

Strengthening capacities in the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use sector of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to enhance transparency and tracking of the Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement.

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10734

Countries

Congo DR

Project Name

Strengthening capacities in the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use sector of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to enhance transparency and tracking of the Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement.

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

10/28/2020

Review completed by PM

2/12/2021

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Climate Change

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
November 10, 2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
November 10, 2020

The output 2.1.1 (M&E) is only focus on adaptation while the climate national strategy includes strongly climate change mitigation objectives. Please explain and complete as needed.

December 17, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

This output focuses on the monitoring and evaluation of adaptation actions because the weakness of national capacities in this area was identified as part of the gaps and barriers analysis in the NDC (point iii of paragraph 14). Adaptation M&E actions are oftentimes not well quantified in national reports. Still, identifying and quantifying the impact of these activities is crucial for their visibility, recognition and subsequent replication.

On the other hand, some of the other outputs of the project are focused on improving processes related to the monitoring and evaluation of national mitigation actions.

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
November 10, 2020

Co-financing of \$105,428 in-kind from the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development is being mobilized. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
November 10, 2020

The GEF amount requested for this project is relatively high comparing with other CBIT projects. This observation is even more accurate if we take into account this project is focused only on one sector (AFOLU). Please consider reducing the GEF grant amount or explain and justify clearly why the project cost is that high.

December 17, 2020

Point well taken, thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless, considering the relatively low number of beneficiaries and the fact that the project activities are focused at national level (we understand the provincial and local level will come next), please explain further 1- how the great dimension of the country explain the high budget requested and 2- the mentioned "many complexities" the country is facing. This information will help better understand the justification provided.

February 11, 2021

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response
17 Dec 2020

Although the activities will be at the national level, there will be participation of representatives of the regions. The transportation, communication and organisation of decentralised training and learning are all impacted directly by the size of the country (greater distances to travel in order to participate in project activities for instance, hence higher travel costs), and the context. Indeed, the security situation continues to be a concern, disrupting foreign investment and development initiatives alike. The current Government encouraged the Congolese army to work with MONUSCO to eliminate armed groups, but despite the progress, international statistics indicate that over 140 armed groups continue to operate in 17 of the DRC's 26 provinces. The impact of these security concerns on our CBIT work lays in the additional cost security measures have on field visits, decentralised training and learning events, transportation, and more. These costs are further exacerbated by poor infrastructure, and oftentimes weak and corrupt bureaucracy (source: US Department of State, 2020).

10 Nov 2020

The cost of the project is due to the great dimension of the country and the many complexities it faces. Furthermore, the AFOLU sector is, significantly, the most important sector with respect to GHG emissions/removals (paragraphs 8 and 9) and efforts in this sector will directly impact the DRC forests, which have regional and global importance, being the second largest area of tropical rainforest in the world.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 10, 2020

The project is requesting a total of \$2,190,000 from the CBIT set-aside (including project cost, fees and PPG). As of the date of this review, there are sufficient resources in the CBIT set-aside to support this project. Cleared.

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

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
November 10, 2020

Yes, the PPG is within the allowable cap. 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
November 10, 2020

The project will benefit to 102 stakeholders, including 64 male and 38 female. Please explain how these numbers were assessed and why there is such difference between male and female, considering the project efforts "to ensure balanced gender representation in the results of the project" as stated under the gender section.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response The estimates were made based on the expected number of people who will participate in the different activities proposed, considering these activities will be targeting technicians, further developing national capacities. The participation of women will be vigorously promoted in all project activities, which has been reflected in Project Core Indicator 11, with an expected percentage greater than 20% of women beneficiaries in previous national projects, as indicated in paragraph 71.

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
November 10, 2020**

1. The Annex C "Project Taxonomy Worksheet" is missing in the PIF. Please complete the PIF as needed.
2. Considering the project focus on AFOLU sector, please consider adding relevant topics/themes related to the sector(s) focused in the proposal.

December 17, 2020

1. Thank you for providing the Project Taxonomy Worksheet. Please also consider in this Worksheet the Climate Change Adaptation to be consistent with the scope of the project.
2. Thank you for the additional input. Cleared.

February 11, 2021:

1. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

17 December 2020

Thank you. CCA has been included in the taxonomy list and in the worksheet which is an Annex to the word-version of the PIF as well.

10 November 2020

1. A separate word document has been added for ease of reference.
2. Climate Change Mitigation/AFOLU was added.

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
November 11, 2020

Overall, the description adequately describes the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed. Both paragraphs 14 and 16 present gaps and barriers identified by the NDC process. These gaps and barriers are very similar but not identical. For a better clarity and justification of the project activities and structure, please merge these 2 paragraphs providing a unique list of the main gaps and barriers identified.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response Both paragraphs were merged into a new version one, now paragraph 14.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
November 11, 2020

The description highlights several existing and very relevant initiatives, such as the development of the first FREL, MRV for the AFOLU sector, the cooperation with the GCF, NDC Partnership and FCPF... To better understand how the proposed project can complement this previous and ongoing works, please elaborate further, even briefly, on the outputs of these initiatives that will be useful for the CBIT project.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

The following paragraphs were modified:

? 19 and point i of 40; indicating the link with the NAP under development as part of a project funded by the GCF

? 21 and 23; with the relationship between the NFMS and the MRV system established for the Forestry sector, as well as the FREL

? 24; with the link to follow up on the revised NDC in the AFOLU sector and its future updates.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
November 11, 2020**

1. We understand that the energy sector is currently far from being the main contributor to the GHG emissions. Nevertheless this sector is targeted in the NDC and its contribution to the GHG emissions is likely to increase in the future. Furthermore, the identified gaps and barriers are not specific to the AFOLU sector. Please consider the possibility to include to some extent the energy sector in the scope of the project.

2. The first output is about the establishment of "methodological process" and the preparation of a document based on the new law. It remains unclear, beyond studies, how the necessary institutional arrangements will actually happen to enable the operation of the CBIT process. Please clarify and eventually adjust/complete this output.

3. The Technical Coordination Committee on Climate has been set up to ensure coherence for the implementation of the national climate policy. Nevertheless, this Committee is not mentioned in the alternative scenario nor under the stakeholders and coordination sections. Considering its role in gathering the different stakeholders involved including different ministries, please clarify how this Committee will be involved in the project.

4. One of the objective of the CBIT is to assist with the improvement of transparency over time. It is not clear in the project description how this objective will be met. Please elaborate further accordingly identifying the outputs that will contribute to this objective.

5. Please, consider in the component(s) description the activities related to the coordination and/or knowledge sharing with the Global CBIT projects, including those specifically focused on AFOLU and forests and led by FAO.

6. To add clarity on the logic behind this project and its contribution to meet the CBIT objectives addressing the identified problems and barriers, please provide a concise Theory of Change under the alternative scenario section.

December 17, 2020

1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.

6. The paragraph 31 and 32 don't address the comment. Please include the Theory of Change (TOC) of the project, showing clearly the casual pathways leading to the project goals from the problems, taking into account the identified barriers (it can through a graph or a diagram). The Agency may wish to refer to STAP guidance on TOC (www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer).

February 11, 2021

Thank you. We take note a strong TOC will be developed with the involved stakeholders during the PPG phase. Cleared.

Agency Response

17 Dec 2020

Considering the Theory of Change development is an important and highly recommended part of the project design phase, it is proposed to develop the TOC jointly with the partners at the beginning of the PPG phase. A participatory process allows greater ownership of project outputs and results by partners, and it secures updated information on project context, stakeholders and assumptions, in addition to the gaps and barriers.

20 Nov 2020

1. The focus on the AFOLU sector is due, as indicated in the answer to point 4, to its importance with respect to GHG emissions/removals (paragraphs 8 and 9) and to the fact that efforts in this sector will directly impact the DRC forests, which have regional and global importance both as a CO₂ sink and for its biodiversity and ecosystem services, being the second largest area of tropical rainforest in the world. Additionally, reliable monitoring of the AFOLU sector, both in terms of mitigation and adaptation, will contribute to the identification of relationships and impacts with other sectors such as Energy, since the production of energy and firewood is the second direct cause of deforestation in the country. Likewise, one of the objectives of the first NDC for Energy sector is reduction of firewood and enhancement of access to electric power (paragraph 13).
2. Point i of paragraph 40 was adjusted.
3. Paragraphs 40 (point i) and 76, and the table in paragraph 66 were modified.
4. The outputs that will contribute directly with the improvement of transparency over time are: 1.1.3, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 3.1.1 and 3.1.3. These outputs and their associated activities will support the processes for monitoring, reporting and evaluating mitigation and adaptation activities, as well as the NDCs, and will contribute to improving the collection, processing, quality and analysis of data, as well as to make them available through a system/platform for data management, storage and exchange. The description of these outputs was modified to indicate how the objective of improving transparency over time will be met: point iii of paragraph 40, paragraph 42, and points i and iii of paragraph 44.

5. Paragraph 45 was added.
6. Paragraphs 31 and 32 were amended.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
November 11, 2020

The text is very limited by stating the project is aligned (including with repeated text). Please explain briefly what makes this proposal aligned with the relevant GEF focal area strategy.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the additional text. Cleared.

Agency Response Paragraph 45 was amended.

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
November 11, 2020

The description says that the CBIT project will fill remaining important gaps but doesn't present how it will add to the existing baseline to enable the country to meet the ETF requirements. Please clarify briefly how this proposal and its outputs/outcomes will build on and articulate with the existing baseline demonstrating its additional value. Such clarification is particularly important considering the several and linked existing initiatives.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Paragraph 50 was added with references on existing baseline.

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
November 10, 2020

The Annex B "GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet" is missing in the PIF. Please complete the PIF as needed.

December 17, 2020

We don't find any word document of the PIF uploaded in the Portal. Please ensure this document is uploaded with the Annex B.

February 11, 2021:

Yes, the table is visible now. Cleared.

Agency Response

17 December 2020

Please, do confirm the table is visible now. It is a small part of the entire worksheet, as all cells are empty with the exception for CI 11.

10 November 2020

The worksheet has been added in the word document of the PIF.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 11, 2020

1. In general for all training, and specifically for output 3.1.2 consider modalities that will help ensure long-term and continuous training and growth of staff that will help retain knowledge and skills within the Government.

2. The financial sustainability is unclear. Please elaborate on how the necessary resources will be made available after the end of the project to ensure continuity of the project achievements.

3. Please also consider the existing global CBIT projects to enhance the scaling-up potential of the project.

December 17, 2020

1, 2, 3. Thank you for the additional inputs. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The description of output 3.1.2 (point ii of paragraph 44) was adjusted and paragraph 59 was modified.
2. Paragraph 58 was expanded.
3. Paragraph 62 was expanded.

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

November 10, 2020

There is no specific location as the project interventions are at country level. Cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

November 10, 2020

1. The information provided for future engagement is adequate. Nevertheless, the description is unclear why the following stakeholders have not been consulted: IPLCs, CSOs and Private Sector Entities, who exactly were the stakeholders consulted and how (we just know that the project identification phase was carried out with a MEDD team). Please elaborate further providing the expected information.

2. How the contribution from the other identified stakeholders can be ensured if they didn't participate in the consultation process for the elaboration of the proposal? This is particularly the case for the ministry of agriculture which has a crucial role ("in charge of the management of all data relating to agriculture").

December 17, 2020

1. Private sector entities are expected to engage in the project but they are not mentioned among the stakeholders consulted. Have they been consulted? if no, please explain why. If yes, please explain who they are. In addition, please indicate who represented the

following stakeholders consulted: civil society organizations including representatives of indigenous peoples, women, youth and others, international organizations and representatives of technical cooperation; and complete the table accordingly. Finally, the 3 categories under the title of this section "Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities", "Civil Society Organizations" and "Private Sector Entities" are not tagged with a "Yes" whereas they have been consulted. Please amend accordingly.

2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

February 11, 2021:

Thank you for the additional inputs. Cleared.

Agency Response

17 Dec 2020

1. The explanation has been expanded in section 2. Stakeholders, and includes the requested detail on stakeholder groups consulted. The table in paragraph 66 has been completed and the 3 categories under the title of this section "Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities", "Civil Society Organizations" and "Private Sector Entities" marked.

20 Nov 2020

1. The explanation was expanded in section 2. Stakeholders.
2. The contribution of key stakeholders is expected due to the interest and commitment they showed during the consultations for the update of the NDC. In addition, the Ministry of Agriculture works closely with the ministries in charge of environment and sustainable development and provides technical inputs in the technical committee, with the other key ministries, such as the ministries in charge of rural development, land use management, infrastructure, planning and finance.

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

November 10, 2020

Yes, 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
November 10, 2020

The description is vague and short. Please elaborate further on what kind of private entities can be involved and their expected respective role in enhancing the country transparency framework.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Paragraph 73 was expanded.
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
November 10, 2020

1. The climate risk, even relatively low for this kind of project, needs also to be taken into consideration. Please complete accordingly.
2. Thank you for considering the risk related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Considering the continuing and evolving situation, please elaborate briefly but further the analysis on the possible impacts and mitigation measures, as well as eventual opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics. For further clarification, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14. The Agency may also wish to contact directly the GEF Program Manager of this project for guidance.

December 17, 2020

1, 2. Thank you for the climate risk screening uploaded in the Portal and the additional information on the COVID-19 analysis. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The table in paragraph 74 was modified slightly, and a climate risk screening was conducted, following the set FAO procedure. The screening summary is annexed as separate document.
2. Point i of paragraph 42 and table in paragraph 74 were expanded.

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
November 10, 2020

Under the coordination section, the Executing Agency is said to be the "Directorate of Sustainable Development " whereas it is the "Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (MEDD)" at the beginning of the project description in the Portal. Please ensure the name of the Executing Agency is exactly the same throughout all the project description and in the OFP's Letter of Endorsement.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response An updated letter of endorsement has been inserted in the Portal, addressing the different concerns (title, title executing agency).

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
November 10, 2020

Yes, 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
November 10, 2020

It is unclear how the project articulates and plans to learn from other relevant projects, initiative and evaluations. Considering the existing initiatives (such as the work related to REDD+ and the reporting to UNFCCC), please provide an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept and how the project plans to learn from other relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations.

December 19, 2020

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response Paragraph 86 was included.
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
November 10, 2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
November 10, 2020

Yes, GEF OFP Mr. Godefroid Ndaukila Muhinya has endorsed this project.
Nevertheless:

1- The title of the project in the letter should be the same as in the project description in the Portal.

2- The letter should clearly identify the Executing Agency which has to be same as the one mentioned in the Portal. The letter says "the proposal will be prepared and implemented by FAO", whereas it should say the proposal will be prepared and implemented by the Executing Agency (not FAO).

Please revise the Letter of Endorsement accordingly.

December 17, 2020

Thank you for the amended Letter of Endorsement. Cleared.

Agency Response A new Letter of Endorsement is inserted in the Portal.
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

N/A

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

November 11, 2020:

Thank you very much for this relevant proposal. The PIF can't be recommended yet as some issues and clarification still need to be considered. Please address the comments above.

December 17, 2020

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

February 23, 2021:

Not yet. There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC ? it should be around 10% as it is with the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$105,428, the expected contribution from co-financing to PMC must be around \$10,543 instead of nothing. Please amend accordingly.

February 24, 2021:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comment. PIF and PPG are now recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

During the PPG phase, please address the following comments:

1. Please consider the potential role of DRC as an LDC and the leading role it may play in knowledge management and using the CBIT Global Coordination Platform.
2. Please fully develop a strong Theory of Change for this project.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

11/11/2020

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/18/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval