishment of the MPA. The report is available and validated by the technical committee responsible for the validation of the Environment Impact Assessment in the country. The report needs to be endorsed by the National Agency of Environment (ANDE). During the PPG, the report will be revisited to review how best the GEF and UNEP safeguard measures have been considered and the amended report will be submitted to ANDE. The identified safeguard measures will be considered in the final project design and the review of the SRIF which will be submitted as an Annex to the CEO endorsement request.

15 June 2015

1. Addressed.

Part III ? Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 5/5/2022 - 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

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 6/22/2022 - The project is recommended for clearance.

JS 6/22/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the comment on gender above and resubmit.

JS 6/16/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the comments above and resubmit.

JS 5/5/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the comments above and resubmit. Please contact jsapijanskas@thegef.org for clarifications.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please see guidance and requests for PPG embedded throughout this review sheet.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	5/5/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval