



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9802</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Congo DR</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Promoting the effective management of Salonga National Park through creation of community forests and improving the well-being of local communities</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-2 Program 3; BD-4 Program 9;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$5,694,749</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$34,527,874</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$40,222,623</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Adamour Bouhari</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	5-11-17 Yes. Cleared	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	5-11-17 Yes. See list under item 6 of PIF Cleared	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	5-11-17 The status of markets and value chains need additional work. This is	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>central to the understanding of Component 2. While market transformation appears a good idea on paper, it may prove to be exceedingly difficult on the ground specially considering the geography of the target area.</p> <p>8-16-17 Cleared</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>5-11-17 The description of the baseline scenario and associated baseline projects (PIF item 2) does not allow the visualization of incrementally. A matrix of Baseline, Proposed investments and Incremental reasoning should facilitate understanding this issue.</p> <p>8-16-17 Cleared</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>5-11-17 General</p> <p>1. The project is requesting significant financial resources from the BD STAR allocation of DRC (\$6.2 million). Nevertheless, most of the proposed activities are focusing on SLM in the Monkoto Corridor rendering very few direct biodiversity GEBs. While understanding that the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>stability of the Park partly depends on the stability of the communities living in the corridor, it is of concern that no funding is going to support the protection of biodiversity in Salonga National Park itself. Unless Salonga NP is fully funded, through other projects and programs (i.e. PARCC and CAFEC), the use of BD resources with very little return on investment is not justifiable. This issue is an outstanding when the UNESCO has declared all WHS in DRC (including Salonga) in peril.</p> <p>2. If ICCN and WWF signed a co-management agreement for Salonga National Park, why is that neither of these two institutions appear as executing agencies? This is of concern, especially considering the situation of ICCN (and Okapi Fund) described in the PIF. Please consult with Government (including ICCN) and elaborate on the subject.</p> <p>3. The project proposes no firm interventions to address two of the threats identified by WWF and mentioned in Component 1: hunting and fishing, and poaching for ivory. Fish farming appears to be out of place and out of time in an area rich in rivers with the potential of sourcing</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>fish for the local population and markets. Isn't sustainable fishing in rivers a more cost-efficient measure than fish-farming? What is the cost of fish meal and who is going to bear that cost? Understanding a project cannot and should not try to do everything, why is Poaching for ivory, not included as an action point?</p> <p>4. The GEFSEC assumes that the co-financiers listed on table C have been consulted and that they have agreed (at least in principle) in providing the co-financing. Please confirm.</p> <p>5. On Co-financing: If the \$8.4 million committed by KfW, and the \$32 million committed by donors for the next 5 years are for activities within Salonga National Park, but not to co-execute the proposed activities by this project, these investments should not be included as co-financing. The funding from PARCC and CAFEC appears to be a genuine co-financing. Please confirm.</p> <p>Component 1</p> <p>1. None of the outputs refer to the main outcome: the formalization</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>of tenure of 225,000 ha. Please explain why there is no reference to the legal land tenure issues that need to be resolved for the communities to acquire formal tenure.</p> <p>2. What authority would the community committees have to enforce agreements in Natural Resource Management? The idea sounds good on paper but is this a realistic (as in operational and easy to implement) proposition?</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>1. Please provide a map of the target areas (225,000 ha) within the Monkoto Corridor.</p> <p>2. Output 2.1.1 appears unnecessary considering the level of knowledge of the region.</p> <p>3. If the project aims at investing \$2.3 M on "sustainable livelihood activities", the baseline investments and co-financing <b>MUST</b> be significant with a strong institutional support on the ground. As previous investments are significant, please prepare a table with the previous/ongoing investments and those suggested by this project. The</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>side-by-side comparison should allow the reader to visualize at a glance how the GEF project complements previous investments.</p> <p>4. Please elaborate on who is going to provide the \$14 M in co-financing and for what activities.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>1. Could the proposed activities under component 3 be linked with those of component 2? The capacity of the partner executing agency, CSO and CBOs should be linked to deliverable on the ground. There is no reason to separate institutional capacity building activities when the project is proposing a set of explicit and measurable interventions on the ground. Merging the two does not exclude an output for investments in the corresponding institutions.</p> <p>8-16-17 Cleared</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>5-11-17 Yes. But see comment under window 5 (Component 3)</p> <p>8-16-17 Cleared</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	4-1-17 Yes Cleared	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	5-11-17 No. Please address issues under items 3,4 and 5.  8-16-17 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	May 11, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 16, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		



<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

---

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.