

Sustainable and Integrated landscape management of the Western Area Peninsula

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9903

Countries

Sierra Leone

Project Name

Sustainable and Integrated landscape management of the Western Area
Peninsula

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/29/2019

Review completed by PM

3/3/2022

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF □

CEO Endorsement □

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11 July 2019:

Few changes are indicated in the Project Description as compared to the PIF and only 2 out of the 6 sections are briefly completed... Nevertheless, all the comments made by GEF Secretariat and STAP implied significant improvements in the project description and in particular regarding the barriers, the baseline and the alternative scenario including the description of the components. The findings of the PPG phase and the responses to GEF Secretariat and STAP should be clearly presented in the Portal. Please complete the proposal accordingly. The detailed description of the project components and activities are even more important than their description was very succinct in the PIF.

In addition, there is one dollar difference in the Total Project Cost. Please correct.

1 September 2021:

1. The complements are not reflected in Part II of the project description in the Portal. Please note that referring to the Prodoc is not enough and each section of the Project Description in the Portal entry needs to be fully completed with a summary of the findings including all the necessary information to fully describe the situation. Please complete the Portal entry accordingly.

2. There is still one dollar difference in the Total Project Cost as regard to the PIF. Please correct throughout all the information provided so that the total project budget is the same in the CEO Endorsement Request as it was in the PIF.

23 November 2021:

1. Surprisingly, this comment is not addressed. The "Part 1. Project Description" remains nearly empty in the Portal entry and rely on the information included in the Prodoc. Please fully fill out this section as in any other GEF project. If there is an issue with the Portal or if for some reason this comment is not understood, please do not hesitate to reach out to the Program Manager of this project in GEF Secretariat for further guidance.

2. There is still still a difference of \$1 between PIF and CEO ER but this may be due to a system issue rounding the numbers. Cleared.

13 January, 2022:

1. Thank you for completing the project description as needed. On the new added text, please address the following comments:

1.1. Under the baseline scenario, please also briefly present the institutional framework at national and local level which is relevant for this project such as EPA, MTCA, MAFFS, MLHE... (which institutions are responsible for what).

1.2. Under the alternative scenario, the names of the Components are missing and the names of most of the outcomes and outputs are different from the table B of the Portal entry. Please add the components and ensure all the names of components/outcomes and outputs are the same throughout all the information provided and in particular in table B and under the alternative scenario.

1st March 2022:

Thank you for the additional information and the amendments. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response: 20 January 2022

1.1 A table presenting the institutional framework at national and local level that is relevant for this project has been added under the baseline scenario in the CEO ER

1.2 The names of the components have been added and the names of components, outcomes and outputs have been updated where they were different in table B and under the alternative scenario.

Agency Response: 16 December 2021

1. The sections that were missing have now been added in the portal under Part II. Project description. These are:

A.1. Project Description

1) Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed

2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects

3) Proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

4) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCE, SCCF, and co-financing

5) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCE/SCCF)

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

2. Thank you.

Agency Response: 16 September 2021

1. The changes made in the prodoc are uploaded in the portal.
2. The one dollar difference is corrected in the portal.

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 11 July 2019:

The PRODOC has been fully reviewed for this re-submission. Changes in the project document compared to the PIF are now clarified in Part II. A of this CEO ER. The project barriers, the baseline, and the project components, outputs and activities (Alternative scenario) have been elaborated in detail based on technical assessments undertaken during the PPG (Annexes 11 to 14 of the UNDP project document). Please see Part II. A of this CEO ER and Sections 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1 of the UNDP project document.

The one-dollar difference arose due to the fact that the GEF Portal did not accept the original figure, which needed to be rounded off. This has been corrected. Please see Table B of this CEO ER.

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

1- Under the section "A.6 Institutional arrangement and coordination" the text says that the project will be implemented by UNDP and in the responses to GEF Secretariat comments, the text says the project will be executed by UNDP. Does-it mean that UNDP will play both roles of implementing and executing agency? Please explain.

2- In Component 1, one output is to identify and address gaps in legal, sectoral policy, institutional and enforcement frameworks. It is unclear how these gaps will be addressed and what ensure they can indeed be addressed. Please clarify.

3- In component 1 and 3, the content, scope and objective of the WAP Master Plan and its related Financing Plan remain vague. Please explain.

4- It isn't clear what is the difference of the 66,500 ha of multi-use landscape in Table B and benefits description and the 69,820 ha of ILM plan and WAP in the same Table B and in the Project Result Framework. Please explain.

5- LDN as a key aspect of LDFA funding should come out more strongly in the project documentation, in particular with regard to alignment with the UNCCD (it is only mentioned in knowledge management). How is the project contributing to Sierra Leone's efforts to potentially set and achieve LDN targets?

6- Please note that depending on the responses to GEF Secretariat, STAP and Council in the Portal, there might be other comments in this box.

1 September 2021:

1, 2, 3, 4. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared if the information provided is fully included in the Portal entry and not only in the Prodoc and in the uploaded CEO

Endorsement Request under the responses to GEF Sec table (as indicated in the box above).

5. The response refers to a report: "The report identifies the WAP as...". Please clarify what is this report and, again, ensure all the information provided as a response to this comment is included in the Portal entry.

7. We take note of the new project of establishing an industrial fishing port at Black Johnson Beach, as well as the full EIA, the monitoring and adaptive/appropriate management measures already envisioned during project implementation. This will be important indeed to ensure the new port will not undermine the project objectives. Thank you.

8. Another important threat for the project area is the urban sprawl and consequent threat posed to the forest. In that regard, please consider identifying synergies and coordination with the new GEF-7 project "Resilient Urban Sierra Leone Project" in Freetown, ensuring a common platform is used to connect this project with the one being implemented by WB.

23 November 2021:

1 and 4. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

2 and 3. We don't find the information in the appropriate section (alternative scenario) in the project description. Please complete the project description as needed.

5. Thank you for the clarification, cleared.

8. Thank you for the consideration. In addition, please add in the Portal entry the note that "the focal points for the two projects will have regular consultations and share information to ensure synergies and coordination. Also, an action plan for coordination will be developed during the initiation phase of this new project."

13 January 2022:

3. Thank you for the clarification of the WAP Master Plan under the alternative scenario. Please clarify the difference between the WAP Master Plan (output 1.4) and the WAP Management Plan (output 2.1) and explain why these 2 different plans are needed.

8. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

9. In addition, in the core indicator section for the core indicator 1.2 please write the exact and full name of the Protected Area "Western Area Peninsula Forest" and indicate its WDPA ID (19249) in the appropriate fields.

1st March 2022:

3. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

9. This comment is partially addressed. Please the exact and full name of the Protected Area "Western Area Peninsula Forest" hasn't been included in the core indicator section for the core indicator 1.2. Please amend as requested in the previous review.

3 March 2022:

9. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response 3 March 2022

The exact and full name of the Protected Area "Western Area Peninsula Forest" has been added in the Portal under the core indicator section for the core indicator 1.2.

Agency Response 20 January 2022

3. The WAP Master Plan (Output 1.4) will be developed for land uses in the whole Western Area Peninsula Landscape while the WAPNP Management Plan (Output 2.1) is specific for only the WAP National Park and will be updated as one of the demonstration projects on ILM implementation on the ground. Output 1.4 has been revised as follows: *"Output 1.4: Master Plan is developed for the Western Area Peninsula Landscape, including detailed land use zoning with clear cross-sectoral governance and implementation structures."*

9. The core indicator 1.2 in the core indicator section has been revised to write the exact and full name of the Protected Area "Western Area Peninsula Forest" and its WDPA ID (19249) has been indicated in the appropriate fields.

Agency response: 16 December 2021

2 and 3: The alternative scenario has been added in the portal and includes the information as requested.

8. The sentence has been added in the portal.

Agency Response: 16 September 2021

1,2,3,4. Yes, the information is in the portal.

5. This is the Sierra Leone Land Degradation Neutrality National Report of February 2018 (https://knowledge.unccd.int/sites/default/files/ldn_targets/Sierra%20Leone%20LDN%20TSP%20Country%20Report.pdf). The following change has been made on page 50, section 3.6 of the prodoc and on pages 29 of the CEO Endorsement Request: "The Sierra Leone Land Degradation Neutrality National Report of February 2018 identifies the WAP as one of the land degradation hotspots", ??

8. On 16 September 2021, a call was held between UNDP RTA and PTA on this new project and the WB focal point and the Management Team of the GEF-7 project "Resilient Urban Sierra Leone Project" in Freetown. It was agreed that the focal points for the two projects will have regular consultations and share information to ensure synergies and coordination. Also, an action plan for coordination will be developed during the initiation phase of this new project. The below information on identified synergies has been added in the Prodoc and the CEO ER under "Planned coordination with other relevant GEF/LCDF/SCCF-financed projects and further relevant initiatives" (Page 57 of the Prodoc and page 24 of the CEO ER):

The World Bank is implementing a GEF 7 project on Resilient Urban Sierra Leone. This project focuses on improving integrated urban management, service delivery and disaster management in Western Area and secondary cities of Sierra Leone. Whilst the technical and geographic focus of the two projects is essentially different, there are two potential areas of synergy: i) Spatial planning ? this new UNDP project on WAP proposes to develop a WAP Master Plan for improved landscape-level, cross-sectoral, landscape management. This may have some natural points of overlap with the WB Resilient Sierra Leone Project's Outputs under Component 1, which include the development of spatial plans- both master and local level. Whilst the WB Resilient Sierra Leone project is focused on urban centres, it does also include the Western Area Rural District (into which the domain of this new UNDP project on WAP falls). This new UNDP project, under Outcome 2, will focus on areas such as Aberdeen Creek and the Sierra Leone River Estuary, which fall within the greater Freetown area, and activities planned for this area (e.g. mangrove restoration and establishment of community-led PAs) may overlap with activities planned under the WB Resilient Sierra Leone project. ii) Forest restoration - Under Component 2 of the WB Resilient Urban Sierra Leone project, there are planned outputs relating to restoration of deforested areas and the development of a Forest Inventory. There may be points of synergy between this and proposed outputs under this new UNDP project on WAP, including the development of a Forest Landscape Restoration Plan, restoration of deforested areas, and adoption of Sustainable Land Management practices to restore production landscapes.

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

1) When the project was under development there was a blanket agreement in place between the Government of Sierra Leone and UNDP for UNDP to implement projects, due to circumstances related to the Ebola crisis that had prevailed at the time. This agreement has now lapsed and, further, government indicated its preference to implement this project under the National Implementation Modality (NIM), especially since there is now a dedicated Ministry of Environment. The project will be implemented under full NIM. The ministry of Environment has been selected as the Implementing Partner (IP), and 6 responsible parties (RPs) have been identified namely the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), the Ministry of Lands, Housing & Environment (MLHE), National Protected Area Authority (NPAA), Environmental Foundation for Africa (EFA), Women's Network for Environmental Sustainability (WONES) and the Tacugama Chimpanzee Sanctuary. See Section VI (Governance and Management Arrangements) of the UNDP project document on page 73.

2) The project intends to support Ministries and Agencies that require policy and legal reforms in the identification of gaps and formulation of recommendations for their adoption, and subsequently lobby with relevant authorities for adoption of recommendations. The following text was added to the description of Output 1.2, to increase clarity on how policy changes will be handled:

?Mandates for relevant MDAs will be reviewed and recommendations provided to refine them and remove conflicts, overlaps and contradictions. This will be undertaken through a consultative and participatory process, building on the Management and Functional Review undertaken by the Public Sector Reform Unit, which aims to enhance effectiveness of the Ministry of Lands, Country Planning and the Environment by: (i) aligning the

mandate and vision of the Ministry to the National Agenda for Change, and (ii) facilitating effective structures and processes.

Institutional and policy baseline assessments undertaken during project formulation (Annex 12), identified policies and legal frameworks requiring to be reviewed and/or updated. This initial assessment will be conducted in more detail in collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAF), Ministry of Lands, Housing and the Environment (MLHE), Ministry of Mines and Mineral Resources (MMMR), Ministry of Water Resources (MWR), and the EPA to review policies and legislation related to ILM, SLM and biodiversity conservation and identify ways to strengthen their coordination, implementation and enforcement. Sector policies and regulatory frameworks will be reviewed/ developed to support mainstreaming of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sector plans. Relevant MDAs, development partners, and NGOs will be mobilized to advocate and facilitate adoption of the recommendations to enhance coordination and collaboration amongst the institutions.? See page 28 of the project document and page 41 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

Nevertheless, in recognition of the pace at which national policy reforms generally take place, delayed policy changes are identified as a risk (high impact and probability) and this is reflected in the project?s risk assessment. See Section 3.1 (description of Output 1.2) and Table 6 of the UNDP project document. See page 58 of the project document and page 41 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

3) The following clarification was added to Output 1.4 to clarify the content, scope and objective of the WAP Master Plan:

(?) ?This will involve an extensive planning process with the objective to: i) provide a platform to bring together the stakeholders in the multi-use landscape to discuss, in a knowledge-informed setting, the importance of the landscape for each of the stakeholders and sectors; ii) increase understanding amongst stakeholders and sectors on how their actions influence, positively or negatively, the interests of others; iii) increase understanding about threats to the landscape and opportunities for collaboration to optimize all stakes, and minimize conflicts; iv) identify and broadly agree on management objectives for the landscape, including zoning, that support the delivery of multiple benefits from the WAP by increasing synergies and minimizing or mitigating trade-offs among food production, biodiversity conservation, protected area management, ecosystem service provision, and poverty alleviation; v) increase stakeholder collaboration and understanding of the requirements needed to adopt a Master Plan for the WAP landscape; vi) identify and agree on monitoring mechanisms to ensure that stakeholders and sectors are mainstreaming requirements and principles of the ILM into their day to day natural resources management, livelihood activities and business transactions resources.? See page 30 of the project document and page 42 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

In terms of the financing plan for the WAP Master Plan, the description of output 3.2 has been clarified on page 40 of the project document and page 42 of the CEO Endorsement Request to include the following activities:

3.2.1 Determine the cost of implementation of the WAP Master Plan, including cost of regular updates to it.

3.2.2 Undertake a public expenditure review to identify current financing levels and gaps that need to be addressed.

3.2.3 Identify other sustainable financing options that can be explored to fill the financing gap (including green tax, debt for nature swaps, endowment fund, incentive packages to scale-up SLM practices, carbon finance, performance payment mechanisms, and regular development partner funding), in collaboration with respective institutions; leverage the Covid-19 pandemic to make the case for funding to maintain essential PA management services, and provide emergency funding to PAs that have suffered income losses due to

the pandemic (including support for the well-being and the food security of vulnerable edge communities of the WAPNP).

3.2.4 Facilitate participation of the private sector in financing the implementation of the Master Plan for example through investments that create jobs related to ecosystem restoration activities, eco-tourism initiatives, markets for sustainable products and services; leverage the Covid-19 pandemic to make the case for increasing funding (as above).

3.2.5 Document the process and produce a technical report, including a section on lessons generated by the process. See Section 3.1 (description of outputs 1.4 and 3.2) of the UNDP project document.

4) During the PIF, it had been estimated that the WAP Landscape covers an area of 66,500 ha. It was however confirmed during the PPG process that the landscape covers 69,820 ha. This has been corrected in both the UNDP project document (see pages 1, 21, 67 and 111) and the CEO ER (see pages 1,2, 6, 36, 42, 48 and 49).

5) The project contributes to LDN targets and this is noted on page 49, section 3.6 of the UNDP project document and on pages 29 and 43 of the CEO Endorsement Request: National Land Degradation Neutrality targets established under the target setting process of the UNCCD (Sierra Leone Land Degradation Neutrality National Report, February 2018). The report identifies the WAP as one of the land degradation hotspots, and the project contributes to achievement of the following target (1 of 6 targets ? Target 2: By 2035, ensure the rehabilitation of 12,237 sq.km of land area suggested as having declined, shown early signs of decline, or stable but stressed conditions in net productivity between 2000 and 2010. This includes 353 sq.km of total land area having declined in land productivity, 2,161 sq. km showing early signs of decline, and 9723 Sq. Km showing stable but stressed conditions between 2000 and 2010.?

The emphasis on LDN appears throughout the project document insofar as the project will provide capacities, policies, plans and incentives to adopt sustainable land management practices in the WAP landscape. The project will therefore reduce land degradation, contributing to achieving land degradation neutrality objectives, once they have been set. This is recognized in various sections of the document, for example:

Section I (development challenge) recognizes the following: Land degradation in the WAP landscape: The LDN target-setting process in Sierra Leone has identified the WAP as a hotspot of land degradation, noting that forests in this area while remaining stable over the last ten years are stressed. The report notes declining productivity in forest areas in the Western Area Peninsula. See page 7 of the project document and page 47 of the CEO Endorsement request.

Section 2.1 of the project document on page 10 (Long-term vision) states that: The desired longer-term outcome of this intervention is to safeguard the ecological functionality and biological productivity of the Western Area Peninsular landscape, in order to meet multiple objectives such as biodiversity conservation, carbon storage, and watershed services, as well as to support resilient economic development, agricultural production and livelihoods, and contribute to land degradation neutrality objectives. This will be achieved through the adoption of an integrated landscape management (ILM) approach that balances different stakes and needs of targeted stakeholders who will be actively engaged in an inclusive, gender sensitive and collaborative process to identify and implement long-term shared objectives and strategies for sustainable utilization of the landscape.?

Section 2.5 (theory of change) states These impact pathways will enable stakeholders to agree on management objectives for the 69,820 hectares of the WAP multiple-use landscape, starting the long-term process for halting unsustainable land use practices, and putting the landscape on a path to land degradation neutrality. Impact pathways 1 and 2

explicitly mention contribution to LDN. See page 21 of the project document and page 43 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

Section 2.2, Table 1 (baseline programs) mentions the LDN Initiative and the national target setting process. See page 11 of the project document.

Section 3.8 (planned coordination with existing initiatives) mentions "Opportunities will also be explored to establish linkages for knowledge sharing through the UNCCD Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Initiative, which has produced guidelines, tools, methods and best practices on the process and sustainable land management processes, hosted by its Knowledge Hub. The project will coordinate with the LDN program to exchange tools and methods, experiences and lessons, with a view to synergize efforts and increase project effectiveness and sustainability." See page 51 and 65 of the project document and pages 24, 28, 43 and 45 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

Component 2 changed from Investment/Technical Assistance to Technical Assistance. It is unclear how in particular the operationalization of the WAP NP Management Plan, the implementation of a Forest Landscape Restoration Plan, leading to increased forest cover by at least 2,000 ha and the adoption of higher efficient fuel wood systems, can be achieved without investments. Please inform about the cost per ha of restoration, the cost of higher efficient fuel wood systems and explain how this result can be achieved without investment. If investments are actually considered, please indicate the share of the investment in the budget of this component.

1 September 2021:

In the budget, under "Contractual services-individual", the Project Manager, Project Assistant part-time; Procurement Officer part-time; and Driver should be covered by the PMC.

23 November 2021:

Thank you for the amendment in Annex G of the Portal entry. Nevertheless, the uploaded Excel budget is consistent with the GEF template budget. Please upload a GEF budget template in the document section, following the same template as in Annex G of the Portal entry (also available

here: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf. Appendix A, page 46-47).

13 January 2022:

Thank you for providing the budget. Please address the following comments:

1. The GEF contribution to component 4 is different in the budget and in the project description (table B). Please correct as needed.
2. The budget lines "equipment" are too vague, and especially the one with a total cost of \$479,400. Please provide budget lines clarifying the different kind of equipment, their unit cost and their total cost.
3. The budget line "Contractual services-Individual" with the description " 50% of Technical backstopping services of PM (Total - \$61,600x50%) to support the development and implementation of activities under Outcome 3" is actually charged under the Component 2. This is not consistent. Please correct.
4. The budget line "Contractual services-Individual" with a cost of \$171,264 is described as contributing to 50% of the PMU cost. Please explain how the other 50% are covered and note that the full cost of the PMU should be charged under the PMC and not under the components. Please amend as needed.
5. The budget line "Contractual services-Individual" with a cost of \$2,063,480 for component 2 actually includes 5 different contracts. Please provide a different budget line for each of these contract and confirm UNDP will not be responsible for the implementation of any part of these contract.
6. The budget line "Contractual services-Individual" with a cost of \$530,250 for component 1 actually includes 4 different contracts. Please provide a different budget line for each of these contract and confirm UNDP will not be responsible for the implementation of any part of these contract.
7. The budget line "Contractual services-Individual" with a cost of \$571,400 for component 3 actually includes 4 different contracts. Please provide a different budget line for each of these contract and confirm UNDP will not be responsible for the implementation of any part of these contract.
8. In the budget lines "Training, Workshops, Meetings", please indicate how events are planned.
9. Finally, please update the Annex G with the amendments requested above.

1st March 2022:

- 1-8. Thank you for the clarification and amendments. Cleared.
9. Thank you for updating the budget. Please address the following comments:
 - 9.1. The last column identifying the responsible entity disappeared as compared to the previous version. Please add this column
 - 9.2. According to the budget, the responsible entity is presented to be the Ministry of Environment for the entire project implementation, which is consistent with the description of the institutional arrangement. Nevertheless, at the beginning of the project description, 3 different executing agencies are mentioned (as shown below). Please ensure

the information is consistent throughout the information provided and amend accordingly the beginning of the project description so that the name of the executing agency is exactly the same as under the institutional arrangement section and in the budget.

Part I: Project Information 

GEF ID 9903	Project Type FSP
Type of Trust Fund GET	Project Title ⓘ Sustainable and Integrated landscape management of the Western Area Peninsula
Countries Sierra Leone	Agency(ies) UNDP
Other Executing Partner(s) ⓘ Environment Protection Agency Sierra Leone (EPA-SL), Ministry of Tourism and Cultural Affairs (MOTCA), Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security (MAFFS)	Executing Partner Type Government

8 March 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. Nevertheless, final checking revealed the need to address the following comments:

1. On PMC proportionality: There is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5.0%, for a co-financing of \$17,442,858 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$872,142 instead of \$557,142 (which is 3.1%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion of PMC.
2. On Table D: please include the missing information in the "Programming of Funds". Same comment applies to the PPG Table F. The information should be "BD STAR Allocation" or "LD STAR Allocation" where appropriate.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds ⓘ

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds ⓘ	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Sierra Leone	Biodiversity	No		2,567,497	243,912	2,811,409.00
UNDP	GET	Sierra Leone	Land Degradation	No		2,642,412	251,029	2,893,441.00
Total Grant Resources(\$)						5,209,909.00	494,941.00	5,704,850.00

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
PPG Required true

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds ⓘ	NGI	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
UNDP	GET	Sierra Leone	Biodiversity	No		73,500	6,983	80,483.00
UNDP	GET	Sierra Leone	Land Degradation	No		76,500	7,267	83,767.00
Total Project Costs(\$)						150,000.00	14,250.00	164,250.00

3. On Core Indicators:

(i) Annex A "Project Results Framework" the value under sub-indicator 1.2 (Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness) should be aligned with the Core Indicator table (17,634.15 ha). Its currently missing in the Results Framework. Please

include it and also label it as 1.2 (It's now labeled as GEF Core Indicators 3). Please label the other Core Indicators numbers in the Results Framework to match the Core Indicator table in terms of core indicator numbers: beneficiaries are under core indicator 1.1, forest land restored under 3.2, and Terrestrial protected areas newly created under 1.1). This will help ensure internal consistency in the project document.

(ii) One protected area WDPA ID remains N.I under CI 1.1. Please complete, as this is mandatory at CEO Endorsement stage. In the event that this remain unknown, please provide a justification under the Core Indicator section, clarifying why and confirming that the WDPA IDs will be updated in the Portal during the months following endorsement.

4. On Co-financing:

(i) Environment Protection Agency: Please change "Grant" to "Public Investment". Also, the letter is dated October 2020 - please confirm whether the full contribution is still available - otherwise, the Agency needs to adjust to the best possible estimate on the available amounts.

(ii) UNDP Sierra Leon office co-financing letter is dated March 2019 - please confirm if the amount is still fully viable after 3 years and if not, please adjust to the available amount.

17 March, 2022:

1, 2, 3 and 4. Thank you for the clarification and amendments. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response 17 March 2022

1. The PMC co-financing has been changed to \$872,142.

2. "BD STAR Allocation" and "LD STAR Allocation" have been added under the "Programing of Funds" column in table D and table F.

3. on Core Indicators

(i) The value "17,634.15 ha" has been added under sub-indicator 1.2 (Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness) in Annex A "Project Results Framework". Also, this sub-indicator has been label "1.2" and labels of other Core Indicators in the Results Framework have been updated to match numbers in the Core Indicator table: "beneficiaries core indicator is now labelled "1.1", forest and forest land restored is labelled "3.2", and Terrestrial protected areas newly created is labelled "1.1".

(ii) This justification has been added under WDPA ID under CI 1.1: "ID not available yet - Designation of this PA is one of this project outputs." The WDPA ID will be updated in the Portal during the months following endorsement. The same justification has been entered under the Core Indicator sections (Project Information and Annex E).

4. On Co-financing:

(i) Co-financing of Environment Protection Agency has been changed from "Grant" to "Public Investment" in CEO ER Word document. In GEF Portal, as the project follows GEF-6 structure, there's is no option to select "Public investment" hence "Other" has been

selected for this Type of co-financing. Also, we have uploaded the e-mail from the Executive Chairman of the Environment Protection Agency confirming that the amount of co-financing committed in the letter dated October 2020 is still available.

(ii) We have uploaded the e-mail from the UNDP Resident Representative in Sierra Leone confirming that the amount of co-financing committed in the letter dated March 2019 is still available.

Agency Response 3 March 2022

- 9.1. The last column of budget identifying the responsible entity has been brought back.
- 9.2. The information has been corrected. Now the Ministry of Environment is there instead of the other 3 agencies.

Agency response 20 January 2022

1. After discussing with the GEF Project focal point, it was agreed to keep the Comp 4 budget for KM & Gender Mainstreaming separate from the M& E budget.
2. The budget line with a total cost of \$479,400 has been revised to clarify the different kind of equipment, their unit cost and their total cost.
3. This has been corrected. The full cost of \$61,600 is now charged under component 3.
4. 50% of the PMU cost will be covered from GEF and the other 50% from UNDP TRAC both are under the PMU budget.
5. Different budget line for each of these contracts has been provided and UNDP will not be responsible for implementation of any part of these contracts.
6. Different budget line for each of these contracts has been provided and UNDP will not be responsible for implementation of any part of these contracts.
7. Different budget line for each of these contracts has been provided and UNDP will not be responsible for implementation of any part of these contracts.
8. Budget lines ?Training, Workshops, Meetings have been revised to clarify events are planned.
9. The Annex G has been updated with the amendments requested above.

Agency Response: 8 December 2021

The GEF budget template in the document section has been revised and uploaded in the portal following the same template as Annex G of the Portal entry.

|Agency Response: 16 September 2021

These budget lines have been brought to the PMC. The changes have been made in the TBWP, the Budget and Work Plan of the prodoc (page 84), the budget note description of the Prodoc (page 88) and in the confirmed co-financing in the prodoc (page 82).

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

The change from Investment/Technical Assistance to Technical Assistance was an error. It has been rectified (under component 2 of Table B of CEO ER on page 3). Also, the following text was added in the project document under budget note 11 on page 87: ?The share of investment in the budget of this component is 75%. This will be used to effectively protect 18,634 ha of WAP landscape (WAPNP + community mangrove PAs), sustainable land management and forest restoration of 2,000 ha of WAP landscape; improving livelihoods and food security and connecting households to improved energy initiatives?.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

The project do take into account potential major risks, but the consequences of climate change are not considered. Please complete accordingly.

2 September, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency response: 16 September 2021

Thank you

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

Following the STAP guidance of 2019 on climate risk screening, this risk has been added to Section 3.10, Table 6 on the climate change risk: ?Sierra Leone?s National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA, 2007) reported that rainfall and temperature patterns experienced in Sierra Leone are changing with negative impacts expected to affect biodiversity, livelihoods and the economy.? The following explanation has been provided as further elaboration of the risk and mitigation measures. ?The Western Area Peninsula that is targeted by the project is increasingly susceptible to erosion, landslides, flooding and extreme climatic conditions, as a result of unsustainable land management practices and deforestation. The project seeks to restore the ecological integrity of the agro-ecological system within the WAP. This will strengthen the role of ecological infrastructure in providing cost effective adaptation and reducing vulnerability in the face of climate change. Vulnerability to land and forest degradation was one of the criteria for selecting project sites. All the project activities have been designed to improve the state of the ecosystem and its ability to provide goods and services, which will reduce vulnerability considerably. SLM technologies such as climate smart agriculture, restoring watersheds and adoption of agro-forestry are good ways of adapting livelihoods to effects of climate change.? See pages 61 and 127 of the project document and pages 18 and 44 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

The following text on an additional risk that has emerged as we were addressing the comments was added in under Table 6 Risks and Mitigation Measures on page 58 the project document and on page 18 of the CEO Endorsement Request: ?The development of

the China-financed fish harbour proposed within the project landscape at Black Johnson Beach might compromise the integrity of the Western Area Peninsula National Park, increase pollution of the Atlantic Ocean, displace local people, and increase poverty in the area. To address this risk, the Ministry of Environment that is the Implementing Partner for this UNDP-GEF project will ensure that the project engages closely with the relevant authorities to ensure that: (i) a full EIA is undertaken, in line with national regulations, and that the possibility of alternate siting of the fish harbour is investigated in this EIA; (ii) appropriate environmental management plans are put in place. Further, the Ministry of Environment will ensure that it puts in place measures to monitor regularly issues such as pollution, impacts on marine life/vegetation, people's rights of access to land and their livelihoods, and implement adaptive management should it be required?.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11 July 2019:

Yes, but it is unclear whether the co-financing is grant or in-kind. While the letter of the Environment Protection Agency dated 29 March says it is grant, the CEO Endorsement Request says it is in-kind in the Portal. Please clarify.

In case the co-financing is in-kind, this would be a critical change of the proposal as approved by the Council and of its capacity to deliver the expected results. In this case, a strong explanation on consequences and on how the project will meet its objectives will be required.

2 September, 2021:

Thank you for the confirmation but the Type of Co-financing from the EPA is still reported as "in-kind" in the table C of the Portal while the letter says it is as grant. In addition, the co-financing of S98,729 from the EPA should be reported as In-kind in table C and not as grant. Please amend table C accordingly.

23 November 2021:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response: 16 September 2021

The error in the portal has been corrected and the table C has been amended (page 4 of the CEO ER).

[Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 11 July 2019:](#)

An error was made while selecting the category in the GEF portal and it will be corrected. The co-financing is almost entirely grant and it will contribute to improving environmental governance and sustainable management of the natural resources in Sierra Leone; providing physical demarcation and zoning of the Western Area Peninsula Forest; protection and restoration of the Western Area Water catchments; enhancing coordination mechanisms of National Climate Change and environmental structures to organise stakeholders and better harmonize the use of scarce resources; sustainable management of water catchment and forest resources in Sierra Leone and; staffing, Office space, logistics and Transport, coordination of different stakeholders to enhance a better project outcome. See new letter of cofinance from the Government of Sierra Leone in the Annex 17a to the project document..

UNDP has also provided a co-financing of USD 300,000 grant to this project.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not applicable.

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not applicable.

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

The description do lists national initiatives and plans the project is consistent with. Nevertheless is is not clear how the project will be coordinated with those initiatives and plans. We also note there is no mention of past GEF project nor eventual other past or ongoing project from other donor. Please elaborate about the planned coordination of the project with some initiatives and plans when appropriate.

2 September 2021:

Thank you for the additional information provided. Please include it in the Portal entry under the "Baseline scenario" section and also under the "Institutional arrangement and coordination" where relevant coordination can be planned. Please also consider the new GEF-7 project ?Resilient Urban Sierra Leone Project? in Freetown as suggested above.

23 November 2021:

The first part of the comment is not addressed. Please include the additional information provided on the baseline in the Portal entry under the "Baseline scenario" section and also

under the "Institutional arrangement and coordination" where relevant coordination can be planned.

13 January 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency response: 16 December 2021

The additional information on national initiatives and plans, past GEF projects that the project is consistent with and how it will be coordinated with them has been added in the portal under Part II. Project justification, A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination, Planned coordination with other relevant GEF/LCDF/SCCF-financed projects and further relevant initiatives; A.1. Project Description,2) Baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.

Agency Response: 16 September 2021

The Additional information provided has been added in the Portal entry as guided. This also include the information below on the new GEF-7 project ?Resilient Urban Sierra Leone Project? in Freetown that was added under the section on Planned coordination with other relevant GEF/LCDF/SCCF-financed projects and further relevant initiatives on Page 57 in the Prodoc and page 24 in the CEO ER:

The World Bank is implementing a GEF financed project on Resilient Urban Sierra Leone. This project focuses on improving integrated urban management, service delivery and disaster management in Western Area and secondary cities of Sierra Leone. Whilst the technical and geographic focus of the two projects is essentially different, there may be two potential areas of synergy: i) Spatial planning ? this new UNDP project on WAP proposes to develop a WAP Master Plan for improved landscape-level, cross-sectoral, landscape management. This may have some natural points of overlap with the WB Resilient Sierra Leone Project's Outputs under Component 1, which include the development of spatial plans- both master and local level. Whilst the WB Resilient Sierra Leone project is focused on urban centres, it does also include the Western Area District (into which the domain of this new UNDP project on WAP falls). This new UNDP project, under Outcome 2, will focus on areas such as Aberdeen Creek and the Sierra Leone River Estuary, which fall within the greater Freetown area, and activities planned for this area (e.g. mangrove restoration and establishment of community-led PAs) may overlap with activities planned under the WB Resilient Sierra Leone project. ii) Forest restoration - Under Component 2 of the WB Resilient Urban Sierra Leone project, there are planned outputs relating to restoration of deforested areas and the development of a Forest Inventory. There may be points of synergy between this and proposed outputs under this new UNDP project on WAP, including the development of a Forest Landscape Restoration Plan, restoration of deforested areas, and adoption of Sustainable Land Management practices to restore production landscapes.

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

Section 3.8 of the UNDP project document elaborates on planned coordination with other relevant GEF/LCDF/SCCF-financed projects and further relevant initiatives as follows:

Learning opportunities and potential technology transfer from peer countries will be explored during project implementation. The PMU will formulate an action plan for collaborating with the following relevant initiatives, clearly identifying actions to be monitored to demonstrate collaboration, learning and sharing lessons.

- NEPAD-led African Landscapes Action Plan aims to mobilize partnerships and resources to put into place the principles of ILM at the Africa-wide scale. The project will establish linkages with this initiative to gain lessons from their experience and apply it to the elaboration of the ILM Master Plan for the WAP (Output 1.3).

- World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT): The spatial planning system (Output 1.3) will draw experiences and lessons from WOCAT, which offers a methodological framework for decision support for mainstreaming and upscaling of sustainable land management practices. Under Output 2.3, the sustainable land and forest management methods will integrate traditional knowledge and science-based methods while building on good practices provided through WOCAT.

- The Restoration Initiative (TRI) is a GEF-funded initiative supported technically by IUCN (lead agency), FAO, and UNEP, supporting forest landscape restoration (FLR) including in Cameroon, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of Congo, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, and Tanzania. Support is provided under three core results areas: i) Policy development and integration; ii) Implementation of restoration programs and complementary initiatives; and iii) Capacity building and finance mobilization. A fourth component on knowledge sharing and partnerships provides support for the capture and sharing of innovative experiences and best practices, raising awareness of FLR needs and benefits, and developing and strengthening critical partnerships. The GEF-funded project in Sierra Leone will assess possibilities to link to this component and tap into knowledge sharing opportunities.

- Opportunities will also be explored to establish linkages for knowledge sharing through the UNCCD Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Initiative, which has produced guidelines, tools, methods and best practices on the process and sustainable land management processes, hosted by its Knowledge Hub. The project will coordinate with the LDN program to exchange tools and methods, experiences and lessons, with a view to synergize efforts and increase project effectiveness and sustainability.

- Promoting youth employment through local economic development (MLSS, GIZ / BMZ): Led by the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, this project aims to sustainably improve employment and income situations for young people engaged in agriculture and working in micro, small and medium-sized businesses (MSMEs). The project is active in the districts of Koinadugu, Kono and Kailahun, which include some of the poorest areas of the country. Its multifaceted approach addresses capacity support for partners, youth development, agriculture value chains, and private sector engagement. Output 2.4 will coordinate closely with this project, and exchange systems, tools and lessons to inform the implementation of the value chains and SLM interventions.

- BRAC Sierra Leone program supports integrated approaches to development with programs on agriculture, food security, and livelihoods, health, nutrition, and water and sanitation, empowerment and livelihood for adolescents, targeting the ultra-poor and microfinance. BRAC has the largest microfinance portfolio in the country, covering 11 districts out of 16 with 31 branch offices across the country. It provides access to credit to people through two main components: a group-based microloan facility targeting women (100%), and an enterprise loan targeting both male and female small-scale entrepreneurs. Under its Agriculture and Livestock Program, BRAC conducts farmers' training, establishes demonstration farms, provides input support to farmers, creates access to markets and improves sustainable farming techniques to improve the agricultural

production and productivity. The project will link to BRAC's micro-finance program for good practices on successful grant making. It may also utilize BRAC on the access to financial institutions interventions, under Outcome 2.

- Gola Rainforest National Park (GRNP) REDD project (NPAA, RSPB, with EU funding): The Gola Rainforest National Park project is the first REDD+ project in Sierra Leone. Covering about 70,000 hectares of Upper Guinea forest, the project works with seven Chiefdoms to strength forest management, linked to carbon credits. The project focuses on three key areas: i) strengthening policies and regulations for the conservation and effective management for the GRNP; ii) Education, capacity building, land use planning and activities to advance sustainable natural resource management by communities; iii) Research and monitoring. The aim is to create a long-term sustainable financing source for the park through REDD+; until carbon revenues become available the RSPB will support on-going conservation management actions. Output 2.2 of this GEF-financed project that aims to establish community managed mangrove PAs will explore the possibility of carbon sales from the community PA, and to this end, the project will tap into the experiences generated by the Gola Rainforest National Park carbon credit scheme.

- Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Out SLM (DS-SLM) (FAO, GEF) has developed a methodological framework for Decision Support for Mainstreaming and Scaling Up SLM from national to local landscape levels. The Decision Support Framework (DSF) offers a detailed description of activities, tools, and methods that are available for use and adaptation by different countries to facilitate SLM Decision-Making. The DSF is currently being applied and tested by FAO with GEF funding in 15 countries. The DSF enables stakeholders to make informed decisions on mainstreaming and scaling up SLM by providing knowledge, understanding, and analysis of the effects of land use change and management, effectiveness of SLM responses, and evidence on the reasons why it is crucial to invest in SLM. Priority SLM strategies are evaluated and selected through a compilation of knowledge and analysis of experiences and shared through the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) online platform^[1]. This GEF-financed project will connect to the decision support tool databases (Output 1.3) and to access tools for SLM (Output 2.3).

The project will ensure that linkages will be established with on-going and future efforts to improve climate information and resilience, including relevant GEF-funded projects (e.g. PIMS 5107 *Strengthening climate information and early warning systems for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change*; PIMS 5178 *Adapting to climate change induced coastal risks management*) and the USAID West African Biodiversity and Climate Change (WABiCC) Programme, in order to maximize impact and sustainability of the investments. Please see Section 3.8 of the UNDP project document, page 56 and CEO Endorsement request page 24 and 45.

[1] WOCAT <https://www.wocat.net/en/projects-and-countries/projects/ds-slm>

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

Yes, cleared.

23 November 2021:

It appears that the total M&E budget is different in the M&E section (\$146,600) of the Portal entry and in the project budget in Annex G (\$179,818). Please ensure the numbers are consistent and amend accordingly.

13 January 2022:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response: 18 December 2021

Changes have been made and the numbers are now consistent. Component 4 in Annex G has two subcomponents: gender and M&E. \$179,818 is the total of the two subcomponents.

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

A table is provided in Annex B including the responses to the comments. Nevertheless, the clarifications and improvements are to be found in the UNDP Project Document and not in the Portal. Please address the comments where appropriate in CEO Endorsement Request in the Portal. Please also indicate where in the Portal the new information is provided and add a title to the table of responses to GEF Secretariat comments.

2 September 2021:

Not addressed. In addition to the Annex B and as mentioned above, please address the comments by completing the relevant sections of the Portal entry. The column "Where to find the information" should refer to the information provided in the Portal.

23 November 2021:

Not addressed. The Annex B is still referring to texts in the UNDP Prodoc while the expected information should be in the Portal entry and the Annex B should refer to the relevant sections in the Portal entry. Please amend as needed.

13 January 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response: 16 December 2021

The sections that were missing have now been added in the portal and the information under column "Where to find the information" in Annex B has been changed to refer to the information provided in the Portal instead of the prodoc.

Agency Response: 16 September 2021

The comment has been addressed in the portal

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

Responses to GEFSEC comments have been provided in this Annex to the CEO Endorsement Request and will be included in the portal.

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

As for GEF Secretariat comments, a table is provided in Annex B including the responses to STAP comments. nevertheless, the clarifications and improvements are to be find in the UNDP Project Document and not in the Portal. Please address the comments where appropriate in CEO Endorsement Request in the Portal. Please also indicate where in the Portal the new information is provided.

2 September 2021:

Not addressed. In addition to the Annex B and as mentioned above, please address the comments by completing as necessary the relevant sections of the Portal entry. The column "Where to find the information" should refer to the information provided in the Portal.

23 November 2021:

Not addressed. Again, the expected information responding to the comments should be in the Portal entry and the Annex B should refer to the relevant sections in the Portal entry. Please amend as needed.

13 January 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response: 16 December 2021

The sections that were missing have now been added in the portal and the information under column "Where to find the information" in Annex B has been changed to refer to the information provided in the Portal instead of the prodoc.

Agency response: 16 September 2021

The comment has been addressed in the portal.

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

All responses have been uploaded into the Portal.

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

The response to comments from Germany is missing. Please complete accordingly.

2 September 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. In addition to the Annex B and as mentioned above, please address the comments by completing as necessary the relevant sections of the Portal entry. The column "Where to find the information" should refer to the information provided in the Portal.

23 November 2021:

Not addressed for the same reason as above. Please amend as needed.

13 January 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response: 16 December 2021

The sections that were missing have now been added in the portal and the information under column "Where to find the information" in Annex B has been changed to refer to the information provided in the Portal instead of the prodoc.

Agency response: 16 September 2021

The comment has been addressed in the portal.

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

Please see response to comment from Germany: (see the SESP in Annex 4 and the ESMF in Annex 8 of the UNDP project document; and Section 3.1 (description of Output 3.3)

Regarding forced evictions, under the UNDP Social and Environmental Standards (SES), UNDP is prohibited from supporting forced evictions of any kind. UNDP defines forced evictions as *"the permanent or temporary removal against their will of individuals, families and/or communities from the homes and/or land which they occupy, without the provision of, and access to, appropriate forms of legal or other protection."* (SES Guidance Note on Standard 5, page 6). This prohibition is reflected in the project's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP; ProDoc Annex 4) and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF; Annex 8). The risk will be further assessed during the project's Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), and the measures required to fulfill the prohibition will be included in the subsequent Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP).

Regarding relocation (i.e. physical displacement), the ESIA will fully assess this risk and all details including the number of people, the location, etc. will be determined at that time. If physical displacement cannot be fully avoided (e.g. if people have settled and engaged in activities that are not compatible with conservation in high conservation value areas or areas with high risk of landslides etc.), then the ESMP will include the required Resettlement Action Plan (RAP) that specifies the mitigation and management measures, including compensation (in line with SES and national requirements). Activities that cause physical displacement, if any, will not be carried out unless/until those required measures are in place. Per the SES, only under narrow and exceptional circumstances will the relocation of indigenous peoples be considered, and no relocation of indigenous peoples concerned will take place without their free, prior and informed consent (FPIC). These requirements will be fully captured in the ESMP and associated stand-alone management plans (Resettlement Action Plan, Indigenous Peoples Plan, etc.), as noted in the project's ESMF.

Incentive-based financing approaches: The project will explore PES schemes for the WAP landscape, and this is described under Output 3.3. See page 41 of the project document and page 4 of the CEO endorsement request.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Not applicable.

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12 July 2019:

Thank you for the proposal. It is not yet ready. Please address the comments above.

2 September 2021:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

23 November 2021:

Not yet. Please consider that all the requested information should be in the Portal entry which is the main document for GEF Secretariat and address the remaining comments.

13 January 2022:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments. In addition, please remove all the color highlights (as the text is very difficult to read, especially with the highlights in red) and only highlight in yellow the new text after this last review.

1st March 2022:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

8 March 2022:

Not yet. Final checking revealed some remaining issues which need to be fixed. Please address the remaining comments in Box 3 above.

17 March 2022:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Response 17 March 2022

The latest comments have been addressed and are highlighted.

Agency Response: 3 March 2022

The latest comments have been addressed and are highlighted in yellow.

Agency Response: 20 January 2022

The comments have been addressed and color highlights from previous versions have been removed. Current changes have been highlighted in yellow as requested.

Agency Response: 16 December 2021

All requested information has now been added in the Portal

Agency Response to GEF Sec comments from 12 July 2019:

Thank you very much for the helpful comments. We addressed them as per the responses above and in the relevant sections of the project document and the CEO Endorsement Request as referenced above.

Also, a COVID-19 risk analysis has been undertaken as the review sheet was received before the pandemic emerged. Results have been integrated in the project document and the CEO Endorsement Request with highlighted in pink. See pages 10, 33, 37, 38, 62, 119, 128 in the project document and on pages 6, 18 of the CEO Endorsement Request.

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/12/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/8/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations