

Integrated management of degraded landscapes for sustainable food systems and livelihoods in Guinea Forest Region and Upper Guinea

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10600

Countries

Guinea

Project Name

Integrated management of degraded landscapes for sustainable food systems and livelihoods in Guinea Forest Region and Upper Guinea

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

11/29/2021

Review completed by PM

2/23/2022

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

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
December 6, 2021:**

No, Table A should only include one FOLUR IP outcome, not multiple outcomes based on Focal Areas (which should appear in Table D). The Agency should edit the Table A Focal Area Outcomes field to read as follows: "Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration"? Please revise accordingly.

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS ⓘ

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund
IP FOLU	Transformation of food systems through sustainable production, reduced deforestation from commodity supply chains, and increased landscape restoration.	GET

Total Project Co

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response Done
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

December 6, 2021:

Please clarify what "GIT" stands for.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response GIT (Gestion Intégrée des Terres) was replaced with ILM (Integrated Landscape Management) throughout the Prodoc and Portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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 CEO Endorsement Request

December 6, 2021:

1. The co-financing letter from the WB is missing. Please provide this letter or any other evidence of a planned co-financing.

2. The co-financing letter from ANAFIC doesn't mention the Type of Co-financing nor whether the co-financing will be Investment mobilized or Recurrent expenditures. In addition, the table included in the letter is not clear about the budget items and doesn't help to understand the kind of expenditure. Please provide a co-financing letter with these information and ensure it is consistent with the information reported in Table C.

3. The co-financing letter from ANAFIC is in French. Please provide a translation in English (no need to be signed, it can be a translation made by the Agency).

4. The co-financing letter from DNFF doesn't mention the Type of Co-financing nor whether the co-financing will be Investment mobilized or Recurrent expenditures. Please provide a co-financing letter with these information and ensure it is consistent with the information reported in Table C.
5. The information in Table C under column "Investment mobilized" is not completed for the co-financing from DNFF. Please complete as needed.
6. The co-financing letter from DNFF is in French. Please provide a translation in English.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the clarifications and translations. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Evidence of planned cofinancing uploaded in Portal.
2. A revised letter was uploaded in the Portal. The annex to the letter, specifies the budget items. \$3M will be provided as investment mobilized and includes annual investment allocations to target Communes (2022-2025 period), \$2M will be provided in-kind and will include PMC related expenses as specified in the Annex.
3. Translation provided and uploaded in Portal.
4. The type of cofinancing from DNFF will be in kind and will be recurrent expenditures. A revised letter was uploaded in the Portal.
5. Done.
6. Translation provided and uploaded in Portal.

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

December 6, 2021:

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 CEO Endorsement Request

December 6, 2021:

In Annex C, the information on the kind of expenditure is missing for the Amount Committed (we only see the Total). Please complete the table.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Addressed.

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

December 6, 2021:

1. According to the alternative scenario, it seems under the output 3.1.1 that all the restoration area will be on forests while the core indicator section indicate that, out of the 10,000 ha restored, 8,000 are reported under the area of degraded agricultural land restored. Please clarify.
2. The Ex-ACT tool can't be open from the Prodoc. Please upload the Ex-ACT tool in the Documents section in the Portal as a separate document.
3. The project is expected to avoid deforestation through the reduction of agricultural expansion. Please explain why this is not captured as a quantified result of the project and particularly through the core indicators 4.4 and 6.1?

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the clarifications and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Output 3.1.1 as spelled in its title targets both degraded forests and degraded agro-sylvo-pastoral systems. The activities (3.1.1.1, 3.1.1.2 and 3.1.1.3) described in the project description/alternative illustrate the restoration activities foreseen ? it is estimated that a total of 10,000 ha will be restored: 2,000 ha with the grazing exclusion technique + 2,000 ha with the alley cropping technique in degraded agricultural land (total 4,000 ha) and 4,000 ha of assisted natural regeneration + 2,000 ha of community restoration activities and reforestation on bare land through: Anderson Plot Technique and Taungya system/ tree in the field technique, in degraded forests (total 6,000ha). Core Indicators 3.1 and 3.2 were updated accordingly.
2. Done

3. The avoided deforestation of 4,807 ha is already included in the EXACT calculation, as detailed in Part I. F., and therefore reflected in Core Indicator 6.1. The HCVF certification is not in use in Upper and Forest Guinea so we can't claim avoided deforestation of HCVF under indicator 4.4.

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

December 14, 2021:

1. Please follow the Portal entry structure which begins with 1a.a. "The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed" and not the very long section titled "1) Context" which is a copy-paste of the Agency Prodoc. The content of this section is indeed relevant, but it should be distributed in the Portal entry sections where they belong (natural resources status under global environmental problems, Climate risk under risks, previous experiences and policy context under baseline, Target sites selection under maps, etc.).

2. The palm oil and rice sectors are briefly presented but how they can cause the environmental degradation, to which extent and where are not clear. Please elaborate further on what kind of plantation/cultivation is degrading the environment (subsistence agriculture, small holders of commercial agriculture or industrial plantation...) and what are concretely the potential consequences of these activities on the environment in the targeted project area. This is important to justify the proposed investments.

3. We understand that in the targeted landscapes are considered as "frontier landscapes", i.e. where there the environmental degradation is not the most important but where is expected to be very high if nothing is done. Nevertheless, this is not clearly demonstrated in the targeted landscapes. Please describe further what is currently happening locally in rice and palm oil sectors to make the project developers think the forests and the environment are under high risk of degradation (beyond the general statement of increasing pressure from growing demand).

4. Please clarify how Market gardening relate to the project.

5. Please ensure the references are correct in the Portal entry. For instance there is no Annex E Figure 5 (there is no such annex neither in the Prodoc).

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the amendments and the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Addressed.
 2. Text was added in Prodoc section 1.a. 2 (pg.35-37)/Global environmental problems, root causes and barriers and highlighted in yellow for ease of reference (see also insertions in Portal section 1.a) a.) .
 3. Please refer to additional text as per above.
 4. The project is focused on landscape management ensuring that each land use can be more sustainable to ensure long term food production in healthy ecosystems. The project will support the planning of this vision as well as some key activities linked to sustainable agriculture and restoration. As rice and palm oil have been identified as two commodity with a strong impact on the landscape as well as a major expansion potential, an important part of the activities are focusing on rendering these commodities value chains more sustainable. One of the key challenge of sustainable agriculture is to be able to increase production without increasing environmental damage and land encroachment. To do so, it is important to both use all the existing agricultural parcels to be best of their sustainable use and re-habilitate others. This is the purpose of market gardening as it can be developed in the low season for rice or/and abandoned low lands. By using these lands this will limit the expansion into new areas. Market gardening is also a very important activity for women and to ensure nutritional balance in diets. To meet the multiple objectives of ecosystem restoration, promotion of deforestation free agriculture and sustainable food systems, farming systems diversification is considered critical (polycropping, agro-forestry, crop livestock integration etc). Focusing exclusively on a single commodity value chain approach (palm oil or rice in this case) would lead farmers to production specialization, perpetuating the monoculture-centered models whose environmental and economic limits are abundantly clear today. Additional text was added in Prodoc Part II, 1.a,1) iii. Agriculture and mining: Key economic sectors linked to natural resources management; market gardening (pg.23).
 5. OK ? Annex E figure 5 is on Prodoc pg.142
- 2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

1. There is a significant co-financing contribution provided by FAO-Guinea reported in table C through several projects. The contribution of these projects remain vague ("FAO will bring its expertise in integrated natural resources planning and support..."). Please elaborate further on the concrete investments provided by these projects.
2. There is no description of the Palm oil and rice value chains, the main stakeholders (producers, processors, traders, cooperatives, financiers, agriculture services...) involved in the targeted landscapes and how they relate one with the others. Please elaborate further on this aspects.

3. Please describe any sustainable initiatives from the private sector already in place or planned the project could articulate with.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Additional text introduced in Prodoc section 1.a) 3. Baseline projects (pg.43)
 2. Additional text introduced in Prodoc section 1.a.1) iii. Agriculture and mining: Key economic sectors linked to natural resources management (pg. 19-23)
 3. Additional text was added in Prodoc section 1.a.3 Baseline projects (pg. 44)
- 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

December 17, 2021:

The description is well structured, comprehensive and detailed including with concrete activities. Thank you. Please address the following few comments:

1. Component 4 on KM and M&E is relevant to all the project components: why then it is said to address low capacity of public services "focus on natural resources and forests in component 3"? Please clarify. If it is the case, please make it explicit in the title of component 4 and ensure KM is also consider somehow for the other components.
2. There is no Annex A3 in the Portal entry. Please clarify and ensure all the references in the Portal entry are correct.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The relevant section in the Portal was updated to address the comment (see Prodoc. section 1. a) 4. pg 48.
 2. Addressed
- 4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

Yes, including with the FOLUR Global Platform. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

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

December 17, 2021:

Yes, but the restoration benefits remain vague: we learn about "10,000 ha of restored land, including 2,000 ha in partnership with mining companies" without more detail. Please elaborate further in this section on the kind of restoration results the project will aim at (species, techniques, land uses...).

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional text added in Prodoc section 7 (pg.84) /Portal section 1.f.

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

December 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

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

December 6, 2021:

1. No, the maps are missing in the section "1b. Project Map and Coordinates". Please provide the maps of the project targeted areas.
2. Please correct in the section the reference to "Annex E" to find the maps as this Annex E includes the Budget in the Portal entry.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the additional and clearly presented information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done
2. Done

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

December 17, 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

December 17, 2021:

We take note of the stakeholders engagement plan uploaded in the Portal, thank you. Using the information included in this plan, please provide a summary of how each category of stakeholders will be engaged in the project implementation.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Additional text introduced in Prodoc and Portal.
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

December 17, 2021:

The table of the gender engagement plan goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right side (format issue). Please ensure the table is within the limit of the Portal entry.

February 18, 2022:

The table of the gender engagement plan still goes slightly beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right side. Please try to adjust the table so that it fits within the limit of the Portal entry page. If needed, the agency can contact the GEF Program Manager and/or directly the GEF ITS team.

February 23, 2022:

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Addressed.

2/23/22:

Fixed.

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

December 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

December 17, 2021:

1. On the climate analysis, please indicate the "Annexe I3" refers to the Prodoc.
2. On the COVID-19 analysis, please also elaborate on how this project may also provide opportunities to increase the resilience of the stakeholders and ecosystems and to mitigate the risk of further spread of the pandemic and new pandemic spillover.
3. The uploaded Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) screening is not complete. Please use the full ESS screening document as the one used for the FAO FOLUR project in Cote d'Ivoire.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done
2. Done, text added in Prodoc and Portal
3. As no ESS was triggered for Guinea, the full ESS was not uploaded. The full ESS is now uploaded.

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

December 22, 2021:

1. In the attached budget, we see that FAO will undertake executing functions. As this is not allowed by GEF Policy, please explain the reason of this. Especially if some functions are normally expected to be handled by other executing agency (such as "Capacity

Development Support and Risk Management specialist"), this must be strongly justified and requested by the OFP in a letter uploaded in the section document of the Portal. The GEF Secretariat will assess the request and decide whether to approve it or not.

2. We note the purchase of motorbikes and vehicles with a total cost of \$225,000. Please note that as per GEF guidelines, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project. The GEF Secretariat assesses such requests and decides whether to approve them, based on following criteria: type of project, operating environment, contribution to achievement of project results, and share of costs covered by co-financing, among others. Please justify and consider such expenses to be covered by the co-financing.

February 18, 2022:

1. We take note of the justification provided for the additional need to support the 3 main Executing Entities. As regard to the MTR, FE, TR, spot checks and audits, please note that if Agencies hire an independent consultant or firm to carry out these activities then the associated costs can be charged to project budget under either M&E or PMC. If Agencies use their own evaluation or audit units/department then we expect the related costs are covered by the Agency fee. As a consequence, if FAO will use its own evaluation unit to implement these activities, the related costs could be fully or at least partially covered by the Agency fee to lower the related cost supported by the project. Also, decreasing these costs could free more resources for the project activities. These are suggestions the Agency may want to consider.

2. Thank you for the justification provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The fiduciary assessments of DNFF, ANPROCA and ANAFIC execution capacities (conducted by the external audit firm BDO) have identified a number of weaknesses that will need minor active support and capacity building to enable DNFF, ANPROCA and ANAFIC to perform their role of Executing Agencies. This will be required especially during the first 2 years of implementation. As part of this process, the EAs have requested training for harmonizing their risk reporting standards and processes with UN and GEF standards, specifically on OPIM reporting requirements. The fiduciary assessment also highlighted moderate risks posed by ANPROCA's limited sub-contracting capacities. FAO's specialist will build their capacities and closely support the implementation of the risk mitigation plan.

Even more importantly, complex institutional arrangements (3 main Executing Entities and several sub- partners) require a high level of coordination, M&E and learning efforts that none of the potential Executing Agencies can bear without support. Under the circumstances, even inputs provided through implementing agency fee and own co-financing, alone, are not expected to be sufficient to ensure the desired level of coordination, coherent flow of knowledge and monitoring of agencies' performances and contributions.

In order to address the above institutional, technical, and operational complexity and to ensure that the program is delivered as one coherent project, the Government of Guinea has requested FAO to perform minor, targeted execution support functions essential to the smooth and consistent delivery of the program. This support will be provided by a dedicated national consultant, namely, a:

? Execution Capacity development Support specialist. FAO's specialist, co-funded by FAO's own fees and resources, will ensure that all AWP&B, risk monitoring plans and all reporting products are prepared in a consistent manner for smooth review and approval from the Project Steering Committee, a key PMC support task that Executing Agencies, alone, will not be able to ensure for a program of this complexity. Again, the intention is to mitigate the risk of fragmentation of the program into 3 stand-alone projects.

Moreover, this specialist will ensure coordination with the FOLUR Global Knowledge Platform: FAO is well-positioned to ensure that the project optimizes its interactions both regionally and globally. Through the above minor execution support functions, FAO will be in a better position to enable the project management unit to interface directly with the FOLUR Global Knowledge Platform ensuring a consistent and reliable bi-directional flow of data and knowledge.

TORs are available in Prodoc Annex N (last page). The OFP supporting letter was uploaded in the section document of the Portal.

2. Government lacks appropriate vehicles (basic motorcycles and pickups) required to support project implementation and monitoring. Lack of mobility will hinder project delivery and compromise the quality of delivery. Ensuring farmers' adoption of innovative systems and technologies and the transition towards sustainable intensification in agriculture and forest production in remote areas with limited/poor communication infrastructures is only possible if project facilitators and extensionists have the means to visit all target areas with high frequency. This implies having transport autonomy that the project would be ensuring in a basic way through the procurement of simple motorbikes and pickups. Otherwise, the possibility to visit target areas will be extremely reduced or simply not possible.

The vehicles fleet available to DNFF, ANPROCA and ANAFIC is currently not sufficient to support project implementation, considering also the extent of the intervention area (covering 13 communes, 11 Prefectures and 2 regions) and poor road conditions requiring the use of basic pickups instead of motorcycles which pose risk hazards.

Based on a vehicles fleet assessment (table 1), the project intends to procure xx motorbikes and 3 basic pickups, that will be based in Nzérékoré, KanKan and Faranah Districts (table 2) at disposal of implementing partners to deliver restoration and agricultural services in the target landscapes. Drivers will be provided as cofinancing. In addition to these vehicles DNFF, ANPROCA and ANAFIC committed to make available additional vehicles in support to the daily coordination transportation of the PMU members, as well maintenance costs for the vehicles.

Table 1 ? Vehicles fleet situation at DNFF, ANPROCA and ANAFIC regional headquarters

Type of Vehicle	Haute Guinée				Guinée Forestière							
	Faranah	Kouroussa	Kankan	Kissidougou	Guékédou	Krouan?	Maccinta	Beyla	Yamou	Nzérékoré?	Lola	
Pickup 4*4												
DNFF	The regional office is based in Kankan and Faranah. There are no pickups available in these prefectures.				Regional office based in Nzérékoré ? no pickup available. DNFF disposes of only one vehicle based in Conakry that will be made available to the PMU (whenever available) as part of DNFF's co-financing.							
ANPROCA	No pickup available. The regional management avails of no pickups from previous projects.				No pick up available in any of the prefectures.							
ANAFIC	ANAFIC has a base in Faranah and Kankan ? each office/base is equipped with a pick-up 4*4 in good condition. These are already 100% used for the activities implemented in the area.				ANAFIC has an office in Nzérékoré where a 4*4 pick-up is available and in good conditions. However this is used for the multiple projects implemented in the area.							
Motorcycles												
DNFF	No motorcycle is available ? some agents work with their own vehicle.				No vehicle nor bicycle available.							
ANPROCA	There is 1 motorcycle available in Kouroussa and 1 in Kankan but these are old.				ANPROCA had made available some motorbikes in 2017 to the prefectures however, these are now in very poor conditions.							
ANAFIC	All communes within these prefectures have motorcycles, most of them are in good conditions. These motorcycles belong to the ADL (local development agents) and are used for project monitoring and delivery ? they are not available most of the time.				All of the target communes are equipped with 1 motorcycle, most of them being in good conditions. Again, availability is restricted due to frequent use by local development agents (ADL).							

Table 2- Proposed vehicle purchase

Vehicle Type	No. of units											Unit cost (USD)	TOTAL (USD)	REMARQUE	
	Kankan				Faranah				Nzérékoré?						
4x4 pickup	1				1				1			35 000	105,000		
Vehicle type	Haute Guinée				Guinée Forestier										
	Far.	Kou.	Kank.	Kis.	Gu?	K?r.	Mac.	Bey.	Yom.	Nz?.	Lol.				

motorbikes	10	5	6	8	4	5	4	4	4	6	4	2000	120,000	Each commune (total) should be equipped with 4 motorbikes (2 for ANPROCA and 2 for DNFF agents), with additional 2 motorbikes to be based in Kaolack (2), Faranah (2), Niakhar (2) respectively? with decentralized coordination/supervision team will be based in Niakhar (local facilitators) additional motorbikes will be based in Kouroussa and Kourouan? due to size of the target
TOTAL													225,000	

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

December 17, 2021:

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 CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

1. In addition to the information provided, please elaborate on how existing lessons informed the project design.

2. Please include in this section a budget including the key deliverables and the timeline for these deliverables.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Additional text was added to the Knowledge Management section 8 of the Prodoc/Portal. An additional Annex O was added in the Prodoc further elaborating on lessons learnt.

2. A budgeted table was added.

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

December 17, 2021:

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 CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 6, 2021:

1. Please attach the map of the targeted project areas in the Annex D.
2. Please attach in Annex E a more detailed budget including: 1- the budget items (not only the cost categories) and 2- columns showing the expenses related to each executing agencies.

February 18, 2022:

Thank you for completing the information of the Annexes D and E. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done
2. Done

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

In the Annex A, please make sure all the GEF core indicators name and numbers are explicit (for instance "Core Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector", "Core indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment", etc.).

February 18, 2022:

In the table, the final target for the core indicator 4.3 is said to be 10,000 ha instead of 145,000 ha. Please correct.

February 23, 2022:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

Done.

Feb 23, 2022:

Done.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

1. The comment from Japan was made on the FOLUR addendum 3 (addition of Madagascar) and is not relevant here. Please remove it.
2. The comments from Switzerland, Germany and France on the FOLUR addendum 2 are not addressed. Please complete.

February 22, 2022:

Thank you for the amendment and additional information, cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done
2. Comments on FOLUR addendum 2 added, also some additional text on the LDN (in response to a comment) was added in Prodoc/Portal section 7 Consistency with National Priorities.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 17, 2021:

The first comment from STAP is not addressed. Please complete.

February 22, 2022:

Thank you for the additional information, cleared.

Agency Response Done.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 6, 2021:

Yes, considering the comment above on PPG status in Table F and Annex C is addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 6, 2021:

1. Please attach the maps in Annex D.
2. Please correct the reference to "Annex E" to find the maps as this Annex includes the Budget in the Portal entry. It should be Annex D. In total, 8 wrong references need to be corrected throughout the project description.

February 22, 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Done
2. Done

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 18, 2021:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

February 22, 2022:






Not yet. Please address the remaining few comments.

March 3, 2022:

Thank you for addressing the comments. Nevertheless, final checking revealed the need to address the following comment (sorry for not having raised this point before):

In Table C on co-financing, please spell out the full name of ANPROCA, DNFF, and ANAFIC.

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
Donor Agency	World Bank	Grant	Investment mobilized	25,000,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	ANPROCA	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,905,611.00	
Recipient Country Government	DNFF	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	5,577,291.00	
GEF Agency	FAO - Guinea	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,412,518.00	
GEF Agency	FAO-FLRM	Grant	Investment mobilized	500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	ANAFIC	Grant	Investment mobilized	3,000,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	ANAFIC	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	2,000,000.00	
Total Co-Financing(\$)				43,395,420.00	

March 6, 2022:

Thank you for the amendments. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/7/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations