

GEF ID:	5537		
Country/Region:	Republic of Congo		
Project Title:	Creation of Conkouati Dimonika PA Complex and Development of Community Private Sector Participation Model to Enhance PA Management Effectiveness CDC&CPSPM		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project	01196
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 BD2		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$106.000	Project Grant:	\$ 2,889,434
Co-financing:	\$15,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$ 18,401,434
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari
Question	Comments from GEF Secretariat		Responses
<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Minor revision: Table A: The formulation of the output 2 "one protected area created and coverage of unprotected ecosystems by 4,446,800 ha" is a little confusing, and do not reflect the activities. The project is going to help to create one new protected area of 93,300 ha. The mention of 4,446,800 ha is confusing. Please, revise the formulation and remove the mention of 4,446,800 ha.</p>		<p>Addressed as proposed</p>

<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>-Please detail more what will be done through public-private partnerships. - List the potential companies that are targeted. - Provide evidence that these companies do not have problems with justice in Congo or in other countries, especially if sensible sectors are explored (mining, logging for instance). - Explain what the measures are to reduce any reputation risks.</p>	<p>Addressed with additional detail under B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation, Private Sector Stakeholders – from page 35</p>
<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>We take note that lessons are taken from the recent study from Rainforest Foundation UK. We recommend to the Agency to pay a particular attention on how the local communities and especially indigenous people are involved and empowered in the project. The mentioned example of WCS in the Lossi-Odjala complex is a good start. We will control this point in the first annual Implementation report.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks. The UNEP Task Manager overseeing implementation of this project will give particular attention to this issue. Beyond WCS- UNEP experience in Lossi-Odjala, other proven experiences in the region and elsewhere in the world and international reference processes like Equator principles, IPIECA (Global oil and gas industry association for environmental and social issues) processes, ICMM (International Council on Mining and Metals) Stewardship will be explored and adapted as necessary to the project areas specific context,</p>
<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient</p>	<p>Please clarify if there are any reputation risks to work with some private companies. Clarify the mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Risk mitigation measures added within Table 10: Risk Assessment from page 32, also detail added to the Project Director / Stakeholder Engagement Officer ToR in Appendix 5</p>

<p>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the items 4 and 11, and see the item 10.</p> <p>For a FSP, in general, UNEP provides a full project document with the request for CEO endorsement. Except a mistake from our part, we did not find this document. Thanks to clarify the existing and available documents.</p>	<p>UNEP would like to thank the reviewers for the useful guidance provided to strengthen the CEO ER.</p> <p>We agree with the remark which highlights UNEP standard practice. However, on this particular case the institutional problem at national level has not allowed for this to be done on this particular PPG phase in time. To avoid further delay which may put the project at risk of cancellation, UNEP decided to go straight to develop the CEO endorsement which includes as much as possible all the necessary and relevant details and information normally required. Nevertheless, baseline data collection was conducted and the report (in French) will be an important guide during the implementation of this project. The Report is being submitted with the package to reinforce the point made in the above.</p>
--	--	---