



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5537		
Country/Region:	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 ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
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 Approval/Expected:	March 21, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	08/22: Yes.	Addressed.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08/22: Yes, in a letter dated August 7, 2013.	Addressed.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/22: BD and LD resources remaining to be allocated are \$3,910,000. Congo is a flexible country. Cleared.	Addressed.
	• the focal area allocation?	08/22:see above	Addressed.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	08/22: N/A	NA

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	08/22: N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	08/22: N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	08/22: N/A	NA
<p>Strategic Alignment</p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <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>08/22: Yes, the project is well aligned with BD1 and BD2 objectives. The project has explicitly articulated which Aichi targets the project will help achieve. Table B lists a number of products expected but please identified SMART indicators for each expected outcomes (e.g. METT, species status, % of revenue increase...).</p> <p>10/02: Table B, Column "Expected Outcomes", further detailed have been provided under the title "indicators". This information, describing some of the expected outputs is useful, however cannot replace the definition of SMART indicators. For example, the indicators could be formulated as followed: Component 1 (i) the PA network will be expanded by % (from % to % of total national superficy); (ii) the MEET of existing PA will increase from x to y; (iii) population of x will remains stable / increase by %. Component 2: (i) the rate of poaching incident has decreased by % from the baseline, (ii) the number of ranger patrols has increase by x% from the baseline, (iii) the number of arrest and conviction have increased by % from the baseline, (iii) the fragmentation of natural habitat around PA has decrease by % from the baseline due to sustainable activities.</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.</p> <p>Please, revise the formulation and remove the mention of 4,446,800 ha.</p> <p>June 20, 2016 Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		11/06: addressed. Indicators have been developed for each components. It is noted that, for some indicators, baseline and targets will be defined at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	08/22: Yes, the project is in line with country's national strategies and plans, including NBSAP, National Environment Action Plan, and Strategic Document for Growth, Employment and Poverty Reduction. Cleared.	Addressed.
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>08/22: The baseline gives a good overview of pressures and on-going related initiatives. Please provide more details regarding the level of investments of these initiatives, including the regional UNEP-IUCN initiative. Please provide further details of scale or magnitude regarding pressures that the project will address (illegal exploitation of wood, mining, poaching, overfishing, artisanal timber...). For example, how much habitat is lost due to illegal exploitation of wood, how much of land is degraded due to subsistence agriculture, how many species is threaten by poaching?</p> <p>10/02: Addressed at PIF stage. It is noted that Component 3, through the development of the biodiversity observatory will improve the knowledge of the biodiversity status and its threats/pressures. However, at CEO endorsement, the project will have to further develop the baseline, based on PPG outputs.</p>	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>08/22: The project design is clear and focused on few FA outcomes. However, please develop SMART indicators for each outcomes and be more explicit with the expected outputs (see comment Item4). METT for each of the PA will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. P9, it is mentioned that the local communities and private sector interest will be assess during the PPG. PPG helps to confirm assumption, further define implementation arrangement; consultation with local communities and partners has to be taken at the PIF stage. Please clarify and confirm the interest of partners listed under Table C and local communities for this project. Under section A.1.4 and A.1.5, the list of expected outputs is not sufficient to appreciate the project 's logic and approach. Please further detail the content of each component. Component 1: does the project will equip and staff the new PA? Is there any capacity building plan for PA agents and local communities? Component 2: describe further the approach developed/ replicated by the project and make reference of concrete success from the pilot site (Lossi). Explain why this approach is sustainable. USLAB: please further explain the partnership with the private sector. What is the added-value of the project in this on-going partnership? CCC and CGCC: please describe these entities, their role, their governance. Why the project will support them?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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>June 20, 2016</p> <p>We are taking the point of the precautions and the risk mitigation measures. However, some of the companies mentioned could have been involved in potentially controversial projects. The reputation of these companies may also evolve. We thank the agency to keep the GEFSEC posted on any change on these partnerships. We are recommending a very cautious approach, notably with the oil and gas companies.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Table B: What is the difference between output 2.1.4 and 2.1.6? In the text, p9 reference is made of local development fund, please explain what is this fund, why and how the project will support it.</p> <p>Component 3: the list of outputs is not sufficient to understand the purpose of this component, please further detail the expected activities.</p> <p>P14: SFM is mentioned as a source of financing solicited for the project p19 but not in the OFP letter neither in Table A, B, or D; please clarify.</p> <p>10/02: It is noted that the project will support (i) gazettelement of new PA, development of their strategic plans, and implementation of key first activities on the ground. Support will also be provided to local communities in their conservation effort. The partnership with local community, based on the successful example of Lossi Forest is promising. At CEO endorsement, further detail about the approach and how it will be adapted to the Conkouati-Dimonika Tchimpounga PA complex will be provided.</p> <p>USLAB: the comment has not been addressed. Please provide further detail on the added-value of the project with regard to the numerous activities already on-going.</p> <p>11/06: Further details have been provided related to USLAB activities. At CEO endorsement, information regarding the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		sustainability of these activities (post-project), linkage with regional initiatives, and complementarity with initiatives supported by other donors will have to be provided. Cleared.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	08/22: The key Global Environmental Benefits is the extension of PA network over 93,300ha and the sustainable management of the surrounding PAs in line with approved land use plan; second is the increase of connectivity and reduce pressure through the development of protected corridors. Cleared.	Addressed.
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		Addressed.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	08/22: A range of organizations is listed in Table A2. However, local communities, CSO will play a key role in component 1 and 2, please provide further information on how they will be involved, how their capacity will be strengthened. 10/02: This is sufficient at PIF stage but at CEO endorsement, further details are expected of how these groups will be engaged.	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. Addressed.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient	08/22: Yes, initial information on potential risks is provided. Further detail, including mitigation measures, is expected at CEO endorsement. Cleared.	Risks are identified and mitigation measures are proposed. Please clarify if there are any reputation

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		risks to work with some private companies. Clarify the mitigation measures. June 20, 2016 Addressed.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/22: Yes, the project is consistent with other related initiatives in the country and the region. The project will facilitate the creation of periodic review of the GEF national portfolio. Cleared.	Yes. The project fits with the COMIFAC Convergence Plan and the Mayombe Transfrontier Initiative.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	08/22: The project will support the development of a landscape approach by creating a complex which will include PA, ecological corridors, and productive landscape. The model could be replicated at the national and regional level. To secure the sustainability of this model, the project will help the government developing the enabling institutional environment.	Addressed.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Addressed.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	08/22: The level of information is not sufficient to evaluate the project financing. Please address comment in Item 7. 10/02: The GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B is appropriate. Cleared.	Cleared.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	08/22: The co-financing ratio is about 1: 5,1; which is fine. The Agency is bringing \$1,215M in cash. P.12, WB and IFAD are mentioned as co-financier but they are not listed in Table C, please clarify. 10/02: Cleared at PIF stage.	Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/22: The project management is about 4.9%; which is fine. Cleared.	Cleared
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	08/22: Yes, PPG is requested. The amount requested is under the norm. Cleared.	Addressed.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	08/22: N/A	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		TT are available.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		The Agency has responded to STAP Comments.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		The Agency has responded to comments from Germany, USA, and Japan.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	08/22: The project cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised in above items. 10/02: The project cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the remaining issues raised in above items. 11/06: The project is technical cleared and recommended for inclusion into future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the items 4 and 11, and see the item 10. 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. June 20, 2016.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
	First review*	August 22, 2013	May 24, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 02, 2013	June 20, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 06, 2013	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**