



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 5368 | | |
| Country/Region: | Guinea-Bissau | | |
| Project Title: | Strengthening the Financial and Operational Framework of the National PA System in Guinea-Bissau | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNDP | GEF Agency Project ID: | 5177 (UNDP) |
| 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: | \$70,000 | Project Grant: | \$2,304,429 |
| Co-financing: | \$16,685,248 | Total Project Cost: | \$19,129,677 |
| PIF Approval: | April 23, 2013 | Council Approval/Expected: | June 20, 2013 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Charlotte Gobin | Agency Contact Person: | Yves de Soye |

| 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 ? | 04/05/2013: The country is eligible. | 03/13/2015: Cleared. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | 04/05/2013: Yes, the OFP has endorsed the Biodiversity project in a letter dated April 4, 2013. | 03/13/2015: Cleared. |
| Resource Availability | 3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | 04/05/2013: Yes, the proposed grant is within the resources available from the GEF TF. A total amount of US\$ 2,600,000 is requested, inclusive PPG and agency fees. | 03/13/2015: Cleared. |
| | • the focal area allocation? | 04/05/2013: Yes, the STAR flexibility mechanism is applied for developing a | 03/13/2015: Cleared. |

*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) |
|---------------------|---|---|--|
| | | Biodiversity project. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | N/A | N/A |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | N/A | N/A |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | N/A | N/A |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? | N/A | N/A |
| Strategic Alignment | <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>04/05/2013: Yes, the project proposal is well aligned with the BD strategy, focusing on Objective 1: Improve sustainability of PA systems. There is no mention of the Aichi targets that the project will help to achieve, therefore please add this information. Please, list the indicators which will be used to track progress, beside the METT and the Financial Sustainability Scorecard.</p> <p>04/12/2013: The Aichi targets are mentioned. It is noted that SMART indicators will be included at CEO endorsement, including METT and the Financial Sustainability Scorecard. Cleared.</p> | <p>03/13/2015: The Aichi targets are mentioned. SMART indicators have been included, including METT and the Financial Sustainability Scorecard. Cleared</p> |
| | <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>04/05/2013: Yes, the project is consistent with the national strategy for PA and biodiversity conservation (NSPAB), with the national forestry policy, and the national adaptation plan for action (NAPA).</p> | <p>03/13/2015: The project is in line with the national strategies for biodiversity conservation and it will help the country to achieve the Aichi Targets. Cleared.</p> |
| | <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>04/05/2013: The baseline project provides relevant preliminary information. As support to CTF development is on-going (including the GEF/WB project), please provide a comprehensive picture of what has been</p> | <p>03/13/2015: The baseline developed in the project document is robust. It includes a comprehensive analysis of the funding challenges and opportunities, and a good overview of the current investments and partners roles. Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| Project Design | | <p>done so far and the remaining gaps to fully operationalise the CTF (beside the funding issue). The baseline resources provides enough information at this stage of the review.</p> <p>At the CEO endorsement stage, more detailed information is expected on (i) the conservation status of the global important species, (ii) the key drivers of biodiversity loss at the PA system level, (iii) the first outcomes of the past and on-going projects related to PA management. METT and financial scorecard will have to be also provided.</p> <p>04/12/2013: The information regarding the on-going projects related to the FBG have been provided. We note that socioeconomic indicators will be provided by CEO endorsement.</p> | |
| | 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | <p>04/05/2013: The components and outcomes of Table B are clear. Regarding the comments made on the following items, please update the outputs accordingly. Quantifiable outputs will have to be formulated by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>04/12/2013: Outcome 1.1 related to forest PA has been removed. Table B has been updated. Cleared.</p> | 03/13/2015: The components and outcomes of Table B are clear, SMART indicators and baseline are provided. Cleared. |
| | 8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | 04/05/2013: The global environmental benefits are well identified. The methodology focusing on increasing the PA representativeness, management effectiveness, and long term financing is relevant in the Guinea-Bissau context. | 03/13/2015: The global environmental benefits are well identified. The methodology focusing on increasing the PA representativeness, management effectiveness, and long term financing is relevant to the Guinea-Bissau context. Cleared. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>We understand that part of the GEF funding (US\$ 1,3 million) will be allocated to the CTF. Thus, this funding will act as a leverage for other funding and by this way, will ensure a sustainable financing mechanism for PA system; which is fine. However, please inform if the CTF includes sinking and endowment components. If so, how much of the initial capitalization (from GEF and other co-financiers) will be placed in the sinking component. If the sinking component is confirmed, please, provide a detail plan on how it will be used over the 5 years period. The investment guideline should have clear rules on the type of investment that the endowment fund will make (as social responsible investment...).</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, a timeframe showing the tentative capitalization stages and the re-investment of initial returns will have to be presented.</p> <p>The use of the revenue generated should be driven by the Guinea Bissau National PA strategy and assessed by the CTF board, therefore please clarify what is the rationale to dedicate part of the annual income of the CTF to some of the terrestrial PAs management.</p> <p>04/12/2013: Clarification has been provided. FBG will set-up an endowment fund. GEF will contribute to the Endowment capital for US\$ 1.3 million. The cofinanciers will bring a total of US\$ 7.3 million to the Endowment. All the</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>activities under component 1 will be dedicated to the set-up of FBG and the capitalization of the endowment. Component 2 will support the activities related to Canthanhez NP. Cleared.</p> | |
| | <p>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?</p> | | <p>04/05/2013: The activities related to capacity building, to strengthen the collaboration between government entities will support the durability of the project. A detailed plan of the capacity building will be provided at CEO endorsement. The socio-economic benefits information is poor. Please, provide more information on the activities related to the development of biodiversity-friendly economic activities (2.3.iii). An emphasize on the mechanism/ incentive which will be put in place ensuring the sustainability of these activities is expected.</p> <p>04/12/2013: Further information has been provided. However, more detail are expected at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>03/13/2015: Project component 2 will dedicate a significant part of its implementation to empower local communities around PAs. It is also noted that the project will build on the successful experience of FIAL; which promotes high level of local communities participation in determining the development needs. Finally, the baseline and project targets regarding cash and in-kind benefit return</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | | | to local communities as a result of biodiversity friendly eco-activities will have to be reported in the first year report. Cleared. |
| | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained? | <p>04/05/2013: The partnership with local NGOs is well appreciated. However, the involvement of the local communities has to be further developed in component 2.</p> <p>04/12/2013: Further information has been provided. However, more detail are expected at CEO endorsement.</p> | 03/13/2015: During PPG phase a stakeholder analysis has been realized. It is confirmed that the project will strengthen the ability of local communities and CSOs within and around the PAs to establish and participate in collaborative agreements with government agencies. Specific training programs will be implemented to improve existing conflict resolution mechanism and participation of local communities in PA management. 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) | <p>04/05/2013: Please clarify the mitigation measure regarding the flow of funds. The global financial trend and its impact on donor funding should be identified and risk mitigation strategy proposed. Same for the climate change risk.</p> <p>04/12/2013: Updated. Cleared.</p> | 03/13/2015: Yes. Cleared. |
| | 12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 04/05/2013: Yes, the project is consistent with the other related initiatives. More detail about the coordination and management arrangement are expected at the CEO endorsement. | 03/13/2015: The International funding and implementation partners are instrumental in the operationalization of the Foundation and the capitalization of the endowment fund. It is noted that the key partners will be part of the project SC. We strongly encourage to allocate their required funding to ensure the establishment and the effectiveness of the FBG's Donor Contact Group. Cleared. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|---|--|--|
| | <p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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. | <p>04/05/2013: The project will build on the result from previous GEF projects and other donors supports by strengthening the institutional framework and by engineering the initial capitalisation of the national Conservation Trust Fund. This will ensure a long term sustainability to the PA national system. The GEF support, over three GEF phases, to sustain the PA system of Guinea-Bissau will represent a model for the rest of the region. The outcome of this long standing partnership, based on internationally collaborative efforts, demonstrates the relevance of the GEF intervention strategy.</p> | <p>03/13/2015: The full operationalization of the Foundation will be a significant milestone for biodiversity conservation and PA management in Guinea Bissau, while representing a model for the rest of the sub-region of what long-term and internationally collaborative efforts can achieve. Cleared.</p> |
| | <p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p> | | <p>03/13/2015: yes, the project structure and design is close to what was presented at PIF stage. 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>03/13/2015: Yes, the cost-effectiveness of the project has been sufficiently demonstrated. Building on previous GEF projects and partnership with other key donors players give good signals on the ability of the project to achieve the targeted goal. Cleared.</p> |
| Project Financing | <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>04/05/2013: yes.</p> | <p>03/13/2015: Yes, 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?</p> | <p>04/05/2013: UNDP will provide US\$370,000 in grant. The co-financing ratio is about 1:5; which is fine. Please confirm that the fund coming from GEF implementation agencies are "new" grants, and not coming from on-going</p> | <p>03/13/2015: The co-financing ratio has increased from PIF stage. The co-financing ratio is now 1:7.2. Most of the co-financing are in cash. Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| | <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed? | GEF projects fundings. Please confirm that the co-financiers have agreed on the proposal proposal. 04/12/2013: UNDP confirmed that discussions were held with all the listed co-financiers and they agreed with the financial proposal. It is well noted that these co-financing will be confirmed at the CEO endorsement stage. | |
| | 18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate? | 04/05/2013: Yes, the level of the PMC is 5%; which is appropriate. | 03/13/2015: Yes, the level of PMC is 5%, which is appropriate. 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? | 04/05/2013: A PPG is requested for an amount of US\$70,000. Cleared. | 03/13/2015: Cleared. |
| | 20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | N/A | N/A |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | 03/13/2015: Yes, the TT have been included. Cleared. |
| | 22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | 03/13/2015: Yes. Cleared. |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |

| 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"> • Convention Secretariat? • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | <p>04/05/2013: The PIF cannot not be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised under the above items.</p> <p>04/05/2013: The project proposal is technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p> | |
| | 25. 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 (SMART +METT+ Financial Sustainability Scorecard) - Strong evidence of global benefits of the concerned PA/PA system is presented - A mechanism for continuing to involve a broad set of stakeholders is presented | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | 03/13/2015: The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO endorsement. It is noted that the baseline and project targets regarding cash and in-kind benefit return to local communities as a result of biodiversity friendly eco-activities will be reported in |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | the first year report. As mentioned above, it is expected that the project will support the establishment and the effectiveness of the FBG's Donor Contact Group. |
| | First review* | April 05, 2013 | March 13, 2015 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | April 12, 2013 | |
| Review Date (s) | 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.**