

Promoting Sustainable Approaches to Ecosystem Conservation in the Imatong landscape of South Sudan

Basic Information

GEF ID

10870

Countries

South Sudan

Project Title

Promoting Sustainable Approaches to Ecosystem Conservation in the Imatong landscape of South Sudan

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Cleared on 25 Sept 2021

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

The component 3 includes concrete actions on the ground to reduce the pressure on forest. Shouldn't the "Financial Type" of this component considered as "Investment" as opposed to "Technical Assistance" (especially considering the 50,000 ha restored)? Please consider that option as if all the investments are technical assistance, we can wonder to which extent enough actions will actually happen on the ground to meet the project objectives.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

"Financial Type" of component 3 has been changed to investment in both, the portal and the PIF

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 30, 2021:

1. IUCN should be categorized as Donor Agency and not Civil Society Organization, please correct the source of co-financing.

Civil Society Organization	International Union for Conservation of Nature	Grant	Investment mobilized	100,000.00
Civil Society Organization	International Union for Conservation of Nature	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00

2. In addition, kindly note that five sources of co-financing have been categorized as Investment Mobilized. Please further develop and describe how these 5 Investments Mobilized were identified in the paragraph below Table C.

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The investments for the Government of South Sudan were identified from the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) budget allocations for the contributing ministries. Civil Society and Community Based Organizations investments were identified through bilateral discussions.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

IUCN has been categorized as Donor Agency in both the PIF and the portal

Investments mobilized were identified in the Medium-Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) budget allocations for the contributing Ministries. During the PIF development process, consultations were held with the government of South Sudan ministries, which expressed interest and commitment in increasing their investment in this high biodiversity value targeted landscape. Therefore, the Government agrees to mobilize resources to support the GEF grant so as to support the achievement of the project development objective, maximize outcomes and carry out replication and scaling-up actions. The figures will be confirmed during PPG through potential agreements.

This has been added in the para below table C in the PIF and in the portal

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 25 Sept 2021

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 25 Sept 2021

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

Yes, with less than \$7 million of STAR allocation, the country has a full flexibility to program its allocations across the three focal areas.
Cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 25 Sept 2021

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response N/A

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

Yes, the PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap. Cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 25 Sept 2021

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

1. In the core indicators section under the indicator 1.2, the following information is missing: the names of the protected areas, WDPA ID and IUCN Category. Please complete

and IUCN Category. Please complete.

2. The number of beneficiaries appear very high considering the project budget. Please explain who they are and how the numbers were calculated.
3. In the core indicator worksheet uploaded in the document section, the terrestrial protected area under improved management effectiveness is 130,200 ha while it is 153,200 ha in the Portal entry. The expected result for the core indicator 6.1 is also different in the core indicator worksheet and in the Portal entry. Please clarify and ensure the numbers are consistent.
4. The project is expected to reduce pressure on the HVCF from the local communities. Please consider the possibility of adding the sub-core indicator 4.4 which should be very relevant (even with a conservative estimate). In such a case, the climate change mitigation benefit should be adjusted accordingly.
5. Please attach the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet in Annex B of the Portal entry (after the map in Annex A).

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the clarifications and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

<p>Core indicators 6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01) Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion September 25, 2021:</p> <p>1. In the core indicators section under the indicator 1.2, the following information is missing: the names of the protected areas, WDPA ID and IUCN Category. Please complete.</p>	<p>Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:</p> <p>In the core indicators section under the indicator 1.2, the name of the protected areas, WDPA ID and IUCN Category have been recorded in the portal.</p> <p>Name is Imatong, WDPA ID is 14089, and the IUCN category V of Habitat/Species Management Area</p>
<p>2. The number of beneficiaries appear very high considering the project budget. Please explain who they are and how the numbers were calculated</p>	<p>Population estimate of Imatong state is 598,190 people (Park ¹¹). However, the number of direct beneficiaries has been reduced to 200,000 (110,000 women & 90,000 men).</p>
<p>3. In the core indicator worksheet uploaded in the document section, the terrestrial protected area under</p>	<p>The right figure should be 110,000 ha. This has been</p>

er improved management effectiveness is 130,200 ha while it is 153,200 ha in the Portal entry.	n harmonised in both the Portal entry and the core indicator worksheet
4. The expected result for the core indicator 6.1 is also different in the core indicator worksheet and in the Portal entry. Please clarify and ensure the numbers are consistent.	<p>The expected result for core indicator 6.1 is 1,544,243tCO₂eq and has been corrected in both the core indicator worksheet and in the Portal.</p> <p>The FAO EXACT worksheet has been attached.</p> <p>The 50,000 ha of land under improved land practices, was divided in 12,500 ha of Maize improved, 12,500 ha of beans and pulses land improved, and 25,000 ha of grazing land improved.</p> <p>For the 10,000 ha of HCVFs under improved management, 2% annual deforestation rate was used. <i>"According to the country's inaugural State of the Environment Outlook Report, launched in June 2018, fuelwood and charcoal account for over 80 per cent of all wood used in South Sudan, with an annual deforestation rate estimated at between 1.5 and 2 per cent."</i> https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/south-sudan-cracks-down-charcoal-trade</p>
5. The project is expected to reduce pressure on the HVCF from the local communities. Please consider the possibility of adding the sub-core indicator 4.4 which should be very relevant (even with a conservative estimate). In such a case, the climate change mitigation benefit should be adjusted accordingly.	The sub-core indicator 4.4 of 10,000ha, has been included in both the portal and the core indicator worksheet at PIF stage
6. Please attach the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet in Annex B of the Portal entry (after the map in Annex A).	A revised GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet has been attached/uploaded

[1] Nakimangole, Peter Lokale (22 April 2016). "Additional Counties in Imatong And Namorunyang States Established". Gurtong. Retrieved 14 August 2016.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

1. The taxonomy reported in the Portal entry at the beginning of the project description is very limited. Many relevant references are missing. Please complete as relevant.
2. Please attach Taxonomy Worksheet in Annex C of the Portal entry.

October 14, 2021:

The taxonomy still needs to be completed. Please complete the taxonomy as needed at PPG stage. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

The taxonomy worksheet has been revised and uploaded in both the portal

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 26, 2021:

1. We learn that many of the key national legislations for biodiversity management in South Sudan are still in the form of Draft Bills. Please clarify why these legislations have not been adopted yet and how the project will be successful to address this issue.
2. The allocation of lands is presented as part of the solution for a successful community-based wildlife and forest resource management. Please clarify the current land tenure and rights in the targeted areas.
3. The Barrier corresponding to the lack of livelihood improvement options is not considered. Wouldn't it be relevant as it relates to and partially justify the activities proposed under component 3?
4. Please clarify what "IDPs" stands for.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the clarifications and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

<p>Part II – Project Justification</p> <p>1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?</p> <p>Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion</p> <p>September 26, 2021:</p> <p>1. We learn that many of the key national legislations for biodiversity management in South Sudan are still in the form of Draft Bills. Please clarify why these legislations have not been adopted yet and how the project will be successful to address this issue.</p>	<p>Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:</p> <p>The section has been reworded to avoid confusion in adoption of the bill in the country.</p> <p>The bills had been drafted in 2015 during the war awaiting approval by the Legislative Assembly. At that time, the peace negotiations in Addis Ababa were pushing for creation of a coalition government and the Legislative Assembly was seating. To date, after signing of the peace agreement, the coalition government has been formed and the Legislative Assembly is in place to enact the bills into law.</p> <p>The South Sudan new parliament was sworn in, on 2 August 2021 under peace deal. The creation of an inclusive national assembly was a key condition of the 2018 ceasefire that paused five years of bloodshed between government and rebel forces that left</p>
--	--

	<p>shed between government and rebel forces that left nearly 400,000 people dead.</p> <p>(https://www.africanews.com/2021/08/02/south-sudan-swears-in-new-parliament-vowed-under-peace-deal/)</p>
2. The allocation of lands is presented as part of the solution for a successful community-based wildlife and forest resource management. Please clarify the current land tenure and rights in the targeted areas.	<p>Using allocation of lands as part of the solution for a successful community-based wildlife and forest resource management has been removed. It had been included by mistake.</p> <p>But a rough description of land tenure systems in the area has been added and the details will be presented during the PPG in the CEO endorsement Request.</p>
3. The Barrier corresponding to the lack of livelihood improvement options is not considered. Wouldn't it be relevant as it relates to and partially justify the activities proposed under component 3?	<p>The barrier on livelihood improvement options has been considered as suggested and has been integrated in barrier #3 and in addition, a new output on livelihoods improvement has been added accordingly (see table B and section 1.3 of the PIF)</p>
4. Please clarify what "IDPs" stands for.	<p>IDPs, is an abbreviation for Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) and it has been corrected in both the PIF and the portal</p>

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 26, 2021:

Please provide the meaning of the acronyms the first time they appear in the text (see for example MWCT).

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

MWCT stands for Ministry of Wildlife conservation and Tourism (MWCT) and has been corrected

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 26, 2021:

1. Under component 2, the description says "following targets: (i) Develop a programme..." but there is no (ii). Please complete or amend this sentence.
2. Under the outcome 3.1.1, the support to the development of mechanisms to incentivize rights holders is unclear. Please explain what such mechanisms could be providing examples.
3. Through the outcome 3.1.3, key priority actions will be implemented. Some of them are known such as the restoration of agriculture lands but the proposal is unclear on this aspect which is very important to reduce pressure on forests. Please elaborate further on the actions considered at this stage.
4. Most of the project is about governance, regulations, planning and capacity building. Please clarify how these activities will have the needed impact to concretely alleviate the pressure on the ecosystems and reduce the environmental degradation.
5. In the TOC, the outputs are not fully visible. Please amend.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the clarifications and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

<p>3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program? Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion September 26, 2021:</p> <p>1. Under component 2, the description says "following targets: (i) Develop a programme..." but there is no (ii). Please complete or amend this sentence.</p>	<p>Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:</p> <p>This has been corrected in both the PIF and the portal. It now reads as:</p> <p>The aim of this component is to enhance the Imatong CFR Management and capacity building for PAME. This is in line with Strategic Objectives 5 and 6 of the GoSS NBSAP with the following targets: (i) Develop a programme for effective management of PAs and PA current network, including situation analysis and development of General Management Plans for all PAs by 2024 (ii) Provide technical capacity support of national and PA level management staff and (iii) generate information for biodiversity conservation and effective protected area management. This project will support the GoSS in delivering on this target through the following outcome and outputs.</p>
<p>2. Under the outcome 3.1.1, the support to the development of mechanisms to incentivize rights holders is unclear. Please explain what such mechanisms could be providing examples.</p>	<p>That phrase has been removed in both the portal and the PIF</p>
<p>3. Through the outcome 3.1.3, key priority actions will be implemented. Some of them are known such as the restoration of agriculture lands but the proposal is unclear on this aspect which is very important to reduce pressure on forests. Please elaborate further on the actions considered at this stage.</p>	<p>Output 3.1.3 has been revised to include restoration of agriculture lands. This has been done in both the portal and the PIF</p>
<p>4. Most of the project is about governance, regulations, planning and capacity building. Please clarify how these activities will have the needed impact to concretely alleviate the pressure on the ecosystems and reduce the environmental degradation.</p>	<p>Under component 2, the project will develop the Imatong forest Management plan and implement its key priority actions to address PAME challenges in an inclusive consultative manner and participatory approach. In addition, Component 3 has been revised to aim at promoting sustainable agriculture practices and community livelihoods improvement to red</p>

	... and community awareness improvement to reduce pressure on the Imatong Central Forest Reserve (ICFR)
5. In the TOC, the outputs are not fully visible. Please amend.	The outputs in the TOC have been made visible and re-posted in the portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

It is unclear how the project will improve financial sustainability of the PA which is also included in the BD 2-7 objective. Please explain.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

The project is only to achieve a part of the objective which is “to protect habitats and species effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate”.

It will not directly aim at Improving financial sustainability but will indirectly contribute to it.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 27 Sept 2021

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 27 Sept 2021

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 27 Sept 2021

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

The geo-referenced information is missing. Please complete.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

The Geo-referenced coordinates have been included in both the portal and the PIF.

They are 3°57'0"N 32°54'0"E

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 27 Sept 2021

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response Cleared on 27 Sept 2021

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

The description of the private sector is general. Please elaborate further providing more details of the stakeholders in the targeted landscape (who they are) and the value chains (what they produce/do).

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

The section of the private sector has been expanded as per section 4 of the PIF.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

1. In the proposal, the risks analysis related to the COVID-19 pandemic identifies key risks but the pandemic can affect other important elements of the project such as the availability of co-financing and expertise. Please ensure all the possible risks are considered and also conduct a brief opportunity analysis exploring possible opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (all the COVID-19 analysis can be a specific and separate note after the risk table). For further clarification, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14, 2020.
2. The climate risk is not enough analyzed. At a minimum, each agency should use a risk screening process that includes four steps (hazard identification, assessment of vulnerability and exposure, risk classification and risk mitigation plan). At PIF stage, A preliminary climate risk screening should be conducted identifying risks and planned risk mitigation or adaptation measures. Please briefly outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project locations or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential impacts for the project that are related to the climate scenarios (during and after the project implementation) and mitigation measures. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.
3. Beyond the potential access issues, the risk of the lack of adoption or engagement by local communities is not considered. Please assess that risk too.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

1. In the proposal, the risks analysis related to the COVID-19 pandemic identifies key risks but the pandemic can affect other important elements of the project such as the availability of co-financing and expertise. Please ensure all the possible risks are considered and also conduct a brief opportunity analysis exploring possible opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (all the COVID-19 analysis can be a specific and separate note after the risk table). For further clarification, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14, 2020.

<p>emic can affect other important elements of the project such as the availability of co-financing and expertise. Please ensure all the possible risks are considered and also conduct a brief opportunity analysis exploring possible opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (all the COVID-19 analysis can be a specific and separate note after the risk table). For further clarification, we advise to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14, 2020.</p>	<p>Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:</p> <p>The risks analysis related to the COVID-19 pandemic has been improved. See section 5 of the PIF</p>
<p>2. The climate risk is not enough analyzed. At a minimum, each agency should use a risk screening process that includes four steps (hazard identification, assessment of vulnerability and exposure, risk classification and risk mitigation plan). At PIF stage, A preliminary climate risk screening should be conducted identifying risks and planned risk mitigation or adaptation measures. Please briefly outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project locations or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential impacts for the project that are related to the climate scenarios (during and after the project implementation) and mitigation measures. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: https://www.stapgef.org/resources/advisory-documents/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening.</p>	<p>Climate change projections/scenarios have been described in section 1.1 of the PIF.</p> <p>More climate risks have been added in the table of section 5 in the PIF but a deeper analysis of climate risks will be undertaken during the PPG</p>
<p>3. Beyond the potential access issues, the risk of the lack of adoption or engagement by local communities is not considered. Please assess that risk too.</p>	<p>The risk of the lack of adoption or engagement by local communities has been included in the risk table of section 5 in the PIF</p>

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

1. At the beginning of the project description, the information for the "Other Executing Partner(s)" is missing. Please inform here the executing agency(ies) of the project.
2. Two relevant GEF projects are mentioned. In addition, under the baseline scenario other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area are identified. Please explain how the proposal will build on and/or articulate with these projects.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the amendment and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

<p>Coordination Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?</p> <p>Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion September 25, 2021:</p> <p>1. At the beginning of the project description, the information for the "Other Executing Partner(s)" is missing. Please inform here the executing agency(ies) of the project.</p>	<p>Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:</p> <p>The entry for "Other Executing Partner(s)" has been filled. It is the Ministry of Environment and Forestry</p>
<p>2. Two relevant GEF projects are mentioned. In addition, under the baseline scenario other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area are identified. Please explain how the proposal will build on and/or articulate with these projects.</p>	<p>This has been added in section 6 of the PIF</p>

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

The description says the project is consistent with a series of plans and activities under the environmental Conventions but it doesn't say

how. Please briefly elaborate further on how the project is consistent with these plans and activities.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

This has been done in section 7 of the PIF

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 27 Sept 2021

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 30, 2021:

We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). The SRIF, however, does not provide “Justification for the response” for the Safeguard 6 (Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement and Safeguard or Safeguard 7 (Indigenous Peoples,) although there is a full or partial physical displacement or relocation of people (6.1) and impacts to the human rights of indigenous peoples (7.3). The SCRIF further notes in Safeguard 4 (Community Health, Safety and Security) that the project will engage security personnel to support project activities. Please provide, if possible, some additional explanation related to these risks and elaborate on any planned measures to avoid, mitigate and manage these risks (e.g. Environmental and Social Management Framework, Environmental and Social Impact Assessment, Indigenous Peoples Plans, Environmental and Social Management Plan).

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response for the 27 September 2021 GEF review:

The project will not be involved in any Displacement and Involuntary Resettlement of local people. Also, the project will not engage security personnel to support project activities. The SRIF has been revised to overall ESS risk classified as Low.

art III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 25, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Cleared on 27 Sept 2021

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

N/A

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

September 27, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

October 14, 2021:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The PIF is now recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

/iew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/30/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval