

# Enhancing Equatorial Guinea's institutional and technical capacity in the agriculture, forestry and other land-use sector for enhanced transparency under the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10120

**Countries**

Equatorial Guinea

**Project Name**

Enhancing Equatorial Guinea's institutional and technical capacity in the agriculture, forestry and other land-use sector for enhanced transparency under the Paris Agreement

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

2/19/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/29/2020

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF** □

**CEO Endorsement** □

**Part I – Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

1. We note that the output envisaged in PIF “1.1.2 Equatorial Guinea's MRV action plan for REDD+ is updated according to the new knowledge and institutional arrangements to respond to the ETF” has been removed. As the total budget of the project is the same, please explain which other activity will be supported/strengthened by the resources made available.

2. The objective of assisting the improvement of transparency over time is unclear to fully align with the CBIT Programming Directions. Please clarify how this objective is covered through the planned activities.

3. Considering the date of the expected project approval, the 2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG should be fully taken in consideration and not as an option as indicated in output 3.1.2 of table B.

**April 28, 2020:**

1, 2 and 3. Thank you for the clarification and relevant inputs. Cleared

## Agency Response

04/20/2020

Table B and section 3 of Part II of the ProDoc have been amended:

1. The resources made available are used to “Train government personnel and key actors (e.g. from university) with a role in national capacity development (i.e. train-the-trainers)” (output 2.1.4). The sentence “Resources initially available for this output will reinforce activities to achieve outcome 2.1, in particular output 2.1.4” was included at the end of paragraph 41. Output 2.1.4 is an activity that was added during the PIF review stage and wasn’t included in the initial budget.
2. Paragraph 48 was included: Four outputs are proposed under this component. These outputs enhance transparency through the strengthening of capacities in data collection, analysis and reporting. In specific, the activities will enhance transparency as follows: 1) national institutions are strengthened through capacity building, i.e. training for data collection consistent with MRV and ETF requirements according to IPCC guidelines; 2) support is provided for the analysis of country-specific data on emission factors based on national data collected and 3) better knowledge about land use/cover is obtained, especially covering all IPCC categories. The support on data collection in the forest sector is in line with national priorities, as the country clearly expressed a need for this activity, not only to increase transparency in reporting but also to support the sustainable management of the country’s rich forest resources. The collection and analysis of this data will help to inform on the progress towards the fulfilment of the country’s NDCs.
3. Agreed, the formulation of Output 3.1.2 was modified as follows: “3.1.2 South-South cooperation and exchange initiatives are organized on ETF experiences, the ‘2006 IPCC Guidelines’ and ‘2019 Refinement’, and national GHG inventories and projections of emissions/removals for the AFOLU sector (see Table B from the ProDoc).” The formulation included “and/or” since the ‘2019 Refinement to the 2006 IPCC Guidelines on National’ is providing updates on specific sections of the ‘2006 IPCC Guidelines for National GHG Inventories’. However, several sections of the 2016 IPCC Guidelines remain unaltered with the ‘2019 Refinement’ and the ‘2019 Refinement’ cannot be used as stand-alone guidelines.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

## Agency Response

Co-financing

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

1. We understand the additional resources from the GCF project are not recurrent and will support activities included in the proposal. It is unclear then why the component 1.1.2 from the PIF has been removed 'because it is being generated by the REDD+ preparation project funded by the GCF'. If the elements already supported with GCF resources are removed from this proposal, why adding such resources as co-financing? Please explain.
2. The financing of the Government of Equatorial Guinea, through INCOMA and INDEFOR-AP, was established to support the CBIT project activities. In such a case of new resources made available, why the co-financing can't be informed as "grant" (instead of in-kind)? Please clarify why this co-financing can't be whether as grant and investment mobilized or as in-kind and recurrent investment.

**April 28, 2020:**

1. Thank you for the clarification and adjustment. Cleared.
2. The co-financing appears still appears in table C as in-kind and investment mobilized and not as grant and investment mobilized as indicated in the response. Please explain or correct.

**April 29, 2020:**

Thank you for the change. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

4/29/2020

Coherent with the co-financing letters, and the comment below, table C has been updated. Co-financing is in-kind and considered a recurrent expenditure.

4/20/2020

1. Output 1.1.2 of the PIF was removed from this proposal because it is being generated entirely by the REDD+ preparation project funded by the GCF, unlike the other outputs and outcomes of the various components that are completed thanks to both GEF and GCF investments. The GEF and GCF projects are complementary. For instance, outcome 2.1 of the CBIT project builds on the MRV action plan, especially on the NFI design, created with support of the GCF project. This has been elaborated in the incremental cost reasoning section. Output 1.1.2 is fully embedded in outcome 1.1, but is no longer identified as a direct output of the CBIT project. Seeking to clarify this idea in the document, Table B and Paragraph 41 have been adjusted.

2. The financing of the Government of Equatorial Guinea, through INCOMA and INDEFOR-AP was informed as grant and investment mobilized. Initially, the co-financing was established in-kind and later modifications had not been fully updated throughout the document. This has been corrected now.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

Yes, out of \$50,000, the amount spent is \$37,411 and the rest is committed. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/ adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

We note that the number of beneficiaries are significantly less than expected at PIF stage. Please explain why, and how the proportion of male and female was determined, including in the CEO Approval in the section related to changes from the PIF.

**April 28, 2020:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/20/2020

The PPG phase has helped to get into a deep consultation with national stakeholders and address properly its national circumstance. The beneficiaries of the CBIT project have been validated with the representatives of government and key stakeholders through interviews, meetings, working sessions and the “Validation workshop for the formulation of the CBIT Equatorial Guinea”, held on November 12, 2019. The number of institutions/individuals that could participate to each activity was analyzed, considering the conditions and limitations of the institutions as well as considering efforts to increase the number of women (see references in paragraphs 56 and 119, and adjustments in table of paragraph 115 of the CER).

The gender study analyzed the issue of fewer female applicants to INDEFOR-AP and suggested this may be traced to the Facultad de Medio Ambiente (Faculty of Environment) at the university (Universidad Nacional de Guinea Ecuatorial - UNGE) where only about 20% of graduates are women; for the current academic year only 11 of 52 students are women. With a limited number of qualified female graduates, it is more challenging to achieve a full gender balance within INDEFOR-AP

therefore the female participation was adjusted to maintain a realistic aim considering the supply of qualified female candidates. The target is however favouring female participation since it is well above the % qualified women in this field.

As a result of the stakeholder consultations, the target numbers of persons and gender by output was established as follows: output 1.1.2: 30 (20 men and 10 women) and output 2.1.4: 40 (29 men and 11 women). Also was included: output 3.1.1: 7 (4 men and 3 women) and output 3.1.2: 3 (2 men and 1 women), erroneously omitted in the submitted version of the ProDoc; to correct this situation, modifications was made in: Table F, indicator 1 of Annex A1, and Annex F. The number of women by activity was specifically analyzed considering the number of the technicians available in the different instances of participation in the project (government, key stakeholders, academy). This information was included in the table of Part II, point 8 of section 1.a (paragraph 115); the column “Brief Justification” in the entire table was adjusted.

## **Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/ adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 18, 2020**

Beyond the environmental issues, please also present the problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed by this CBIT project, so that we can understand the relevancy of the proposed activities and how they articulate with the baseline scenario to adequately fill the gaps.

**April 28, 2020:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/20/2020

A new paragraph was included at the end of section 1 (see paragraph 15 in the ProDoc):

Even with the recent advances to meet its international commitments and to manage its forests, Equatorial Guinea does not have enough trained personnel or institutional arrangements to allow reporting on its progress in a consistent and transparent way. Neither does it have quality information about forest resources, nor has it institutionalized the necessary instruments to collect and analyze it, despite the fact that forests is one of the main economic sectors for the country. To



overcome this situation, the country needs to increase its institutional and technical capacity in specific aspects, for which, the CBIT project will support the establishment of an inter-institutional coordination mechanism and the necessary arrangements to integrate and plan activities related to transparency in the sector; the consolidation and development of capacities for the preparation of GHG inventories; the incorporation in INDEFOR-AP of the necessary structures for the collection and analysis of activity data and forest data that allow calculating national emission factors for different land use classes; the development of national capacities for the systematic collection, analysis and reporting of data, prioritizing the participation of women and generational replacement; development an archiving and dissemination system for sector documentation; and South-South cooperation and exchange initiatives on the MTR and related aspects.

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 18, 2020**

1. Considering that the GCF project is in its final stage of execution and is contributing to some of the CBIT project results, it is difficult to understand why part of the ambition presented at PIF stage are decreased, such as the output 2.1.1 (now a subset of national data' because the available funds are not sufficient') and the number of beneficiaries while there are already 8 trained technicians to contribute to the output 2.1.4.
2. The structure of the baseline scenario section is unclear: paragraphs 15, then 16, then a, b, a, 1, 2.... Please organize this section for a better understanding.

**April 28, 2020:**

- 1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

4/20/2020

1. The adjustments to what was established at the PIF stage, rather than reducing ambition, seek to adapt the outputs to the national conditions. As indicated in the revised paragraph 41 of the ProDoc, output 2.1.1 is fully being generated as part of the GCF project, while the table of paragraph 115 includes a brief description about the number of beneficiaries validated with national institutions and key stakeholders. With respect to the National Forest Inventory, this is a relevant activity of the project and a priority for the national institutions of the sector, as well as for the knowledge and management of the country's forest resources. Paragraph 49 of the ProDoc was expanded and indicates that the NFI design prepared with GCF funding is highly ambitious and that the costs estimate provided with this NFI design, reveals that only a subset of national data for different land use classes can be collected and analysed with CBIT funding. In addition, paragraph 98 was added to the ProDoc stating that for first complete NFI measurement (first cycle of measurement), according to the design made, approximately USD 500,000 additional will be required. FAO and INDEFOR-AP will continue looking for funds to complete the NFI in the same time frame of the project. To deepen these aspects, the column

"Brief Justification" was adjusted in table of Part II, section 1.a, point 8 (paragraph 115 of the ProDoc). The total cost of the NFI is higher than foreseen in the PIF stage, but the achievement of this output is considered of high impact for the Government, and FAO and INDEFOR-AP will continue looking for funds to complete the NFI. If this additional funding is not found, the data to be collected (with lower intensity than the NFI design) will still be nationally representative and can be used as stand-alone product.

2.The structure of the reference scenario section was reorganized (see paragraphs 17 to 20 of the ProDoc).

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 18, 2020**

As mentioned regarding the table B, please clarify how the objective of assisting the improvement of transparency over time is intended to be met.

**April 28, 2020:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/20/2020

To enhance transparency over time, the CBIT project (i) will improve the technical and institutional capacities for the reporting process and the monitoring of international commitments of Equatorial Guinea, (ii) will support the collection and generation of activity data and emission factors, and (iii) will improve the availability of the documentation of the AFOLU sector. Paragraph 48 of the CER includes more details about the specific aspects.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 18, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 18, 2020**

1. The GEF grant for component 1 is said to be \$46,702 which doesn't correspond to the amount indicated in table A. Same kind of inconsistencies are also noted for the components 2 and 3. Please correct accordingly.
2. The baseline and the GEF CBIT project are presented in parallel and the articulation between both is unclear. Please briefly indicate in one sentence or two what is missing in the baseline to achieve the CBIT objectives before presenting the activities of the proposal. In particular the baseline if focused on forests, we could expect some additional and particular work related to agriculture would be required.

**April 28, 2020:**

Thank you for the corrections and the complements provided. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/20/2020

1. The document was revised and the figures adjusted in Table B in Part I; paragraphs 94, 97 and 101 of the Part II, point 5 of section 1.a, and Annex B of the ProDoc.
2. Paragraphs 94, 97 and 101 of the ProDoc were modified, including the missing aspects in the baseline to achieve the objectives of the CBIT.

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

Regarding the potential for scaling-up, please also refer to the CBIT global projects, including notably the one dedicated to the AFOLU sector.

**April 28, 2020:**

Thank you for the complementary consideration. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/20/2020

In paragraph 141 of the ProDoc the following information was clarified:

FAO will ensure there is coordination with the two FAO-CBIT global projects. Equatorial Guinea will benefit from tools that will be presented by the project “Global Capacity-Building Towards Enhanced Transparency in the AFOLU Sector” (CBIT-AFOLU) (GEF ID: 9864). Thanks to the “Building global capacity to increase transparency in the forest sector (CBIT-Forest) (GEF ID: 10071) project, Equatorial Guinea will benefit from the update of the Global Forest Resource Assessment (FRA) reporting platform, the e-learning course on “Forests and Transparency under the Paris Agreement”, case studies from different regions on forests and transparency, and the communication material (infographics, flyers) to help raise awareness on forests and transparency. Furthermore, Equatorial Guinea can participate to any regional technical capacity-building workshop on national forest monitoring system organised by the above mentioned project, provided it covers the cost of participation.

## **Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

The project is national-level. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

### **Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 17, 2020**

The NGOs and local communities have been consulted but their expected role in the implementation of the project is unclear. As regard to the NGOs, they are expected to be involved in the output 2.1.4 aiming to train on data collection. Will their involvement limited to be trained? Please explain further.

**April 28, 2020:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/20/2020

The following text was added in the CER:

The NGOs will participate in the training on data collection, focusing on aspects where they could potentially contribute, which concerns in specific collection of socio-economic data and –if applicable– data on sustainable management efforts by local communities.

However, during the in-country stakeholder consultations concerns about the capacity and interest of existing NGOs to be involved in any data collection aspect was raised. Therefore, during data collection training activities, the potential role of NGOs will be further assessed and evaluated, and participation in data collection established with interested and qualified NGOs only.

#### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 17, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 17, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Risks**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 17, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 18, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

While the description in the Portal refers to the general project budget and the indicative work plan, the knowledge management approach including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline is unclear. Please elaborate separately in the Portal the approach with the expected information on budget, key deliverables and timeline and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

**April 28, 2020:**

Thank you for the new inputs. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/20/2020



In section '8. Knowledge Management' a table was included with the key deliverables, timeline and budget. A paragraph on how KM will contribute to the project's overall impact was added as well.

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 16, 2020**

As it is a CBIT project, global environmental and adaptation benefits are expected to be indirect, particularly through the validation and dissemination of climate change-related measures. Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 17, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Project Results Framework**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 17, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**GEF Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 17, 2020**

Yes, the GEF Secretariat comment has been addressed. cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Council comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

STAP comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

Convention Secretariat comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

Other Agencies comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

Status of PPG utilization

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

March 17, 2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion** N/A

**Agency Response**

Project maps and coordinates

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

March 17, 2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**March 18, 2020**

Not yet. Please address the comments above. Thank you.

**April 28, 2020:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comment.

**May 13, 2020:**

Not Yet. The co-financing letters from the government indicate that the both sources of co-financing are in-kind (and not grant as indicated in table C). Please indicate in table C that the sources of co-financing are "in-kind" and referred as "Recurrent expenditures".

**May 15, 2020:**

Thank you for the clarification. The project is now recommended for CEO approval.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**First Review**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

**Cover memo**

The context:

The tropical forest covers 93% of Gambia's territory. In line with its Paris Agreement commitments, the country wishes to advance with the implementation of its Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) and increase transparency of its reporting as per the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF). The country has submitted its NDC with a strong focus on the Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use (AFOLU) sector as well as the energy sector. Even with the recent advances to meet its international commitments and to manage its forests, Equatorial Guinea does not have enough trained personnel or institutional arrangements to allow reporting on its progress in a consistent and transparent way. Neither does it have quality information about forest resources, nor has it institutionalized the necessary instruments to collect and analyze it, despite the fact that forests is one of the main economic sectors for the country.

The project:

In line with national priorities, this project will strengthen institutional and technical capacities in the AFOLU sector to respond to the enhanced transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. The project will establish coordination mechanism and institutional arrangements to integrate and plan transparency-related activities in the AFOLU sector, train government representatives on MRV and forest reference emission levels, develop a land classification system and a land use/cover map, develop a report containing country-specific emission factors for different land classes in order to improve the estimation of carbon stocks, elaborate national GHG inventories and projections and organize a South-South cooperation and exchange meeting on ETF experiences. The funds requested to the GEF CBIT

will be complemented by and be implemented in parallel with the support received by the Green Climate Fund (GCF) readiness facility. In addition, the GEF CBIT funds will complement funding received from the Central African Forest Initiative (CAFI) to strengthen national remote-sensing capacities and develop a forest cover and forest cover change assessment.

The project will be implemented through 3 components: 1- Strengthening institutional capacity in the agriculture, forestry and other land-use (AFOLU) sector to respond to the Enhanced Transparency Framework (ETF), in line with national priorities on mitigation; 2- Component 2. Enhancement of technical capacity to collect and analyze data to respond to support sustainable forest management (SFM) and transparency-related requirements in the AFOLU sector; and 3- Strengthening technical capacity to assess and report emissions and removals and exchange knowledge at regional level in the AFOLU sector.

Co-financing:

The total co-financing of \$536,896 from the Government and GCF is relatively important for a CBIT project.