

Transforming and scaling up results and lessons learned in the Monte Alen and Rio Campo Landscapes through an inclusive Landscape-scale approach, effective land use planning and promotion of local governance

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10293

Countries

Equatorial Guinea

Project Name

Transforming and scaling up results and lessons learned in the Monte Alen and Rio Campo Landscapes through an inclusive Landscape-scale approach, effective land use planning and promotion of local governance

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

12/10/2020

Review completed by PM

4/22/2021

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/29/2021- All cleared thank you.

JS 4/28/21

1-2-3i - 4ii - 4iii Cleared, thank you. However:

4i - The budget pasted in annex E is not readable. Please use the IT support contact provided to include a readable budget.

3ii The M&E budget is still included twice in the portal entry. Please delete it from the *Benefits* section and elaborate on socioeconomic benefits in that section:

10. Benefits

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

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the proposed project will be conducted in accordance with established IUCN and GEF procedures/guidelines, and in coherence with the regional project's M&E system and framework. The PMU will be in charge of the ongoing M&E of the project throughout the implementation period. The standard M&E reports and procedures required for all IUCN/GEF projects will apply to the M&E plan for the proposed project, including the following elements in the table below:

M&E activity	Description	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
Inception Workshop and Report	The Inception Workshop gathering the stakeholders involved in the project and resulting Inception Report provide the occasions and means for the project start-up. Will be undertaken by the PMU.	Within the first two months of project start-up.	PC	US\$ 4,000

JS 4/27/2021

- The table D between the child project and the PFD has some differences as shown below - please revise table D to match with the PFD's table D.

Table D of the child project					Table D of the PFD					Difference					
Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Amount(\$)	Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Amount(\$)	Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Multi Focal Area	1,784,863	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Multi Focal Area	1,784,862	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Multi Focal Area	1,784,862	1,945,500.00
IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Biodiversity	1,784,862	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Biodiversity	1,784,862	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Biodiversity	1,784,862	1,945,500.00
IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Climate Change	892,431	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Climate Change	892,432	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Climate Change	892,431	972,750.00
IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Land Degradation	892,431	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Land Degradation	892,431	IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Land Degradation	892,431	972,750.00
Total Grant Resources(\$)				5,354,587.00	Total Grant Resources(\$)				481,913.00	5,354,587	481,913	5,836,500			

- On Project Information:**

i. As IUCN will be the main executing agency, please revise executing partner type to "GEF Agency":

Executing Partner Type

Government

ii. Expected completion date should be corrected to 5/31/2025 to match the 48 months duration

- On the M&E Budget:**

i. Kindly note that audits have been charged to M&E. Please correct and charge audits (\$28,000) to the PMC portion of the budget.

M&E activity	Description	Frequency	Responsible	Budget (GEF funded)
Audits	A financial audit will be undertaken every year. The PMU will develop and implement a strategy to address audit recommendations after each audit.	Annually	PC Administrative and Financial Assistant IUCN Regional Program Coordinator	Total indicative cost: US\$ 28,000 (US\$ 7,000 per year).
TOTAL indicative COST				US\$ 159,300

ii. Kindly note that the M&E budget table has been included twice in the Portal: both in the M&E section and the . Please delete it from the *Benefits* section and elaborate on socioeconomic benefits in that section:

10. Benefits

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

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of the proposed project will be conducted in accordance with established IUCN and GEF procedures, ensuring coherence with the regional project's M&E system and framework. The PMU will be in charge of the ongoing M&E of the project throughout the project period. The standard M&E reports and procedures required for all IUCN/GEF projects will apply to the M&E plan for the proposed project, including the elements in the table below.

4. On the Budget Table:

i. The format uploaded in the Portal off the margins ? it has suffered some design alterations. Please upload it again and correct the formatting.

ii. The total M&E in the Budget Table (\$151,240) does not match the total provided in the M&E Budget (\$159,300). Also, annual project audit (\$28,000), currently charged to M&E, must be charged under PMC. Please correct.

iii. The Budget states that "for project team members (Project Coordinator, Project Finance and Administrative Officer, Technical Assistant/Communication Officer) costs integrate gross salary, social security and management fees". Please note that GEF portion cannot cover ?management fees? and revise the budget accordingly.

19/2021 - All cleared.

JS 4/16/2021

A- Amounts have been corrected, i.e. total reverted back to \$5,354,587, almost everywhere except in Table 21 of the ProDoc, which still shows \$5,354,480. Please correct Table 21.

All the rest is cleared.

JS 3/22/21

Thank you for the revisions and replies throughout this review sheet. In the next submission, please highlight the changes made in the portal entry.

A- The GEF amounts in table A have been reduced from a total \$5,354,587.00 to a total of \$5,354,480.00 in what is most likely a typo. Please correct throughout the submission (Portal, ProDoc, Budget) to use the previous agreed total, as it would otherwise leave unused a small part of the country's STAR allocation.

1-3: Cleared.

4- Thank you for the clarification. However, the execution arrangements are still not entirely clear or consistent throughout the documents. The response below mentions IUCN, INDEFOR-AP, INCOMA and UNDP, while the portal entry has only IUCN, INDEFOR-AP, INCOMA; the LoE dated March, 3 2021 mentions IUCN, the Permanent Secretariat/National Council for Sustainable development, MAGBOMA through INDEFOR and INCOMA, and UNDP; the letter of support for execution by IUCN from the OFP mentions execution services by IUCN, the Ministry of Finance, INDEFOR and MAGBOMA. Please clarify and align all documents.

5- Please report all the funding under IP SFM Congo instead of breaking it down in various focal areas in table A. In the portal entry of the resubmission, the funds are still broken down in various focal areas:

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1-1	Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors	GET	1,824,687.00	11,600,000.00
LD-1-1	Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)	GET	932,256.00	6,500,000.00
CCM-2-7	Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts for sustainable forest management impact program	GET	932,256.00	6,500,000.00
IP SFM Congo	Promoting effective Coordination for Sustainable Forest Management	GET	1,665,281.00	7,850,000.00
Total Project Cost(\$)			5,354,480.00	32,450,000.00

JS 12/15/2020

1-The project remains aligned with the Congo IP except for the replacement, compared to the PFD stage, of landscape-scale land-use planning by the support to "a national land use plan, as defined in the REDD+ National Investment Plan". The Congo IP has been designed to support land-use planning in specific transboundary landscapes in order to achieve significant impact on key zones by concentrating limited GEF funds on targeted geographies. Supporting a national process, which is sparsely described in ProDoc and does not seem to be fully funded yet, would likely only dilute the ca. \$500,000 of GEF funds devoted to that exercise without resulting in significant GEBs. Please reduce the level of activities at national level, especially remove those related to the national land-use planning framework.

2- Given the track records of related GEF projects in Equatorial Guinea, the proposal, as recognized in the ProDoc, appears very ambitious with more than 50 activities, very diverse in nature and covering a wide range of topics, in less than 4 years. Please consider streamlining the proposal to focus on delivering on protected areas management effectiveness, and capacity and institutional building therein, and on integrated land-use planning with adequate on-the-ground implementation. Please notably reconsider part of the awareness raising activities (4.1.1.1, 4.1.1.2, 4.1.2: more than \$500,000 for awareness raising and school programs, including \$200,000 for TV documentaries that do not appear to be linked to the rest of the project) and studies (1.2.1, 1.2.2.2, 1.2.2.4, 3.1.2, 3.1.2.3 for a total of more than \$500,000, most of them relying on international consultants and post-docs with apparently limited involvement of in-country partners). The added-value and employability within the project of the studies should be reassessed. Output(s) responding to a clear strategy for behavior change tied to the implementation of the ILUMPS and the effectiveness of protected areas could be welcomed instead of stand-alone activities on general awareness raising (please refer to STAP advisory document on behavior change: <https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/STAP%20Behavior%20Change%20Paper%20%28web%29.pdf>).

3- COVID-19: We note the CEO endorsement request contains a short elaboration on "widespread health crisis". However, the current stakeholder engagement plan does not mention COVID once and none of the documents demonstrate that mitigation and contingency measures have been designed to ensure that the project can be successfully rolled out under current or possible future COVID-related restrictions.

Please note that the GEF expects all new PIFs and CEO Endorsements to demonstrate a strategy or action framework for the COVID-19 pandemic. This should include an analysis of emergent risks and opportunities relative to specific context for the project. Please refer to "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics"

(<https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>) and elaborate accordingly in relevant sections of the CEO endorsement request. Please most notably elaborate on mitigation and contingency measures that will be put in place and consider elaborating further on the project's contribution to mitigate COVID's impact on targeted beneficiaries.

4- Please add the executing partner(s) in the portal entry:

Countries Equatorial Guinea	Agency(ies) IUCN
Other Executing Partner(s):	Executing Partner Type Government

5- Please report all the funding under IP SFM Congo instead of breaking it down in various focal areas in table A.

Agency Response

1 ? The number of activities at the national level has been reduced, including those related to the national land use planning framework

2 ? The proposal has been streamlined to focus on delivering on protected areas management effectiveness, capacity and institutional building and an integrated land-use planning with emphases on implementation of activities in the landscapes. We have therefore removed and/or merged some activities. The overall budget of component 4 (knowledge management activities) was decreased from 735,480 USD to 493,140 USD. Awareness raising activities of output 4.1.1 have been linked to outcomes 1.3, 2.1 and 3.1 and will target local communities of the project target sites that are beneficiaries of the activities of these outcomes, with the aim of creating behaviour change. They will therefore not be standalone activities.

We have also decreased the number of studies, notably by prioritising those that are important to the project.

3 ? A covid-19 action framework has been developed and a section on COVID-19 added in the stakeholder engagement plan.

4 ? We have added the Executing Partners in the Portal Entry. The main Executing Partner is IUCN. However, IUCN will issue Executing Agreements with INDEFOR-AP, INCOMA and UNDP.[AK1]

5 - IUCN All funding under IP SFM Congo has been reported.

IUCN 15 April 2021

Highlighted in green in CEO endorsement form

A-Corrections have been made

4- We have clarified the execution arrangements and aligned all documents.

5- Corrections made in CEO endorsement

IUCN ? 19 April 2021

Table 21 has been removed in order to avoid confusions among versions. Please refer to excel spreadsheet attached to the submission and the budget copied in the annexe section of the portal.

IUCN - 27 April 2021

1. Addressed

2. Addressed

3. Addressed

4.i - Sorry but we cannot do better than copying an image of budget. this is done in the revised submission.

4.ii - Addressed. Revised budget attached. Updated version of ProDoc attached also.

4.iii Budget has been revised. management fees are not part of the costs.

29 April 2021

All addressed.

On the budget section, we have liaised with IT and cannot do better than this. Please use the excel spreadsheet attached to this submission if needed.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/22/21- Cleared.

JS 4/22/2021

Many thanks for the revised budget. According to the new ProDoc, output 4.2.3 related top M&E has been added to component 4 but is not reflected in Table B, while corresponding budget is charged on component 4. Please :

-add output 4.2.3 in table B in the portal.

-add the corresponding \$151,240 to outcome 4.2 in the GEF budget template so that the budget for component 4 matches between the budget template and table B. Please do keep as well the separate M&E column in the GEF budget template, adding a note clarifying that these costs are covered in outcome 4.2.

JS 4/19/2021 - The new table B seems to integrate together the M&E budget within the PMC, when it should be separate. Also, the issue with project staff charged to components and not primarily to PMC remains. Please correct as suggested in the comment box dedicated to Annexes further down this review sheet.

JS 4/19/2021

1- Given that no new GEF budget template was uploaded and given the detailed budget in the ProDoc, the issue with project staff charged to components and not primarily to PMC remains. Please correct as suggested in the comment box dedicated to Annexes further down this review sheet.

2-Cleared

JS 4/16/2021

1- Table B budget is aligned with the detailed budget in ProDoc and the GEF budget template included in the ProDoc (table 20). However, see above on project staff charged in components rather than PMC further down in this review sheet.

2 - The correction does not seem to have been made in the portal entry. Table B still shows *4.1.2. School curriculum and programs developed and enhanced to increase knowledge and support for sustainable management of Equatorial Guinea and Congo Basin biodiversity*, when it has been deleted in the ProDoc. Please correct.

JS 3/22/2021

1- Many budget inconsistencies remain but it seems to be because an old version of the excel budget template was uploaded. GEF funding of PMC is \$136,480 in Table B when it is \$125,790 in the GEF budget template provided as a separate Excel file in the portal. None of the components' total budget in table B are consistent with those found in excel budget template. Please correct while addressing comment A in the comment box above on the project total to ensure use of the full STAR allocation.

2- Thank you for the revisions but *4.1.2. School curriculum and programs developed and enhanced to increase knowledge and support for sustainable management of Equatorial Guinea and Congo Basin biodiversity* has been deleted in the ProDoc when it is still present in table B. Please correct.

JS 12/16/2020

1- budget inconsistencies: While the total GEF funding (\$5,354,587) matches, GEF funding of PMC is \$241,790 in Table B when it is \$125,790 in the GEF budget template provided as a separate Excel file in the portal. Total budget for components 2 and 4 in table B are not consistent with the budget template and the M&E budget in the ProDoc is \$129,500 (section 7) vs \$162,680 in the budget template. Please correct.

2- Some outputs are missing in the portal entry's table B compared to the ProDoc (e.g. outputs 1.3.1 and 1.3.2). Please correct.

Agency Response

1 ? The budget has been reviewed and inconsistencies removed

2 - This has been corrected. All outputs have been included in the Portals entry's table B when compared to the ProDoc.

IUCN 15 April 2021

1- Corrections made in CEO Endorsement form

2-Corrections made in CEO Endorsement form

IUCN ? 19 April 2021

|

1. Addressed. Table 20 removed as explained above in the revised ProDoc submitted.

2. Addressed

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/19/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 4/16/2021

3- Table C has not been revised in the portal. From previous answers, we understood that all co-financing is in-kind, it should thus be reflected as such in Table C and as recurrent expenditures instead of investment mobilized. Please correct.

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Ev
Recipient Country Government	INDEFOR	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	32,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	IUCN	In-kind	Investment mobilized	350,000.00	
Civil Society Organization	BZS	In-kind	Investment mobilized	100,000.00	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				32,450,000.00	

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified




The project will generate substantial investment mobilized through the INDEFOR programme on protected areas and REDD.

3/22/2021

1-2- We note the project title in the co-financing letters does not exactly match that of this submission, but it is very close and no confusion can be made about the identity of the project. Other aspects of the letters are adequate. Cleared.

3- Please correct the portal entry, which shows all co-financing as investment mobilized. From the answers below, we understand that all co-financing is in-kind and to be reflected as recurrent expenditures.

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

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)	Evidence
Recipient Country Government	INDEFOR	Public Investment	Investment mobilized	32,000,000.00	
GEF Agency	IUCN	In-kind	Investment mobilized	350,000.00	
Civil Society Organization	BZS	In-kind	Investment mobilized	100,000.00	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				32,450,000.00	

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

The project will generate substantial investment mobilized through the INDEFOR programme on protected areas and REDD.

4- Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/10/2020

1- We note that co-financing is reported at \$32 million, all from the recipient government, when \$37.5 million from 7 sources were announced at PFD stage. Please clarify why co-financing from the 6 other sources, including from the implementing agency, has not materialized during PPG.

2- The co-financing letter provided does not show the same project title as this submission and does not specify the type of the co-financing. Please provide an adequate co-financing letter.

3- Please clarify the nature of the "public investment" co-funding and explain why it is entirely characterized as investment mobilized.

4- Note that co-financing is reported as \$33,600,000 in the ProDoc (Table 13), and references are made to co-financing from BZS and WCS. Please correct.

Agency Response

1 ? We have just obtained two additional co-financing from the Bristol Zoological Society (100,000 USD) through their project in Monte Alen National Park and IUCN (350,000 USD) through the Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) Programme. However, partners like UNDP and WCS informed us that they did not have the necessary co-financing to commit to the project. UNOPS does not have an office or a project in Equatorial Guinea while. PACEPCo and CAFI are still discussing their future activities and funding options with the Government of Equatorial Guinea and were unable to commit any amount since discussions are still underway.

2 ? The co-financing letter of the Government of Equatorial Guinea has been corrected. It now includes the same project title as this submission and has also highlights the type of co-financing (in-kind).

3 ? After reviewing the current situation, the Government of Equatorial Guinea has opted for ?in-kind? co-funding since it will be linked to on-going initiatives, projects and programs implemented by the Government through INDEFOR-AP, INCOMA, PN REDD+ and P-LDN.

4 ? Correction has been made

IUCN 15 April 2021

3-Corrections made in the Portal entry and CEO Endorsement form

IUCN 19 April 2021

Addressed

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/19/2021 - Yes, cleared.

JS 4/16/2021

Table D should reflect the use of the STAR allocation, including its breakdown per focal area, as planned in the LoE. The current table D assigns all the grant to the IP set aside. Apologies if the guidance was unclear, but it is in table A and table A only that all funds have to tagged to the Congo IP.

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

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
IUCN	GET	Equatorial Guinea	Multi Focal Area	IP SFM Congo Set-Aside	5,354,587	481,913
Total Grant Resources(\$)					5,354,587.00	481,913.00

Please correct.

JS 3/22/2021

Thank you but amounts are even less consistent with that of the PFD and the LoE. Note that since GEF project amounts have been reduced compared to last submission (see comment A in first comment box), the agency fee proposed in table D is above 9% and would not be acceptable.

Current totals (project amount + fees) with tables D and F are \$2,079,547 for BD when it should be \$2,000,000 if total GEF amount was to remain as planned in the LoE and PFD; \$992,019 for CC instead of \$1,000,000; and \$1,059,506 for LD instead of \$1,000,000.

Please correct.

JS 12/15/2020

While the projects amounts in table D are consistent with that of the PFD and the LoE, neither is the breakdown of the agency fees, nor the total.

Current totals (project amount + fees) with tables D and F are \$2,039,722 for BD when it should be \$2,000,000; \$952,194 for CC instead of \$1,000,000; and \$1,019,681 for LD instead of \$1,000,000.

Please correct.

Agency Response

[This has been corrected](#)

[IUCN 15 April 2021](#)

[Corrections made in CEO Endorsement form](#)

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared.

JS 4/16/2021

The typo has not been corrected. Please correct:

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
PPG International Consultancy Firm	100 570,00	77 7256,00	23 314,00
Travel International Consultancy Firm	19 348,28	19 348,28	0,00

JS 3/22/2021

1- Thank you for the correction. Please further correct the typo introduced in the new version of Annex C:

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
PPG International Consultancy Firm	100 570,00	77 7256,00	23 314,00
Travel International Consultancy Firm	19 348,28	19 348,29	0,00

2- Cleared.

JS 12/15/2020

1- Annex C shows a PPG budgeted amount that is higher than the allowed amount (\$150,000). Please correct.

2- Please provide the list of studies and assessments made under the PPG.

Annex C shows a total of \$143,284.36 spent or committed. Please note remaining funds can be used only on eligible expenditure items under PPG within one year after the project has been CEO Endorsed/Approved. Thereafter, any unused PPG funds must be returned to the Trustee, for credit to the respective GEF Trust Fund.

Agency Response

1 ? This has been corrected

2 - No major studies and assessments were made under the PPG. Noted- we will return any unused funds to GEF Secretariat.

[IUCN 15 April 2021](#)

Typo introduced in the new version of Annex C has been corrected

LCN 7 19 April 2021

Typo corrected in the portal

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/19/2021- Thank you, all cleared

JS 4/19/2021

The METT scores have been added in the portal but most WDPa ID are still missing.
Please correct:

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)
Altos de Nsork National Park	NA	National Park		70,000.00			35.00		
Estuario de Muni Nature Reserve	NA	Habitat/Species Management Area		60,000.00			37.00		
Monte Alen National Park	20267	National Park		200,000.00			40.00		
Piedra Nzas Natural Monument	NA	Natural Monument or Feature		19,000.00			40.00		
Río Campo Nature Reserve	NA	Natural Monument or Feature		33,000.00			41.00		

All the rest is cleared.

JS 4/16/2021

1- Cleared. The assumption on core indicator 11 elaborated on in the "Main changes to PIF" are noted. We notably note that 8,000 of the 21,000 total beneficiaries would be radio listeners and tv viewers.

2. The WDPA ID and METT scores are provided in the attached core indicator worksheet but still do not appear in the portal on our side, and the few METT scores that are provided there are not consistent with the ones in the PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK or in the attached worksheet. Please correct.

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) ⓘ	MET score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	score (Achieved at MTR)	score (Achieved at TE)
Altos de Nsork National Park	NA	National Park		70,000.00					
Estuario de Muni Nature Reserve	NA	Habitat/Species Management Area		60,000.00			16.70		
Monte Alen National Park	20267	National Park		200,000.00			37.50		
Piedra Nzas Natural Monument	NA	Natural Monument or Feature		19,000.00					
Rio Campo Nature Reserve	NA	Natural Monument or Feature		33,000.00			19.80		

3- Cleared, thank you.

4- Please confirm that all the 202,500 ha reported under core indicator 4 are anticipated to be forests, including the 2,500 ha under 4.3 in production landscapes. If not, please revise the Ex-ACT calculation, which currently assumes that all these 202,500 ha are slightly degraded forests (low degradation).

JS 3/22/2021

Terrestrial targets have been reduced to 382,000 ha of Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness and 202,500 ha under improved practices, while the mitigation target remains the same at 32,251,611 MtCO₂eq.

1- Thank you for the clarification. However, please add the methodology/assumptions used to derive the 20,000 figure under table F in the portal entry.

2a- The WDPA ID do not appear on our end. Please correct.

2b- Please note that baseline METT scores and target scores at mid-term and termination are required at CEO endorsement stage for all protected areas reported under core indicator 1. Please provide these for all protected areas and attach the the dedicated GEF template (<http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF7-BD-TrackingTool-Protected%20Area%20Projects.xlsx>) with the next resubmission.

2c- Thank you, cleared. But correct also the METT scores in the Results Framework in the portal entry.

3- Thank you for the clarification, we understand from the ProDoc that the project will go beyond planning and support actual implementation of each land use plan(activity 1.3.1.2). Please clarify the extent and nature of the support the project plans to provide to implementation so that practices are indeed improved over the targeted 200,000 ha.

4- Thank you for the confirmation on the 382,000 ha of PAs. We note that the ProDoc cites a FAO study that found that ca. 9% of all forests in the country have been degraded over 10 years (230,000 ha out of 2,500,000 ha over 2004-2014). Hence 10% forest degradation (which is what going from very low to low degradation in EX-ACT amounts to) over 20 years in target PAs seems an acceptable assumption.

However, please clarify why no mitigation benefits are anticipated from the 202,500 ha reported under core indicator 4.

A- The targets for core indicator 4 have not been updated in annex F. Please revise.

JS 12/15/2020

Targets at PFD stage were a total of 736,000 ha impacted, 75,000 direct beneficiaries (40,000 women and 35,000 men) and 12,112,102 tCO₂eq of mitigated GHG emissions. While the number of direct beneficiaries remain unchanged in the table F and text states that it actually decreased to 20,000, the other targets have been considerably increased with more than 1.5 million ha impacted (382,000 ha under 1.2; 1.067 million under 4.2; 50,500 ha under 4.3) and 32,251,611 MtCO₂eq of mitigated GHG emissions.

1- Please clarify if the target under core indicator 11 (beneficiaries) is 75,000 as currently reflected in table F or 20,000, as mentioned in the text. Please provide the methodology used to determine the number of beneficiaries in the portal entry under table F.

2- core indicator 1:

2a-Please add in table F the WDPA ID of all PA shown under core indicator 1 (20268 for Altos de Nsork, 20260 for Estuario de Muni, 313360 for Piedra Nzas, 313361 for Rio Campo).

2b-Baseline METT scores, which are required at CEO endorsement request stage, are missing for 2 of the 5 PAs. Please provide the baseline METT scores for all 5 PAs using the dedicated GEF template (<http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF7-BD-TrackingTool-Protected%20Area%20Projects.xlsx>).

2c-The targets set for METT scores at project completion are rather low, especially for the Estuario Muni PA (30%). Please consider increasing the ambition of the project with regards to these METT target scores or justify the low targets that have been set.

3- More than 1 million ha are now reported under core indicator 4 because the "the project will support the development of a national land use plan" . However, given the project's outputs and budget it does not seem realistic to claim that more than half of the country will be directly impacted by the project and see comment 1 in the first comment box of this review that will lead to a revision of this output.

Please revise the target on core indicator 4 to reflect the area outside of PAs that will be directly impacted by the project. Please note the development of a land-use plan is not a sufficient condition for considering all the corresponding hectares under improved management. A credible rationale linking the land use plan(s) and key supporting on-the-ground implementation (e.g. finance through small grants, knowledge, capacity through training) to justify the target should be provided. Note that, for this project, the relevant sub indicators of core indicator 4 are 4.1, 4.3 and 4.4. Given that no certification is to be obtained as part of the project, remove the target on core indicator 4.2. Since the project is supported by the BD and LD focal areas, both BD-related sub indicators (4.1 and 4.4) and the LD-related one (4.3) should have a target.

4- Please provide the assumptions used in the GHG mitigation calculations (EX-ACT tool) under table F and provide a rationale for the assumptions used. Most of the mitigation potential seem to stem from the assumption that the degradation of the forest over 382,000 ha (i.e. probably the protected areas targeted by the project) will remain very low when it is supposed to shift to low under the baseline scenario. Under the EX-ACT methodology, this is equivalent to assuming that 10% of the forest would be degraded in the PAs over 20 years in the baseline scenario. Please justify this assumption. Please also note that the calculations provided seem to assume that 1,500 ha of cropland will shift to agroforestry with or without the project, which is probably a typo.

Agency Response

1 ? The target for indicator 11 is 20,000. The number of direct beneficiaries was estimated by taking into consideration the targets of all the training and capacity

building activities, activities providing jobs (e.g. eco-guards, community patrol teams, forest guards?), livelihood activities of component 3, and knowledge sharing activities of component 4 (TV documentaries, radio shows etc).

2a ? WDPa ID of all PAs were added

2b ? The METT scores for the 3 PAs were obtained from another GEF project that had interventions in these PAs. However, the METT scores for the other 2 PAs does not exist and this explains why we have included an activity on METT assessment for these 2 PAs that will be executed in the early stage of the project execution (Activity 2.1.2.3).

2c ? METT scores were revised accordingly

3 ? Indicator 4 has been reviewed and the following assumptions made:

Indicator 4 = 202,500 ha

Indicator 4.1 = 200,000 ha ? it is assumed that each of the 5 local land use plans developed will contribute to 40,000 ha under improved management to biodiversity

Indicator 4.3 = 2,500 ha ? it is assumed that the micro-projects developed in the areas surrounding each of the 5 PAs, along with the 5 local LUPs will contribute to 500 ha under sustainable land management in production systems in each of the 5 project target areas.

Indicator 4.4 = 0 ha ? we were not able to obtain a map of HCV forests in Equatorial Guinea and cannot therefore estimate an avoided loss of these forests

4 ? Assumptions used in EX-ACT tool:

- Duration of Project: 4 years of Implementation phase, 16 years of capitalization phase for total of 20 years of accounting
- According to the global ecological zones map, Equatorial Guinea falls within the 'tropical rainforest' category, i.e. Zone 1 forests
- Management degradation: It is assumed that forests in protected areas currently have a very low degradation level. With the project, improved management will ensure this level stays very low, whereas without the project, the forests would reach a low level of degradation over 20 years. This assumption is linked to the risks of illegal logging in the PAs, the non-consideration of PAs in land use planning processes (with the potential of infrastructure being built within the PAs), and the encroachment of local community cropping in PAs.
- Other sections are not applicable to the project

[IUCN 15 April 2021](#)

[1-Methodology explained in CEO endorsement form](#)

2a-WDPAs are given in Annex F

2b-GEF Templates provided and corrections made in results framework

2c- METT scores in the Results Framework in the Portal entry has been corrected

3 - The support provided to implementation of the plans will vary according to the plans developed. However, some of the actions to support that can be expected include setting up appropriate governance structures in the communities to implement the plans, demarcating boundaries of the zones defined in the plans, supporting community applications to obtain rights on their lands (*bosques comunales*) so as to control, access and manage their natural resources, supporting sustainable community enterprises and activities related to fisheries, agriculture, agroforestry, forestry, NTFPs etc (linked with activities of output 1.3), and building community capacity for natural resource management and for enterprise and financial management.

4 - This was an oversight, mitigation benefits have been added to the EXACT tool and justification given in CEO Endorsement form

A-Targets updated

IUCN ? 19 April 2021

2-The portal has been updated. Those are aligned with the prodoc, the tracking tool and the core indicator worksheet.

4-We confirm that ha reported are all to be forests.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

JS 1/2/2021

1- "Unclear land tenure and access rights" has been identified as barriers but a corresponding output has been removed. Please clarify how the project plans to address this barrier.

Agency Response 1 ? This barrier has been removed from the identified barriers as the project will not be able to address it (it would be too ambitious, the project cannot address all existing barriers).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 3/22/2021- Thank you for the revisions and clarifications. However, as the project still mentions a national land use planning process, please include in the baseline in the portal entry a short elaboration on this potential national process, specifying all the associated uncertainties surrounding its implementation during this project lifetime.

All the rest cleared.

JS 1/2/2021

1-One of the main change to the project design is the addition of a contribution to a "a national land use plan, as defined in the REDD+ National Investment Plan". According to the description of outcome 1.3, the process is "driven by the government, with CAFI guidance", is already under way" and benefits from "an existing budget allocated by the government". However, the baseline does not mention this process and co-financing for this child project has decreased despite the addition of a contribution to national land-use planning, which benefits from a national budget line that was most probably not

foreseen as co-funding at PFD stage. Please provide a detailed description of this national land use planning process, including budget, timeline and scope. The ProDoc states that the government plans to fund half of the process between 2020 and 2022 with ca. \$28 million. Annex B states that CAFE funding, if any, would only arrive at a later stage. Has funding been secured to cover the other half and successfully roll out the process within the 4 years of this proposal?

2-Please revise or remove the first occurrences of "**Strengthening of the system of protected areas in Equatorial Guinea for the effective conservation of representative ecosystems and globally significant biodiversity** (concluded??)" in the portal entry and in the ProDoc (p62). As reflected in the detailed description of the project later on in the portal entry and on pp68-69 of the ProDoc, the project is a closed GEF-supported one and many lessons learnt can gathered from its implementation.

Agency Response

1 ? All activities related to the national land use plan have been removed. However, we still believe it would be useful for the project to make the link between the community based land use plans developed at local level and the national land use plan, as these could provide input for the national LUP, and serve as an example for future land use planning processes in the wider landscape.

2 ? This has been removed

[IUCN 15 April 2021](#)

Description provided in CEO Endorsement form (baseline section)

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

JS 3/22/2021- All cleared, thank you.

JS 1/2/2021

1- Thank you for including a "theory of change diagram". However, the diagram does not present an adequate theory of change (ToC). While there remains diverse ways of displaying a ToC diagram, the current diagram lacks an accompanying narrative and is essentially a juxtaposition of lists of barriers, outputs, means used, etc. that does not convey any causal link, i.e. the intervention logic. What are most notably missing are a description of the causal pathways by which interventions are expected to have the desired effect, as well as underlying assumptions and justification that these causal pathways are necessary and sufficient. Please refer to STAP's guidance <https://www.stagef.org/theory-change-primer>.

2- Changes compared to the PFD-stage are justified and all acceptable but the change from landscape-scale land-use planning to a contribution to a national land use planning process (see first comment box and baseline comment box in this review sheet). Please strengthen the contribution of the project at the landscape scale and explain how the local land use plans the project plans to develop (output 1.3.2) would articulate with the landscape scale land use plans. Further, if the national scale land use planning is indeed to be developed within the timeframe of the project, please explain how the local and landscape-scale land use plans the project plans would develop articulate with the national land use plan, both in terms of timeline, institutional arrangements and content.

Please note that part of the proposal points to the removal of landscape-level work (description of outcome 1.3: "*it will be more impactful for the project to support an existing national land use planning process, which is driven by the government, with CAFI guidance, is already under way and for which there is an existing budget allocated by the government, rather than proposing the development of landscape level land use plans, the landscape level not being recognized by local stakeholders*"), while other parts still mention it (section on incremental cost reasoning: "*The development of land use plans at national, landscape and local levels will be supported*").

3- Please clarify the anticipated scale and scope of the local land use plans (1.3.2). The ProDoc states that the output will include support to implementation but less than \$430 000 are budgeted for 5 local LUPs.

4. workplan inconsistencies: Contrary to what the text proposes, The workplan does not allow for the study 2.1.4.5 to be used by output 1.2.1, which finishes before 2.1.4.5. Likewise, the timeline provided in the ProDoc for the studies 3.1.2.2 (delivery at end of year 2) seems to make them hardly usable to design the small grants of 3.1.1 (call for proposal finishes 6 months before that according to the timeline). Please revise.

5- 3.1.2.3: please consider removing the study on people's perception of the Monte Allen Park, which seems redundant with the SAPA (2.1.2.1).

Agency Response

1 ? The ToC has been reviewed to include assumptions and risks and highlight the causal pathways

2 ? The project's contribution has been strengthened at the local level, within the landscapes, with funds initially planned to support the national land use planning process reoriented towards the development of local land use plans. The project does not plan to develop a landscape level land use plan but rather to ensure appropriation of the landscape concept in the country (as this is not currently a recognized concept), and of the LUP methodology.

The articulation of the local land use plans with the national land use plan will be detailed during project implementation, depending on the state of advancement of the national LUP. The development of local LUP will be done in close coordination and collaboration with the Ministry of Finance, in charge of the national LUP process.

3 ? 5 community based local LUP will be developed with the support of the project. The budget for this is 806,300 USD. One LUP will be developed in the vicinity of each PA, and will cover a small number of communities all located in the same area. The exact number of communities and their location will be defined during project implementation (see details of selection process in the ProDoc)

4 ? The work plan has been revised accordingly

5 ? Activity 3.1.2.3 (which has become 3.1.2.2 after streamlining) concerns carrying out research on human-wildlife conflicts in order to understand them and propose and test appropriate mitigation measures ? this is not redundant with SAPA (Social assessment for protected areas).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/2/2021 - Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021- Cleared.

1/2/2021 - To be revisited once the baseline on the national land use planning process is clarified.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021- Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/18/2020 - The elaboration in the dedicated section is mainly related to socio-economic benefits. Please elaborate on global environment benefits, including conservation of globally significant biodiversity, sustainable use of the components of globally significant biodiversity; GHG emission mitigation, and improved provision of forest ecosystem goods and services, making the link to the targets set under the core indicators (table F).

Agency Response

Some of these elements were already presented in this section. They have been reinforced and added to, namely:

- The project will contribute to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity, i.e. part of the forests of the Congo Basin that are of critical importance at the global level and extremely rich in flora and fauna, through improved management effectiveness of 382,000 ha of protected areas. It will also lead to the sustainable use of this globally significant biodiversity.
- It is anticipated that the above interventions will lead to avoided GHG emissions and carbon sequestered of 32,251,611 tCO₂eq, due to reduced forest degradation and deforestation.
- The project will also generate sustainable co-benefits due to a reduction in the degradation of forest ecosystems and their functions. This will contribute to maintaining species richness and trophic dynamics; help maintain and improve the ecosystems' capacities to ensure multiple ecosystem goods and services; and provide increased opportunities for food security and livelihoods.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - The last comment below has not been addressed. Please correct the output number in "*The standardised M&E system to be established under output 5.1.2*" in the section on scaling-up.

JS 3/22/2021 - Thank you, for the clarifications. However the portal entry refers to an output 5.1.2, which does not exist in table B. Please correct.

All the rest is cleared.

JS 1/2/2021

On sustainability, please clarify :

-the post-project strategy regarding the ecoguards that will be recruited through the project (2.1.3.1).

- to what extent the \$948,460 budget for consultants and post-docs will support institutions with sustained presence on the ground. In particular, to what extent the support to BZS (3.1.2.3) and University of the West of England (1.2.2.1) through post-docs will build local capacities? Are local university involved?

Agency Response

The strategy for the eco-guards recruited through the project is for them to be fully incorporated to INDEFOR-AP staff. INDEFOR-AP has a solid existing baseline, with an operational budget. Although this budget is currently insufficient, it is on the increase year after year. The objective is that INDEFOR-AP's budget will have increased sufficiently by the end of the 4 year project to cover the costs of eco-guards recruited. In addition, output 2.1.1 aims to build and reinforce INDEFOR-AP's fund management as well as its capacity to search for and obtain funds from donors, and not only be dependent on government funds.

Finally, the GEF project *Regional Project for Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas in the Congo Basin* should lead to increased financing for PAs managed by INDEFOR-AP, and therefore for eco-guard costs.

The budget for consultants and post-docs has been reviewed:

- 162,000 USD for post-doc research
- 330,060 USD for international consultants
- 395,650 USD for national consultants

Regarding the post-doctoral research, it would be run in close collaboration with INDEFOR-AP. Recent graduates from the National University of Equatorial Guinea's (UNGE) School of Environmental Sciences, who would assist in all aspects of the research, would also be recruited, trained and mentored.

Throughout the duration of the work (24 months), the postdoc would closely work alongside two INDEFOR-AP technicians, who would be trained in social research and wildlife monitoring methods, and would lead efforts translating the results of the study into evidence-based, community-led conservation solutions through stakeholder engagement and participatory mapping. Similarly, as the postdoc would be based in country, they would serve as mentors to UNGE graduates, overseeing their scientific training and fostering their career development.

The type of expertise that INDEFOR-AP technicians and UNGE mentees would receive is virtually absent in Equatorial Guinea. As such, they would be in a unique position to lead national efforts to provide further training to INDEFOR-AP, relevant government agencies (e.g., Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Forestry and Environment) and national conservation charities (e.g., ANDEGE) staff, improving the country's ability to effectively monitor, manage and protect their biodiversity. For instance, the methodology to find community-led solutions to promote human-wildlife coexistence in this project could be easily applied to other protected areas in Equatorial Guinea, such as Rio Campo Nature Reserve, where human-wildlife coexistence is a growing concern.

In addition, for all the studies proposed in the logical framework, provision has been made for both national and international consultants, the idea being that they can work as teams and the national consultants can receive guidance and coaching by the international consultants on certain specific expertise. This will contribute to building capacity of local consultants.

IUCN 19 April 2021

Addressed in the revised ProDoc

Project Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 3/22/2021 - As specified in the CEO endorsement request template and the GEF Portal Hover Tip: *"Please enter the geolocation ID number from the geonames.org database, followed by a short description of the site. If there is more than one location or intervention site, please enter all corresponding geolocation ID numbers separated by a coma, followed by a short description of each. If you cannot find the geolocation ID, please enter latitude and longitude of one point in the project area."*

JS 12/15/2020 - Maps are provided. Please provide coordinates.

Agency Response

The project intervention will take place in a large surface area, maps have been provided to identify these areas. It is not clear how coordinates are to be provided for areas, when coordinates reflect specific positions.

IUCN 15 April 2021

Coordinates have been provided

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 1/2/2021 - Yes, cleared.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/18/2020 - Yes, but see comments on private sector actors further down.

Agency Response

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021 - All cleared.

The gender analysis and action plan is provided as appendix 9.5 in the ProDoc.

JS 12/18/2020 A gender analysis has been carried out but is mostly at the national level. A gender action plan is provided and recommends, among other things, to carry out an in-depth assessment of the social context in each targeted site at inception.

1- Please clarify why the in-depth assessment(s) have not been carried out during PPG.

2- Are these in-depth assessment(s) to be part of the SAPA (Activity 2.1.2.1)? If not, please confirm that the assessment(s) will be carried out and clarify which is the corresponding budget line (\$15,000 is needed according to the gender action plan).

3- The Gender Action seems to be mostly restricted to monitoring the share of women participation and does not outline a clear project strategy to reduce gender inequalities. Please provide an elaboration on the overall approach, including the specific dimensions of gender inequalities targeted by the project. Please notably clarify for each action in the Gender Action Plan which dimensions of gender inequalities are targeted. Please

also consider going beyond encouraging women to speak and incorporating gender-responsive aspects in some outputs by including truly pro-active actions to foster women access and participation in the project (e.g. dedicated grants, outreach, training).

Agency Response

1 ? The gender assessment was carried out during PPG stage according to available resources and time. However, a more detailed assessment would ensure that the project is better adapted to the site-specific gender problematics.

2 ? Yes, the in-depth gender assessment will be conducted as part of the SAPA. The corresponding budget of 15,000 USD has been integrated to that activity (2.1.2.1).

3 ? The specific gender inequalities targeted by the project have been added to the gender action plan.

No extra gender actions were added however as pro-active actions to foster women participation were already included, such as:

- A minimum of 40% of women participate in all trainings proposed
- A minimum of 50% of women are recruited in conservation opportunities (eco-guards and community patrol teams)

A minimum of 50% of women benefit from the micro-project grant

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 12/18/2020

1-The forestry private sector is to be involved but it seems no consultation took place during project preparation. Please clarify and justify the feasibility of their involvement in corresponding project activities (Outcome 3.2.).

2- A eco-tourism strategy (Output 3.1.3) is to be developed but no corresponding private sector actor is mentioned, has been consulted or is planned to be consulted. Please clarify how an adequate strategy will be developed in this context.

Agency Response

1 ? Although the forestry sector was at a standstill with limited activity during the PPG field work (and thus consultation was not possible), it is highly probable that the sector will become active again during project implementation. It is therefore important for the project not to completely put aside this sector. The situation of the private forestry sector will have to be reassessed at project inception and engagement carried out then to further clarify the implementation of outcome 3.2. This outcome has been planned for implementation starting from year 2 of the project, therefore leaving enough time for engagement of the sector prior to implementation.

2 ? This activity has been removed from the logical framework in order to streamline project interventions and focus resources on higher impact activities

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 12/18/2020

The project is rated moderate on ESS risks and an ESMS and a Human rights and security risks assessment are provided. However:

1- COVID-19: Please see comment in the first comment box of this review sheet.

2- Climate: Please see STAP guidance on climate risk screening (link below) and provide an adequate climate risk screening. At a minimum, at CEO endorsement stage, the climate risks should be identified, listed and described. This can include:

a.) Outlining the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location (or as close to it with data available), which are relevant for the type of intervention being financed (e.g. changes in temperatures, rainfalls, increased flooding, sea level rise, saltwater aquifer contamination, increased soil erosion, etc).

b.) Time horizon if feasible/data available (e.g. up to 2050). Please refer to list of examples from STAP guidance.

c.) Listing key potential hazards for the project that are related to the aspects of the climate scenarios listed above (describe how the climate scenarios identified above are likely to affect the project, during 2020-2050).

d.) Describing plans for climate change risk mitigation, including how climate change will be taken in to account in land use planning.

(<https://stapgef.org/sites/default/files/publications/Climate%20Risk%20Screening%20web%20posting.pdf>)

Agency Response

1 ?Covid-19 comment has been addressed on page 114 of the PRODOC.

2 ? A climate risk screening has been provided on pages 115-117 of the PRODOC
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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021- All cleared.

We note the proposal for IUCN to act as both IA and EA for this project, the corresponding letter of support from the OFP and the justification provided, including the absence of viable alternatives present on the ground.

JS 3/22/2021 -

1- Please upload the support letter, which is included at the end of the ProDoc as a separate file in the portal. Please include its annex 1, which is neither uploaded in the portal, nor present in the ProDoc.

3- Thank you for the clarifications. It is however unclear why UNDP is still shown as involved in activities 3.1.1.1 and 3.1.1.2 and not involved in 3.1.1.3. It seems from the clarification provided that UNDP would only be involved in 3.1.1.3 but we understand that IUCN would still be in charge of signing grant agreements and of oversight in activity 3.1.1.3. Please confirm and correct accordingly in the portal entry and the ProDoc.

Activity 3.1.1.1: Put in place a micro-project grant to support local communities, particularly women and youth, in diversifying their livelihoods (e.g. NTFP ventures, IPLC, ecotourism, policies/legislation, local livelihoods, etc.)	IUCN, UNDP, Local
Activity 3.1.1.2: Identify and implement capacity-building and experience sharing programs for local entrepreneurs and community members in order to improve and diversify their livelihoods	IUCN, UNDP, Local
Activity 3.1.1.3: Contribute to setting up a GEF UNDP small grants program for Equatorial Guinea	IUCN

JS 12/18/2020

The GEF Agency Fee Policy explicitly precludes the merging or crossing over of the implementing functions of the GEF Agencies and the execution functions undertaken by EAs. However, in exceptional cases and as required by the Agency in accordance with its policy requirements, per the request of the beneficiary country/countries, and with the appropriate justification, the same GEF Agency may carry out both functions.

We note accordingly the proposal for IUCN to act as both IA and EA for this project and the justification provided. However:

1- Please provide a letter of support from the OFP for the proposed execution arrangements. The letter should clearly the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including any execution activities provided by the GEF Agency. Note that both the current LoE and one of the co-financing letter provided in the ProDoc plan for execution by UNOPS, UNDP, and the Permanent Secretariat/National Council for Sustainable Development.

2- We note that it is adequately intended to separate implementation from executing functions in different units of the GEF Agency (Cameroun office for execution, headquarters and regional office in Senegal for implementation). Please however clarify the lines of responsibility, reporting, monitoring and evaluation and accountability within the GEF Agency between the project implementation and execution functions.

3. Please clarify the delivery mechanism for the small grants (output 3.1.1), and notably the respective role of IUCN, UNDP and the "local NGOs" , including fiduciary

responsibilities. Please notably ensure that council decision on agenda item 16 (Summary of the Chair, 59th GEF Council Meeting) is taken into account in the oversight responsibilities with respect to execution partner UNDP.

Agency Response

1 ? A letter of support from the OFP for the proposed execution arrangements has been included. The letter also highlights the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including the execution activities. UNOPS has been deleted since they do not have any execution role. IUCN as the main Executing Agency will sign sub-executing agreements with Government Agencies and UNDP to execute some key activities identified in the PRODOC.

2 ? We have clarified the lines of responsibility, reporting, monitoring and evaluation and accountability within the GEF Agency between the project implementation and execution function in the PRODOC (page 128) and in the CEO (page 39).

3 ? IUCN Cameroon Office will be the main fiduciary control body to manage the two main small grants programs on the field based on its previous experience in the management of other important and complex small grants programs (e.g. CARPE, SOS, etc.). Oversight functions and controls will be carried out by the IUCN Regional Office for Central and West Africa and IUCN Headquarters. Within this framework, IUCN will select (through a transparent process) and sign small grants agreements with meritorious Community-based organisations within the landscapes. Secondly, in order to facilitate the setting up of a GEF/UNDP small grants program for Equatorial Guinea, IUCN will sign an execution agreement with UNDP in Equatorial Guinea.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/18/2020 - An elaboration is provided in section 4.7 of the ProDoc.

1-Please elaborate on the project contribution to the country's LDN targets.

Agency Response

1 ? The contribution to the LDN targets has been integrated

IUCN 15 April 2021

3 ? This was an oversight and has been corrected

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 12/18/2020 - Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared.

JS 3/22/2021 - The excel budget template uploaded with this submission does not seem to have been updated. Please correct.

JS 12/28/2020 - Yes, however budget are inconsistent between the portal entry (129,500) and the budget template (162,680). Please revise while noting that \$162,680 seems a bit high for this proposal.

Agency Response

The M&E budget was reviewed and nor represents 159,300 USD.

IUCN 15 April 2021

Updated excel sheet provided

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 CEO Endorsement Request

See similar comment box further up in this review sheet.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/22/2021- Cleared. We note that M&E, as described in table B and the ProDoc is part of component 4, and thus the M&E column in the GEF budget template is to be considered as part of component 4.

JS 4/22/2021

Thank you for the revision. We note that project staff are still charged to components on top of PMC but that corresponding terms of reference are provided and PMC funds are exhausted. GEF share of PMC is at the 5% limit and 5.4% of the co-financing, which is all in-kind, is dedicated to the PMC.

However, the budget pasted in Annex E in the portal entry is still barely readable and has not been updated, it contains the previous figures. Please correct, making sure that component 4 budget matches that of table B, i.e. include M&E costs (see comment box on table B further up).

JS 4/19/2021: Please address comments A and B below.

JS 4/19/2021

A- The budget pasted in Annex E in the portal entry is not readable. Please correct.

B- Given that no new budget template was uploaded and given the detailed budget in the ProDoc, the issue with project staff charged to components and not primarily to PMC remains. Execution costs are indeed to be borne by the PMC, being the PMC made of a GEF portion and a co-financing portion, so that project Staff can be charged to components **only** when PMC funds are exhausted. **Please increase the PMC**, co-financing portion and/or GEF portion while maintaining proportionality between the two and maintaining GEF portion at or below the 5% of GEF project financing limit, to cover as much as possible staff costs. Please then revise the ToR as needed to reflect the remaining costs charged to components, if any.

JS - 4/16/2021

2a- Thank you for the updated ToR for project staff. However, execution costs are to be borne by the PMC, being the PMC made of a GEF portion and a co-financing portion, so that project Staff can be charged to components only when PMC funds are exhausted. Please increase the PMC, co-financing portion and/or GEF portion while maintaining proportionality between the two, to cover as much as possible staff costs then revise the ToR as needed to reflect the remaining costs charged to components.

Please also paste the GEF budget template in the portal entry under Annex E.

All the rest is cleared, thank you.

JS 3/22/2021 -

1- Thank you but the LoE does not seem to have been uploaded in the portal. Please correct.

2a- The excel budget template uploaded with this submission does not seem to have been updated. Please correct.

Please note that since project staff is charged to both PMC and project components (i.e. not only to PMC), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval. The Terms of reference provided in the ProDoc do not describe unique outputs but rather

point to staff performing general project management work. Please charge general project management under the PMC. Given the level of co-finance of PMC costs reported in table B, it would be acceptable for GEF share of PMC costs to reach 5% of GEF project financing since adequate proportionality between the PMC covered by co-financed amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding would be maintained. For all staff charge that would remain on project components, please provide adequate terms of reference linking these costs to unique outputs.

2b- The budget dedicated to vehicles is justified. Cleared.

2c-2e: Cleared.

3- METT scores are required at CEO endorsement stage. Please upload the METT scores with the dedicated GEF template:

<http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF7-BD-TrackingTool-Protected%20Area%20Projects.xlsx>

4- Cleared.

JS 12/15/2020

While we note the title of the submission is not reflected in the LoE, the LoE is specific enough and the title of the project is consistent with the one approved in the PF

D. However, the LoE plans for execution arrangements that are different than those proposed in the CEO endorsement request. Other aspects of the LoE provided as an annex to the ProDoc are adequate.

1- Please upload an appropriate letter of endorsement as a standalone document in the portal.

2- budget:

2a. There are many inconsistencies between the portal entry and the attached budget template (PMC is \$125,790 in the template vs \$241,790 in the portal entry ,some component`s total are also different, M&E budget is 129,500 in the portal vs 162,680 in the template). Please revise.

2b. Please justify the need for the purchase of \$132,000 worth of vehicles and \$72,000 of vehicle maintenance cost and why these costs cannot be covered by co-funding.

2c. Clarify what the \$200,000 of "Support to set up GEF UNDP small grants program for EG" will cover in concrete terms.

2d. Please clarify what the \$100,000 of "Support eco-tourism strategy implementation" and \$375,000 of "support to community based plans" will cover in concrete terms. How

are these different (scope, geographies, beneficiaries, delivery mechanism) between themselves and from the micro-project fund (\$450,000)?

2e. Please justify the high cost of training in output 2.1.3 (15 persons trained for a total budget of \$92,980) and consider revising.

3- Please provide the METT scores with the dedicated GEF template: <http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF7-BD-TrackingTool-Protected%20Area%20Projects.xlsx>

4- Taxonomy: Please untag the project for 'Foods systems, Land Use, and Restoration'. Please also tag the project with a score of 0 on the Rio marker for climate adaptation.

Agency Response

1 ? We have uploaded an appropriate letter of endorsement as a standalone document in the portal.

2a ? The budget has been reviewed to address inconsistencies

2b ? These 2 vehicles are very necessary since it will facilitate the execution of the activities of this projects in these two remote landscapes, notably because the few vehicles owned by t INDEFOR-AP are not only old but have been assigned to other projects. Secondly, the main project Team will be based in the landscapes where there are no vehicles since the few vehicles owned by INDEFOR-AP are based in their Head Office and assigned to other projects. Also, the vehicle maintenance costs are very necessary not only to keep the vehicles up lifespan of theproject but also to avoid current inconveniences linked to vehicle maintenance due to lack of funds. This will eventually slow the implementation of the activities of the projects on the field.

2c ? The \$200 000 of support to set up GEF UNDP small grants program for EG will be used to:

- a) Set up a CSO/community support team (that will design project proposal template, project evaluation guidelines/template, select guidance note for sustainable, environment-friendly and economically-viable micro-projects that meet the objectives of the CBSL IP in Equatorial Guinea, ;
- b) Build the capacity of CSO on the elaboration of community-project ;
- c) Launch a call for proposal for the development of micro-projects at community level;
- d) Select and approve small grants for

- e) CSO/community-based projects;
- f) Support the implementation of selected micro-projects for local entrepreneurs and community members (M&E, templates for progress and final reports of project implementation);
- g) Facilitate knowledge sharing and documentation of best practices and lessons learnt/communication.

2d ? The ?support eco-tourism strategy implementation? activity has been removed from the logical framework (see explanation above).

The support to community based plans corresponds to the funds needed to develop community based land use plans in 5 pilot communities (one in the surroundings of each of the 5 project PAs), following the roadmap that will be developed based on the CBSL LUP methodology. The funds will cover costs for a team of facilitators in land use planning processes, community meetings and consultation activities, small studies/assessments required, participatory mapping exercises, liaison officer in each community, the development of an action plan etc. Beneficiaries of this activity will be communities as a whole.

The development of local land use plans is very different from the micro-project fund which will fund alternative livelihood activities in local communities (up to 50 communities, at least 3 in the surroundings of each of the 5 project PAs). Beneficiaries of this activity will be individuals and formal or informal groups within the participating communities.

The communities benefiting from the development of LUP will also likely benefit from the micro-project grant scheme.

2e ? The cost of training for output 2.1.2.4 (train protected area management personnel on best management practices) has been reviewed to a lower budget of 79,480 USD. The training proposed in this activity is not a one off training session but an in-depth training course/programme that will be held over several sessions, with various modules, covering a variety of topics (see detailed description in the prodoc). The trainees are technicians that require reinforced training to develop specific capacities to manage protected areas adequately and according to best practices. Reducing the budget further would dilute the efficiency of the training and its impact.

3 ? As highlighted above, the METT scores for the 3 PAs were obtained from another GEF project that had interventions in these PAs. However, the METT scores for the other 2 PAs does not exist and this explains why we have included an activity on METT assessment for these 2 PAs that will be executed in the early stage of the project execution (Activity 2.1.2.3). This will give us additional material to fill in the necessary METT information of all 5 PAs using the GEF METT template.

4 ? The ?food systems, land use, and restoration? has been untagged. We have also untag the table with a score of 0 on the Rio Mark.

IUCN 15 April 2021

1 ? We have now uploaded the LoE in the Portal

2a ? Updated budget provided

ToR of project staff updated to describe their responsibilities linked to project components and activities.

3 ? METT templates provided

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 3/22/2021 - The Results Framework has not been updated in the portal entry (Annex A), e.g. it still includes outputs 1.2.3 and 4.1.2, which no longer exist according to the ProDoc, and the target METT scores are still the old ones. Please revise.

JS 1/2/2021 -

1-Please see comment above on missing METT scores and the low targets set for some METT score at project completion.

Agency Response

Noted

IUCN 15 April 2021

Updated results framework provided

UCS * 19 April 2021

|

Ja ? PMC is equivalent to 5.8% now, which corresponds to the share of co-financing in PMC. We have maintained the budget structure, which has M&E in the PMC (as M&E is part of project coordination) while the technical inputs of the CTA and other staffs are included in the components according to their ToR.

|

The GEF excel budget is now posted in the portal.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

1 ? The support to the national land use plan has been removed from the project logical framework, thereby ensuring that there is no duplication with CAFI funding.

2 ? An explicit elaboration to Norway and Denmark?s comments on the risk analysis has been given in the specific annex responding to STAP and Council Comments.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/19/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 4/16/2021 - Annex B contains only responses to STAP comments and still do not include responses to Council comments, which were included in a previous version of the CER. Please revise, taking into accounts comments for 1/2/2021 below.

JS 3/22/2021 - There are no responses to Council comments in the portal entry and no updated response annex has been uploaded with this submission. Please update the portal entry with response to Council comments.

JS 1/2/2021 -

1- The response to Norway-Denmark states that there is no duplication with CAFI since it has no planned investments in the country and its support to the national land use planning process would come only at a later stage. This does not seem coherent with the fact that the proposal would contribute to the very same national land use planning

process, which needs CAFI co-funding. Please clarify. Clarify also if CAFI focal point will be invited to participate in the PSC.

2 Please provide an explicit elaboration on how Norway-Denmark's comments on the risk analysis have been taken into account.

Agency Response

1 ? The support to the national land use plan has been removed from the project logical framework, thereby ensuring that there is no duplication with CAFI funding.

2 ? An explicit elaboration to Norway and Denmark's comments on the risk analysis has been given in the specific annex responding to STAP and Council Comments.

IUCN 15 April 2021

Updated responses to comments provided (annex B)

IUCN 19 April 2021

Addressed. These responses were in the word document but not copied to the GDI portal. These should be in now

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/22/2021 - Cleared.

JS 1/2/2021

1- Please address STAP's comment related to how the project will ensure effective participation of forest-dependent, particularly indigenous, people, in consultations/planning. STAP noted the "substantial barriers to this and a long history of marginalization in such deliberations". The response points to some consultative/participatory activities the project will put in place but does not outline explicitly how the project will pro-actively ensure that marginalized people will be able to effectively have a voice.

2- The ToC provided does not adequately responds to STAP's comments. Please see comment on the ToC in a previous comment box of this review sheet.

Agency Response

1 ? The project has been reoriented towards less national-level actions, and more local level activities, thereby making participation of forest dependent people evident (the majority of local communities are at least partly forest dependant). No indigenous people have officially been identified in the project targeted area, apart from a family of pygmies living to the east of Rio Campo Nature Reserve, close to the northern border with Cameroun, and no longer leading a traditional way of life. This family, along with other forest dependant people will be consulted and will participate in various project activities.

There is currently insufficient information about the vulnerable groups in the sites influenced by the project (e.g. elderly people, persons with disabilities, children, ethnic minorities, displaced people, people living in poverty, marginalised or discriminated individuals or groups, among others). The Social Assessment for Protected Areas (SAPA) and Site Assessment for Governance and Equity (SAGE) that will be conducted at project inception in all 5 PAs will identify vulnerable groups in the 5 PAs and the buffer zones. The Environmental and Social Management Framework developed thereafter will include detailed guidelines on consultation and participation of vulnerable groups.

2 ? The ToC has been reviewed.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 3/22/2021 - Cleared.

JS 1/2/2021 - Please see comment on the annex C further up.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 4/16/2021 - Cleared.

JS 12/15/2020

Maps are provided.

1- Please provide coordinates as text in the portal entry.

Agency Response [See previous comment on coordinates above](#)
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 4/29/2021. Yes, the project is recommended for endorsement.

JS 4/28/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address remaining comments in the first comment box of this review sheet.

JS 4/27/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address remaining comments in the first comment box of this review sheet.

JS 4/22/2021- Not at this stage. Please address the very few remaining comments (missing output 4.2.3 in table B, GEF budget template to be aligned with table B on component 4, Annex E/GEF budget template to be updated in the portal entry with new figures and be made readable) and resubmit.

JS 4/19/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address the remaining comments above (Budget - Staff still charged to components instead of primarily to PMC) and resubmit.

JS 4/19/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address the two remaining comments above (Budget - Staff still charged to components instead of primarily to PMC; missing WDPA ID) and resubmit.

JS 4/16/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments above and resubmit.

JS 3/24/2021 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

JS 1/14/2021- Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

1/15/2021

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	3/24/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/16/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/19/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations