



Transformational Change in Sustainable Forest Management in Transboundary Landscapes of the Congo Basin

Part I: Project Information

Name of Parent Program

The Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (CBSL IP)

GEF ID

10269

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

☐ CBIT

☐ NGI

Project Title

Transformational Change in Sustainable Forest Management in Transboundary Landscapes of the Congo Basin

Countries

Regional, Africa

Agency(ies)

UNEP

Other Executing Partner(s)

UNEP

Executing Partner Type

GEF Agency

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Forest, Congo, Forest and Landscape Restoration, REDD - REDD+, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Income Generating Activities, Ecosystem Approach, Sustainable Forest, Sustainable Livelihoods, Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Climate Change, Climate Change Mitigation, Agriculture, Forestry, and Other Land Use, Biodiversity, Mainstreaming, Extractive Industries, Agriculture and agrobiodiversity, Infrastructure, Fisheries, Forestry - Including HCVF and REDD+, Financial and Accounting, Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting, Biomes, Tropical Rain Forests, Wetlands, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Productive Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Species, Threatened Species, Illegal Wildlife Trade, Wildlife for Sustainable Development, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Convene multi-stakeholder alliances, Transform policy and regulatory environments, Demonstrate innovative approach, Stakeholders, Civil Society, Non-Governmental Organization, Community Based Organization, Academia, Communications, Behavior change, Education, Awareness Raising, Public Campaigns, Private Sector, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, Large corporations, SMEs, Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, Beneficiaries, Type of Engagement, Information Dissemination, Consultation, Participation, Partnership, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender-sensitive indicators, Women groups, Knowledge Generation and Exchange, Gender results areas, Capacity Development, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Access and control over natural resources, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Innovation, Targeted Research, Learning, Theory of change, Adaptive management, Indicators to measure change, Knowledge Exchange, Knowledge Generation

Rio Markers

Climate Change Mitigation

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 0

Submission Date

12/10/2020

Expected Implementation Start

9/1/2021

Expected Completion Date

8/31/2026

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

737,313.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
IP SFM Congo	Landscapes and marine habitat under improved management (excluding protected areas) Terrestrial habitat under improved conservation and sustainable use (million hectares) Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of CO2e) Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)	GET	8,192,366.00	49,935,044.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			8,192,366.00	49,935,044.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

To catalyze transformational change at a regional level by scaling up best practices and innovations originating from sustainable forest management in transboundary landscapes. This will be realized through the following project components.

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
-------------------	----------------	-------------------	------------------	------------	---------------------------	----------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Integrated Transboundary Land Use Planning	Technical Assistance	1.1: Land-use planning decisions in transboundary landscapes in the Congo Basin are based on enhanced integrated land use management plans (ILUMPs) developed in a consultative manner and based on natural capital accounting and systems thinking	<p>1.1.1 Enhanced land use planning methodology developed through a consultative process and other land use planning tools made available to support national child projects</p> <p>1.1.2. National stakeholders of the six basin countries trained on the land use planning methodology developed under Output 1.1.1</p> <p>1.1.3. ILUMPs developed in consultation with stakeholders for three segments of two transboundary landscapes that are not covered by national child projects</p> <p>1.1.4. Four transboundary ILUMPs are consulted, elaborated and their endorsement by appropriate national inter</p>	GET	2,198,700.00	27,442,085.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Targeted management interventions to provide safe and extensive habitat for stable and/or increasing populations of endangered species	Technical Assistance	2.1: Enhanced regional capacity for addressing wildlife crime	2.1.1. Support and technical assistance provided to revise ECCAS Eco Security Policy and Strategy as a tool to fight wildlife crime.	GET	1,635,073.00	8,308,459.00
		2.2. Conservation of great apes and forest elephants is integrated into regional development processes	2.1.2. Awareness in relevant law enforcement organizations about wildlife trafficking is raised			
			2.2.1. Long-term zoonotic disease surveillance systems strengthened in the TNS landscape to minimize the risks of disease transmission between human and wildlife and vice versa, with a specific focus on great apes and elephants.			
			2.2.2. Monitoring of illegal killing of elephants to support decision making relating to elephant conservation and law enforcement in the sub-region strengthened.			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
3. Empowerment of IPLCs and forest-dependent people and greater private sector engagement	Technical Assistance	3.1: Local communities , forest-dependent people and private sector implement and scale up SFM investments in the Congo Basin	<p>3.1.1. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities are empowered to actively participate and defend their rights in land use planning and private sector engagement processes, and to gain institutional recognition of their land tenure rights and role in conservation and SFM</p> <p>3.1.2 Mechanisms are created or enhanced to scale up market access of and private sector investment sustainably produced palm oil and cocoa in the Congo Basin</p> <p>3.1.3 Multi-stakeholder partnerships are scaled up for effective implementation of sustainable forest management in the Congo Basin</p> <p><i>3.1.4. Digital platform is enhanced for data management and improved community</i></p>	GET	1,222,527.00	5,689,500.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
4. Knowledge Management	Technical Assistance	<p>4.1: National and transboundary stakeholders use enhanced knowledge for CBSL SFM on-the-ground actions</p> <p>4.2: Enhanced knowledge on current and potential impact of climate change on Congo Basin applied for policy planning and analysis</p>	<p>4.1.1. Existing and new tools and knowledge resources relevant to CBSL IP child projects are harvested, captured and/or created and made available</p> <p>4.1.2. A CBSL knowledge management platform (KM Platform) is created and operational</p> <p>4.1.3. CBSL IP online Community of Practice (CoP) is developed and enhanced through increased membership and diversity of users</p> <p>4.1.4. Regional capacity development through training and knowledge sharing workshops, field visits and study tours, and online training events</p> <p>4.1.5. Knowledge management governance structure established</p>	GET	1,238,200.00	1,230,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
5. Program Coordination and Communication	Technical Assistance	5.1: Improved coordination among program stakeholders and other donors, and increased awareness of CBSL program and lessons among national decision-makers and the global audience	5.1.1. Coordination Unit and Program Steering Committee are established and operational 5.1.2. M&E system is established, tracking measurable progress, and feeding back into adaptive management of the CONGO IP program strategy 5.1.3. Congo IP Communication and Outreach Strategy developed and implemented	GET	1,532,400.00	4,750,000.00
Sub Total (\$)					7,826,900.00	47,420,044.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
GET			365,466.00	2,515,000.00		
Sub Total(\$)			365,466.00	2,515,000.00		
Total Project Cost(\$)			8,192,366.00	49,935,044.00		

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
GEF Agency	UNEP (GRASP)	Grant	Investment mobilized	11,420,000.00
GEF Agency	UNEP (GRASP)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	265,000.00
Other	WCMC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6,119,000.00
Other	IUCN Palm Oil Task Force	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	58,906.00
Civil Society Organization	Rainforest Alliance	Grant	Investment mobilized	400,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Rainforest Alliance	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00
Donor Agency	CAFI	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	7,000,000.00
GEF Agency	UNEP	Grant	Investment mobilized	200,000.00
Donor Agency	UNODC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,778,973.00
Other	WCS (NGO)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00
Other	IUCN ARRC Taskforce	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	30,000.00
Other	IUCN ARRC Taskforce	Grant	Investment mobilized	190,375.00
Donor Agency	CITES MIKE	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,389,486.00

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Donor Agency	USAID	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	16,883,304.00
Total Co-Financing(\$)				49,935,044.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

Investments other than recurrent costs were counted as investments mobilized.

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	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNEP	GET	Regional	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Congo Set-Aside	8,192,366	737,313
Total Grant Resources(\$)					8,192,366.00	737,313.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

☐

PPG Amount (\$)

200,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

18,000

Agenc y	Trust Fund	Country	Foca l Area	Programmin g of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
UNEP	GET	Regional	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Congo Set-Aside	200,000	18,000
Total Project Costs(\$)					200,000.00	18,000.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	1,215,014.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	--------	---------------	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	---------------------------

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	1,215,014.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	--------	---------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Name of the Protected Area	WDP ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Dzanga Sangha (TNS/CAR)	12568931459	SelectProtected Landscape/Seascape		457,900.00			52.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Lobeké (TNS/CAM)	1256891245	SelectWilderness Area		217,800.00			66.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Monts de Cristal NP (MAMC/Gabon)	125689306237	SelectNational Park		120,000.00			26.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Noua-bale-Ndoki NP (TNS/RoC)	12568972332	SelectHabitat/Species Management Area		419,314.00			77.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	213940.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	213,940.00		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title	Submitted
-------	-----------

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)	0	17805882	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)		17,805,882		
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
------------	---------------------------------	---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		206,625		
Male		208,755		
Total	0	415380	0	0

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

1a. Project Description.

-

An estimated 84% of forest disturbance area in the Congo Basin region is due to small-scale, non-mechanized forest clearing for agriculture (Tyukavina et al. 2018)[1]¹. Selective logging is the second most significant disturbance driver, contributing roughly 10% of regional gross forest disturbance area and more than 60% of disturbance area in Gabon. Other drivers include fires, large-scale agriculture, residential and commercial construction, road construction, natural forest disturbance, and mining (see figure below). Furthermore, in a more recent paper Molinario et al. (2020)[2]² emphasize the need to assess the deforestation footprint of large-scale agroindustry and resource extraction activities in the landscape-level context to avoid underestimation. Employment opportunities in these commercial concessions create rural communities that rely on shifting cultivation and Non Timber Forest Products (NFTPs) for their subsistence and household needs, hence contributing to further forest loss and degradation. With this in mind, the landscape context needs to be included in future land-use change dynamic analysis, land-use planning and governance.

Baseline scenario and projects

In the "business-as-usual" scenario, there are several important recently completed, nearing completion, or ongoing conservation initiatives undertaken by the governments of the six Congo Basin countries with the support of NGOs, multilateral and bilateral aid agencies, research organizations, and CSOs. This forms an important foundation of work to which the regional project will add value.

Long-term solution and barriers to coordinated regional action

The Congo Basin countries recognize the urgent need to step up regional cooperation to secure conservation and enhancement of forests, biodiversity and carbon stocks, and make a shift from the current unsustainable land use policies and practices to sustainable land and forest management that can be enforced overtime and adopted at a landscape level. There is a need to anticipate land-use change dynamics within land-use planning and the local governance of natural resources to

protect intact dense rainforests. There are, however, a number of barriers that impede coordinated regional action:

Barrier 1: Lack of national and transboundary land use planning and use of available technology and processes to scale land use planning and implementation practices

Barrier 2: Weak enforcement and lack of a uniform, harmonized regional approach in dealing with wildlife crime and the conservation of endangered species

Barrier 3: The involvement of local communities, indigenous people and forest-dependent communities, as well as the involvement of the private sector, is not optimal in order-to scale interventions

Barrier 4: Lack of knowledge of the importance of the Congo Basin in terms of global environmental benefits and the threats that could adversely impact the provision of these benefits and services

Barrier 5: Insufficient coordination and communication of best practices among the Congo Basin countries, donors, and executing agencies

Project goal and objective

The objective of the regional child project is to catalyze transformational change at a regional level by scaling up best practices and innovations originating from sustainable forest management in transboundary landscapes. This will be realized through the following project components:

COMPONENT 1: INTEGRATED TRANSBOUNDARY LAND USE PLANNING

Outcome 1.1. Land use decisions in transboundary landscapes in the Congo Basin are based on enhanced Integrated Land Use Management Plans (ILUMPs) developed in a consultative manner and based on natural capital valuation and systems thinking

COMPONENT 2. TARGETED MANAGEMENT INTERVENTIONS TO PROVIDE SAFE AND EXTENSIVE HABITAT FOR STABLE AND/OR INCREASING POPULATIONS OF ENDANGERED SPECIES

Outcome 2.1. Enhanced regional capacity for addressing wildlife crime

Outcome 2.2. Conservation of great apes and forest elephants addressed effectively on a regional level

COMPONENT 3: EMPOWERMENT OF INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND LOCAL COMMUNITIES (IPLCs) AND
FOREST-DEPENDENT PEOPLE, AND GREATER PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT

Outcome 3.1. Enhanced capacity of local communities, forest-dependent people, and private sector to implement and scale up SFM investments in the Congo Basin

COMPONENT 4. KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT

Outcome 4.1. National and transboundary stakeholders use enhanced knowledge for Congo Impact Program Sustainable Forest Management (IP SFM) on-the-ground actions

Outcome 4.2. Enhanced knowledge on current and potential impact of climate change on Congo Basin targeting policy interventions

COMPONENT 5. PROGRAM COORDINATION AND COMMUNICATION

Outcome 5.1. Improved coordination among program stakeholders and other donors, and increased knowledge and awareness of Congo IP program and lessons among national decision-makers and the global audience

Alignment with GEF priorities

This regional child project is aligned with the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program developed under the GEF 7 Sustainable Forest Management Impact Program (GEF 7 Programming Directions). The regional child project will contribute to the objectives of the biodiversity, land degradation, and climate change focal areas.

Incremental cost reasoning

The regional child project builds on baseline initiatives being undertaken by various entities in different countries of the basin (for more detail see section on baseline scenario and projects in the Project Document), by taking a more cross-sectoral and inter-institutional approach and focusing on transboundary dialogue and action.

Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the Steering Committee at agreed intervals.

Maximizing global environmental benefits in transboundary landscapes

The programmatic approach will help ensure that investments to promote biodiversity conservation, SFM, and SLM in one country are not undermined by indirect threats from other countries within the same transboundary landscape. For example, the regional project will develop a land-use planning methodology that integrates systems thinking and natural capital economic valuation into decision-making. Once the methodology has been finalized and agreed in a regional workshop, the various child projects will take the lead in developing national integrated land use management plans. By having the same methodology applied by basin countries in different transboundary landscapes concurrently, the programmatic approach will enhance the global benefits of improved land use in the Congo Basin. Land use planning in sectors of the key transboundary landscapes that are not covered by national child project will be addressed by the regional child project.

Ability to transfer knowledge and experience: The Knowledge Management (KM) component of the regional child project will help in the transfer of knowledge and experience among basin countries so one country can benefit from the lessons and approaches proving successful in other countries.

Testing various approaches in different contexts: The 6 country projects and 1 regional project under the IP will enable the testing of different approaches in different socio-economic, political and ecological contexts. Innovations in one context could be applicable to others. For example, community management of protected areas and natural resources will be demonstrated in several child projects, as will local income generation through sustainable tourism. This will lead to a broader set of experiences for further replication.

Common approach to monitoring impacts and disseminating lessons: The 6 country projects will have a common system for monitoring impacts (under component 5 of the regional child project), and a shared knowledge base (component 4 of the regional child project). This will facilitate comparisons and sharing of good practices across the different transboundary landscapes.

Sustainability and innovation

The regional child project will take important strides towards sustainability by focusing on the inter-related factors of building stakeholder trust and motivation, putting in place important measures that can help with sustaining capacity and financing after the project, and building resilience in outcomes, as noted in the GEF-STAP paper on durability.

In terms of sustaining financing for the actions initiated under the regional child project, the CONGO Impact Program Coordination Unit (IP CU) will be responsible for developing a communications strategy to build visibility and interest in the program from a broad range of actors.

In terms of innovation, although as outlined in the baseline section there has been a plethora of conservation projects in the Congo Basin in recent years, the regional child project offers a number of key policy and institutional innovations. To mention a few, strengthening indigenous

and local community tenure and management rights and the use of integrated land use planning (ILUMPs) is innovative for the Congo Basin region, as is the application of natural capital accounting (NCA). To ensure effective and relevant application of all of these innovations, the project will incorporate lessons learned from similar projects as well as from the CONGO IP program as it advances, including by allocating resources to documentation and uptake of lessons learned under the Knowledge Management component of the project.

Changes in ?alternative scenario?:

Component	PFD approval	CEO Endorsement
-----------	--------------	-----------------

Component 1: Integrated transboundary land use planning	<p>At the time of PFD approval, it was anticipated that the regional child project would design ILUMPs for critical areas of 2-3 transboundary landscapes that are not covered by national child projects.</p>	<p>Based on consultations with stakeholders, this has now been narrowed to 3 segments of 2 landscapes namely, RoC and Cameroon segments of TNS (CAR segment of TNS being covered by World Bank-led CAR child project), and Gabon segment of MAMC landscape (Equatorial Guinea segment covered by IUCN-led child project).</p>
	<p>At the time of PFD approval, it was anticipated that five transboundary ILUMPs would be consulted, elaborated and endorsed through the support of the regional child project.</p>	<p>Due to changes in the national child projects, this is now reduced to four transboundary ILUMPs. There are four transboundary landscapes for which this cross-border dialogue and agreement will be important: TNS, MAMC, LTLT, and CMRC. The other two landscapes mentioned in the PFD were the TRIDOM and Grand Kivu. For the TRIDOM landscape (Cameroon, Gabon, RoC), at the time of PFD approval, it was anticipated that the Cameroon child project led by WWF-US would undertake ILUMPs for the Ngoyla and Mintom Council areas (Dja) and this is still the case; the GAB child project led by the World Bank was going to develop ILUMPs for the Minkebe area, but due to security concerns will no longer be doing so; and the regional child project was going to focus on Odzala. However, since the World Bank has pulled out of Minkebe, and given the limited resources available under the regional project, the latter will not be able to cover the Minkebe and Odzala areas, and transboundary work will not be possible for the TRIDOM under the CBSL IP at this time. The Grand Kivu landscape is transboundary with DRC and several other countries (Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi, Tanzania) that are not part of the CBSL IP and thus the transboundary dialogue aspects that are central to this output cannot be applied there either.</p>
		<p>A new land use planning related output has been added to this component ? 1.1.5 Developing a knowledge-base for sustainable vegetable oils in the Congo Basin (with a special focus on palm oil) ? Palm oil development is an emerging threat in the</p>

<p>Component 2: Targeted management interventions to provide safe and extensive habitat for stable and/or increasing populations of endangered species</p>	<p>Under the PFD, the following outputs were envisioned:</p> <p>2.1.1. Creating and/or strengthening the networks between the six basin countries and across agencies in single countries to ensure the effective criminalization and prosecution of wildlife crime</p> <p>2.1.2. Raising the awareness of trade, customs and related law enforcement organizations about wildlife crime</p> <p>2.1.3. Supporting enforcement agencies with technological and forensic advances to improve the deterrence, detection and prosecution of wildlife crime along the trade chain</p> <p>2.1.4. Annual meetings of the GEF 7 Global Wildlife Program attended by the six basin countries? representatives on wildlife crime</p>	<p>Based on discussions during the PPG and available resources it was determined that partnering with UNODC on wildlife crime will capitalize on synergies between the CBSL IP and the ECCAS-UNODC-EU efforts in this regard. Based on this, the outputs envisioned for this under the PFD have been merged in to one Output (2.1.1) that will be implemented in close partnership with UNODC.</p> <p>Outputs 2.1.1 through 2.1.4 have been merged in to one Output 2.1.1 Support and technical assistance provided to revise ECCAS Eco Security Policy and Strategy as a tool to fight wildlife crime.</p> <p>For the second outcome under this component related to conservation of great apes and elephants, discussions during the PPG phase led to the establishment of partnerships with WCS and WWF as the best means of furthering the outcome in the most efficient way. The focus will be primarily on great apes and forest elephants, but improving the survival conditions for these species is expected to have benefits for other species too. In addition, it is not considered feasible to use an SGP modality to respond to immediate threats to great apes so this has been removed.</p>
	<p>Under the PFD, the following outputs were envisioned:</p> <p>2.2.1. Small, competitive grants for on-the-ground projects that respond to immediate threats are implemented</p> <p>2.2.2. Long-term technical advisory support to strengthen cross-border capacity to effectively manage wildlife population is implemented</p>	<p>Since a small grants program was not considered transformational given the limited resources available, and considering that the COVID-19 pandemic that unfolded during PPG phase highlighted the need for increased work on zoonotic diseases, the outputs have now been changed to:</p> <p>Output 2.2.1. Long-term zoonotic disease surveillance systems strengthened in the TNS landscape to minimize the risks of disease transmission between humans and wildlife and vice versa with a specific focus on great apes and elephants.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2 Strengthening the monitoring of illegal killing of elephants to support decision making relating to elephant conservation and law enforcement in the sub-region.</p>

<p>Component 3: Local Community, Forest Dependent People and Private Sector Empowerment</p>	<p>3.1.1 Study conducted and guidelines developed on how to empower local communities and forest-dependent people in decision making on SFM aspects (including land tenure, rights and access) in the Congo Basin</p> <p>3.1.2. Study conducted and recommendations made on how private sector financing of SFM in the Congo Basin can be elevated (e.g., impact investing in SFM activities of local communities and forest-dependent people)</p> <p>3.1.3. Small grant facilities/micro credit schemes that support SFM and community and forest dependent people empowerment are established, with priority support areas and access requirements identified</p> <p>3.1.4. Platform established as one-stop shop for community access to financing (impact investing, small grants, micro credit) with a portfolio of projects under implementation.</p>	<p>During the PPG consultations with partners, notably Rainforest Alliance, it was indicated that a study as mentioned in 3.1.1 above is not required because the central African countries have already developed a 'road map' on this. Similarly, the study under 3.1.2 was also not considered transformational and instead, an alternative Output 3.1.2. Mechanisms are created and enhanced to scale up market access of and private sector investments in sustainably produced palm oil and cocoa in the Congo Basin has been inserted to build on the studies already done, as well as Output 3.1.3 Multi-stakeholder partnerships are scaled up for effective implementation of sustainable forest management in the Congo Basin. Furthermore, While the small grants mechanism was initially proposed in the PFD, it has since become clear that at least four of the country child projects already include small grants mechanisms to support IPLCs to pilot sustainable livelihoods projects based on SLM and CBNRM to reduce deforestation, IWT and unsustainable bush meat exploitation and promote participatory forest management. These grant support mechanisms tailored at landscape level are likely to be more sensitive to local context, and therefore more effective, than regionally-managed ones. After careful consideration, UNEP came to the conclusion that, rather than duplicating the efforts of the national child projects with yet another grants mechanism, more impact could be achieved through a redesign of component 3 to strengthen existing regional coordination mechanisms for forest-dependent peoples, giving them a voice in integrated land use plan development processes.</p> <p>In summary, the outputs now read as follows:</p> <p>3.1.1. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities are empowered to actively participate and defend their rights in land use planning and private sector engagement processes, and to gain institutional recognition of their land tenure rights and role in conservation and SFM</p> <p>3.1.2 Mechanisms are created or enhanced to scale up market access of and private sector investment sustainably produced palm oil and cocoa in the Congo Basin</p> <p>3.1.3 Multi-stakeholder partnerships are scaled up for effective implementation of sustainable forest management in the Congo Basin</p> <p>3.1.4. Digital platform is enhanced for data management and improved community access</p>
---	---	---

Component 4: Knowledge Management	<p>At PFD approval the following outputs were envisioned. All of these have been retained however the ordering and phrasing has been slightly changed to follow a more logical sequence, and in some cases the output has been subsumed in another one. See below.</p>	<p>4.1.1. Existing and new tools and knowledge resources relevant to CBSL IP child projects are harvested, captured and/or created</p> <p>4.1.2. A CBSL knowledge management platform (KM Platform) is created</p> <p>4.1.3. CBSL IP online Community of Practice (CoP) is developed and enhanced through increased membership and diversity of users</p> <p>4.1.4. Regional capacity development through training and knowledge sharing workshops, field visits and study tours, and online training events</p> <p>4.1.5. Knowledge management governance structure established</p>
	<p>4.1.1. Existing tools and knowledge resources repackaged, enhanced, and made available through online portal (ref. 5.1.5.) (wording changed)</p>	
	<p>4.1.2. Four annual CBSL regional knowledge sharing and capacity development workshops (this is now included under 4.1.4)</p>	
	<p>4.1.3. Training workshops on priority CBSL/SFM topics at regional level (this is now included under 4.1.4)</p>	
	<p>4.1.4. Regional Congo Basin exchange visits on SFM (this is now included under 4.1.4)</p>	
	<p>4.1.5. CBSL/SFM online Communities of Practice (CoPs) are developed and enhanced through increased membership & diversity of users (this is now 4.1.3)</p>	
	<p>4.2.1. Studies on current and potential climate change impacts on the Congo Basin focusing on biodiversity loss; findings feed in to land use planning methodology development exercise (ref. 1.1.1.)</p>	
	<p>4.2.2. Strategies and policy briefs developed on the mitigation of CC impacts on the biodiversity of Congo Basin</p>	Based on discussions with GRI and within

Component 5: Program Coordination and Communication		The information system and CBSL web portal has been moved to Component 4 as it fit more logically with the KM Portal. The previous output 5.1.3 on Partnership Strategy has been integrated in to the technical components as each component will work with key partners to advance the components. Overall, the PSC will support and advance the partnerships established under the different technical components of the regional child project (for example, partnerships with the private sector, donors, research institutes, international NGOs, and knowledge networks).
---	--	---

Changes in co-financing:

At PFD approval, the co-financing estimates were as follows:

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment mobilized	Amount (\$)
Multilateral agency	European Union	Grant	Investment mobilized	38,350,000
Other	CAFI	Grant	Investment mobilized	7,000,000
NGO	Conservation Justice	Grant	Investment mobilized	5,016,000
Other	GRASP	Grant and In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	1,050,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	Grant and In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	10,480,000
NGO	Rainforest Alliance	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000
Other	UNEP -WCMC	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,567,000

Total Co-financing				65,963,000
--------------------	--	--	--	------------

At CEO Endorsement, committed co-financing has changed as follows:

During PPG, the partnership with Conservation Justice hasn't materialized, nor has the EU co-financing. On the other hand, co-financing from UNODC, WCS, USFS, CITES-MIKE and IUCN was secured and co-financing letters obtained.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Investment Mobilized	Amount (\$)
GEF Agency	UNEP (GRASP)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	11,420,000
GEF Agency	UNEP (GRASP)	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	265,000
Other	WCMC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	6,119,000
IGO	IUCN Palm Oil Task Force	Grant	Investment mobilized	58,906
CSO	Rainforest Alliance	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	400,000
CSO	Rainforest Alliance	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000
Donor Agency	CAFI	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,500,000
Donor Agency	CAFI	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	3,500,000
GEF Agency	UNEP	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	200,000
UN Agency	UNODC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	4,778,973
NGO	WCS	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	100,000

IGO	IUCN ARRC Taskforce	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	30,000
IGO	IUCN ARRC Taskforce	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	190,375
UN Agency	CITES MIKE	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,389,486
Donor Agency	USFS	In Kind	Recurrent expenditures	16,883,304
Total Co-financing				49,935,044

Changes in GEF-7 core indicators:

-

GEF-7 Core Indicator	At PFD Approval	At CEO Endorsement and reason for change
----------------------	-----------------	--

GEF-7 Core Indicator	At PFD Approval	At CEO Endorsement and reason for change				
GEF core indicator 1.2 Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness as measured by METT score (see detailed notes to GEF-7 core indicator worksheet)	2,386,114 ha consisting of,	1,215,014 ha consisting of,				
	<table><tr><td>Odzala-Kokoua NP (TRIDOM/ RoC)</td><td>1,354,600</td></tr></table>	Odzala-Kokoua NP (TRIDOM/ RoC)	1,354,600	<table><tr><td>Nouabale-Ndoki NP (TNS/ RoC)</td><td>419,314</td></tr></table>	Nouabale-Ndoki NP (TNS/ RoC)	419,314
	Odzala-Kokoua NP (TRIDOM/ RoC)	1,354,600				
	Nouabale-Ndoki NP (TNS/ RoC)	419,314				
	<table><tr><td>Ntokou-Pikounda NP (TRIDOM/ RoC)</td><td>457,200</td></tr></table>	Ntokou-Pikounda NP (TRIDOM/ RoC)	457,200	<table><tr><td>Lobeke (TNS/CAM)</td><td>217,800</td></tr></table>	Lobeke (TNS/CAM)	217,800
	Ntokou-Pikounda NP (TRIDOM/ RoC)	457,200				
	Lobeke (TNS/CAM)	217,800				
<table><tr><td>Lossi Gorilla Reserves (TRIDOM/ RoC)</td><td>35,000</td></tr></table>	Lossi Gorilla Reserves (TRIDOM/ RoC)	35,000	<table><tr><td>Dzanga Sangha[3]³ (TNS/CAR)</td><td>457,900</td></tr></table>	Dzanga Sangha[3] ³ (TNS/CAR)	457,900	
Lossi Gorilla Reserves (TRIDOM/ RoC)	35,000					
Dzanga Sangha[3] ³ (TNS/CAR)	457,900					
<table><tr><td>Nouabale-Ndoki NP (TNS/ RoC)</td><td>419,314</td></tr></table>	Nouabale-Ndoki NP (TNS/ RoC)	419,314	<table><tr><td>Monts de Cristal NP (MAMC/ Gabon)</td><td>120,000</td></tr></table>	Monts de Cristal NP (MAMC/ Gabon)	120,000	
Nouabale-Ndoki NP (TNS/ RoC)	419,314					
Monts de Cristal NP (MAMC/ Gabon)	120,000					
<table><tr><td>Monts de Cristal NP (MAMC/ Gabon)</td><td>120,000</td></tr></table>	Monts de Cristal NP (MAMC/ Gabon)	120,000				
Monts de Cristal NP (MAMC/ Gabon)	120,000					
	<p>During the PPG phase, based on discussions with partners changes were made to Components 1 and 2 as described above.</p> <p>Component 2 of the regional child project (zoonotic disease surveillance system) is expected to impact this indicator through activities in the Lobeke, Dzanga Sangha, and Nouabale Ndoki in the TNS. In addition, Component 1 will design ILUMPs for Cameroon and RoC segments of the TNS landscape and for the Gabon segment of the MAMC landscape, and this will have indirect beneficial impacts on Lobeke, Dzanga Sangha, Nouabale Ndoki and Monts de Cristal NPs.</p> <p>This resulted in the above changes to core indicator 1.2.</p>					

GEF-7 Core Indicator	At PFD Approval		At CEO Endorsement and reason for change		
GEF core indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity through ILUMPs (see detailed notes to GEF-7 core indicator worksheet)	ROC sector of TRIDOM	4,916,200			5% of area
	ROC sector of TNS	1,728,000	CAM sector of TNS	1,470,799	73,540
	Gabon sector of MAMC	1,080,000	RoC sector of TNS	1,728,000	86,400
			Gabon sector of MAMC	1,080,000	54,000
	Total	7,724,200	Sum	4,278,799	213,940
			<p>Component 1 through ILUMPs will lead to improved practices in 3 segments of 2 landscapes (Gabon sector of Monte Alen-Mont de Cristal; RoC and Cameroon sectors of TNS). The project's presence in the field will translate to an estimated 5% improvement in the management of the landscapes. At PFD approval the regional project was to design ILUMPs for ROC sector of TRIDOM but this had to be changed to the CAM sector of TNS for the following reason:</p> <p>For the TRIDOM landscape (Cameroon, Gabon, RoC), at the time of PFD approval, it was anticipated that the Cameroon child project led by WWF-US would undertake ILUMPs for the Ngoyla and Mintom Council areas (Dja) and this is still the case; the GAB child project led by the World Bank was going to develop ILUMPs for the Minkebe area, but due to security concerns will no longer be doing so; and the regional child project was going to focus on Odzala. However, since the World Bank has pulled out of Minkebe, and given the limited resources available under the regional project, the latter will not be able to cover the Minkebe and Odzala areas, and transboundary work will not be possible for the TRIDOM under the CBSL IP at this time.</p>		

GEF-7 Core Indicator	At PFD Approval	At CEO Endorsement and reason for change
GEF core indicator 6.1 Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector (see detailed notes to GEF-7 core indicator worksheet)	19,228,762 tCO ₂ e	Total emissions reduction expected to be generated are approximately 17,557,599 tCO ₂ e. The reduction from the PFD stage is due to the fact that the area for which the regional child project will design ILUMPs has changed based on consultations with stakeholders during the PPG. At PFD stage the estimate was 7,724,200 ha but that has been revised down to 4,278,799. The project had originally planned to work in the RoC segment of TRIDOM but that has been changed to CAM segment of TNS, which is a smaller area than the former. Also, at the PFD stage it was assumed that 300 ha would be reforested during the project lifetime. However, this is no longer considered feasible during stakeholder consultations.
GEF core indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment (see detailed notes to GEF-7 core indicator worksheet)	Not specified.	Component 1 will have direct beneficiaries inasmuch as IPLCs will participate in the planning process to generate ILUMPs. Component 3 will cover around 265,000 through Output 3.1.1 with REPALEAC and around 10,000 beneficiaries (producers and farmers) in their supply chains, to adopt improved social and environmental practices and increase their investment and/or sourcing of responsible products from the targeted landscapes, as a result of technical support, guidance and awareness raising from the project team under Output 3.1.2 See Appendix 17 note 3 for more details.

[1] A. Tyukavina, M. C. Hansen, P. Potapov, D. Parker, C. Okpa, S. V. Stehman, I. Kommareddy, S. Turubanova, Congo Basin forest loss dominated by increasing smallholder clearing. *Sci. Adv.* 4, eaat2993 (2018). Supplementary material for this article is available at <http://advances.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/4/11/eaat2993/DC1>

[2] Molinario, G., Hansen, M., Potapov, P., Tyukavina, A. & Stehman, S. 2020. Contextualizing Landscape-Scale Forest Cover Loss in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) between 2000 and 2015. *Land* 9(1),

[3] Dzanga section of the park, 49,500 ha, the Ndoki section of the park, 72,500 ha and in-between a reserve, 335,900 ha.

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.

Project Map



Source: CAFI

The regional child project will operate on two levels:

- (1) Activities that have a region-wide impact across all six countries of the Congo Basin
- (2) Site-level interventions that include:

ILUMPs in RoC and CAM segments of TNS

ILUMP in Gabon/Monts de Cristal/ MAMC

Zoonotic disease surveillance in TNS PAs

Name	Longitude (x)	Latitude (y)
Dzanga-Sangha and Dzanga-Ndoki	16.217798	2.890330
Monts de Cristal	10.308157	0.721063
Nouabalé-Ndoki	16.604985	2.497669

1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

The objective of the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (Congo IP) is to catalyze transformational change in conservation and sustainable management of the Congo Basin through landscape approaches that empower local communities and forest dependent people, and through partnership with the private sector. This 5-year regional child project (RP) is one of seven child projects under the Congo IP, and is led by UNEP as GEF Implementing Agency. The other six child projects are national child projects in the following countries (lead GEF Implementing Agency in parenthesis): Cameroon (WWF-US), Central African Republic (World Bank), DRC (UNEP), Equatorial Guinea (IUCN), Gabon (World Bank), and the Republic of Congo (UNEP). The regional project is designed to address barriers to regional dialogue and collaboration on actions to promote sustainable forest management in the six Congo Basin forest countries. The regional project will address these barriers through five components: (i) integrated transboundary land use planning; (ii) targeted management interventions to provide safe and extensive habitat for stable and/or increasing populations of endangered species; (iii) empowerment of IPLCs and forest-dependent people to undertake sustainable forest management, and greater engagement of the private sector in these efforts; (iv) regional knowledge management activities to develop shared knowledge and capacities across the six countries; and (v) program management and coordination. The regional project will work in close collaboration with related ongoing programs in the Congo Basin such as Central African Forest Initiative (CAFI), Eco-syst?mes Forestiers en Afrique Centrale (ECOFAC), and others, as well as with regional institutions such as Central Africa Forest Commission (COMIFAC), Economic Community of the Central Africa States (ECCAS), and Regional Network of Local and Indigenous Populations for the Sustainable Management of Forest Ecosystems in Central Africa (REPALEAC). By promoting much-needed regional collaboration and action under these five components, the regional project will contribute to the long-term goal of healthy and thriving forest ecosystems in the Congo Basin such that large patches of forest cover and peatlands in key transboundary landscapes are protected, connectivity of large blocks of forest maintained, wildlife populations are stable, forest dependent people are empowered to manage their lands and improve their livelihoods, and exploitation of natural resources is sustainable with cross-sectoral and transboundary land-use planning in place.

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Private Sector Entities Yes

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement

To catalyze transformational change in land-use, SFM, biodiversity conservation, and livelihoods of forest dependent people in transboundary landscapes by scaling up best practices and innovations at regional level hinges on sound and complete resource use information as well as harnessing the support and vision of diverse stakeholder groups, decision and policy-makers, and other concerned parties. Capturing the interest, knowledge and experience of different groups necessitates a variety of platforms and approaches aimed at participation and consensus building. A key element to the success of the regional child project will be to promote specific participation strategies, such as same-sex meetings and carefully structured group processes, to ensure women's representation and participation in the overall Congo IP. The promotion and/or integration of forest dependent people and other minority groups in decision making processes and management institutions through the FPIC (Free Prior Informed Consent) principle will be central to the regional child project's actions. The analysis of gender issues will guide the design of ILUMPs as well as the implementation and management of activities within the overall Congo IP. It is envisaged that it may also be necessary to put in place a specific Indigenous Peoples Plan according to the ESES guidelines. Such a plan should also include specific gender safeguards regarding the rights, roles and responsibilities of women members of landscape communities, as well as the specific needs of disadvantaged and marginalised community members within the landscape.

Process stakeholders include those directly affecting biodiversity and others affected by the project and can be disaggregated into various types of forest dependent people representatives, private sector groups (logging/mining), various government services, the international community, etc. At the regional level, the following government agencies and stakeholders were consulted: ECCAS, COMIFAC, CEFDHAC, REPALEAC, World Bank (WB), CAFI, US Forest Service, World Conservation Monitoring Center (WCMC), the Global Wildlife Program (GWP), UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), Environmental Investigation Agency, German CBFP Facilitation, Conservation Justice, and Man & Nature.

See Section 5.1 Stakeholder Engagement Plan in the UNEP project document for a detailed explanation.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only; Yes

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier; Yes

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes

Executor or co-executor;

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

Achieving the Regional Project Objective to make "Transformational Change in Sustainable Forest Management in Transboundary Landscapes of the Congo Basin" is only possible if knowledge of both men and women are engaged. A clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities of women and men in forest management initiatives is vital not only for due diligence?e.g., to avoid harm to the vulnerable, but also to achieve positive results. Women and men deploy different resources, strategies, and knowledge even as they work together. Women and men also experience different constraints and problems. In turn, gender roles and responsibilities are shaped by sociocultural contexts that may be as or more important than gender itself in determining access to, benefit from, and knowledge of forests and forest management. Such variables include ethnicity, age, education, wealth, skill set and employment, locality, power and social status.

Women remain key to success. Women play a critical role in the management of forest resources and biodiversity. Investment in women percolates to families and society as a whole. Understanding their role as well as the gender dynamics that shape natural resource management is a necessity for assuring sound outcomes. For rural women, forest conservation is a life and death issue centering on, for example, access to, use and management of forest products, food security, revenue to ensure payment

of school fees, health costs and other needs, security in entering forests and going to market, and health impacts of unclean water, malnutrition and loss of diversity.

The incorporation of gender-related aspects, specifically aimed at empowering women and ensuring their participation in decision making in wildlife and landscape management, will be a priority across all activities.

See Appendix 22 Gender Analysis and Action Plan for a detailed explanation.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; Yes

Improving women's participation and decision making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

One of the key barriers that this project aims to overcome is that the involvement of the private sector is not optimal in order to scale interventions.

Historically, international action has supported the government as a central player in attempting to reinforce regulatory measures and the organization of surveillance. However, there is a need to increase involvement of the private sector and in order to scale sustainable forest management, innovative approaches involving the private sector will have to be explored, as public funding will always be limited.

This project investigate and encourage ways to enhance private sector engagement in various ways. For example, under component 2, Output 2.2.2, the regional child project will strengthen the capacity in great ape range states to conduct Strategic Environmental Impact Assessments (SEIA), to respond to requests for expert advice and to fully engage with industry, governments, and multi-lateral institutions such as the IFC. As a result of revision of the IFC Performance Standard 6, the Avoidance, Reduction, Restoration and Compensation (ARRC) Task Force now provides expert advice to clients of IFC (and

Equator Banks aligned with IFC Performance Standards), governments, and industry, as conditioned by the loan agreements for projects taking place in ape-range countries. Companies which seek funding from IFC and whose operations have a potentially negative impact on great apes and their habitats are obliged to seek expert advice from the Task Force. Additionally, through empowering IPLCs and forest dependent people to sustainably manage forest resources and securing greater private sector financing for scaling up these efforts (Component 3) the project will build capacity, strengthen partnerships and catalyze private sector investment towards sustainable forest management to increase the financial benefits and sustainable revenues of local communities.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Table Risk management measures

Risk	Rating (high/ medium/low)	Mitigation
------	------------------------------	------------

<p>Risks regarding marginalized communities and gender include IPLCs and forest dependent communities lacking government support to strengthen their land and resource rights. Their participation in project activities may not be welcomed by other communities. Gender mainstreaming in project implementation may be inadequate and women's participation in training sessions, workshops, consultations etc. not supported by governments and regional bodies.</p>	<p>Low to medium</p>	<p>The project will advocate for and raise awareness of decision-makers of the importance of strengthening the land and resource rights of indigenous and forest-dependent peoples.</p> <p>The project will seek to comply with and apply relevant international guidelines and best practices regarding equal participation and inclusion of all stakeholders, such as women, youth, disabled and indigenous peoples, in decision-making concerning natural resources. Such instruments include the Free, Prior, Informed Consent (FPIC) guidelines and various declarations, resolutions and conventions.</p> <p>The regional project activities will be aligned with COMIFAC's <i>Sub-regional Strategy for Gender Mainstreaming in the Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the Congo Basin</i>, as well as with UNEP's guide on <i>Gender Equality and the Environment</i> as well as ESERN. A project-specific gender mainstreaming action plan will also be implemented. Any relevant guidance from REPALEAC will also be considered during inception.</p>
<p>Technological risks concern the implementation and coordination of project activities through internet tools and remote technologies, which may be inadequate due to poor technological capacity in the countries. Adult literacy may also be an issue in some areas.</p>	<p>Medium to high</p>	<p>The fact that most of the project sites are remote with low connectivity will be taken into account when developing the outreach/capacity building/knowledge management instruments. These will be made accessible with low bandwidth and mobile phones. The question of literacy will be considered as appropriate with relevant communication activities.</p>

High staff turnover in local and regional institutions can undermine capacity building and knowledge management activities and hence compromise the long-term impact and effectiveness of the project.	Low to medium	The project's efforts on knowledge management are designed to create an online repository of knowledge products including training materials, training videos, and such. There will also be an actively moderated Community of Practice. These aspects could help mitigate issues related to staff turnover in other institutions that the project has no control over. New staff that are central to the project will be able to access the online knowledge repository and participate in ongoing knowledge management events.
Limited financial and technical capacity in partner organizations can seriously compromise timely and cost-effective implementation of the project and the sustainability of project results.	Low to Medium	Gaps in technical capacity of partner organizations will be assessed and filled in through targeted and inclusive training activities. Capacity building of both formal and customary institutions will focus on strengthening structures, systems and processes to help ensure long-term effectiveness and sustainability of the project outcomes.
Limited availability of data and lack of access to reliable information, such as social dimensions of land and resource use, and wildlife crimes.	Medium to high	The project will nurture a culture of data creation and collection respecting local customs and norms, and information sharing amongst all project partners by capacity building exercises and demonstrating the crucial role of data in integrated land use planning. This is an important aspect in building trust amongst the partners and to sustain long-term results.

<p>Political risks include insufficient political, institutional, and financial support from the national governments (ministries, politicians) and the various regional sectoral and cross-sectoral bodies. These risks would hamper any effective transboundary/cross-border activities.</p> <p>Internal/political barriers can prevent different sectors (planning, environment, forests, tourism, agribusiness, etc.) from working together to achieve integrated and sustainable forest management and land use planning. This would prohibit institutional alliances from forming and lower the political weight of the project.</p>	<p>Low to medium</p>	<p>Political decision-makers will be closely involved in the implementation of activities since the start to ensure national and regional buy-in for the project. They are made aware of the importance of cross-sectoral approach in sustainable land use planning. Existing partnerships are used to maintain close relationships with key political stakeholders. Effective and open communication channels are created since the start to increase transparency of project activities and ensure all partners are updated. This is also to build trust between the different partners who are not used to working together or share information.</p>
<p>Insecurity and instability in the region may delay or prevent project activities and prohibit people from fully participating in regional project activities and overall compromise the project.</p>	<p>Low to medium</p>	<p>The project will closely liaise with government actors, other UN agencies and international partner organizations to stay up-to-date on the development of the security threats and situation in different landscapes the project is targeting.</p> <p>A contingency plan will be developed, and the project will refrain from starting activities in landscape segments that are considered the most volatile at the time.</p>

<p>Lack of data concerning climate change threats to Congo Basin forests and communities impacting land use planning, and low national capacity to respond to these threats.</p>	<p>Medium to high</p>	<p>Incorporation of climate change considerations will be part of the work under Components 1 and 4 of the regional project. Climate change vulnerability assessment and downscaled climate models including scenario planning will be developed for and applied to the priority landscapes and recommendations will be made for policy makers on how ILUMPs can incorporate climate change considerations. The Congo IP will also benefit from the related knowledge created by other projects in the region, notably the UNEP-FAO joint IKI project on Congo Basin Peatlands, results of which can be shared and replicated in other countries.</p>
--	-----------------------	---

<p>The uncertain development of the COVID-19 global pandemic may have significant consequences to the project given the restrictions on travel, social gatherings and meetings and tourism operations, as well as shifting donor priorities and larger scale socio-economic impacts.</p>	<p>Medium to high</p>	<p>All appropriate risk mitigation measures will be applied during the implementation of the regional project, such as physical distancing and remote working arrangements as required. A zoonotic disease surveillance mechanism is already included among the Component 2 activities, whereas the learning platform in Component 4 will offer an opportunity to explore integration of animal-human health issues as countries emerge from current crisis. Building resilience in populations particularly vulnerable to the socio-economic impacts of COVID-19 in the region may become mainstreamed in the regional project. The regional project will include a focus on strengthening forest-dependent communities. The sub-components related to livelihoods, especially of local communities and forest dependent communities, as well as those creating jobs with the private sector, become particularly important. Close coordination with other donors and partners on post-COVID-19 response will be pursued and partnerships with social and humanitarian stakeholders considered.</p>
--	-----------------------	--

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Institutional arrangements

UNEP is the executing entity. The institutional framework will consist of a CBSL Coordination Unit, and a Program Steering Committee (PSC) that will be established as a formal coordination mechanism. The PSC will be co-chaired by UNEP and ECCAS. See Output 5.1.1 in the UNEP project document for a description.

Coordination with current GEF interventions

The project will enhance efforts that promote: cross- boundary collaboration and support knowledge exchanges in the Congo Basin as well as other regional forums and with other GEF-funded programs. In particular, the regional child project will link with with:

- GEF5 Restoration Initiative that unites 10 Asian and African countries and three GEF agencies ? IUCN, FAO and UNEP ? in working to overcome existing barriers to restoration in support of the Bonn Challenge.
- GEF-7 Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration Impact Program (FOLUR) with the objective to ensure efficient and effective food value chains for multiple benefits, remove deforestation from supply chains and expand restoration of degraded lands. The regional child project will ensure coordination on the value chains work (in particular palm oil, coffee, and cocoa sectors to identify the right platforms).
- Global Wildlife Partnership: The regional child project will ensure that representatives from the 6 basin countries on wildlife crime attend the annual meetings of the GWP. The knowledge management platform will also link up with that of the GWP on topics that are of interest to the Congo Basin stakeholders. For example, GWP resources related to wildlife crime and trafficking in Central Africa could be made more accessible to stakeholders of the regional child project by translating them into French. Furthermore, during the inception phase, the CONGO IP CU will review and assess the experience of the Global Wildlife Program and the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program, and based on their lessons will finalize a program-wide M&E framework

Lastly, the regional child project will build on the work done under the GEF-4 project Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems in the Congo Basin (CBSP) and draw lessons from Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) portfolio as well as the portfolio on mercury.

Coordination with current non-GEF interventions

Central African Forest Initiative: The primary focus of CAFE is on country level activities, while the CBSL IP regional project (RP) puts an emphasis on transboundary landscapes and on region-wide joint and coordinated actions by all basin countries. Therefore, the CBSL IP regional project complements the work of CAFE. Coordination between CAFE and the CBSL IP will be important as there are a lot of complementarities, synergies, and opportunities for coordinating and harmonizing activities. The CBSL IP regional project will coordinate with CAFE on the land use planning methodological process. Component 1 of the regional project will be working on methodology development (for example, integrating natural capital valuation in land use plans) and capacity development for application of this methodology by country child projects in target transboundary landscapes. The regional project will ensure that its landscape level methodology aligns with CAFE's national LUP methodology. CAFE is also working in DRC, RoC, and Gabon on promoting sustainable agriculture, sustainable wood energy, and sustainable forest management (increasing the proportion of forests under SFM plans, reducing illegalities, enhancing transparency in permitting, promoting community forestry). The regional project will coordinate with CAFE through its knowledge management component (Component 4) to promote knowledge exchange across landscapes and national child projects under the CBSL IP on CAFE's successful experiences in promoting sustainable agriculture, reducing forest clearing due to charcoal and fuel wood, and community forestry.

ECCAS/UNODC: Component 2 of the regional child project (specifically Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2) will work closely with ECCAS/UNODC on wildlife crime. The regional child project will specifically complement Objective 2 of UNODC's work program namely, "Strengthening of regional and international cooperation capacities" actions, involving two or more countries, concerning borders identified by ECCAS and / or by certain traffic flows.

Africa Coexistence Landscapes Project: This project is developing a systems model that would help land use planning in the buffer transboundary zone between Cameroon and RoC in the TNS. The regional child project will be designing ILUMPs in CAM and RoC segments of TNS and will build on existing land use plans and associated data from the ACL project.

Global Peatlands Initiative: The regional child project will collaborate with this initiative and its International Center for Peatland Research (CIFOR) on south-south knowledge exchange.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

This is a regional project and it is aligned with the axes of COMIFAC's Convergence Plan for 2015-2025 which include: (a) Priority strategic themes: harmonization of forestry and fiscal policies; management and sustainable development of forest resources; conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity; combatting climate change and desertification; socio-economic development and multi-actor participation; and (b) Cross-cutting themes: sustainable funding; training and capacity building; research and development; communication, awareness building and education.

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

The Project through its Knowledge Management component 4 will complement, build on, learn from, and contribute to the visibility of current region-wide efforts involved in knowledge creation and sharing (e.g. COMIFAC's knowledge initiatives and outputs, OFAC's State of the Forest reports, CBFP knowledge development and networking initiatives, Global Wildlife Partnership's knowledge creation on wildlife issues in the Congo Basin, CAFI, CARPE, ECOFAC etc.) to help catalyze collaborative management across the Congo Basin and leverage partnerships through the CBFP colleges so as to expand knowledge and increase the reach of interventions. The KM of the RP will also provide targeted technical assistance to the child projects to increase stakeholder knowledge on conservation and sustainable forest management practices in the Congo Basin.

Furthermore, it will strengthen capacity for regional cooperation to manage the Congo Basin forests ecosystems through existing Institutions: ECCAS, COMIFAC, and the following CBFP colleges: Private Sector, Donor, Multilateral, civil Society, and therefore contribute to the visibility of, and complement as relevant, current region-wide efforts involved in knowledge creation and sharing

Finally, it will establish mechanisms for assimilating, documenting and sharing knowledge gained through project experiences.

See the UNEP project document for a detailed description.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

Component 5 (Output 5.1.2) of the project addresses M&E. See the UNEP project document for a detailed description.

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time Frame	Costing
Project Inception Workshop and Report	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	Within first two months of Project start up	Total: \$10,000
	? Project Management Unit /PMU		
	? UNEP		
Measurement of Means of Verification of Project results (outcome indicators and GEF tracking tools, including baseline data)	? Project Steering Committee will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions/ agencies, and delegate responsibilities to relevant executing partners	Start, mid and end of Project (during evaluation cycle); and annually.	Total: \$10,000
	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers		
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress (progress and performance indicators)	? Oversight by Project Coordinator & Project Managers	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and as defined in annual work plans	Total: \$10,000
	? PMU		
Annual Risk Review (ARR) and Project Implementation Report (PIR)	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	Annually	None
Periodic Status/Progress Reports to UNEP	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	Semi-annual/Quarterly	None

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time Frame	Costing
Mid Term Evaluation	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	At the mid-point of Project implementation	Total: \$35,000
	? UNEP Task Manager		
	? National and External Consultants		
Terminal Evaluation	? UNEP Evaluation Office	At least 3 months before the end of Project implementation	Total: \$45,000
	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers		
	? UNEP Task Manager		
	? External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)		
Project Final Report	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	Within 2 months of Project completion	None
Co-Financing Report	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	Within 1 month of PIR reporting period	None
	? PSC		
Field Visits	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	As appropriate	Total: \$10,000
	? Representatives of Executing partners		
	? UNEP		
Publications of Lessons Learned and other Project Documents	? Project Coordinator & Project Managers	Annually, part of semi-annual reports and Project Final Report	Total: \$10,000
	? Project Executing Agencies		
Total M&E Plan Cost			\$130,000

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

Under the regional child project, socio-economic benefits are most directly addressed through the Component 3. The aim is to enforce a regional framework to empower local communities and especially the forest-dependent people to better manage their land and the related forest resources and increase their financial benefits and sustainable revenues through stronger partnerships with the private sector. New business models for community forest enterprises that are driven by the local communities themselves are created. This is enabled through increased access to private financing.

In particular, this project will help to bridge the gap between the short-sighted nature of commodity companies? business operations, which often ignore longer-term sustainability aspects, and local community producers? weak access to markets and private finance. This will be achieved by building capacity, strengthening partnerships and catalyzing and scaling private sector funding towards sustainable forest management at the local level through matchmaking. Through the measures described under Component 3 that are applicable throughout the region, communities will increase their negotiation power, access markets and gain more prominence in landscape-level decision-making, and consequently take a better control over the resources that their livelihoods depend on.

Integrated land use planning under Component 1 also supports socio-economic benefits, especially through sustainable planning of the emerging sector of vegetable oils, such as palm oil production. For the first time in the Congo Basin, a mapping exercise will identify the areas that best optimize environmental and socio-economic aspects of production further to be integrated in the ILUMPs at the ground level.

These regional framework measures for sustainable resource use, when implemented at the local level under the national child projects, can induce long-lasting global benefits. Since forest clearing for subsistence needs is the most significant driver of deforestation in the Congo Basin, creation of an environment that encourages local communities and forest-dependent people to invest in their customary land and use the resources more sustainably will eventually help curb the deforestation trends. As commercial resource operations in the larger region are also emerging, it is critical that sustainable sourcing practices are introduced and encouraged from the start to avoid large-scale ecosystem degradation, and subsequent negative impacts on local livelihoods.

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification *

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
Low			

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title	Module	Submitted
Appendix 18 ESERN	CEO Endorsement ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

See Appendix 4 of the UNEP project document.

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Below are comments made on the Program Framework Document (June 2019). Comments have not been received specifically on the regional child project. However, the below comments have been addressed if they apply to the context of the regional child project.

Comments from Denmark and Norway	Response
Our constituency welcomes this project but is very concerned about possible overlap with the work of the Central Africa Forest Initiative, CAFI which Norway, among others, is an important donor to. We would strongly encourage finding mechanisms that will ensure the best possible coordination between these two programs and avoid any double reporting. Coordination meetings should take place at the country level since each country has different projects. More specifically:	<p>A call was held with the CAFI Secretariat to discuss synergies. CAFI is part of the PSC of the regional child project and also a co-financier. Better coordination between these two programs will also be ensured through the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Under Output 1.1.1 of component 1, it is proposed that at the inception of the regional child project, a regional workshop will be organized to discuss and finalize the proposed ILUMP methodological process with stakeholders (including representatives from country child projects, COMIFAC, ECCAS, CAFI, REPALEAC, REDD+ projects and national organizations), to ensure all land use planning actors in the target landscapes have a shared vision of the methodological process. - For the legal endorsement of the proposed ILUMPs, it is proposed that the regional and national child projects build on existing national inter sectorial mechanisms set up for CAFI and ECOFAC VI programs to promote, support and endorse national land use plans.
In terms of the results and indicators, how to ensure that there is no double reporting compared to CAFI-funded programs?	The regional and national child projects will be focusing on landscapes that do not overlap with CAFI investments, but rather complement them and add value to CAFI's LUP efforts.

Component 1 of the program ?Enabling integrated framework for countries in targeted transboundary landscapes to plan, monitor and adapt land management and leverage local, national and international investments for SLM/SFM? as well as the land use planning methodology developed under the regional component of the program, <u>overlap with the land use planning efforts in DRC and Gabon and potentially in Rep Congo</u> . CAFI and the country focal points should be associated to the methodological work to avoid duplication or guidance contrary to on-going work already funded by CAFI.	Under Component 1 of the regional child project an enhanced methodological process for design of ILUMPs will be developed that builds on ongoing work (see description of Component 1). CAFI will be part of the discussions and workshops for design of this enhanced methodology. Anticipating these discussions, during the PPG phase the regional child project has, for example, specifically requested from the CAFI Secretariat existing documentation produced by UNDP in support of the DRC government in its land use planning reform.
<u>Equateur provincial program in DRC</u> (FAO and WWF as implementing agency, approved in 2018): It would be important that in the program development phase the deliverables of the CAFI program could be mapped and a gap analysis be conducted to make sure that the GEF program in the same area does not duplicate those efforts. Tenure and natural resource rights are supported in DRC by CAFI both through the national land tenure reform process as well as the above mentioned Equateur program.	This is to be addressed by the DRC child project led by UNEP.
It is unclear to us whether CAFI funded programs are counted as baseline investments or co-financing. More specifically:	CAFI programs are considered co-financing.
If baseline investment; its characterization as sectoral and lacking integration (page 45) should be reconsidered as this is not in line with CAFI's stated objectives nor the realities in the field.	CAFI programs are considered co-financing.
If considered co-funding, then it is very important to further ensure synergies:	
The document already mentions that CAFI should participate in the steering committee of the impact program and that the CAFI focal points will participate in the steering committees of the national Child projects. This is very positive.	CAFI is part of the steering committee for the regional child project.
Synergies should be further enhanced before the setting up of such committees (i.e. during the program development phase to avoid duplication with CAFI programs):	The regional child project reached out to the CAFI Secretariat in the PPG phase.

By sharing the GEF project approval cycle with the CAFE secretariat and exchange views before decision-making points so that CAFE can comment the documents	The regional child project was initially planning to organize a validation workshop before the Covid-19 outbreak at which CAFE and other partners were invited. The draft project document for the regional child project will be shared with the CAFE secretariat to solicit their feedback.
Same at the child project level, share programming cycle with the CAFE focal points and allow them to participate in the development of the project documents.	To be addressed by national child projects.
The risk analysis underestimates some risk factors and should be updated. The role of COMIFAC in this program should also be re-assessed as it has a limited mandate. More specifically:	Role of COMIFAC and ECCAS: The RP will be supervised and executed by UNEP, and UNEP will co-chair the Program Steering Committee (PSC) with ECCAS. COMIFAC will play an important role in Component 1 (ILUMPs); an important aspect of this component is the landscape-level high-level, cross-sectoral mechanism and this will be led by COMIFAC (based on existing landscape agreements). At this level, and building on lessons learned by the CARPE Program, COMIFAC leadership will be critical to guide the land use planning team within child projects. Building on the provision of existing landscape transborder agreement, COMIFAC leadership will be critical throughout the stakeholder consultation process leading to the endorsement of transboundary ILUMPs, the definition of operational rules based on the ILUMPs, and the setting up of management structures as well as model collaborative management agreements defining the roles and responsibilities of the respective stakeholders for each macro zone under the ILUMP. The regional child project through its partnership with both ECCAS and COMIFAC, will promote and facilitate the institutional anchoring of national child project ILUMPs within the national inter sectorial coordination mechanisms established within each country to support and guide the CAFE and ECOFAC VI programs.
R1: National governments (ministries, politicians) and the various regional sectoral and cross-sectoral bodies do not provide adequate political, institutional, and financial support to the objective of the CBSL IP ? this is high risk: all the endorsements provided in the document come from low to senior level officials from Ministries of environment.	This risk was identified for the overall CBSL IP under the PFD. During the PPG phase, a theory of change and risks to realizing the objective of the regional child project have been further analysed and assessed. See section on risks in UNEP project document.

R6: Private sector partners not interested in diminishing their exposure to deforestation and other material risks ? being involved in the program development (probably being consulted) does not mean that private sector will invest, this is an underestimated risk.	Same as above.
R8: High transaction costs related to coordination and collaboration in a program involving six countries, three GEF Agencies, and multiple partners.	Same as above.
R9: Resistance/ complexity related to transboundary collaboration ? this risk especially between specific countries should not be underestimated.	Same as above.
R11: Risk of duplication with existing programs as mentioned above.	Same as above.
COMIFAC is primarily a sectorial institution, interacting with the ministries of forestry and environment in the region. The program document should therefore rethink the role of COMIFAC as a normative body especially in an area where it does not have any mandate (land use planning is not the responsibility of ministries of forestry).	The regional child project aims to promote an integrated, cross-sectoral approach to sustainable management and practices in production landscapes by working with both ECCAS, which is a regional cross-sectoral institution, and with COMIFAC, which is a regional sectoral institution. In addition, as explained above, based on existing landscape agreements, COMIFAC will play a leadership role throughout the stakeholder consultation process leading to the endorsement of transboundary ILUMPs.

Comments from Canada	Response
There are two particular deficiencies: identifying and addressing the barriers to scaling and transformation, particularly with regard to vested interests; and articulating a clear theory of change (TOC) that links drivers of deforestation/forest degradation and their root causes to project structure, outcomes and overall objective, and which identifies critical assumptions. STAP recommends further clarification of barriers and how to address them, along with the development of a clear, detailed TOC with a clear logical sequence of the steps and assumptions required. In the PPG phase, the CBSL should provide detailed and realistic objectives that can be monitored and measured (and adjusted if necessary) over time.	Please see the TOC (Section 3.4 of the UNEP project document and TOC diagram in Appendix 24), and risks (Section 3.5 of the UNEP project document), that have been developed in the PPG phase for the regional child project.

Comments from USA	Response
Recognizing that the intent of these projects is to mitigate or reverse deforestation, the United States needs to officially confirm for internal purposes that the following projects will not involve any logging of primary forests.	Confirmed

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
STAP Overall Assessment	<p>Minor</p> <p>STAP welcomes the submission of the Program Framework Document for the Congo Basin Sustainable Landscapes Impact Program (CBSL). The Basin is the Earth's second largest area of contiguous moist tropical forest, but the services it provides are under increasing pressure from deforestation, fragmentation, and infrastructure and other economic activities. There have been numerous conservation activities in the Congo Basin in recent years (outlined in detail in the Baseline section), this program offers a number of important policy and institutional innovations. For example, the use of integrated land use planning (iLUMPs) and the application of natural capital accounting (NCA) is innovative for this region, as is strengthening indigenous and local community tenure and management rights. <u>For all of these innovations, it will be important to incorporate lessons learned from similar projects as well as from the CBSL program as it advances.</u> The program builds strongly on multi-stakeholder partnerships, which should help promote durability of project benefits. <u>Risks are well articulated at a general level, but lack specificity or convincing responses in some cases.</u> Note that <u>there are real barriers to effective participation of Indigenous People and Local Communities (IPLCs) and women in consultations and planning processes.</u> To overcome these barriers, <u>proactive strategies and targeted expertise will be required to mitigate.</u> There are two particular deficiencies: <u>identifying and addressing the barriers to scaling and transformation, particularly with regard to vested interests; and articulating a clear theory of change (TOC) that links drivers of deforestation/forest degradation and their root causes to project structure, outcomes and overall objective, and which identifies critical assumptions.</u> STAP recommends further <u>clarification of barriers and how to address them,</u> along with the development of a <u>clear, detailed TOC</u> with a clear logical sequence of the steps and assumptions required. In the PPG phase, the <u>CBSL should provide detailed and realistic objectives that can be monitored and measured</u> (and adjusted if necessary) over time.</p>	<p><u>Incorporating lessons learned from similar projects, as well as the CBSL as it is implemented:</u> The regional child project includes a summary of lessons from regional initiatives (Appendix 19 of UNEP project document). In addition, the regional project allocates resources to documentation and uptake of lessons learned under Component 4 (KM).</p> <p><u>Risks lack specificity and convincing responses:</u> The Program Framework Document was more general as it was trying to provide a framework that encompassed all child projects. Risks and mitigation measures have been made more specific at CEO Endorsement within the specific context in which regional actions must take place under the regional child project. See section 3.5 of the UNEP project document.</p> <p><u>Identifying and addressing the barriers to scaling and transformation, particularly with regard to vested interests:</u> Barriers to scaling and transformation have been identified by the regional child project ? see sections 2.3 and 2.6 of UNEP project document.</p>

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	The objectives are vague, and say little about what state is aimed for in terms of actual global environmental values (biodiversity, carbon storage, etc). The overall objective is "To catalyze transformational change in conservation and sustainable management of the Congo Basin through landscape approaches that empower local communities and forest dependent people, and through partnerships with the private sector". But this says very little about what such change should look like, or how it relates to biodiversity/carbon/land degradation goals. The "long term solution" put forward is that "The six basin countries need to work together to undertake national and cross-border actions that stabilize forest cover, peatlands, and wildlife populations so that the Congo Basin forest ecosystem remains healthy and thriving" (p. 36); and later on p 44 it is said that realising the overall objective will lead to "an intermediate state wherein the Congo Basin forest ecosystem is healthy and thriving with stable forest cover, peatlands, and wildlife populations". But this could involve stable forest cover/biodiversity etc at levels much lower than today - <u>is it possible for objectives to actually set out what the project seeks to achieve in terms of forest/biodiversity/climate outcomes, being realistic about the coming pressures?</u>	<p>The regional child project's objective is to catalyze transformational change in sustainable forest management in transboundary landscapes by scaling best practices and innovations at a regional level. See section 3.2 of the UNEP project document.</p> <p>The GEBs targeted by the project are captured in the core indicators. See Appendix 17 of the UNEP project document.</p>
A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Overall yes, though the categorisation of activities into components is conceptually fuzzy, and the links between each components and how these address drivers/threats/root causes is not clearly explained.	STAP was commenting on the PFD. The regional child project describes threats, root causes and barriers in sections 2.3 and 2.6 of the UNEP project document. There is a one-to-one correspondence between barriers and components (see section 2.6).
A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Program Outcomes are provided for each Component; however, they are not broken down into specific short term and medium term effects. For Component 1 - the main output is the number of ILUMPs developed and the area they encompass. Component 2 has to do with improved management effectiveness (METT) and connectivity. Component 3 focuses on forest-related value chains and the extent to which communities are engaged and empowered. And Component 4 refers to CB, KM and regional cooperation.	The regional child project, in its Results Framework, has identified indicators along with targets to be achieved by project mid-term and end.

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Yes	N/A
Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	It is hard to assess this without a clear TOC that identifies how the outputs of each component affect outcomes and the objective, and identifies critical assumptions. On the whole the activities do indeed appear appropriate and likely to generate these GEBs, but the complexity of the program and the large number of potential risks make this difficult to assess.	The regional child project has defined clear outcomes/outputs/activities ? see description of components under section 3.3 of the UNEP project document and the Results Framework in Appendix 4 that defines indicators with baselines and targets.
A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	As discussed above, outputs are not specifically outlined for each of the Components. Rather indicators are provided for each Component which seem to serve the same purpose.	Outcomes and outputs have been developed in greater detail under the regional child project ? see description of components under section 3.3 of the UNEP project document and the Results Framework in Appendix 4.

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
Is the problem statement well-defined?	<p>Key points are generally well covered in the problem statement, although this is not written clearly and needs much stronger organisation - for instance, there is no explicit discussion of root causes, although some of these are highlighted earlier in the program rationale. Specific points: <u>*A general point throughout is that the term "PA" is used without definition</u>, and it is not clear whether it includes zones such as community-managed hunting zones/community forests and state-run trophy hunting concessions etc? Different uses seem to imply that PA either does or doesn't include these at different points. So this is hard to interpret. Cultural and socio-economic significance: <u>*Great to see the analysis of the underlying problems with tenure here, though these could be helpfully pulled out as a root cause. *Important to recognise that conservation and PAs have also been a major cause of eviction and dispossession of forest peoples from their land, not just granting of concessions for agriculture/forestry etc. *Discussion of peoples is somewhat inadequate</u>, and in particular doesn't highlight the difference between forest peoples generally recognised as indigenous ("Pygmies"), who are primarily hunter-gatherer and marginalised in land policy/politics etc, and the agricultural ("Bantu") groups. C African states (including Gabon - see http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/504451468251730621/Programme-Sectoriel-Forets-et-Environnement-PSFE-Plan-de-developpement-des-peuples-autochtones) have recognised the need to recognise indigenous peoples - see e.g. work of African Commission https://www.iwgia.org/images/publications//African_Commission_book.pdf. Legislative and policy context: <u>*It may be helpful for this to include key characteristics of legislative/policy contexts operating at national level in region: there are high-level characteristics across the region that are extremely relevant to understanding current situation e.g. highly centralised state ownership of land, in general with little capacity, inadequate enforcement capabilities and often patchy environmental regulatory frameworks, etc.</u></p>	<p><u>Definition of the term PA:</u> To be addressed by national child projects in the specific context of their interventions.</p> <p><u>Conservation and PAs have also been a major cause of eviction and dispossession of forest peoples:</u> To be addressed by national child projects in the specific context of their interventions.</p> <p><u>Discussion of peoples is somewhat inadequate:</u> To be addressed by national child projects in the specific context of their interventions.</p>

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
<p>Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?</p>	<p>Threats and Root causes: *Recent publication on deforestation in region could helpfully be cited https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/4/11/eaat2993.full * The connection made here to lack of tenure of indigenous/forest dependent people is puzzling - presumably it is not indigenous people (generally reliant on hunting/gathering) that is responsible for this? Or if this is intended to imply that it is because of lack of tenure that forest people can't keep the farmers out of their lands, this should be clarified. * Discussion of some drivers is superficial e.g. discussion of poaching and trafficking focused on lack of law enforcement rather than highlighting underlying drivers of poaching/IWT, which can include dispossession, lack of incentives to conserve, lack of legal rights to sustainably use etc (see e.g. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/conl.12082), as highlighted in earlier discussion. *<u>There is no clear integrated discussion of root causes</u> here - proximate drivers are discussed (spread of agriculture, poorly managed forestry, poaching etc), sometimes with reference to root causes like population growth, and sometimes without. Annex D, which apparently has a diagram showing root causes, is missing. <u>Barriers: * This section is not clearly and coherently organised</u> - a clearer and more logical breakdown of broad context; proximate threats; root causes; and barriers to change would be really helpful. *Much of this material reads as articulating drivers of harm, rather than barriers to change (and indeed much is phrased as drivers e.g. "Conflicting and isolated sectoral developments....lead to habitat loss..."). * Each barrier has a lot of rather unrelated points lumped in together, without a clearly articulated conceptual grouping. For example, in the first, the lack of community rights to manage land does not fit well under the heading "Conflicting and isolated sectoral developments..". While lack of these rights does raise conflicts over land use, it is a much broader point that also leads to other issues, so this is not a good fit. This barrier might be better named something like "Lack of integrated land use planning" and be one of the root causes of deforestation etc. In the third barrier, too, there are many disparate elements lumped together. Most of it appears to be linked by being about lack of incentives for biodiversity-friendly livelihood/economic activities. But the title as written is extremely broad and cover so much more - such as that for communities many potentially sustainable uses are simply illegal. *Barrier 3: Note that there are some models of community management in the region - it is an overly strong statement to say their engagement in PA management and benefit-sharing is lacking. Rather, perhaps better to highlight there is a need for strengthening, scaling up and learning from positive examples. Important to note that the major, or at least very important, benefits of sustainable use for forest dependent communities will generally be subsistence use - food, medicine, cultural uses etc, rather than commercial (though recognition of scope for these is welcome).</p>	<p><u>Threats and root causes</u> have been developed in more detail for the regional child project ? see section 2.3 of the UNEP project document (citing recent publications).</p> <p><u>Barriers: * This section is not clearly and coherently organized:</u> Barriers have been developed within the specific context of the regional child project ? see sections 2.3 and 2.6 of the UNEP project document.</p>

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
Is the baseline identified clearly?	*The baseline section does not give a clear picture of the current trajectory of environmental change in the region, but rather of what is being planned or underway in the region. If this is what is intended by the baseline here this is fine, but it would be helpful to have a clearer baseline on the actual on-the-ground biodiversity/forest/climate parameters that are the subject of the program. As written here it is mainly a list of what various donors/agencies are currently planning to do, without enough detail to understand how these affect the situation on the ground, although some of the country baselines (e.g. for CAR and ROC) do give a clearer idea of the on-the-ground baseline. There is more useful comment on the baseline on p45 which could be incorporated here, and in the section on Incremental/additional cost reasoning - these sections are more helpful to the reader in understanding the baseline situation.	The 'baseline trajectory' has been described under the baseline section of the UNEP project document ? see section 2.5.5 of the UNEP project document.
Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	No, but this detail will be developed through child projects.	To be addressed by national child projects.
Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	Baseline information for the overall program lists numerous programs and ongoing activities, organizations, etc. as per usual. As part of the CBSL IP, it would be very useful if the <u>coordination grant in developing a platform could provide detailed information on all of these programs in a spatially explicit manner to show how they related to each other and how this project will add value</u> in terms of overall global (and local) benefits.	The feasibility of detailing baseline information in a spatially explicit manner will be assessed during project implementation.
For multiple focal area projects:		
are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;		
are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	<u>No lessons from past work are described</u> , and drawing such lessons would be extremely helpful.	<u>Lessons from past projects</u> : See Appendix 19 of the UNEP project document.
how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	It is not clear any past lessons have informed this.	See Appendix 19 of the UNEP project document.

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
What is the theory of change?	<p>Annex 5, a diagram of the TOC, is not included. The TOC is described to some extent in the text, but as there is no logic of how each program component will address the key drivers described, it is hard to work out exactly what the TOC is. The program logic does not clearly and convincingly link root causes and proximate threats to program structure and outputs, or clearly identify critical assumptions in the logical chain. The components of the program (which are confusingly given substantively different names at different points) (e.g. (i. integrated land use planning ii. Maintaining/enhancing connectivity in key landscapes iii. Sustainable use outside PAs) are articulated in terms of how they address the four identified barriers, without linking this back to underlying drivers/root causes that were identified earlier. For example, the document states "The single most important national policy issue related to biodiversity conservation is land and resource ownership", but there are no program components that clearly link to and address this driver. While assumptions and risks for program success are articulated at a general level, it would be helpful to integrate these into a graphic TOC, to identify critical assumptions that underlie particular causal pathways in the TOC ? this would indicate what parts of the program are dependent on what assumptions. One important assumption/risk is about forest-dependent, particularly indigenous, people, being able to participate effectively in consultations/planning, should be highlighted ? there are substantial barriers to this and a long history of marginalisation in such deliberations. This underpins achievement of much of the program?s desired outcome (particularly given small scale conversion to agriculture is a key driver of forest loss), so deserves explicit and careful attention.</p>	See section 3.4 of the UNEP project document for the TOC diagram.
What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	<p>The PFD indicates the four program components will address the four barriers, with (it is implied) each addressing one barrier. But how the components link back to the drivers and root causes is not well articulated. This comes back to the unclear articulation of the drivers and root causes to begin with. And the linkage of each program component to its corresponding driver is weak. For example, component (ii), "the long-term viability of forests providing important habitat... is improved by maintaining/enhancing connectivity... " is linked to overcoming barrier (ii) "forest landscape sustainability is compromised by poor governance of protected areas, buffer zones and corridors". But improving connectivity doesn't address poor governance. This seems rather conceptually confused. The diagram may help. The discussion on p45 under integration is much clearer in indicating how exactly the program is intended to shift the baseline (in relation to integrated planning at least). Including a similar description for the other components would be extremely helpful in clarifying the TOC and enabling assumptions and risks to be articulated.</p>	See sections 2.3 and 2.6 of the UNEP project document that clarify the links between Threats-Root Causes-Barriers-Components.

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
<p>? Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?</p>	<p>Overall the mechanisms of change are plausible, but underlying assumptions are not well articulated. For example, the program highlights throughout the inclusion of forest-dependent people, but the assumptions around being able to do this effectively (and the barriers to doing this effectively) are not recognised anywhere. *Component 1 is well described, and the text on p45 under integration makes clear how it is expect to address a key driver of degradation, the lack of integrated land use planning. It seems that <u>empowering communities to manage forests/wildlife</u> is part of the thinking here, from some of the language, but if this is among the objectives of this component it should be stated - otherwise they are likely to be politically marginalised in the process ("involvement" in practice can mean just being told what is going to happen, unless it is really clear that one of the aims is to entrench a legally-recognised management role). <u>There needs to be a focus in this section on implementation as well as planning, and some sort of process to adaptively review and support implementation in the face of inevitable roadblocks.</u> This may be inherent but it may be good to make it explicit to ensure the focus is on effective implementation, not just the planning phase. Or if this is done in component 4 perhaps indicate that clearly. *Component 2 is clearer here. Re the indicators here, it is perhaps a bit concerning that these focus so narrowly on protected areas, as there is so much important biodiversity outside of current PAs. Note that many aspects of this component and others actually contribute to addressing wildlife crime (the benefits, better governance, inclusion) - addressing wildlife crime goes well beyond "catching poachers". *Component 3 is extremely broad, but the logic of combining all "use" activities together is clearer here. Note, however, that this component is sometimes spoken of as being about empowering communities (see e.g. p 51, para beginning "Furthermore"..), whereas it is much broader than this and is about shifting private sector patterns of exploitation also. Note that text is rather inconsistent as whether it is trying to shift communities away from using the forest or to trying to use it sustainably (important to encompass both - former where uses are unlikely to be able to be made sustainable (e.g. primate hunting, high populaiton growth), latter where they can (most subsistence uses, NTFPs, community forestry etc)). <u>The indicators here need work though - what about area under sustainable subsistence use? area under management where communities have decision-making role? reduced deforestation by private sector? Reduced overexploitation of subsistence resources? Reduced IWT involving communities?</u> Would be good to get beyond Output indicators to Outcome here.</p>	<p>Under Component 1 of the regional child project, an enhanced methodological process will be developed for design of ILUMPs and this methodology will ensure empowerment and inclusion of communities in the design of ILUMPs. As regards implementation of ILUMPS this will be addressed under the national child projects. Indicators for the regional child project are included in the Results Framework in Appendix 4.</p>

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes, this seems clear. Note that in the CAR section we seem to have moved from the project's approach of empowering communities to play a role in managing forests/wildlife to "alternative" livelihoods - is making subsistence use sustainable not important here? In the DRC section, where it says "private" land - is this intended to mean community land? Nothing on wildmeat in Gabon, where it is a major issue (NTFPs and wood won't feed people) (see e.g. CIFOR work https://www.jstor.org/stable/26267975?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents)?	To be addressed by CAR, DRC and Gabon child projects.
Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	Yes, although many indicators currently measure only outputs rather than outcomes (see above for example).	Indicators for the regional child project are in the Results Framework (Appendix 4 of the UNEP project document). The outcome indicators suggested by STAP above to be addressed by national child projects.
Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	There are some important innovations here. Applying NC accounting. <u>Integrated land use planning is innovative in this region at least. Incorporating lessons learned on how it has helped, AND what goes wrong in such processes, would be extremely reassuring.</u> Strengthening indigenous/LC tenure/management rights is innovative in the region (though it has been ongoing for thirty years elsewhere), but likewise it would be reassuring to see some lessons learned from experience incorporated here in term of where/how this works and how it can go wrong. These are the main innovations - the rest appears to be about scaling up and coordinating what is already going on.	See Appendix 19 of the UNEP project document for a summary of lessons learned.

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Transformational change will be needed (i.e. through NCA or other means) to provide an attractive alternative to large scale logging, mining, forest concessions, etc. that are planned for the Congo Basin and which are expected to contribute to much needed economic growth and poverty alleviation.	The enhanced methodological process for design of ILUMPs to be developed under Component 1 includes the integration of NCA (through a partnership with WCMC). Furthermore, the work of the wildlife health programme (component 2), the ARRC task force (component 2), and the oil palm task force (component 1) is regional and transformational, and can leverage more funding from other donors.
Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?	Strongly recognised, although assumptions and risks here not clearly articulated (e.g. structural barriers to women's participation (family responsibilities, male opposition etc))	See Appendix 22 of the UNEP project document that provides a gender analysis and action plan for the regional child project.
Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?	*Risks are generally well articulated. Note that there are <u>real barriers to effective participation of IPLCs and women</u> in consultations (people with little political power often unable to speak out clearly in support of their own interests, unable to attend meetings, language barriers, may be subject to (violent) reprisals from others, etc.) These risks will need proactive strategies and targeted expertise to mitigate. The <u>mitigation measure for Risk 2 re divergence of economic interests is unconvincing</u> . Several of the risks appear to justify the existence of the program itself (for example R8 on coordination and R 11 on duplication. A very real risk is R10 on conflict (medium to high) but the mitigation measure doesn't seem to account for how projects might be designed differently as a result (see Ratner, B.D. 2018. Environmental security: dimensions and priorities. Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel to the Global Environment Facility. Washington, DC.)	The regional child project has developed its own TOC and risk analysis. See section 3.4 and 3.5 of the UNEP project document.

What STAP looks for	STAP Comment	Response
Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	There is little evidence of this.	See Appendix 19 of the UNEP project document for a summary of lessons learned.
Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	"	See Appendix 19 of the UNEP project document for a summary of lessons learned.
Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	"	See Appendix 19 of the UNEP project document for a summary of lessons learned.
How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	"	See Appendix 19 of the UNEP project document for a summary of lessons learned.
Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	"	See the detailed description of Component 4 (Knowledge Management) for mechanisms to capture and feed lessons learned into this and future projects.

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).

(Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEFTF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Consultants	89,880	74,660	25,220
Travel	34,120	6,500	27,620
Validation Workshop	36,000	0	36,000
Total	160,000	81,160	78,84

ANNEX D: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.



Source: CAFI

The regional child project will operate on two levels:

- (1) Activities that have region-wide impact across all six countries of the Congo Basin
- (2) Site level interventions that include:

ILUMPs in RoC and CAM segments of TNS

ILUMP in Gabon/Monts de Cristal/ MAMC

Zoonotic disease surveillance in TNS PAs

Name	Longitude (x)	Latitude (y)
Dzanga-Sangha and Dzanga-Ndoki	16.217798	2.890330
Monts de Cristal	10.308157	0.721063
Nouabalé-Ndoki	16.604985	2.497669
Lobéké	15.849274	2.300843

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Please find a summary below and see appendix 1 attached.

UNEP Budget Line		Outcome 1	Outcome 2	Outcome 3	Outcome 4 (RM)	Outcome 5 (Prog)	PMC	Total
10	PERSONNEL COMPONENT							
1100	Project personnel							
1101	Regional Project Coordinator	202,400	151,800	151,800	151,800	253,000	101,200	1,012,000
1103	Finance Assistant	-	-	-	-	-	175,000	175,000
1104	KM and M&E Specialist	-	-	-	400,000	400,000	-	800,000
1106	Administrative Assistant	-	-	-	-	80,000	20,000	100,000
1199	Sub-total	202,400	151,800	151,800	551,800	733,000	296,200	2,087,000
1200	Consultants							
1201	Land Use Planning Expert (1.1.1)	120,000	-	-	-	-	-	120,000
1202	Gender and IPLC Experts	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	-	80,000
1203	Consultants to develop regional knowledge products (4.1.1)	-	-	-	101,500	-	-	101,500
1204	Consultant to support Community of Practice activities (4.1.3)	-	-	-	57,000	-	-	57,000
1205	Consultants for downscaled climate models (4.2.1)	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	50,000
1206	Consultants for taxonomic work to screen and rank priority species based on conservation value (4.2.2)	-	-	-	70,000	-	-	70,000
1207	Consultant Graphic Design (5.1.4)	-	-	-	-	15,000	-	15,000
1208	Consultants for translation of communications materials (English/French) (5.1.4)	-	-	-	-	50,000	-	50,000
1209	Consultants for copy editing / revising communication materials and knowledge products (5.1.4)	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	100,000
1210	Consultant CBSI IP M&E Manual, SOPs, and Governance (5.1.2.1)	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	20,000
1211	Consultant Lessons Learned Papers and other Reports (5.1.2.2)	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
1212	Consultants GEF-7 core indicators measurement (5.1.2.2)	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
1213	Consultants measurement of project progress and performance indicators (5.1.2.2)	-	-	-	-	10,000	-	10,000
1214	Consultant to support communication work	24,000	24,000	24,000	36,000	36,000	-	144,000
1299	Sub-total	160,000	40,000	40,000	330,500	267,000	-	837,500
1600	Travel on official business							
1601	Travel costs for project staff	40,000	40,000	40,000	30,000	40,000	-	190,000
1602	Travel costs to participate in annual meetings of the GEF 7 Global Wildlife Program (2.1.1)	-	116,000	-	-	-	-	116,000
1603	Travel to field sites for CBSI IP Communication Stories (5.1.4)	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	20,000
1604	Participation in regional events (outreach with private sector, journalists, universities, etc.) (5.1.4)	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	20,000
1605	Participation in regional and international events (GEF meetings etc.) (5.1.4)	-	-	-	-	20,000	-	20,000
1606	Travel costs to engage with private sector partners and enhance a mechanism to incentivize large companies to increase sustainable sourcing (output 3)	-	-	81,000	-	-	-	81,000
1699	Sub-total	40,000	156,000	121,000	30,000	100,000	-	447,000
1999	Component total	402,400	347,800	312,800	912,300	1,100,000	296,200	5,371,500
20	SUB-CONTRACT COMPONENT							
2200	Sub-contracts for supporting organizations							
2201	Subcontract to USFS for design and delivery of ILUMP training (1.1.2)	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	200,000
2202	Subcontract to WCMC for design and delivery of ILUMP training and NCA integration in ILUMPs (1.1.2 and 1.1.3)	350,000	-	-	-	-	-	350,000
2203	Subcontract to USFS for design of ILUMPs in TNS/CAM, RoC (1.1.3)	250,000	-	-	-	-	-	250,000
2204	Subcontract to USFS for design of ILUMPs in MAMC/Gabon (1.1.3)	150,000	-	-	-	-	-	150,000
2205	Subcontract to UNODC for a study on wildlife trafficking and the entire supply chain in the Congo Basin (2.1.1)	-	200,000	-	-	-	-	200,000
2206	Sub-contract to Global Wildlife Conservation for ARRC task force (1.1.4)	200,000	-	-	-	-	-	200,000
2207	Sub-contract to WCS (2.2.1)	-	300,000	-	-	-	-	300,000
2208	Sub-contract to Rainforest Alliance (3.1.2 and 3.1.3)	-	-	440,000	-	-	-	440,000
2210	Sub-contract to University of Liverpool (1.1.5)	300,000	-	-	-	-	-	300,000
2211	Sub-contract for ICT support to KM Platform (4.1.2)	-	-	-	115,000	100,000	-	215,000
2212	Sub contract for other IT related costs (4.1.2)	-	-	-	10,000	-	-	10,000
2213	Subcontract for printing and publishing communications materials (brochures, leaflets, banners, reports, etc.) (5.1.4)	-	-	-	-	37,000	-	37,000
2214	Subcontract for ICT support to M&E software or cloud based system (5.1.2.1 & 5.1.2.2)	-	-	-	-	90,000	-	90,000
2215	Subcontract to CITES MIRE (2.2.2)	-	647,273	-	-	-	-	647,273
2216	Subcontract to REPALEAC	-	-	413,727	-	-	-	413,727
2299	Sub-total	1,450,000	1,147,273	853,727	125,000	227,000	-	3,803,000
2999	Component total	1,450,000	1,147,273	853,727	125,000	227,000	-	3,803,000
30	TRAINING COMPONENT							
3200	Training							
3201	Training to enhance regional capacity on starting and managing multi-stakeholder partnerships (3.1.3)	-	-	46,000	-	-	-	46,000
3202	Learning visits to other transboundary landscapes (1.1.4)	120,000	-	-	-	-	-	120,000
3203	Annual CBSI regional knowledge sharing and capacity development workshops (4.1.4)	-	-	-	25,000	-	-	25,000
3204	Training workshops (4.1.4)	-	-	-	46,000	-	-	46,000
3205	Field visits and study tours (4.1.4)	-	-	-	26,000	-	-	26,000
3206	Online training events, expert webinars (4.1.4)	-	-	-	12,500	-	-	12,500
3207	Validation workshop for downscaled climate models (4.2.1)	-	-	-	30,000	-	-	30,000
3208	Consultation for taxonomic work (4.2.2)	-	-	-	50,000	-	-	50,000
3109	Training M&E	-	-	-	-	14,000	-	14,000
3199	Sub-total	120,000	-	46,000	189,500	14,000	-	369,500
3200	Group training							
3201	Training-of-trainers workshop on ILUMP methodology (1.1.1)	37,300	-	-	-	-	-	37,300
3299	Sub-total	37,300	-	-	-	-	-	37,300
3300	Meetings/Conferences							
3301	Project Steering Committee meetings	-	-	-	-	100,000	-	100,000
3302	Inception Workshop	36,000	-	-	-	-	-	36,000
3303	Workshop to finalize and approve ILUMP methodology (1.1.1)	18,000	-	-	-	-	-	18,000
3305	Annual meetings to discuss transboundary aspects of ILUMPs (1.1.4)	80,000	-	-	-	-	-	80,000
3306	Advocacy meetings for transboundary ILUMPs w/ govt, media, others (1.1.4)	35,000	-	-	-	-	-	35,000
3307	Meeting/conference to raise awareness of trade, customs and related law enforcement organizations (2.1.1)	-	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000
3308	Workshop to design an action plan that feeds in to ECCAS policy and strategy eco security concept (2.1.1)	-	60,000	-	-	-	-	60,000
3399	Sub-total	169,000	110,000	-	-	100,000	-	379,000
3999	Component total	326,300	110,000	46,000	189,500	114,000	-	785,800
40	EQUIPMENT AND PREMISES COMPONENT							
4200	Non-Expendable equipment							
4201	Laptop	-	-	-	1,400	1,400	1,400	4,200
4202	Office space for Regional Project Coordinator	-	-	-	-	-	47,866	47,866
4299	Sub-total	-	-	-	1,400	1,400	49,266	52,066
4999	Component total	-	-	-	1,400	1,400	49,266	52,066
50	MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT							
5200	Publications, Translations, Dissemination and Reporting costs							
5201	Materials to support advocacy of transboundary ILUMPs (1.1.4)	10,000	-	-	-	-	-	10,000
5202	Materials to support awareness raising campaigns targeting trade, customs and related law enforcement orgs. (2.1.1)	-	20,000	-	-	-	-	20,000
5203	Measurement of Project Indicators / Baseline Data collection	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	-	50,000
5299	Sub-total	20,000	30,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	-	80,000
5500	Evaluation							
5501	Audit reports (5.1.2.2)	-	-	-	-	-	20,000	20,000
5502	International M&E Specialist: Mid-Term Review	-	-	-	-	35,000	-	35,000
5503	International M&E Specialist: Terminal Evaluation	-	-	-	-	45,000	-	45,000
5599	Sub-total	-	-	-	-	80,000	20,000	100,000
5999	Component total	20,000	30,000	10,000	10,000	90,000	20,000	180,000
99	GRAND TOTAL	2,198,700	1,635,073	1,222,527	1,238,200	1,532,400	365,466	8,192,366

ANNEX F: (For NGI only) Termsheet

Instructions. Please submit an finalized termsheet in this section. The NGI Program Call for Proposals provided a template in Annex A of the Call for Proposals that can be used

by the Agency. Agencies can use their own termsheets but must add sections on Currency Risk, Co-financing Ratio and Financial Additionality as defined in the template provided in Annex A of the Call for proposals. Termsheets submitted at CEO endorsement stage should include final terms and conditions of the financing.

ANNEX G: (For NGI only) Reflows

Instructions. Please submit a reflows table as provided in Annex B of the NGI Program Call for Proposals and the Trustee excel sheet for reflows (as provided by the Secretariat or the Trustee) in the Document Section of the CEO endorsement. The Agency is required to quantify any expected financial return/gains/interests earned on non-grant instruments that will be transferred to the GEF Trust Fund as noted in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy. Partner Agencies will be required to comply with the reflows procedures established in their respective Financial Procedures Agreement with the GEF Trustee. Agencies are welcomed to provide assumptions that explain expected financial reflow schedules.

ANNEX H: (For NGI only) Agency Capacity to generate reflows

Instructions. The GEF Agency submitting the CEO endorsement request is required to respond to any questions raised as part of the PIF review process that required clarifications on the Agency Capacity to manage reflows. This Annex seeks to demonstrate Agencies' capacity and eligibility to administer NGI resources as established in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy, GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, June 9, 2017 (Annex 5).