

Using Marine Spatial Planning in the Gulf of Guinea for the implementation of Payment for Ecosystem Services and Coastal Nature-based Solutions

Basic Information

GEF ID

10875

Countries

Regional (Cote d'Ivoire, Ghana, Togo)

Project Title

Using Marine Spatial Planning in the Gulf of Guinea for the implementation of Payment for Ecosystem Services and Coastal Nature-based Solutions

GEF Agency(ies)

IUCN

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Leah Karrer

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 26, 2021). Yes. Please note that since the summary of the screening report stated, "Based on this early judgement project is tentatively rated as a moderate risk projects," the GEF expects to see additional ESS screening assessments provided as part of the submission of the CEO endorsement.

(Karrer, Oct 25, 2021). No. Please address these final points:

1) The PIF reads with the implication that it will occur in the entire region. Table B, particularly the components, do not indicate the target countries. The title only notes Gulf of Guinea, which implies more countries. As we've discussed, since there are only LOEs from 3 countries, it needs to be clear they will be the focus. Please:

- a) Specify in all the component titles in Table B the 3 countries
- b) Edit the first section 1.a) Transboundary environmental and adaptation problems and root causes for the 6 countries – just delete "for the 6 countries" which implies all will be in the project
- c) Add a statement in the first paragraph of the Justification clarifying the focus will be the 3 countries.
- d) Also, please correct the typo "GGlobal environmental..."

During PPG this will need to be addressed throughout the document.

2) On Project Information: the countries included in this regional project were not included, neither "Africa" was deleted – please edit to be "regional, Togo, Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire"

3) Co-financing: when the co-financing is classified as recurrent expenditures, normally the type of co-financing is 'in-kind' – this was not adjusted. If it truly is grant, hence, "investment mobilized" should be added with the explanation on how this was identified. Please amend.

4) Letters of Endorsement: Cote d'Ivoire letter is not signed by the official OFP (Mrs. Alimata Kone-Bakayoko), neither includes the distribution of funds' allocation. Please get the correct letter.

5) Environmental and Social Safeguards (comment provided by Gabriella): the comment on ESS, was not recoded in the review sheet and the issue remain about the contradictory overall risk rating of the project. The project overall ESS risk in the portal is classified as low. The attached "Brief Summary of the main finding" in the Preliminary ESMS Screening states, however, that "Based on this early judgement project is tentatively rated as a moderate risk projects."

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response -

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer Oct 15, 2021). Yes. However during PPG, please address the following remaining points:

1. *For the CER, the focus on 3 countries needs to be clear. Output 2.2.1 was edited in this regard and the national efforts in Table 8 were revised to only reflect the 3 countries; however, the document still reads that the entire region will be addressed. Please include a clear statement indicating that the focus will be on the 3 countries and that "regional" refers to the 3 countries. For example, the objective needs to specify the 3 countries and Component 1 which currently note Gulf of Guinea.*

2. *Component 1 was edited to "mineral extraction (include coastal land-based extraction activities)", which does not reflect the range of land-based activities affecting coastal and marine ecosystems noted in the Root causes section, including land-based sources of pollution and sedimentation from wastewater, plastic waste, agriculture and forestry. For the CER, this needs to be clear.*

3. *During PPG consideration needs to be given as to whether it is realistic for the project to develop new MPAs.*

4. *The first paragraph of the PAS still only refers to the valuation of fishery services not other services. Output 2.1.3 has added services beyond fisheries and tourism seemingly as an after thought. During PPG the range of services need to be given full consideration throughout the project plans.*

6. *During PPG the MSP needs to consider the economic impacts of options. Please include this point along with social cohesion, equity, etc. in Output 1.1.4. for the CER.*

7. *While the additional language adding other services is appreciated, the text for Output 2.1.2 still emphasizes fishing by noting “The mapping will indicate ecosystem vulnerability hotspots that require specific intervention, and those that are under significant pressure to provide services from the fishing industry. This will aid in determining which areas of productivity should be prioritised for developing payments for their services.” Further, in the Component 3 text the 2nd paragraph again emphasizes fisheries. The text under Output 3.1.2 also again stresses only fisheries services as the priority. For the CER there needs to be consistency – either focus on the breadth of services or focus on just fisheries. Either way decide and be consistent.*

11. *During PPG the breadth of threats needs to be addressed, which is still not the case in the PIF. The third paragraph under Component 3 does not include the breadth of threats identified in the Root causes section. For example, land-based sources of pollution and sedimentation are not noted, shipping, ports, oil and mining.*

More concerning, the Component 3 table does not indicate any plans for reducing threats. Outcome 3.2 is most relevant as it's titled “Improved management” yet the outputs are focused on prioritizing areas, engaging stakeholders and monitoring pilots. The pilots would seem the most likely place for measures to control threats, but doing so is not mentioned in the table. Instead there is great detail on monitoring. Where will the threats (e.g. pollution, habitat destruction, over-fishing) actually be managed? This question needs to be addressed during PPG.

13. *During PPG within the TOC, the list of items under Component 3 needs to reflect NBS, including management of the range of threats, which is more than conservation and restoration of habitats.*

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No.

Geographic Scope

1. The priority concern is that because the project is only endorsed by Togo, Ghana and Cote 'd Ivoire, these are the only countries where project activities can occur. This focus is not clear from the PIF, which discusses the entire FCWC region. This 3 country focus needs to be specified for all three components. In addition the three countries need to be noted under “Countries” in Part I: Project Information and "Africa" needs to be deleted. Alternatively, you need to secure LOEs from all the countries in the FCWC that will participate.

Component 1

2. The *Transboundary environmental and adaptation problems and root causes* section describes a suite of land and sea-based activities threatening the marine and coastal ecosystems. Please clarify whether Component 1 MSP will address the sea as well as land-based threats or only the sea-based threats. From the description it seems only the sea-based activities (shipping, ports, fishing, mineral extraction, aquaculture, nature protection) will be considered.

3. There is mention (1st paragraph of *Proposed Alternative Scenario* section) that the project will “support the implementation of

sustainable managements plans for fisheries and MPAs. There is also mention in the third paragraph of Component 1 that “national plans and strategies will be drafted”. Will those be developed as part of this project or separately? They are not indicated in the outputs. Please clarify where those are planned.

Component 2

4. Multiple ecosystem services are provided by healthy marine and coastal ecosystems, including not only fisheries, but also tourism and recreation opportunities, storm protection for shoreline development, sediment stabilization, water purification and carbon sequestration, which benefit the tourism industry, shoreline developers, insurance companies and the general public. Yet, there is mixed messaging regarding the focus of the project activities. The first paragraph of the PAS notes the project “aims at delivering a sustainable new model for the management of fisheries in the Gulf of Guinea” without mention of other services. In contrast, the second paragraph of the PAS notes that the project will “mobilize the private sector (fisheries, tourism, extractive industries, etc) to invest in the ecosystems...” indicating the breadth of services will be the focus of the project. Then Component 2 (see Output 2.1.1), only focuses on PES related to fisheries tourism. Such a narrow focus misses opportunities for PES and NBS from the other services. Please consider expanding component 2 to include the range of ecosystem services, which would provide opportunities to seek payments from these stakeholders (ie. developers, public) and be consistent with the quote regarding mobilizing the private sector. And please ensure consistent (Output 2.1.1. text notes fisheries and tourism; whereas Table B only mentions fisheries).

5. The scope of the Component MSP outputs needs to be clarified. There is a big leap from training, creating a working group, and reviewing reports to the establishment of a MSP for 3 countries’ EEZs. The process for creating the MSP for the EEZs needs to be described and arguably warrants a few outputs leading up to the MSP, such as scoping, mapping and assessing the ecological, socioeconomic trade-offs for different spatial zoning options, determining the trade-offs among different zoning options, and engaging all of the relevant stakeholders in this extensive process.

6. It is also not clear what the MSP will actually entail. Will it define zones for different activities – e.g. where fishing can occur or oil/gas exploration or water based tourism? Or will it go further and actually establish management measures to ensure the various activities are sustainable, such as measures to minimize oil/gas spills, ensure shoreline development does not lead to sedimentation of marine ecosystems, etc? Please explain.

Component 2 (PES)

7. The discussion of vulnerability in Output 2.1.2 text needs to consider the various threats to the resources, which are discussed in the *Transboundary environmental* section (i.e. land development, oil and gas exploration, agriculture, aquaculture, shipping, litter). The text notes “pressure...from the fishing industry”, but unsustainable fishing is only one threat.

8. It is unclear how the PES will address these threats. Please clarify. Will the payments only go to nature based solutions in component 3? What about threats that require measures beyond NBS? Will funding go to the government to regulate those threats?

9. For Outcome 2.2 please revise so clear you mean payments for ecosystems established “Increased contribution of beneficiaries” is

9. ... of outcome 2.2 please revise so that you mean payments for ecosystems established. Increased contribution of beneficiaries is unclear.

10. For Output 2.2.1 please clarify what is meant by the "3 chosen FCWC countries" and pilot schemes. There are only 3 countries in this project. What will the "PES pilot schemes" entail? There is mention of international companies, but the beneficiaries are national fisheries and tourism. Examples of possible schemes would be useful just as you provide NBS examples in the text for component 3. Also why is there reference to the IUCN NBS standard when NBS is in component 3?

Component 3 (NBS)

11. For Component 3 please clarify what you mean by NBS. There is mention of restoration and protection projects, such as presumably establishing MPAs. Does it also include regulations to control threats, such as land-based pollution, over-fishing, etc? Will such regulations be considered. If not, how will those threats be addressed?

12. Finally, often projects have a component that focuses on knowledge sharing and monitoring. You might consider adding this as a way of targeting resources and effort for sharing experiences in the region with other countries and learning from their experiences.

13. The Theory of Change diagram is not included in the Portal version although it was in the version emailed to me. Please ensure it is included in the Portal version. It is clear; however, there needs to be an explanation in the text.

Agency Response

1. There was a misunderstanding but it is now changed. The three countries for the implementation of activities are Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire and Togo. "Region" and "regional" will then refer to three countries.

2. In the Transboundary Environmental and Adaptation Problems and Root Causes, a paragraph was added to describe the coastal threats.

The description of component 1 has been updated to include coastal land-based activities. Aquaculture and resource extraction encompass land and sea-based activities too.

3. The identification of MPAs will be done under the drafting of MSPs. The project will support the implementation of ICZM and MPAs management plans. Some ICZMs will be already be developed by the WACA project (as indicated in paragraph 2 of component 1). The text has been revised to update the sentence around management plans for fisheries to avoid this confusion and now states it supports the implementation of plans already developed externally. It has also been updated under component 1 to ensure clarity that the MSP plans will be guided by the national plans and strategies that are being developed by WACA.

4. Agreed. This has been updated in the DIF

4. Agreed. This has been updated in the PIF.

5. Output 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 undertakes these activities. This has been updated in text to clarify this. Output 1.1.2 indicates that stakeholders will be engaged throughout the process at every relevant stage.

6. The project will focus on zoning (to identify key areas for interventions of PES and NBS) and will support the implementation of any management measures or plans that are developed in concurrent projects or government initiatives by complimenting existing work (as indicated in paragraph 2 of component 1), and will develop targeted management measures when possible. 1.

7. Agreed. This has been updated in the PIF.

8. Priority will be given to NbS as the funds generated by PES should be directed to protect and conserve those natural resources that produce ecosystem services. However, if it can be shown that NbS would not be the most appropriate solution to conserve an ecosystem bringing services, the case for funding could still be considered.

9. Outcome 2.2 now reads as: Establishment of a PES system, increasing the monetary contribution by beneficiaries for their use of ecosystem services, improved regional cooperation and understanding of PES.

This has been updated across the document.

10. Output 2.2.1 now reads as:

PES pilot schemes Togo, Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire in place as a guide for FCWC countries.

The sentence where "Fisheries" is mentioned starts with "For example", as an example of PES can be international fishing companies paying fishing rights to better manage national fisheries ecosystems and biodiversity conservation.

The IUCN NBS note as been moved to component 3, and a note has been added to output 2.2.1 to indicate that the restorative and protective activities are as part of component 3.

11. Examples of further NBS have been added under component 3 to ensure that these regulatory actions and other forms of NBS have been included.

12. Each component has monitoring and knowledge sharing as an output(s). This has been enhanced under each component to ensure that sufficient resources and effort are allocated within each component for dissemination of lessons learned and knowledge exchange. Furthermore, the development of the regional working groups in component 1 closely coordinated with the Guinea Current Commission and the Regional Coordination Units will open the channels for learning from other countries in the region to inform the activities undertaken in this project.

and project

13. The ToC was uploaded in the main text of the document in the original submission in the portal. We will double check and make sure it is there in the re-submission. A paragraph has also been added in the text to summarise the diagram under the description of the components.

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer Oct 15, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No.

There is no co-financing from the governments. During PPG please pursue co-financing from the governments which is important in demonstrating commitment to, and sustainability of, the project.

Typically the type of co-financing grant is categorized as Investment mobilized. Please describe how it was identified. If the type of co-financing is in-kind please request the agency to make the modifications in the table.

Agency Response Co-financing from governments will be pursued during PPG.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within

the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Secretariat Comment at PIF / WORK Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes. The MPA ha is \$8.57/ha which is reasonable. More detail regarding the basis for the core indicator calculations will be needed for the CEO Endorsement Request.

Agency Response To be further developed in the PPG phase.

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 15, 2021). Yes.

During PPG consideration will be needed regarding the role of women related to the various threats that are managed by the project, which are not all reflected in the gender section. For example, agriculture, wood exploitation, plastic pollution, mineral extraction, oil exploration, shipping, ports and harbor construction.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No.

The discussion focuses on women in fisheries, but tourism and other sectors are also beneficiaries. Please reflect on the role of women related to the various services and how they will be affected. In addition, the project should more clearly outline its plans to carry out a gender analysis during project preparation to inform the development of a gender action plan.

Agency Response

Two sentences were added to include other sectors than fisheries in which the project will intervene and from which women will benefit.

The PIF has been updated to include that during the development of the PPG, a full analysis will be undertaken to ensure that all project components consider the needs and preoccupations of women, men, youth and people living with disabilities. This will inform the development of a gender action plan to be carried through the project.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 15, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No.

The explanation of stakeholder engagement needs to expand on the private sector. In particular, for the MSP the various stakeholders involved in marine activities need to be engaged to design and agree to the MSP. These include not only fisheries and tourism, but also oil and gas, shipping, seabed mining and aquaculture. As land-based activities benefit from healthy ecosystems (e.g. shoreline development is protected from storms by mangroves and seagrasses) and impact (e.g. farming), they need to be engaged as well, particularly coastal developers, farmers and potentially insurance companies.

Agency Response One sentence reflecting those points is now included in the text.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 15, 2021). Yes.

The risk section on COVID notes, "The project intervention logic has the potential to address critical issues around human-wildlife interaction (including increased exposure to viruses), and the landscape management plans will explicitly integrate this concern..."; yet, such interations are not reflected in the project plans. During PPG please ensure they are.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No

The COVID impact explanation is useful in the baseline section. However, the risk section is not linked to these impacts in discussing how the project will address these concerns. There is mention of health extension services, measures to address human-wildlife interactions and landscape management plans; however these activities are not in the project. Please revise the risks section on COVID to discuss how the project will address the impacts. Also, please consider if there are new opportunities due to COVID such as new investments or policies that might benefit the project goals?

Please also discuss how climate change may affect the project activities. For example, the zoning of uses may have to be adaptable as uses shift. Fishing grounds may shift as fish populations migrate with warming waters.

Finally, the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and IUCN attached the Preliminary ESMS Screening. However, the ESS section in the GEF Portal and "Brief Summary of the main finding" in the Preliminary ESMS Screening states that "Based on this early judgement project is tentatively rated as a moderate risk projects." Please clarify the overall ESS risk fating of the project at this stage.

Agency Response

Two sentences were added to highlight how the project will address a renewed Covid pandemic. The last paragraph of the Covid section addresses the new opportunities offered.

Climate change has been updated to include the impact of climate change on the planning and implementation of activities.

The ESS risk classification has been updated in the PIF/portal .

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 15, 2021). Yes; however, point 2) below needs to be addressed during PPG. the text notes, "The project will ensure it has all the deliverables of the GCLME and based on the documents, will consider to follow-up and/or strengthen the initiatives and activities already developed." This assessment needs to occur during PPG and the relationship with GCLME and the proposed Guinea Commission clearly explained in the CER. This point will be carefully reviewed for CER.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No.

- 1) Please change the type of executing partner from Government to Other.
- 2) Please add with regard to engaging with the Gulf of Guinea LME, particularly the proposed Guinea Commission.
- 3) The *Incremental cost reasoning* and the *Coordination* sections do not sufficiently explain how this project will build upon and not duplicate existing efforts. It is particularly important to understand how the Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire German funded project led by the Abidjan Convention (the Abidjan project) relates to the proposed project. The Abidjan project is ending this year and includes the development of MSPs for Ghana (mama wati pilot project) and for Cote d'Ivoire. Please elaborate on the existing MSPs and clarify how the proposed project is different. If the MSPs have already been developed, then the proposed resources could be focused in other outputs.
- 4) It is also important to understand the relevance to the other projects, which needs to be a priority for exploration which can be done during the PPG, specifically:
 - Strengthening the GCLME project – this project is ending this year and has developed planning frameworks and regional mechanisms for addressing threats to the LME. What frameworks and mechanisms are relevant to Ghana, Togo and Cote d'Ivoire? How will the project work with these? Will the PES consider funding any of the measures identified by the GCLME project?
 - European Commission mangrove project - this project is targeting Togo and Ghana. What mangrove protection measures have been put in place and how will this project consider building on those through the NBS plans?
 - CECAF, GREPPAO and FishGov projects – these 3 projects have focused on strengthening fisheries management. What measures have they established in Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire and Togo? How will the project help strengthen these, such as using the PES to fund these efforts?
 - WACA – this project seems more focused on climate change and more coastal, so be most relevant with regard to expanding the PES to relate to storm protection and erosion prevention measures and considering the entire EEZs.

Agency Response

- 1) This will be updated in the portal

- 2) This has been added to the coordination under non-GEF financed initiatives.

- 3) A paragraph is added in Incremental costs

4. This point will be addressed more in-depth during the PPG but additional inputs have also been added to the revised PIF.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 15, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No.

Table 8 includes countries beyond the 3 involved countries implying these other countries will be engaged. Please recall activities can only take place in the 3 countries.

Agency Response This has been updated in the PIF.

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 26, 2021). Yes. Please note that since the summary of the screening report stated, "Based on this early judgement project is tentatively rated as a moderate risk projects," the GEF expects to see additional ESS screening assessments provided as part of the submission of the CEO endorsement.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). Yes.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Oct 15, 2021). No. Only the Ghana English LOE is in the Portal. The Togo LOE is in French; the translation needs to be posted. The Cote d'Ivoire letter and translation are missing. Please post the Togo and Cote d'Ivoire LOEs with translation ASAP.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No.

As noted above, it needs to be clear how many countries are participating. There is mention of all FCWC countries and then just Ghana, Togo and Cote d'Ivoire. Which ever countries are engaged have to submit LOEs. Currently there are only LOEs from Ghana and Togo. The Togo letter needs to be accompanied by a translation in English. And please upload for Cote d'Ivoire. If other countries will be engaged, then please upload their LOEs signed by the current OFPs.

Agency Response As mentioned, there will be three countries part of this project Ghana, Côte d'Ivoire. The LOE from Ghana was sent and is OK. The LOE from Côte d'Ivoire and Togo were sent in French. The GEF focal point for each countries was contacted to request the LOE to be sent in English and should come soon.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

(Karrer, Oct 22, 2021). Yes.

(Karrer, Oct 15, 2021). No. The LOE for Cote d'Ivoire needs to be provided with translation. And the translation of the Togo LOE needs to be provided.

(Karrer, Sept 29, 2021). No. See above comments.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

First Review	9/29/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/15/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/25/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/26/2021

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval