



Strengthening ecological connectivity in the Dulombi-Boé Tchetché complex (DTB)

Part I: Project Information

GEF ID

10556

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

☐ CBIT

☐ NGI

Project Title

Strengthening ecological connectivity in the Dulombi-Boé Tchetché complex (DTB)

Countries

Guinea-Bissau

Agency(ies)

IUCN

Other Executing Partner(s)

Executing Partner Type

Other Executing Partner(s)

Instituto da Biodiversidade e das Areas Protegidas (IBAP)

Executing Partner Type

Beneficiaries

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Forest and Landscape Restoration, Forest, Focal Areas, Sustainable Land Management, Land Degradation, Income Generating Activities, Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Ecosystem Approach, Community-Based Natural Resource Management, Sustainable Forest, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Biodiversity, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Illegal Wildlife Trade, Species, Wildlife for Sustainable Development, Conservation Trust Funds, Financial and Accounting, Biomes, Mangroves, Consultation, Type of Engagement, Stakeholders, Participation, Beneficiaries, Civil Society, Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Women groups, Gender Mainstreaming, Gender Equality, Awareness Raising, Gender results areas

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 0

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Duration

48 In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

429,579

Submission Date

3/23/2020

A. Indicative Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements

| Programming Directions | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
| BD-1-1 | GET | 1,200,000 | 1,800,000 |
| BD-2-7 | GET | 1,200,000 | 1,800,000 |
| LD-1-3 | GET | 1,800,000 | 4,624,000 |
| LD-2-5 | GET | 573,100 | 600,000 |
| Total Project Cost (\$) | | 4,773,100 | 8,824,000 |

B. Indicative Project description summary

Project Objective

Improved and sustained ecological connectivity of the DBT Corridor and related transnational protected areas of Niokolo-Koba (Senegal) and Badiar (Guinea) by strengthening biodiversity conservation and improving sustainable land use.

| Project Component | Financing Type | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-------------------|
|-------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|------------|----------------|-------------------|

| Project Component | Financing Type | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|---|----------------------|--|---|------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Component 1 : Governance and stakeholders capacity building | Technical Assistance | Outcome 1.1 Improved policies, regulations, institutional collaboration and stakeholders' (IBAP, Bioguineé, DGFF) capacities for long term management based on landscape and ecosystem approach | <p>Output 1.1.1 Management plans of main ecosystems designed (with updated datas on ecological corridors of the DBT) and implemented using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach</p> <p>Output 1.1.2 At least 3 protected areas demonstrate improved management effectiveness and governance equity (through METT and related tools, benchmarked to the IUCN Green List Standard)</p> <p>Output 1.1.3 Political, institutional and multi stakeholder platforms established between sectorial ministries (agriculture, Environment and Biodiversity, Natural resources, Urban and Regional Planning, etc.) and other keys actors (National Guard, civil society actors, conservation actors and researchers)</p> <p>Output 1.1.4. Cooperation protocols (between conservation actors and the paramilitary body) and joint management committee established and implemented.</p> | GET | 1,500,000 | 2,000,000 |

| Project Component | Financing Type | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|---|----------------|---|--|------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Component 2 : Management and restoration of ecological connectivity corridor and wildlife mobility | Investment | <p>Outcome 2.1 Degraded land and ecological corridors under restoration with collaboration of stakeholders</p> <p>Outcome 2.2 Enabling environment to support voluntary LDN target implementation</p> | <p>Output 2.1.1: Land and ecosystem restoration activities in selected corridors</p> <p>Output 2.1.2 : Value chains development of priority NTFPs is supported in the various sites to facilitate Forest Landscape Restoration</p> <p>Output 2.1.3: Financing mechanism for the complex developed in collaboration with stakeholders (Government, Communities, Private Sector) supporting BioGuinée and other funding mechanisms for the protected area system in Guinée-Bissau</p> <p>Output 2.2.1 Policy and institutional work at national levels supported to integrate LDN tool into the existing planning frameworks</p> <p>Output 2.2.2 Measures are identified and implemented to address the LDN target of Guinea Bissau</p> | GET | 2,615,810 | 5,124,000 |

| Project Component | Financing Type | Project Outcomes | Project Outputs | Trust Fund | GEF Amount(\$) | Co-Fin Amount(\$) |
|--|----------------------|---|--|------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Component 3 : Monitoring, evaluation, knowledge management and sharing | Technical Assistance | 3.1. Project implemented based on RBM, and lessons learned/best practices documented and disseminated | Output 3.1.1 Knowledge on good management / restoration of natural resources documented and disseminated Output 3.1.2 A gender strategy is developed and implemented Output 3.1.3. Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and system (including LDN achievements)developed and implemented. | GET | 430,000 | 1,200,000 |
| Sub Total (\$) | | | | | 4,545,810 | 8,324,000 |
| Project Management Cost (PMC) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | 227,290 | 500,000 |
| Sub Total(\$) | | | | | 227,290 | 500,000 |
| Total Project Cost(\$) | | | | | 4,773,100 | 8,824,000 |

C. Indicative 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(\$) |
|--------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| Donor Agency | MAVA Foundation | Grant | Recurrent expenditures | 100,000 |
| GEF Agency | Le programme PAPBio de l'Union Européenne (UICN/UE) | Grant | Recurrent expenditures | 2,500,000 |
| Government | PACVEAR (project to support value chains and agricultural and rural entrepreneurship) Ministry of Agriculture and rurul development | Grant | Recurrent expenditures | 3,500,000 |
| Others | Bioguinée Foundation (BioGuinée Fund) | Equity | Recurrent expenditures | 2,724,000 |
| Total Project Cost(\$) | | | | 8,824,000 |

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The project will mobilize investment through the BioGuinee Foundation and its related Fund. The project will build on this existing mechanism and will ensure that more funding is allocated to private sector development activities in the area, and at the national level as well.

D. Indicative 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(\$) | Total(\$) |
|--------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------------|
| IUCN | GET | Guinea-Bissau | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 2,000,000 | 180,000 | 2,180,000 |
| IUCN | GET | Guinea-Bissau | Land Degradation | LD STAR Allocation | 2,773,100 | 249,579 | 3,022,679 |
| Total GEF Resources(\$) | | | | | 4,773,100 | 429,579 | 5,202,679 |

E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

☐

PPG Amount (\$)

150,000

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

13,500

| Agency | Trust Fund | Country | Focal Area | Programming of Funds | Amount(\$) | Fee(\$) | Total(\$) |
|-------------------------|------------|---------------|------------------|----------------------|------------|---------|-----------|
| IUCN | GET | Guinea-Bissau | Biodiversity | BD STAR Allocation | 62,852 | 5,657 | 68,509 |
| IUCN | GET | Guinea-Bissau | Land Degradation | LD STAR Allocation | 87,148 | 7,843 | 94,991 |
| Total Project Costs(\$) | | | | | 150,000 | 13,500 | 163,500 |

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) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 296,188.00 | 0.00 | 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 | WDPA 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) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 296,188.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

| Name of the Protected Area | WDPA 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 | WDPA 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 Dulombi-Boe-Tchetché | 125689 | SelectProtected area with sustainable use of natural resources | 296,188.00 | | | | | | |

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) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 142518.00 | 0.00 | 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) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 72,518.00 | | | |

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) |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 70,000.00 | | | |

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 HC VF)

| 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) | | 110000 | 0 | 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) | | 110,000 | | | |
| Expected metric tons of CO ₂ e (indirect) | | | | | |
| Anticipated start year of accounting | | 2026 | | | |
| Duration of accounting | | 20 | | | |
| 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 | 50,000 | | | |
| Male | 45,000 | | | |
| Total | 95000 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

By conserving 26.3% of its territory (12.4% Marine Protected Areas and 13.9% Land Protected Areas), Guinea-Bissau will achieve Aichi's targets. Its land and marine protected areas participate actively to the efforts to reduce land degradation and biodiversity loss. Eight protected areas have been created and one Biosphere Reserve (Bijagós Archipelago) to which connectivity corridors between the Boé-Dulumbi protected areas and main ecological habitats (Cufada lagoon, Wendu Leidi and Wendu Tcham Lagoons) have been identified, as well as transboundary protected areas (Guinea-Bissau, Republic of Guinea, Senegal) which should also be functional through the project. Despite conservation efforts, biodiversity and habitat losses in protected and unprotected areas are increasing. Losses, related to population growth and high demand and consumption of natural resources (World Bank, 2011), cause the transformation of land and ecosystems. With climate change, environmental degradation has been accelerated and has caused greater vulnerability of territories and populations. Land is being deforested and degraded, species diversity reduced, rivers sedimenting and adaptation difficult.

In this context, the Dulombi-Boé-Tchetché connectivity project, complementary to the GEF UNDP project on ecological connectivity in the DBT and other projects and initiatives implemented at the national level in Guinea-Bissau down to the Coastal Line, will achieve initiated actions and improve the ecological connectivity of the DBT Corridor and related transnational habitats and ecosystems (Niokolo-Koba in Senegal, Badiar in Guinea) by strengthening the governance of protected areas and stakeholders capacities, restoring ecological connectivity and mobility. The Dulombi-Boé-Tchetché complex with 406,556 ha, represents 11.23% of the national territory and hosts an important biological diversity. It is particularly critical for the global environment, notably the DBT shelters rare plant species (*Combretum glutinosum*, *Ficus sp.*, *Parinari excelsa*, *Zanthoxylum leprieurii*, *Erythrina senegalensis*, *Gardenia terrifolia*, *Acacia macrostachya*, *Allophylus africanus*, *Cassia sieberiana*, *Combretum micranthum*, *Faidherbia albida*, *Detarium microcarpum*, *Vitex madiensis*, *Albizia zygia*, *Uvaria chamae*, *Synsepalum*, *Anisophyllea laurina*, *Antiaris toxicaria*, *Morinda geminata*, *Terminalia macroptera* etc.), three important watershed areas (Corubal, Gêba and Gambia), several threatened animal species such as baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*), green monkeys (*Cercopithecus aethiops*), patas (*Erythrocebus patas*), chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and black and white colobus (*Colobus polychromos*), Nile crocodile (*Crocodylus niloticus*), hippopotamus (*Hippopotamus amphibius*), elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) and the wild dog (*Lycaon pictus*). In addition, the DBT hosts Ramsar sites (Wendu Tcham, Cufada, Wendu Leidi).

Therefore, it is important for Guinea-Bissau to extend and strengthen the efforts of conservation and restoration of ecosystems in protected and unprotected areas in order to improve the management of soil, water and forests and to ensure the conservation of biodiversity in contiguous protected areas, in unprotected areas, permanent access to ecosystem services, mitigation of the effects of climate change, etc.

1b. The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description);

Global environmental and/or adaptation problems

Presently, the threat to biodiversity in the DBT corridors is mainly due to competing use for natural resources. Unsustainable agricultural practices, timber and non timber products exploitation, extensive animal husbandry and beekeeping, have resulted in biodiversity loss and fragmentation of ecosystems and habitats (savannah, forests and wetlands). They have also generated negative effects as uncontrolled deforestation, and the depredation of plant and animal species, land degradation. The original habitats have been transformed, mainly the forest habitats and wetlands in grasslands and savannah of monocultures in vast spaces of the DBT. These challenges are responsible for the deterioration of ecosystems and environmental imbalance.

Habitats degradation and loss of biodiversity are related to human activities and pressures on ecosystems. Unsustainable practices (Slash-and-burn agriculture^[1]¹, Bush fires^[2]², forestry, Animal husbandry) have affected forest ecosystems and their species, altering environmental balance. Forest losses in Guinea Bissau are considerable. The rate has been around 40,000 to 60,000 ha per year since the late 1980s. Alterations in vegetation cover are 55.9% for dense forests between 2002-2007 (CARVOG, 2009). On another level, the transformation of forests into wooded savannahs is also significant and reaches 30% between 2002 and 2007. They also illustrate unsustainable practices in agriculture (mpam mpam, slash-and-burn agriculture) and the expansion of cashew nut cultivation. Globally, forest cover at the national level from 1990 to 2007 is declining. In contrast, tree savannah increased during the same observation period by up to 13%. As a result, many plant species are in decline or in loss: Pau Incenso^[3]³ (*Daniella oliveri*), Bissilão (*Khaya senegalensis*), *Lophira lanceolata*, *Goiaba de lala* (*Schreberia arborea*), *Tambacumba* (*Parinaria macrophila*), *Mancone* (*Erythrophleum guineensis*), *Faroba de lala* (*Albizia zizia*), *Pau Conta* (*Azizelia africana*), *Poilão foro* (*Bombax costatum*), *Mango de mato* (*Cordia pinnata*), *Macite* (*Terminalia macroptera*), *Faroba* (*Parkia biglobosa*), *Pau carbon* (*Prosopis africana*), *Pau sangue* (*Pterocarpus erinaceus*), *Fidida branca* (*Federbia albia*), *Mampataz* (*Parinaria excelsa*), *Pau bicho amarelo* (*Chlorophora regia*), *Pau bicho preto* (*Antiaris africana*), *Cibe* (*Boatlanta rrasus aethiopium*). The fauna is also affected by deforestation^[4]⁴ in the DBT complex and threatened of extinction: chimpanzees, elephants, lions, tigers, hippopotamuses, buffaloes etc.

Fragmentation has generated a loss of connectivity and between different landscape unit (protected areas), affecting animal populations and possibilities of species to adapt from degraded areas to conserved ones. Natural forests are currently substituted by cashew plantation or burn lands and savannahs. This situation means more human presence in fauna habitats and doesn't provide needed conditions for species displacement and proliferation.

Land degradation is intensifying and extending to all areas and ecosystems. It is caused by deforestation and climate change. The denudation of the soil accentuates erosion, which acts here as the main factor of soil degradation. The loss of soil properties affects food security and ecosystems. Indeed, we observe a decrease in soil productivity and a reduction of the capacity for artificial or assisted regeneration of ecosystems. In addition, erosion affects the storage capacity of groundwater and surface water, causing silting of river basins. Finally, habitat loss, fragmentation and homogenization of natural communities modify connectivity patterns, isolate populations and communities and limit them to sub-optimal habitats (Tilman et al. 1994, Fahrig 2003, Holyoak et al. 20056 , Crooks and Sanjayan 2006).

By reducing the productive capacity of soils, land degradation contributes to increased poverty and food insecurity. Without an appropriate response, this situation can lead to famine, social instability and even conflict in the long term. The need for an appropriate policy response is therefore undeniable and urgent in economically and ecologically viable models (Mohammed Rachid Doukkali et al., 2018)[\[5\]](#)⁵.

Restoration of the productive capacity of degraded lands is a necessity to secure and obtain a sustainable lever for a profound transformation of economies and the well-being of populations. There are several SLM practices and techniques to help communities better manage their environments. To scale up these technologies, the establishment of adequate financing mechanisms is necessary for developing a massive investment in land restoration. This approach is a winning option for achieving LDN goals. Guinea Bissau is engaged on the integrated process to facilitate the enable environment for voluntary LDN target implementation in the country; this process need to be strengthened in other to maintain the productivity of land resources, support ecosystem functions and services and thus meet the needs of current and future generations in Guinea Bissau.

-

1.c Barriers

The barriers to ecological continuity and connectivity between the DBT complex and its surrounding areas are legal, institutional, managerial, human and economic.

Barrier 1: Legal: The laws governing land use and access to natural resources are insufficient and weakly adapted to the real requirements of conservation and environmental protection. The Land Law, although elaborated since the end of the 1990s, suffered for a long time from deficiencies and gaps in terms of regulations of access to land and the different possible and tolerated uses. This resulted in negative consequences for nature conservation. Indeed, the lack of norms on access and land use in rural areas has favoured the proliferation of cashew tree plantations, the uncontrolled opening of new agricultural wastelands and consequently a drastic reduction in plant cover, loss of habitats and biodiversity. In addition, the institutions in charge of the laws enforcement suffer from a lack of capacities to assume their missions. This results in the loss and degradation of biodiversity in protected areas and ecological corridors

Barrier 2: institutional: Efforts to integrate environmental issues into public policy dated from the early 1990s. Several structures were created to implement the government's vision on environmental conservation, such as the Directorate General of Forests and Fauna (DGFF), the Directorate General of the Environment and the Institute of Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP). Despite their relatively long existence, technical, scientific, operational and financial shortcomings still persist. These structural weaknesses limit action on the field and contribute to the aggravation of environmental degradation. Another problem facing Government institutions is the limited technical capacity to managing ecological connectivity between one and several ecosystems, between ecosystems dispersed in several national jurisdictions. This results in gaps in the planning and the design of policies and technical recommendations to experts and communities in the field.

The lack of synergies between the different institutions in charge of conservation and environmental protection affects the effective conservation of the environment and the ecological connectivity between the DBT and the adjoining areas. There is a real fragmentation of roles and approaches of environmental conservation and restoration. IBAP, in accordance with the 2011 framework law on protected areas, is responsible for the integral management of protected areas (including forests) and biodiversity. The DGFF is in charge of forest management, including monitoring and management of animal species, forest concessions, community forest management or customary management, according to the prerogative of the 2011 Forest Law. The different laws create overlapping actions but do not address the fundamental issue of synergies. These overlapping actions and lack of inter-institutional collaboration hamper the management of the ecological corridors whose are very important for the connectivity and the biodiversity conservation in the DBT complex. The lack of synergies also impedes the implementation of economies of scale that could be useful in a context of economic crisis and funding deficit. Indeed, the development of synergies between the different public institutions in charge of the environment will be one of the main objectives to be achieved during the implementation of the project in order to strengthen conservation and restoration issues.

Barrier 3: Financial: The economic, social and financial situation of Guinée-Bissau is under many pressures. Hence, IBAP, as the Government Institution in charge of the management of natural ecosystems and protected areas is relying on external support and projects for achieving national plans as well as fulfilling the country's commitments to multilateral agreements such as the ones under the Convention on Biodiversity (UNCBD) and the Convention to Combat Desertification and Degradation (UNCCD). For almost ten years, IBAP has benefited from substantial institutional support from the MAVA Foundation (<https://mava-foundation.org/>). With MAVA's exit strategy by 2023, IBAP will be prepared to take over from all the achievements supported by MAVA from 2023 to continue to address emerging threats to conservation, despite the limited financial resources. Limited institutional capacity and planning has also not been supportive of establishing the financing mechanisms that will support the financing of critical and endangered biodiversity and ecosystems. That is why the sustainable financing is an absolute necessity. The foundations were put in place through the Bioguinée Foundation. This now needs to be strengthened and enhanced in order for this mechanism to mobilize and attract other types of financing, which are more sustainable and build on local and regional entrepreneurship. Finally, the non existence of business plans for the different PAs is a barrier to compensating for the absence of state subvention. On another level, the long-term management capacity of PAs, especially the challenges of aligning the use of funds with conservation benefits, inhibits the thesaurus of PA management. The long-term solution is to have a well-funded SNAP that conserves important ecosystems.

Barrier 4: Technical and operational. The productive systems (agriculture, beekeeping, livestock...) used by population has a negative impact on ecosystems: current land use practices are unsustainable and increasingly contribute to the loss of habitats and ecosystems. For example, in agriculture, current practices contribute more to the loss of habitats and ecosystems. Animal husbandry, beekeeping, fishing and hunting also contribute to the loss of habitats and ecosystems.

1.d. The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects,

The South-East of Guinea Bissau has important biological reserves for local communities and for the whole world in terms of biodiversity and carbon sequestration. The DBT complex, containing most of the remaining primary forest in Guinea Bissau, is contiguous to areas of settlement and intensive land development. The existing ecological corridors (Cuntabane, Serifo-Xitole, Quebo) are considered ecological lungs, which are at risk of no longer fulfilling their connectivity functions. In spite of the advanced degradations observed, corridors still have ecological potentials that can fully fulfil the functions of interconnection and safeguarding biodiversity. In the baseline scenario, without conservation and restoration of these areas, the accelerated degradation of connectivity corridors will continue, which will negatively affect the DBT Complex and the global environmental benefits it generates.

Socially, ecosystem services are important and contribute significantly to the reduction of poverty. However, the agricultural sector is heavily dependent on interannual variations in rainfall, resulting in poor diversification. This has an impact on ecological resources and sustainable development. This has direct impacts on forest resources, inter-habitat and inter-species mobility. Indeed, land management is very important as the main element in maintaining or destroying forest habitats, which are corridors for the movement of wildlife, plant species through pollination and water retention.

In corridors, forests are increasingly degraded and lose their valuable capacity as corridors of ecological connectivity, carbon sequestration and soil fixation. In the baseline scenario, only the GEF-UNDP project attempted to establish connectivity corridors between protected areas in the DBT and beyond. This action will be continued, strengthened and completed with the proposed project.

Also, the baseline scenario shows strong possibilities of complementarities between some programs operating in the area and the proposed project. These investments are already addressing the thorny issue of forest and land degradation, as well as biodiversity loss. The biggest challenge in the baseline scenario is the very weak interaction between the different conservation projects and actions in the area. The proposed project under GEF 7 will address this gap and play the needed coordination role between these initiatives. The project would therefore serve as a platform for incentives for actors and stakeholders. It will be complementary and additional to the UNDP GEF 5 project, through component 1 on institutional strengthening, particularly on improving policies, regulations and institutional capacities for the management of protected areas. The project will also work closely with the Bioguine fund in order to establish a pathway where funding is targeted towards mobilizing more sustainable sources of funding by promoting income-generating activities such as ecotourism, scientific tourism, the valorisation of ecosystem products, and the carbon market. The proposed project will also coordinate closely with the PAPBIO project focused on conservation of ecosystems in ecological corridors, particularly in areas of connectivity between forest and wetland ecosystems through mangrove conservation and restoration. These two projects, focusing on biodiversity management and mainstreaming as well as sustainable resources management through land management, will be complementary with the IFAD REDE project, which will focus on restoration by setting up sustainable production systems, and support the conservation and restoration of forests through the fight against the unsustainable practices such as the propagation of cashew monoculture and bush fires. The co-financing from these baseline activities will be further refined during the Project Preparation Phase.

By making the link between all these initiatives, the project would therefore help to improve ecological governance, sustainable use of land and ecological resources and would help to combine the needs of conservation with those of sustainable development. It will integrate, in a participatory approach, all territorial governance mechanisms such as the carbon market, forest management, water resource management, biodiversity, land use planning, etc.

The project will build on the following projects and initiatives, which are all focused on either strengthening the protected area network or sustainable land management and restoration, but not on linking the ecosystems (protected and non-protected) together.

The development programme for Guinea-Bissau 2015-2025 (TERRA RANKA - new start), by focusing on increasing the area under rice cultivation, aims to reduce the human impact on plant species and thus enable the maintenance of biodiversity, the circulation of species and ecological connectivity between several areas and territories. Selecting the rice sector will help to relieve the forests that are under heavy pressure from slash-and-burn and plantation agriculture. In addition, Axis 3 of the TERRA RANKA strategic operational plan makes biodiversity a central issue of governance, which will facilitate the mobilization of funds for nature conservation and the promotion of socially equitable and ecologically sustainable development. Finally, this project will strengthen the proposed one and allow to allocate additional funds to institutions in charge of environmental protection and the safeguarding of biodiversity such as IBAP.

The BioGuinea Foundation, created in 2011 and registered under British law, the BioGuinea Foundation is a public utility grant making institution in Guinea Bissau which supports biodiversity conservation, the promotion of sustainable community development and environmental education in Guinea Bissau. The establishment of the Foundation is the result of a fruitful collaboration between several committed international and national actors: the World Bank, the European Union, the Global Environment Facility/UNDP, the French Global Environment Facility (FFEM), the MAVA Foundation, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the Institute of Biodiversity and Protected Areas (IBAP), the Government of Guinea-Bissau and many others. The Foundation's mission is to generate permanent flows of financial resources and mobilize partnerships for biodiversity conservation, sustainable community development and environmental education in Guinea-Bissau.

To consolidate this sustainable role of the BioGuinea Foundation, the World Bank and the GEF5/UNDP, through the partnership with IBAP, have financed projects that have enabled the BioGuinea Foundation to operate and to fundraise an initial capitalization of 7,379,000 Euros. With the end of the GEF5/UNDP project, the BioGuinea Foundation requires support to continue its fundraising and capitalization mission. The proposed project under GEF 7 on ecological connectivity of the DBT will reinforce the efforts of the BioGuinea Foundation and, above all, enable it to : (i) raise additional funds for the functioning of protected areas from private sources in the sake of diversification, (ii) train national competencies to play an effective fundraising role in appropriate for a related to private sector funding, and (iii) initiate concrete activities for the protection/restoration of protected areas based on local entrepreneurship and the private sector. The GEF funding will be additional as it will use BioGuinée Fund as a baseline and an established Financial Mechanism to develop innovative financing models for the protected area. This GEF funding will not duplicate the previous phases and ensure that the Foundation brings in and develop additional instruments mobilizing the private sector for contributing the financial sustainability of the protected area system, in particular ecotourism, scientific tourism, the valorisation of ecosystem products, and the carbon market.

The PAPBio programme of the European Union (EU), has the overall objective of promoting endogenous, sustainable and inclusive economic development that meets the challenges of climate change. Specifically, the programme will aim to achieve integrated protection of biodiversity and fragile ecosystems and enhanced resilience to climate change. The aim of the project is to achieve an integrated protection of the diversity and fragile ecosystems of Mangrove in West Africa and their enhanced resilience to climate change. In Guinea Bissau, the PAPBio programme focuses on the regions of Cacheu, Quinara, Tombali and the Bijagos Archipelago. In the Quinara and Tombali regions in particular, it involves the Cufada lagoons, the Corubal watershed, the Gêba watershed, the Rio Grande of Buba, the Rio Cacine, the Rio Tombali, the Rio Pefine etc. These ecosystems are the main habitat extensions of the DBT parks and are the connectivity corridors that effectively maintain the link between the DBT and important ecosystems such as the Cufada lagoons through the Salifo-Xitole-Fifiol forest connectivity corridors, the Cuntabane-Quebo corridor, the Colbuia wildlife corridor. The proposed GEF7 project on connectivity corridors of the DBT whose objective is also to strengthen the governance of ecosystems, will allow the restoration of mangrove ecosystem in the Corubal basin and to be fully complementary of PAPBio programme in Guinea Bissau.

Family Farming Diversification, Integrated Markets, Nutrition and Climate Resilience Project: this IFAD project in Guinea Bissau, estimated to USD 65.7 million, will promote crop diversification to reduce the country's dependence on a monoculture - rice or cashew nuts. The project will also support climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, including reducing bush fires and deforestation, improving water management in lowland areas, increasing the organic matter content of cultivated soils and protecting and creating forests in upland areas. REDE will be implemented in four regions - Bafatà, Cacheu, Gabú and Oio - and will develop 14,000 hectares of watersheds and 3,500 hectares of arable lowlands. In addition, 175 kilometers of roads, 3 semi-wholesale markets, 5 weekly markets and 2 collection centers will be renovated. The project will target women and youth, as well as disabled people and returning migrants. The project is fully aligned with the objectives of the GEF 7 project, in particular the reduction of deforestation, the loss of habitats and biodiversity and land management etc.

Value Chain Support Project and Agricultural and Rural Entrepreneurship (PACVEAR - AfDB): This project will intervene in three regions in the North and East of Guinea-Bissau (Bafata, Oio and Gabu). It aims to improve the production environment in the rice and horticultural sectors and to promote businesses in all links of the value chains of the targeted sectors in order to create sustainable employment and increase the income of rural populations. By focusing on rice and horticulture sectors, the project aims also to reduce pressures on forest resources related to slash-and-burn agriculture and cashew plantations. Therefore, it is fully complementary to the GEF 7 project on the ecological connectivity of the DBT complex.

1.e The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project

The proposed project aims at the ecological connectivity between the protected areas of the DBT complex by improving their management and that of the land, forests, habitats, ecosystems, promoting sustainable productive systems. The project will enable the establishment of an ecosystem favourable to the mobility/return of animal species, the conservation of biodiversity and the permanence of species flows as well as the provision of various ecosystem services to the populations. In addition, the project will support the implementation of sustainable management plans for ecosystems and corridors, the development of multi-stakeholder and multi-scale synergies, communication, the production and enhancement of knowledge and the dissemination of good practices at the local and transnational levels. The project theory of change is attached to this submission as an annex. Based on this, the below paragraph are providing details on the project's three components as they are currently planned.

Component 1: Governance and stakeholders capacity building. This component will prioritize addressing barriers 1 and 2 through the achievement of one outcome : Improved policies, regulations, institutional collaboration and stakeholders' (IBAP, Bioguiné, DGFF) capacities for long term management based on landscape and ecosystem approach . Component 1 is therefore consistent with the logic of capacity building of the main conservation actors (particularly in protected areas), policies improvements and inter-institutional linkages to enable the restoration of species mobility between territories. It focuses on five important aspects :

- ü Policies and knowledge strengthening: This will be addressed by reviewing existing laws and rules, training of the main actors involved in the management of protected areas. The assessment of the existing law will be made with the participation of all relevant stakeholders, in order to identify gaps and constraints to be addressed. During this process, the project will also assess needs in terms of capacity building or law enforcement. The findings of the assessment will therefore be used for the laws improvement and regulations
- ü Capacity building: Stakeholders will be trained on relevant laws and regulations, and on the integration of the landscape and socio-ecosystemic approach in the management and restoration of connectivity corridors.
- ü Long term planning strategies: This will allow the concerted and participatory elaboration of ecosystem management plans, the participatory mapping of the different resources and rights issues related to the corridors, and the main threats in order to plan the necessary interventions.
- ü Synergies and complementarities building: This will enable the mobilization of all relevant stakeholders around common protocols, committees and action plans for the effective management of protected areas and connectivity corridors, sharing of experiences and solutions.
- ü Ecosystems Management / Monitoring: The project will support the sustainable management of the ecosystems (inside and outside the protected areas). Ecosystem dynamics will also be followed during project implementation and will particularly concern sensitive ecosystems in the DBT.

Finally, Component 1 will focus on strengthening the capacities of park rangers and technicians from different institutions with a focus on the effective management of protected areas, the restoration of forest landscapes, the conservation/restoration of watersheds of main rivers, and the dynamics of habitat conservation of trans-national vocation. It will also strengthen the capacities of park rangers and technicians on law enforcement and wildlife monitoring at the DBT complex and target ecosystems. Regarding the transnational

dimension, capacity building on the shared governance of transboundary ecosystems will be addressed and will contribute to the removal of barriers to ecosystem-based monitoring of conservation policies..

The outcome and outputs of this component are :

Outcome 1.1. Improved policies, regulations, institutional collaboration and stakeholders' (IBAP, Bioguine, DGFF) capacities for long term management based on landscape and ecosystem approach:

- Output 1.1.1 Management plans of main ecosystems designed (with updated data on ecological corridors of the DBT) and implemented using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach
- Output 1.1.2: At least 3 protected areas demonstrate improved management effectiveness and governance equity (through METT and related tools, benchmarked to the IUCN Green List Standard)
- Output 1.1.3. Political, institutional and multi stakeholder platforms established between sectorial ministries (agriculture, Environment and Biodiversity, Natural resources, Urban and Regional Planning, etc.) and other key actors (National Guard, civil society actors, conservation actors and researchers)
- Output 1.1.4. Cooperation protocols (between conservation actors and the paramilitary body) and joint management committee established and implemented

Component 2 : Management and restoration of ecological connectivity corridors and wildlife mobility : This will mainly achieve two results: a) Degraded land and ecological corridors under restoration with collaboration of stakeholders and, b) Enabling environment to support voluntary LDN target implementation. This component will focus on the capacity of stakeholders to conserve and/or restore biodiversity in ecological corridors, to implement sustainable development initiatives in protected areas and buffer zones, to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders to finance conservation and protection actions of PAs and to address international targets related to land restoration and biodiversity. The purpose of this component is to promote alternatives to the abusive and unsustainable use of land and species. It will also aim to initiate land and ecosystem restoration actions with all stakeholders, to put in place a solid governance approach for ecological corridors, to develop and implement solutions that will allow ecosystems and populations to be resilient to the changes induced, and to set up new financing mechanisms for the management of protected areas.

The outcomes and outputs of this component:

Outcome 2.1. Degraded land and ecological corridors under restoration with collaboration of stakeholders

- Output 2.1.1: Land and ecosystem restoration activities in selected corridors
- Output 2.1.2 : Value chains development of priority NTFPs is supported in the various sites to facilitate Forest Landscape Restoration
- Output 2.1.3: Financing mechanism for the complex developed in collaboration with stakeholders (Government, Communities, Private Sector) supporting BioGuinée and other funding mechanisms for the protected area system in Guinée-Bissau

Outcome 2.2: Enabling environment to support voluntary LDN target implementation

- Output 2.2.1 Policy and institutional work at national levels supported to integrate LDN tool into the existing planning frameworks
- Output 2.2.2. Measures are identified and implement to address the LDN targets of Guinea Bissau

Component 3 : Monitoring, evaluation, knowledge management and sharing : This component will make sure that the project implementation is based on results-based management and facilitate that project finding and lessons learned are applied in future operations. The solutions implemented may be replicated in other ecological corridors of connectivity in the country and in regional level. The project will develop an appropriate communication strategy to mobilize all relevant stakeholders from the various ecosystems and habitats. This will involve mobilizing knowledge to establish and promote the project's vision for the ecological connectivity of DBT, mobilize community and stakeholder support, and facilitate partnerships. In this sense, the action will consist in setting up a dynamic network of expertise in ecological connectivity. The network will have as its first vocation the dissemination of good practices and knowledge useful for the conservation and protection of biodiversity in protected areas and in ecological connectivity corridors. It aims to capitalize experiences, acquired knowledge, valorization of traditional knowledge, techniques and practices for the sustainable exploitation of ecosystems, the restoration and conservation of ecosystems, and sustainable productive systems. Finally, the component will focus on development of tools for monitoring and evaluating the project implementation and formulating useful recommendations for the sustainability results reached.

The outcomes and outputs of this component are structured as follows:

Outcome 3.1. Project implemented based on RBM, and lessons learned/best practices documented and disseminated

- Output 3.1.1 Knowledge on good management / restoration of natural resources documented and disseminated
- Output 3.1.2 A gender strategy is developed and implemented
- Output 3.1.3. Project Monitoring & Evaluation Plan and system (including LDN achievements) developed and implemented.

4) Alignment with GEF Focal Areas and Strategies

The project is aligned with the Biodiversity Focal Area. It will mainstream biodiversity across landscapes (BD 1-1) by working directly with communities and stakeholders active in the area, ensuring that productive activities are also integration biodiversity conservation, in particular in the agriculture, tourism and other industrial sectors. At the landscape and corridor level, in particular under component 1, the project will respond to the GEF 7 Biodiversity focal area objective 2-7, which aims at addressing direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate. The project, mainly under component 2, will respond to the Land Degradation Focal Area objective LD 1-3 (Maintain or improve flows of ecosystem services, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people through Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR)). In fact, it will support the coordination of restoration activities ensuring among the various stakeholders active within the landscape. Finally, the project is also aligned with the Land Degradation Neutrality agenda (GEF 7 programme objective LD-2-5) as it will support the establishment of the relevant policy and institutional framework for this matter. As the project objective is to work in a corridor that hosts a complex of protected areas and productive landscapes where forests, biodiversity and land health are all interlinked and under significant pressure from productive activities, the combination of LD and BD focal areas funds is highly relevant to ensure the maximisation of global environment benefits.

-

1.f. Incremental Reasoning

-

The analysis of this baseline shows that the GEF-UNDP project funded in GEF 5 has established the institutional framework for managing the complex. This has been complemented by initiatives and projects focusing on protected areas and natural resources management such the establishment of the Bioguinee Fund to support the protected area system directly in Guinée-Bissau. Later on, the PAPBio Programme focusing on one end of the DBT corridor on the Coastal line has been launched and ensures that

ecosystem services from the coastal line are maintained. This is critical to survival of the DBT complex and related corridors. In parallel, the country has embarked on undertaking large restoration work under the Terra Ranka programme and with the support from initiatives sponsored by the FIDA or the AfDB with the objective of making value chains more sustainable. However, this has not suffice to halt environmental degradation and pressures on critical ecosystems such as the DBT Complex.

The incremental reasoning of the project lays in the fact that it will address an evident need for better coordination among the biodiversity conservation activities, which are lacking considerable support given the scale of the needs and the threats to the ecosystems. In particular, it is critical to ensure there is coordination between all restoration, conservation and productive activities in the area. In that context, it is important that stakeholders coordinate better to identify and support ways of financing activities aiming at mainstreaming biodiversity in productive landscapes as well as KBAs such as the complex, including protected areas and buffer zones (widely speaking). Also, land health is critical to sustaining the ecosystem services and their transfers from one area to the other. There has yet never been any activities related to implementing recommendations from the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target setting exercise. This project will fill this gap by supporting the development of LDN related policies, which will lead to enhanced implementation of land health measures in the future, which is vital for the sustainability of the complex, and ecosystems in the area.

-

1.g Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF); and

The proposed project will enable to better coordinate activities in an area that is critical for biodiversity as it encompasses critical ecosystems, protected areas and productive landscape that are important for livelihoods. In Guinée-Bissau the DBT complex and its related corridors is related to the Coastal line downstream of the Corubal River. Ecosystems connectivity is also transnational as it relates to the network of protected areas in Senegal. This project will not only generate GEB from its direct interventions in Guinée-Bissau by restoring the connectivity between the various landscapes and ecosystems along the Corubal Corridor. It will support ecosystem services connectivity at a transboundary level. All these benefits will be refined further during the PPG phase. At this stage, and at the National level, the Global Environmental Benefits that the project will trigger will be the following:

- Sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity: The project will lead to the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity in 296,188 ha of protected areas and the 142,518 ha of forests and habitats adjacent to these protected areas
- Increase of land area under sustainable use and management : Throughout the project, 296,188 Ha will be under SLM good practices, which will benefit from restored soil and healthy lands following the project.

- Increase the potential for carbon sequestration and reducing greenhouse gas emissions: With more forests conserved or planted, the project will increase the contribution of DBT to carbon sequestration, protection of freshwater sources, combating erosion, land degradation and declining land productivity, food insecurity and deforestation. This is currently estimated to 110,000 ton of CO₂ equivalent. This estimate will be refined during project preparation.

1.h. Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

The project's innovation rests in the corridor approach it foresees for the DBT complex. There are no initiatives aiming at supporting ecological connectivity between protected, non-protected or productive landscapes. In order to achieve this objective, the project will support the development of the institutional and regulatory framework related to the management of these ecological corridors. It will support the development of inclusive multi-stakeholders platforms and capacity building at the local and regional levels, including Government, communities and private sector partners. The project's innovation is also related to supporting the crowding in of more investors into activities that will generate global environment benefits in corridors and the vicinity of protected areas. The project will achieve this by mobilizing the experience and expertise of Guinée-Bissau in natural resources management, and existing mechanisms such the BioGuinée Fund. The project will support better coordination among all the projects in the baseline which constitute the majority of the conservation and restoration initiatives in Guinée-Bissau. It will ensure that the activities and outcomes achieved are sustained by supporting investments from smallholders and companies from the various sector active in the project area. This will ensure on one hand the paradigm shift promoted by the project by having sustainable financing to support the ecosystems restoration, conservation and management developed and enhanced by the project. On the other hand, it will help communities and potential private partners to continue to invest in good practices aimed at managing ecosystems in a sustainable manner.

As this is truly innovative for Guinée-Bissau, this project will have the potential of being replicated in the Country on other complexes but also at the regional level in other neighbouring countries. This project will be active on a complex that is transboundary. The sustainability of the activities to be implemented in Guinée-Bissau by this project will be conditional in the long run to other countries taking a similar path in the near future. The longstanding relationship of IUCN in Guinée-Bissau and in the regions, through a strong Membership base of government and non-government actors will help promote this approach, based on concrete activities in Guinée-Bissau to be showcased to neighbouring countries.

[1] The transformation of natural forest into agricultural land is 6500 ha from 2000 to 2013 and 2511 ha of forest into shrubs, grassland and open vegetation during the same observation period (UNCCD, 2018). The vegetation cover at the national level decreased from 132,196 hectares in 1990 to 65,775 hectares in 2007 for dense forests and from 831,773 hectares in 1990 to 706,998 hectares in 2007 for dry forests.

[2] **Bush fires:** consume more than 40,000 ha of forest per year and accelerate the loss of biodiversity. The use of fire in agriculture, hunting and beekeeping is an old accustomed in rural areas. It is done in an uncontrolled and not mastered process and is at the origin of the decimation of animal and vegetal species. In addition, bush fires cause significant soil impoverishment and food insecurity in rural areas, increase greenhouse gas emissions and accelerate the effects of climate change

[3] Vernacular name in Creole of Guinea Bissau.

[5] Mohammed Rachid Doukkali et al., 2018. Is Land Degradation Neutrality in Africa Possible? Policy Brief, OCP Policy Center PB-18/31

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

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

The project is located in the east and south-east of Guinea-Bissau, in the border area with Guinea. It is located between latitudes 11°32'12.7 "N 14°37'17.0 "W and 12°14'17.1 "N 13°57'06.7 "W. It corresponds to the administrative regions of Bafata, Gabu and Tombali and covers six (06) departments. Geographically, it corresponds to the highlands of Guinea-Bissau which are the last buttresses of Fouta Djallon and the lowlands dominated essentially by the Corubal watershed. It has a land area of 406,556 hectares and an exceptional biodiversity.

The vegetation is diverse and composed of species varying from herbaceous savannah, shrubby savannah, tree savannah to open forest, gallery forest and palm grove. The following botanical families can be distinguished: Anacardiaceae, Annonaceae, Bignoniaceae, Bombaceae, Cesalpiniaceae, Combaceae, Euphorbiaceae, Fabaceae, Hypericaceae, Mimosaceae, Moraceae, Oleaceae, Hizophoraceae, Rubiaceae, Sapindaceae, Sapotaceae, Simarobaceae, Sterculiaceae etc. The rare and threatened species are numerous: *Acacia macrostachya*, *Allophylus africanus*, *Anthocleista procera*, *Antiaris toxicaria*, *Antidesma*, *Cassia sieberiana*, *Margaritaria discoidea*, *Schrebera arborea*, *Terminalia macroptera*, *Erythrophleum suaveolens*, *Faidherbia albida*, *Ficus lutea*. The flora shelters diversified habitats serving as a refuge for diverse animal species. We count 22 mammal families decomposed into 53 genera and 74 species. It concerns Bovidae, Canidae, Cercopithecidae, Elephantidae, Felidae, Galagidae, Herpestidae, Hippopotamidae, Hominidae, Hyenidae, Hystricidae, Leporidae, Lorisidae, Manidae, Mustelidae, Nandinidae, Orycteropodidae, Procaviidae, Sciuridae, Suidae, Trichechidae, Viverridae. We also find a diversity of reptiles belonging to 5 big families: Crocodylidae, Varanidae, Dermocheylidae, Cheloniidae, Manidae.

From hydro-geomorphological and geological points of view, the area is characterised by the presence of reliefs dominated by micro-watersheds draining small tributaries of the Corubal (Seli and Fefine in particular). Throughout the watershed, gallery or riparian forests are found. Connectivity between environments and ecosystems is ensured for the land area by gallery forests and for the aquatic area by the various watercourses.



2. Stakeholders

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

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Private Sector Entities Yes

If none of the above, please explain why:

In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.

During the design and preparation of this Project Information Form (PIF), various meetings and exchanges were conducted which identified executing agency –IBAP–, the GEF national Focal Point, the Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity, the General Directorate of Forest and Fauna (DGFF), NGOs, Directorate of Sustainable Development, Directorate of Agriculture, Local communities of the DBT with parks directors and private sector to collect their inputs in order to incorporate all relevant targets and outcomes into the project. The table below gives an overview of all stakeholders relevant to the project's development, including their strengths, and weaknesses.

During the preparation of this PIF, IUCN and the executing agency – IBAP – worked closely and shared the different drafts with relevant stakeholders of the project and integrated their inputs. These consultations have taken place in September, December 2019, March and April 2020. Representative of private sector and local communities have been consulted so that to get participative approach and feedback from main beneficiaries.

| Stakeholder Engagement during Project Identification | | | | |
|--|------|---------------------|-----------|------------|
| Stakeholder | Role | Means of engagement | Strengths | Weaknesses |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| Directorate General for the Environment - DGE | To provide answers to all questions relating to environmental legislation and the different international environmental conventions. | Meetings, documents, legislation | Political and strategic directions; National environmental and strategic plans; Environmental projects portfolios; Sustainable development strategy; Ecological monitoring and participatory mapping. | Insufficient staff Insufficient means for the implementation of activities Limited financial means |
| Directorate General for Sustainable Development | To highlight the government's vision in terms of socially equitable and environmentally sustainable development. | Meetings, documents, legislation, government program | Experience in forest and ecosystem restoration, Ecological monitoring and participatory mapping | Insufficient staff Insufficient means for the implementation of activities Limited financial means |
| Directorate General of Agriculture | Provide elements of understanding on the country's agricultural policy, the situation of arable lands across the national territory, changes in agricultural practices on lands and ecosystems. | Mapping of arable land, current status of fertility and land degradation. In addition, the Directorate will share knowledge on land management, farmers' networks. | Experience in forest restoration, Ecological monitoring and participatory mapping | Insufficient staff Insufficient means for the implementation of activities Limited financial means |
| Directorate General of Fauna and Forests - DGFF | Provide a reference situation of the forests of Guinea Bissau, describe the main tendencies affecting the fauna of the country, characterize the threatened habitats. | Georeferenced forests datas, forest and fauna laws | Experience in forest restoration, Ecological monitoring and participatory mapping | Insufficient staff Insufficient means for the implementation of activities Limited financial means |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas - IBAP | Provide a reference situation of the main protected areas in the country, provide the texts of laws relating to the creation and management of protected areas, and informations on all the factors of environmental degradation. | Datas on protected areas, visits to the DBT complex and potential connectivity corridors, connection with other public institutions in charge of environmental management. | <p>Manage protected areas in Guinea Bissau</p> <p>Availability of technical staff and material in the DBT</p> <p>Strong interaction with stakeholders involved in the DBT management and its corridors</p> <p>High importance for the Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity</p> <p>Experience in corridors identification and connectivity process elaboration</p> <p>Experience in ecological monitoring and participatory mapping</p> | <p>Few experience in ecological corridors management</p> <p>Some difficulties in protected areas management and governance</p> <p>Insufficient funds to manage protected areas and corridors.</p> |
| NGOs | To establish a general overview of the environment and the different environmental policies of the country, the synergies between the different stakeholders. | Own datas, Materials | <p>Knowledge of the area of intervention,</p> <p>Staff available, including active local animators equipped with vehicles and motorized</p> <p>Experience in vegetable gardening, sensitization of local communities; facilitating farmers concertation, diagnosis piloting, and recovery of seawater rice fields</p> | Insufficient financial resources for the implementation of activities |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| Local Communities : All Farmers (men and women), Women, Young people, Council of elder, Traditional power structure, Village committees, Youth and women associations | <p>Share information about Traditional knowledge on land and ecosystems management,</p> <p>Give informations about traditionnal knowledge of seawater and freshwater management</p> <p>Land users,</p> <p>Inform about regulator role that promotes consultations and manages conflicts within the community,</p> <p>Inform about the existence of village development committees and land management committees in some project sites</p> <p>Provide information on gender equity and progress, opportunities</p> | Focus groups, targeted consultations, including gender-sensitive engagement | <p>Strong social connexions between communities,</p> <p>Strong collaboration with central and local administration</p> <p>Existence of village development committees and land management committees in some project sites</p> <p>Recognition of IBAP's missions</p> <p>Existence of women and youth councils</p> <p>Existence of Environmental conscience</p> | <p>Low educationnal level</p> <p>Low organizational level</p> <p>Weak economical ressources</p> <p>Recurrent conflits about land and resources uses</p> |
| Private stakeholders | Provide informations on potential private sector opportunities and engagement | Meetings, Focus groups, targeted consultations | <p>Financial ressources</p> <p>Knowledge of the market</p> <p>International connexion</p> | Limited financial capacities |

The private sector is mainly related to smallholders without real structuration and organization. However, the project will aim at enhancing the structing of the private sector by supporting partners and investors in specific sectors linked to biodiversity in the area (agriculture, tourism). CSOs are also active in the region and will have a great role to play in the project. Other keys actors are the various government institutions. There is no dialogue framework between these actors; that is why these actors act in a dispersed manner. A multi-stakeholder platform will be set up and supported during the project implementation to facilitate dialogue between all the stakeholders (government institutions, private sector, CSO, local communities, etc.), build interactions amongst all participants, stimulate engagement of these actors on the project, and in fine their contribution to the transformational change. This platform will be involve in the project implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Their representative will be a member of the Project Steering Committee and will ensure the considerations of interests and needs of the various actors, including the vulnerable groups.

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis).

The project will ensure there is gender equality from design towards closure, through implementation of best practices in terms of the methodologies for ensuring activities and outcomes are inclusive. In productive landscapes, women have a critical role to play and the project will be designed and implemented in a way in which gender equality will be the driving criteria for eligibility. It will ensure that the activities are made in a way that social and economic benefits are shared in an inclusive manner, looking in particular at vulnerable groups. The thorough application of IUCN's ESMS will safeguard vulnerable groups and individuals, including women and youth, from losses related to any sort of potential access restriction to some of the natural resources that can serve as the basis of livelihoods in the area. This will be done through an inclusive and gender equal consultation process where the voice of all will count.

During the development of the PPG, a gender specialist will be recruited to ensure that all project components take into account the needs and preoccupations of women, men, youth and people living with disabilities. The expert will work with communities and women, on the basis of adapted frameworks, in order to verify if women's real needs are taken into account in discussions and orientations on the use of land and natural resources, if access to resources is equitable and if there are still social barriers impeding women's access to different resources. Additionally, the IUCN Green List Standard, which will help frame management effectiveness and equity advancements (Outputs 1.1.4) includes criteria and indicators relating to improved gender equity in protected and conserved areas. Evaluation against the Standard will focus on these elements and help the project to benchmark progress.

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; and/or Yes

generating socio-economic benefits or services for women. Yes

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

Yes

4. Private sector engagement

Will there be private sector engagement in the project?

Yes

Please briefly explain the rationale behind your answer.

The private sector is mainly related to smallholders and other partners and stakeholders active in the region, mainly in the fields of tourism and the agriculture sector. The project will be innovative in that sense as up to date, support to biodiversity conservation and restoration has mainly be done through public sector support and the strengthening of Governments and Public Organizations, including the institutions in charge of biodiversity management and the protected area network. Given the limited capacity in the country, the project will continue to strengthen these capacities, especially in light of the need for cooperation among various stakeholders and partners. However, the project will bring work with Government institutions and partners such as mechanisms like the BioGuinée Fund to expand the scope of intervention and support to the private sector. For doing so, the project will support the enabling environment for, at the end of the project, having more investments and opportunities for partners to invest into the project area in relevant sectors such as agriculture, agro-forestry or sustainable tourism. During PPG, a more thorough assessment of the private sector partners active in the area and how they could partner in the project activities will be done, considering their involvement is critical for achieving sustainable impact in the area while at the same time maintaining livelihoods.

5. Risks

Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the Project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the Project design (table format acceptable)

| Risques Description | Niveau | Mitigation measure(s) |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|
| Political instability | High | The semi institutional and financial autonomy of the IBAP is a determining element for the continuity of the project implementation even during the occurrence of political-institutional crises. On another level, IBAP has a strong partnership with donors and other institutions that allows it to continue its action even in the occurrence of major crises. |
| Institutional Risks | medium | The project will capitalize on the experiences of the various stakeholders to minimize institutional risks. It will be based on the good practices of the different institutions involved in the implementation, particularly their knowledge of the project area. |

| | | |
|-------------------------------|--------|---|
| Land Access Conflicts | High | <p>The project will support the establishment of mechanisms for social intermediation and peaceful resolution of land-related conflicts. It will carry out public consultations to identify the social categories excluded from access to land, the factors of exclusion and will propose alternative and equitable solutions to reduce or eliminate land-related conflicts.</p> <p>In this sense, the territorial and social diagnosis that will be carried out in the first year of the project will make it possible to identify land uses, conflict zones and traditional means of conflict resolution and will enhance them in order to alleviate social tensions related to land.</p> |
| Implementing Risks | medium | The project will be implemented by IBAP which has a solid experience in project implementation in the target area and is the government agency in charge of the management of protected areas in Guinea Bissau. From an institutional point of view, IBAP has a semi-autonomy that makes it an institution out of the countless political and institutional disturbances that undermine the effectiveness of state institutions. |
| Ecological and climatic risks | Medium | Forest ecosystems continue to benefit from climatic conditions favourable to rapid and successful restoration. This will allow the rapid recovery of lost areas. In addition, the region benefits from the presence of park rangers who act as a tremendous force of deterrence. Finally, the relatively low population densities and the deterioration of communication routes are positive factors in the reduction of ecological risks. |
| Epidemiological risk | Medium | Given the situation caused by the epidemic of COVID 19 in 2019 and 2020 around the world, the probability that an epidemic threatens project advancement is not unlikely. The project will ensure that all staff can respect hygiene and mitigation measures in the case of such an epidemic. The project will also be designed in a manner that components can be implemented independently so delays are not too high, should the case happen. |

As per IUCN ESMS and in line with the GEF Guidance, the project is currently rated as “moderate risk” (Ref. to the Preliminary assessment attached to this submission). However, the project is expected to lead to environmental and social outcomes that are highly positive. Nevertheless, environmental and social (E&S) risks have been identified. These mainly stem from potential access restriction that the project will generate. The social analysis that will be carried out during the PPG phase as part of the baseline study will provide a better understanding of the socio-economic conditions and social structures prevailing in the intervention sites and guide stakeholder consultations and the further fine-tuning of project activities. The ESMS Screening will then provide for a more comprehensive judgement of the risks and deliberate about the assessment needs. As per GEF guidelines, an ESMS preliminary screening is attached to this submission.

6. Coordination

Outline the institutional structure of the project including monitoring and evaluation coordination at the project level. Describe possible coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

The project will be under the responsibility Ministry of the Environment and Biodiversity. IBAP (Institute for Biodiversity and Protected Areas) will ensure the execution in partnership with the Directorate General for Sustainable Development (DGDD), the Directorate General for the Environment (DGE) and the Directorate General for Forestry and Fauna (DGFF) under the Ministry of Agriculture and Sustainable Development. IBAP will support the Government of Guinea Bissau to define and confirm its commitments in the framework of the various climate conventions to which it is committed. This will include carrying out evaluations and assessments to monitor and evaluate the actual results, in coordination with the various environmental conservation and restoration projects underway in Guinea Bissau, in particular the GEF projects and the projects identified in the baseline. In addition, the proposed project will also address lessons learned from the various interventions in this area and share information with the various similar projects funded by the GEF in Guinea Bissau. IUCN, as the implementation agency, will be in charge of the supervision of the project.

The proposed project will interact with other GEF and non-GEF projects already implemented or being implemented in the DBT complex. These are:

Strengthening the financial and operational framework of the national protected area system in Guinea-Bissau: The proposed project will develop actions to continue or strengthen the benefits of the GEF-UNDP project. The GEF-UNDP project on the DBT protected areas and connectivity corridors aims at (i) better representation of the SNAP ecosystem, (ii) improved ecological connectivity, (iii) transboundary migration of large mammals and threatened or endangered species (including elephants), and (iv) greater resilience of the DBT complex as a whole to climate change and the process of desertification. Five new protected areas are created and managed: Dulombi National Park with 98,951 hectares; Boé National Park with 95,280 hectares; Tchetché National Corridor with 33,604 hectares; Cuntabane-Quebo National Corridor with 55,003 hectares; Salifo National Corridor with 36,162 hectares. Its implementation required a unique partnership framework gathering conservation stakeholders, rural communities, rural organizations and local NGOs. In addition, the project promoted the sustainable use of natural resources through ecotourism, agriculture and livestock and the valuation of ecosystem services.

This project will therefore essentially resolve the limitations left by the GEF-UNDP project:

- Extend the useful ecological utility of the project by being the exit strategy of the project, providing guidance and guidelines to achieve the sustainability of the actions. The proposed project can answer some of the questions that still remain, such as whether the Government has the capacity to implement all the regulations that are being drafted or if the FBG endowment capital will be able to cover for a percentage of SNAP's recurrent costs;
- Support the government efforts to ensure a greater percentage towards biodiversity and proper SNAP management. FBG alone cannot guarantee financial sustainability.
- Create a IBAP-DGFF and other stakeholders Commission to ensure the continuity of coordination between actors.
- Innovative co-management models by building synergies to have greater participation of local authorities, communities, stakeholders in planning exercises, implementation and supervision of conservation activities.

- Strengthening the visibility of CNP authorities within the park's areas and animals mobility zones.

The Corubal Integrated Water Resources Management Project (PROGIRE / Corubal): the project is submitted for the funding of the GEF International Waters Focal area. The project objective is to promote sustainable and integrated management of Corubal waters between Guinea Bissau and Guinea. This project has the merit of bringing efforts to conserve and restore the environment between the two countries, thereby enabling the conservation of ecosystems and habitats throughout the river basin. It will undoubtedly promote the consolidation of connectivity corridors throughout the watershed by restoring the forest landscapes it intends to establish, in particular reforestation in the upstream parts of the main river and the various tributaries.

The project on **Protection and Restoration of Mangroves and productive Landscape to strengthen food security and mitigate climate change** is a GEF / IUCN project implemented in the northern and southern regions of Guinea Bissau by IBAP. The project aims to restore 1,500 ha of mangroves and 1,100 ha of degraded rice fields in order to contribute to better adaptability of populations to climate change and guarantee food security.

The project on **Promoting better access to modern energy services through sustainable mini-grids and low-carbon bioenergy technologies among Guinea-Bissau's forest-dependent communities** is a GEF / UNDP project focused on rural Boe regions and which aims (a) to Strengthen and further develop a political, institutional and administrative environment favorable to the management of the RE energy sector, in particular for off-grid solutions in isolated rural areas; (b) Contribute to improving the livelihoods of marginalized rural communities dependent on forests by providing them with sustainable energy solutions for their faster socio-economic development, paying particular attention to women as a vulnerable group and key actor change.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Is the Project consistent with the National Strategies and plans or reports and assesments under relevant conventions

Yes

If yes, which ones and how: NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc

The project is in line with the following national strategies and plans:

National Action Plan for Adaptation (NAPA) : The project is aligned with Guinea Bissau's NAPA in terms of climate change adaptation, specifically natural resources long term access, resilience of ecosystems. This GEF project will contribute to reduce pressure in natural resources and loss of habitats and biodiversity. Finally, it will capitalize lessons-learned and good practices generated by projects implemented under the NAPA.

National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) : The project is aligned with several NBSAP's priorities, including (i) Realizing vulnerability assessment and developing relevant adaptation measures to improve the resilience of the prioritized ecosystems to climate change, (ii) Promote the implementation of integrated water resource management plans, including the protection and restoration of critical wetlands, (iv) Update the assessment of all wetlands in the country, develop and implement management plans in accordance with Ramsar site management principles.

National Agricultural Investment Plan second phase (PNIA2) : The project is aligned to the priorities of the PNIA2. For instance, the sub-program on Sustainable management of natural resources (water, soil, forests, etc.) including integrated water resources management, sustainable soil fertility management, management of forest resources, incorporates the issues and priorities of the proposed GEF project and are being addressed by its components. Specifically, the Consistency with PNIA Priorities will be achieved through (i) sustainable soil fertility management, management of forest resources, (ii) Improvement of the knowledge about natural resources, (iii) sustainable management of forest resources.

Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP): The project is therefore aligned to the fifth core principle of DENARP II, which promotes a sustainable development, more resilience to climate change. The fourth principle of the strategy - which deals with the consideration of capacity building needs - is also well integrated in this project that aims at strengthening capacities from the local communities to the national institutions.

Strategic and Operational Plan for 2015-2020: The project is aligned to several axis of the Guinea Bissau Strategic and Operational Plan for 2015-2020. In particular the project is contributing to the biodiversity and sustainable management of natural capital pillar, which includes amongst others programmes on capacity building in the management of natural capital, knowledge and surveillance of natural resources and preservation of ecosystems. The present project is contributing to these efforts by strengthening the governance of natural resources, the establishment of an appropriate and efficient institutional framework, the protection of biodiversity, the implementation of sustainable income-generating activities.

National Action Plan to Combat Desertification. The project is in line with the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification of Guinea Bissau. It will help to address national LDN priorities by 2030, as presented in the following table.

| | Number of sites (2030) | Total (hectares) | Related project outputs |
|--|------------------------|------------------|---|
| Restoration and Management of main River Basins | 3 | 20.000 ha. | Output 1.1.1 Management plans of 4 main ecosystems (wetlands, forests, savannah, and fallow land) designed (with updated datas on ecological corridors of the DBT) and implemented using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach. |
| Desanding and Management of Main and Rivers | 12 | 200 Km | |
| Wetlands planning and management | 25 | 7.000 ha. | |
| Restoration and Management of Saltwater rice field | 22 | 18.000 ha. | Output 1.1.1 Management plans of 4 main ecosystems (wetlands, forests, savannah, and fallow land) designed (with updated datas on ecological corridors of the DBT) and implemented using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach. Output 2.1.1: Land and ecosystem restoration activities in selected corridors |
| Restoration and Management of Freshwater rice fields (Great and Small Valleys) | 10 | 8.000 ha | Output 1.1.1 Management plans of 4 main ecosystems (wetlands, forests, savannah, and fallow land) designed (with updated datas on ecological corridors of the DBT) and implemented using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach. Output 2.1.1: Land and ecosystem restoration activities in selected corridors |

| | | | |
|------------------------------------|----|------------|--|
| Restoration of mangrove vegetation | 8 | 5.000 ha | Output 1.1.1 Management plans of 4 main ecosystems (wetlands, forests, savannah, and fallow land) designed (with updated datas on ecological corridors of the DBT) and implemented using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach. |
| Forest restoration | 37 | 40.000 ha. | <p>Output 1.1.1 Management plans of 4 main ecosystems (wetlands, forests, savannah, and fallow land) designed (with updated datas on ecological corridors of the DBT) and implemented using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1: Land and ecosystem restoration activities in selected corridors</p> <p>Output 2.1.2 : Value chains development of priority NTFPs is supported in the various sites to facilitate Forest Landscape Restoration</p> |
| Cashew cutting and replanting | 30 | 10.000 ha. | Output 2.1.2 : Value chains development of priority NTFPs is supported in the various sites to facilitate Forest Landscape Restoration |

8. Knowledge Management

Outline the Knowledge management approach for the Project, including, if any, plans for the Project to learn from other relevant Projects and initiatives, to assess and document in a user-friendly form, and share these experiences and expertise with relevant stakeholders.

Being a project that combines conservation, restoration and sustainable development, the knowledge to be generated should allow the understanding of the challenges and the mobilization of all the actors to exchange and share knowledge and good practices. It will be a question of implementing an inclusive communication strategy in order to compromise all the stakeholders and obtain their commitment around the project. It will essentially focus on the engagement of communities and partners, good communication, governance mechanisms that facilitate connectivity, support for management and networking, the promotion of impactful initiatives, the " cross-border commitment to the establishment of transnational connectivity corridors.

Part III: Approval/Endorsement By GEF Operational Focal Point(S) And Gef Agency(ies)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT (S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S): (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter with this template).

| Name | Position | Ministry | Date |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Mr. Joao Raimundo Lopes | Secretariat of State for Environment | Ministry of Environment | 1/20/2020 |

ANNEX A: Project Map and Geographic Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project intervention takes place

The project is located in the east and south-east of Guinea-Bissau, in the border area with Guinea. It is located between latitudes 11°32'12.7 "N 14°37'17.0 "W and 12°14'17.1 "N 13°57'06.7 "W. It corresponds to the administrative regions of Bafata, Gabu and Tombali and covers six (06) departments. Geographically, it corresponds to the highlands of Guinea-Bissau which are the last buttresses of Fouta Djallon and the lowlands dominated essentially by the Corubal watershed. It has a land area of 406,556 hectares and an exceptional biodiversity.

The vegetation is diverse and composed of species varying from herbaceous savannah, shrubby savannah, tree savannah to open forest, gallery forest and palm grove. The following botanical families can be distinguished: Anacardiaceae, Annonaceae, Bignoniaceae, Bombaceae, Cesalpiniaceae, Combinaceae, Euphorbiaceae, Fabaceae, Hypericaceae, Mimosaceae, Moraceae, Oleaceae, Hizophoraceae, Rubiaceae, Sapindaceae, Sapotaceae, Simarobaceae, Sterculiaceae etc. The rare and threatened species are numerous: *Acacia macrostachya*, *Allophylus africanus*, *Anthocleista procera*, *Antiaris toxicaria*, *Antidesma*, *Cassia sieberiana*, *Margaritaria discoidea*, *Schrebera arborea*, *Terminalia macroptera*, *Erythrophleum suaveolens*, *Faidherbia albida*, *Ficus lutea*. The flora shelters diversified habitats serving as a refuge for diverse animal species. We count 22 mammal families decomposed into 53 genera and 74 species. It concerns Bovidae, Canidae, Cercopithecidae, Elephantidae, Felidae, Galagidae, Herpestidae, Hippopotamidae, Hominidae, Hyenidae, Hystricidae, Leporidae, Lorisidae, Manidae, Mustelidae, Nandinidae, Orycteropodidae, Procaviidae, Sciuridae, Suidae, Trichechidae, Viverridae. We also find a diversity of reptiles belonging to 5 big families: Crocodylidae, Varanidae, Dermocheylidae, Cheloniidae, Manidae.

From hydro-geomorphological and geological points of view, the area is characterised by the presence of reliefs dominated by micro-watersheds draining small tributaries of the Corubal (Seli and Fefine in particular). Throughout the watershed, gallery or riparian forests are found. Connectivity between environments and ecosystems is ensured for the land area by gallery forests and for the aquatic area by the various watercourses.

