



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

GEF ID:	<b>5368</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Guinea-Bissau</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening the Financial and Operational Framework of the National PA System in Guinea-Bissau</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5177 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$70,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,304,429</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$11,610,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$13,984,429</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Charlotte Gobin</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Yves de Soye,</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	04/05/2013: The country is eligible.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	04/05/2013: Yes, the OFP has endorsed the Biodiversity project in a letter dated April 4, 2013.	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> 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.	
	• the focal area allocation?	04/05/2013: Yes, the STAR flexibility mechanism is applied for developing a Biodiversity project.	

	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> 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>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, 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 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>	

Project Design		<p>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>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<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>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>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.</p> <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</p>	

		<p>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 rational 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 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 <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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.</p> <p>The socio-economic benefits</p>

			<p>more information on the activities related to the development of biodiversity-friendly economic activities (2.3.iii). An emphasis 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>
	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>	
	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>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> 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.	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability and the</li> </ul>	<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,</p>	

	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	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.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	04/05/2013: yes.	
	<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><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</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 GEF projects fundings. Please confirm that the co-financiers have agreed on the proposal proposal.</p> <p>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.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project</b>	04/05/2013: Yes, the level of the PMC is	

	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.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
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. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	04/05/2013: The PIF cannot not be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised under the above items.  04/05/2013: The project proposal is technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please, ensure that the following issues are addressed at the CEO endorsement:	

		<p>realistic prospects for attracting a level of capital adequate for the fund</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear and measurable goals and objectives are defined</li> <li>- Co-financing is confirmed</li> <li>- Implementation arrangements and potential partnerships with other initiatives are well set-up</li> <li>- GEF Tracking tools are included (SMART +METT+ Financial Sustainability Scorecard)</li> <li>- Strong evidence of global benefits of the concerned PA/PA system is presented</li> <li>- A mechanism for continuing to involve a broad set of stakeholders is presented</li> </ul>	
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 05, 2013	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2013	
	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.