



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

GEF ID:	5806		
Country/Region:	Congo		
Project Title:	Creation of Loungo Bay Marine Protected Area to Support Turtles Conservation in Congo		
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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$54,795	Project Grant:	\$712,329
Co-financing:	\$2,635,000	Total Project Cost:	\$3,456,919
PIF Approval:	June 16, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	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 ?	04/29: Yes	5-6-16 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	04/29: Yes, the operation focal has endorsed the project in a letter dated of April 11, 2014. Cleared	5-6-16 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	04/29: Yes.	5-6-16 Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	04/29: Yes, the project will use the flexibility option to use the remaining STAR allocation from LD and BD focal areas to develop a BD project. Cleared.	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 LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	04/29: N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	04/29: N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	04/29: N/A	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	04/29: N/A	NA
Strategic Alignment	<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>04/29: The project is in line with the Biodiversity strategy and framework. Please make clear reference to CBD Aichi Targets that the project will help to achieve and include SMART indicators for each of the components, under the column "expected outcomes".</p> <p>05/16: There is clear reference to CBD Aichi targets that the project will help to achieve. Cleared.</p>	5-6-16 Cleared
	<p>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?</p>	<p>04/29: The project is consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and laws, related to the implementation of the CBD, CMS, and CITES action plans. Cleared.</p>	5-6-16 Cleared
	<p>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>	<p>04/29: The baseline provides a good overview of the current situation. However, please provide further information on the status of the marine turtles population targeted by the project, based on existing global and national data (including on Renatura research activities). Please further stress the importance of Loungo Bay for the conservation of the global population of turtles. A brief presentation of the PA national</p>	<p>5-6-16</p> <p>At PIF stage the GEF requested: "At CEO endorsement, please provide a comprehensive overview of the financing coming from the government and international NGOs on Turtles conservation and related field. Cleared at PIF stage".</p> <p>The information provided under A.4 (Baseline project...) is the description of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>network will help to identify how the future MPA will fit into this network and what kind of support can be expected (e.g. financing, rangers training). Finally, an insight of the current financing provided by the government for marine turtles' conservation and PA management would be useful, as well as an insight of the amount of funding provided by NGOs and biltateral for related activities.</p> <p>05/16: Information related to the status of the PA network and Turtles population are sufficient at PIF stage. At CEO endorsement, please provide a comprehensive overview of the financing coming from the government and international NGOs on Turtles conservation and related field. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	<p>the natural history of the Congo and target site (Loango) rather than the list of investments that will take place on site whether or not the GEF project is approved (the definition of "Baseline Project"). Is the list of contributions in co-financing the future investments or are there funds of co-financing that would assist in delivering the proposed outcomes of the project?</p> <p>9-16-16 Addressed in the revised MSP and Response Matrix. Cleared</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>04/29: Yes, outcomes and outputs of the project framework are clear and appropriate however, further clarification and work need to be done.</p> <p>(i) regarding the small funding amount allocated to the project it is recommended to reduce the number of components to focus on one or two objectives only. A merging of component 2 and 3 for a clear focus on conservation activities and alternative livelihood development may be relevant.</p> <p>(ii) Table B / Indicators and expected products: for each component, please provide at least one SMART indicator (e.g. the Hawksbill population has increased by % at the end of the project).</p>	<p>9-23-16</p> <p>Some of the proposed activities for Component 2 ("Creation of a Marine Turtles Observatory") are not really necessary. Not clear why there is a need for: i) A "Web-based Marine Turtles Data Base" (CMTD)", ii) a "Network of observation sites", and iii) conducting "Training on sea turtle data collection and monitoring" when there are already too very competent institutions collecting and publishing the information. In short, there is probably very little added value in creating an Observatory. The GEF suggests keeping the budget for this component as is, and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>For the expected outputs, rather than presenting the process, indicate the expected products (e.g output 1.4 : gazettelement of the MPA).</p> <p>(iii) Component 1: Indicate the tentative size of the future MPA. Output 1.5: be very explicit on the expected product. Financing is a key pillar of MPA sustainability, GEF is supportive of initiative promoting sustainable financing therefore please detail further what are the expected activities and initial assumption.</p> <p>(iv) Component 2: Please explain how the observatory will work with the MPA and how the structure will be funded after the end of the GEF project. Output 2.7: please confirm that the research activities will involve national research institut, please name them and specify their roles. Please bear in mind that GEF doesn't not finance scientific activities per se; therefore please explain how these activities will directly contribute to the management of the area.</p> <p>(v) Component 3: This component is important for the success of the project, please further elaborate on the success of RENATURA in reducing impact of coastal inhabitant and local fishermen. Please explain how the GEF will scale-up this succesful pilot. Second, initial insight of the economic and social relevance to support suggested alternative activities will have to be provided at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>05/16: The conclusion of the national and</p>	<p>support those already doing the work under outputs 2.3 and 2.7.</p> <p>9-5-16 Properly addressed in the CEO Endorsement and Review Sheet. Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>local stakeholder's consultation is noted. Table B: SMART indicators measuring the impact at component level (e.g. the Hawksbill population has increased by % at the end of the project) are missing and will have to be developed for CEO Endorsement. Thanks for having listed indicative products in Table B; these products will have to be confirmed at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>More detail information has been provided regarding output 1.5. The involvement of skilled partners is appreciated. At CEO endorsement, the project will have to be explicit on the kind of mechanism that will be developed and the role of the project in this process. The information related to the observatory is not satisfactory. We have some concern regarding the value and sustainability of the creation of this new structure. At CEO endorsement, initial business plan, governance arrangement, and strategy will have to be provided. Finally, initial insight of the economic and social relevance to support suggested alternative activities will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>04/29: Yes, the project will target the conservation of 5 marine turtles species recognized to be endangered by both the CITES and CMS and are included in the IUCN red list. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	<p>5-6-16 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		5-6-16 Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	04/29: The project will based the core of its activities on the partnership with CSOs and local communities. Initial information on the kind of cooperation and level of their involvement in the MPA governance have been provided and will be further detailed at CEO endorsement. Cleared at PIF stage.	5-6-16 Component 3 addressing this point. The project must provide some insights into the Gender considerations. This cannot be postponed to year 1 of implementation (p. 17). Please indicate what areas of work the project expects to tackle this issue. Keep in mind that not all investments may be gender-related. Cleared
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	04/29: Please take into account the consequence of the climate change, including on coastal erosion, turtles migration. 05/16: Cleared at PIF stage.	5-6-16 Cleared
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	04/29: Yes, the project is consistent and has been developed based on the current initiatives. Further detail on how the project will built on regional network e.g. RASTOMA and regional initiative e.g PRCM will be provided at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared at PIF stage.	5-6-16 Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. • Assess whether the project is	04/29: The project will support the creation of the first MPA in Congo; which will not only expand the national PA network but will also encourage the country to increase the number of MPA	5-6-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	<p>inside its waters. The project will support the protection of a unique nesting and feeding areas of 5 marine turtles; by improving local and national awareness, by promoting economic activities which have limited impact on marine biodiversity. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>5-6-16 Output 1.4 changed from "Lounago Bay MPA PA created" at PIF stage, to "MPA regulatory framework drafted and follow the regular process for the PA creation" at CEO Endorsement. The language at CEO Endorsement, and the dedicated activities listed on p.23, suggest that the creation of the MPA is not going to be pursued anymore. There are a number of "soft targets" (expert reports and consultation meetings) rather than a step-by-step approach to the gazetting of the MPA. This is a significant deviation from Component 1 and the Title of the Project. The project should use the GEF resources to take the necessary steps to make this happen. Not clear why the project is investing in the development of the Management Plan of a MPA that may not be created. And if created later, the Management Plan will be outdated. The GEF requests restructuring the Component with the necessary investments to create the MPA. Understanding that this may not happen within time and budget of the project,</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>clear and directional steps need to be taken. Or is the creation of the MPA no longer possible?</p> <p>9-16-16 Addressed in the revised MSP and Response Matrix. Cleared</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>5-6-16 Cleared</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>04/29: As mentioned above, with regards to the small funding allocated to this project; it is recommended to focus on one or two objectives only. Merging component 2 and 3 to better link conservation and sustainable livelihood could be a interesting option.</p> <p>05/16: Cleared.</p>	<p>5-6-16 Only assuming the co-financing (both in cash and in-kind) become effective during project implementation. Cleared</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>04/29: The current co-financing ratio is 1:3.5. Co-financing from the private sector are welcome, please provide the name of these potential cofinanciers. Thanks to also indicate the amount of co-financing provided by the Agency. The co-financing ratio is low, at CEO endorsement stage, a higher level of cofinancing will be expected.</p> <p>05/16: Cleared.</p>	<p>5-6-16 In the Letters of Co-financing, UNESCO is providing \$20,000 and WCS \$10,000. In Table C. the figures are mixed-up.</p> <p>9-16-16 Addressed in the revised MSP and Response Matrix. Cleared</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>04/29: The PMC is 10% of the GEF grants; which is acceptable. Cleared.</p>	<p>5-6-16 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	04/29: Yes, a PPG is requested and the amount is slightly above the norm but justification has been provided. Cleared.	5-6-16 Cleared
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	04/29: N/A	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		5-6-16 Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		5-6-16 Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	04/29: The project cannot be approved at this stage; please address the comments made in the above items. 05/16: The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- initial insight of the economic and social relevance to support suggested	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		alternative activities - initial business plan, governance arrangements, and strategy for the Turtle Observatory will have to be provided - increase the level of cofinancing - provide the Tracking Tools	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		5-6-16 No. Please address issues under items 6,10,14 and 17. 9-23-16 Please address comments under item 7. 9-5-16 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	April 29, 2014	May 09, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 16, 2014	September 23, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		October 05, 2016

* 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.