



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

GEF ID:	4640		
Country/Region:	Congo DR		
Project Title:	Democratic Republic of Congo Conservation Trust Fund		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	127437 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$11,636,363
Co-financing:	\$49,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$61,136,363
PIF Approval:	October 11, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	01/24/2012: Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	01/24/2012: Yes, but please translate the letter in english. 08/31/2012: Addressed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	01/24/2012: Yes, the WB has an experience with the preparation of the CTF and is implementing the following GEF projects: #2100 "Support to ICCN's program for the rehabilitation of the National Park Network" and the #3772 "CBSP, Forest and nature Conservation Project".	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	01/24/2012: No	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	01/24/2012: Yes, the WB Country Assistance Strategy recognizes the importance of helping DRC to improve	

		The WB staff in-country includes notably a sector leader for sustainable development, an environmental specialist, a senior social development specialist. Capacity for providing support on financial management, procurement and administrative services is also available.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	01/24/2012: Yes	
	• the focal area allocation?	01/24/2012: Yes	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	01/24/2012: Yes, the project proposal is well aligned with the Biodiversity result framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	01/24/2012: Yes, the project will focus on the objective 1 of the Biodiversity Focal Area, in improving the sustainability of the protected area system. Please, give more detailed information on the expected outputs. 08/31/2012: Addressed. The expected outputs are well described. More information on the indicators will be provided at CEO endorsement stage.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	01/24/2012: Yes, firstly the project is in line with the National Strategy for	

	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	project is a logical follow-up of the GEF projects #2100 and #3772.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>01/24/2012: We understand that the project will capitalize on the capacity building developed by the on-going GEF project #2100. The project should also built on the capacity building undertaken by the GEF project #3772, so please mention this project too. The project will strengthen the financial, administrative capacities of the ICCN. Please, provide more information on the capacity building of the other actors concerned by the CTF establishment.</p> <p>08/31/2012: Addressed. the project will build from the two on-going GEF projects and activities will be developed to build the capacity of ICCN's staff and CTF's board members.</p>	
Project Design	11. 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>01/24/2012: The baseline provides useful information on the current funding supporting the ICCN and on the direct fundings to some national parks. The partners involved in the biodiversity conservation in the country are mentionned. Please, provide also information on the current status the PA system rehabilitation. As three GEF projects on Protected Areas are on-going in this region, and that ICCN and MECNT have already conducted some studies, please, provide more detailed information on what has been done so far and the remaining gaps to set-up a CTF.</p> <p>08/31/2012: Addressed.</p>	

	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>01/24/2012: In the table 1 (p8), the GEF funding amount is different from the amount suggested in the project framework, please clarify. We understand that part of the GEF funding will be allocated to the CTF. Thus, this funding will act as a leverage for other fundings and by this way, will ensure a sustainable financing mechanism for PA system, which is fine. However, please provide the rational to allocate about 80% of the GEF funding to the CTF. It could be relevant to allocate the GEF fund to field activities too...Futhermore, in order to optimize the leverage, it is recommended to allocate the GEF funding both in the sinking and in the endowment funds.</p> <p>08/31/2012: Addressed. We note that the allocation of the financial partners between sinking and endowment component will be submitted at the CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>01/24/2012: - Please, revise the project framework breakdown in order to split the activities between the two following components: one component dedicated to the improvement of the PA management effectiveness and a second component dedicated to the establishment and the management of the Conservation Trust Fund.</p>	

reformulate them. This column has to inform on the target for reducing, for example, the protected area management funding gap. In this column, please also develop indicators notably on the biodiversity status in PAs where the project is involved, the capacity built...More detailed information should be given on the expected outputs.

- Please provide the detail and the rational to develop a Park Funds with 2 components (sinking and endowment components)
- Please provide the justification and the rational to allocate the GEF fund only under the sinking fund.
- p 9 of the PIF states that the endowment fund component will be designed to meet the goals of other donors. Please provide clarification.
- For the sinking fund, please, provide a detail plan on how it will used over the 10 years period and how it will differ from the endowment fund
- The budget component to support the establishment and operation of the CTF is high, please reduce it and give more details on its activities as it is expected that the management cost is covered by the interest from the sinking and endowment funds. Please, provide clarification on the business plan and the overall co-financing ratio by other donors.
- Please clarify if the choice to dedicate the annual income of the CTF to three PAs management has been the result of the study undertaken by the government. Have other options been

the choice of only three PAs. Which entity will be in charge of the choice of these 3 PA?

- The board structure. The diversity of representativeness in the board establishment is welcomed, however, please, provide clarity about the rationale for the board composition (ratio of private sector to CSO, ect...)
- With regards to the funded activities by the CTF, we encourage the consideration of having some competition by opening the fund/projects to NGOs and other institutions, based on good practices.
- Please, provide some information on the investment options for the endowment. There should be clear rules on the type of investment that the endowment fund will make (as social responsible investment...).
- In the expected outputs of the table A, there is a mention of new protected areas, which is not further detailed in the rest of the PIF, please clarify.
- The potential request of \$300,000 for a PPG is very high, and will require robust justification.
- Please, explain the rationale to build on the Columbia CTF experience. Exchange of experience could also be sought amongst African CTFs.

08/31/2012: Addressed.

We note that:

- detailed indicators (METT, bio-indicators) will be provided at CEO endorsement stage.
- the rationale to develop a CTF with 2 components (sinking and endowment

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the allocation of financial partner between sinking and endowment component will be submitted at CEO endorsement stage. - the sinking fund (US\$3.8 million) will finance the first three years of support to targeted national parks. - Under component 1, beside establishing the CTF, the project will notably provide capacity building to relevant audience, develop communication and fund-raising strategies. - the PPG has been pull out. - the investment strategy for the CTF will include social responsibility principles. Further information will be provided at CEO endorsement stage. 	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	01/24/2012: Yes.	
	16. 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?	01/24/2012: The project will allow the preservation of the ecosystem services, and, by this way will ensure the sustainable development of the country. The project will build on the on-going GEF projects, which aim to reinforce the ICCN's capacity to deal with social and economic development as well as gender mainstraining.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	01/24/2012: The project suggests to include representatives of CSO and Indigenous peoples into the CTF Board, which is well welcomed. The potential needs of capacity building for board members should be considered in the project. 08/31/2012: Addressed. Activities to	

		been included.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	01/24/2012: The potential risks are clearly identified (poor investment strategy, inadequate governance, political instability, poor ownership from communities, lack of capacities, climate change). However, the global financial trend and its impact on donor funding should be identified and risk mitigation strategy proposed. 08/31/2012: Addressed.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	01/24/2012: Information is given. But please, provide more detailed on the bilateral donors and NGOs activities (notably WWF). Please, see how to build close partnership with the on-going GEF project #2906 "CBSP-Sustainable Financing of Protected Areas System in the Congo Basin"; this project implements activities at the PA level on business plans and financial mechanisms development. 08/31/2012: Addressed.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	01/24/2012: Some information are provided on the role of the ICCN, the structure of the CTF board, the WB in-country expertise; but please provide more details on the project implementation and arrangement amongst partners. 08/31/2012: Addressed.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	01/24/2012: Yes, the GEF project management cost is about \$550,000, so 4.8% of the GEF total funding. 08/31/2012: The GEF project management cost has been withdrawn, which is welcomed.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	01/24/2012: The suggested breakdown of funding per component has to be reviewed according to the comment made on items 13 and 14. 08/31/2012: Addressed.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	01/24/2012: the current co-financing is about 1:8, which is a very good signal at the PIF stage. Please, provide more information on the initial consultations made between the WB and the cofinanciers. 08/31/2012: The cofinancing has been reduced. However, the cofinancing ratio is still strong: 1:4.2.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	01/24/2012: The WB through the Forest Investment Program will provide \$15,000,000 of co-financing. 08/31/2012: The WB cofinancing has been withdrawn. WB will not provide direct cofinancing to this project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators		

Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? • Convention Secretariat? • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>01/24/2012: The project document can not be recommended yet. Please, address the issues above.</p> <p>08/31/2012: The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the CEO endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present a robust risk analysis and a realistic prospects for attracting a level of capital adequate for the fund - Clear and measurable goals and objectives are defined - Co-financing is confirmed - Implementation arrangements and potential partnerships with other initiatives are well set-up - GEF Tracking tools are included (METT+ Financial Sustainability Scorecard) - Strong evidence of global benefits of the concerned PA/PA system is presented - The operating/administrative cost are less than 25% of the trust's income - A mechanism for continuing to involve a broad set of stakeholders is presented 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		

	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 24, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 31, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* 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.