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

GEF ID:	**10034**		
Country/Region:	**Equatorial Guinea**		
Project Title:	**Promoting Community-Based Forestry for Climate Change Mitigation and Sustainable Livelihoods in Equatorial Guinea.**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCM-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,329,455**
Co-financing:	**$18,186,100**	Total Project Cost:	**$23,515,555**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Pascal Martinez**	Agency Contact Person:	**Maria Ruiz-Villar,**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	23 March 2018 Yes. Cleared.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	26 March 2018 Yes. Cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	26 March 2018 1- The drivers of the environmental	9 April 2018 1. The project will address, political and

[1] 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)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	degradation and the barriers to combat it are well explained. While the table p.12 presents a comprehensive list of underlying drivers and barriers, only 2 barriers are identified in paragraphs 14-16 as "to be addressed". It is unclear whether the other drivers and barriers need also to be addressed or not, such as international and national timber demand, the weak gouvernance and the lack of land use planning. Please explain. 2- In terms of innovation, the proposal explains it will put in practice an innovative approach in Equatorial Guinea, that has not been implemented in the past, without providing further details about this approach. Please be more specific about the envisaged innovative approach. 3- It is unclear how the the proposal intents to scale-up by establishing the enabling environment and basic grounds. Please be more specific regarding the enabling environment and basic grounds that are expected to scale up the participation of local communities in forest management. 11 April 2018	institutional barriers (including tenure, governance and land planning), technological barriers (including technical and institutional capacity), economic barriers (timber demand, lack of economic opportunities), as well as social barriers (lack of environmental awareness). The text in the project document (section 1.1.) is revised accordingly. Some of the underlying drivers listed may not be addressed, especially demographic growth and international timber demand, although by improving the management of forests through community-based forestry, including possible collaborative arrangements between forest companies exporting timber and communities, the adverse impacts will be minimized, Also, there have been recent measures put in place by the Government to deal with timber demand e.g. a series of legislative measures in 2017 that seek to limit large-scale commercial logging for export until an assessment of forest resources is completed and there is a better understanding of the situation of the sector. 2. Community-based forestry is a novel concept in Equatorial Guinea, and there is limited experience in the country regarding approaches to support

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		1. Thank you for the added information. Cleared. 2, 3. Thank you for the clarification. The information provided in the proposal is relevant but remain succinct. We expect innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up be further explored and demonstrated at CEO endorsement stage. Cleared.	communities to manage their natural resources. In this project, lessons, tools and approaches developed through the more than 40 year experience on community forestry will be used. The approach will include specific approaches on participatory processes, conflict management, institutional arrangements, market knowledge and appropriate technologies and production practices. Community forestry as an innovative approach in the context of Equatorial Guinea is now specified in the text (section 1.6). 3. The sustainability and scale up of the project will be supported by a number of results: (i) by incorporating community forestry as one of the priorities in the development plan that guides public investment and in sectoral plans and programmes, (ii) by creating and demonstrating the economic and productive potential of sustainable managed forests by communities, (iii) by creating technical capacities that can be transferred, and (iv) by addressing the key enabling aspects for community-based forestry identified through global research. Text under sub-section 1.6 revised accordingly.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	26 March 2018 1- The proposal explains that limited enforcement of the law limits the capacity of communities to protect and manage their resources. It is unclear how the project will tackle this risk and especially for the project beneficiaries. Please clarify this point. 2- In paragraph 19, there is a typo mistake with "climate chance" instead of "climate change". Please correct. 11 April 2018 1. Thank you for the clarification. We expect the clarification be made also in the project document at CEO endorsement. Cleared. 2. Thank you for the correction. Cleared.	9 April 2018 1. The lack of or weak law enforcement capacity will be addressed under component 2 – "output 2.4 comprehensive capacity development programme for the extension service, and other support institutions (e.g. forest administration staff, decentralized government units) developed and implemented." This will include enhancing the capacity of law enforcement institutions. Besides, the strengthening of organizational capacities of communities, foreseen under output 3.1. will include support to effective local enforcement, as one of the factors contributing to successful community-based forestry. 2. Typo corrected in proposal.
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	26 March 2018 1- Land tenure is described as a key barrier, including overlaps of different uses. To address it, the component 1 proposes reviews and draft proposals of legislative and policy instruments. Considering the time for the studies to be realized and for the reforms to be enacted, it is unclear how and when the actions at community level (which	9 April 2018 1. The project will initially support those communal forests where tenure regime is relatively clear (communities with a Certificate that demarcates the forest over which they have rights of use of forest resources, which has been obtained by a few communities under current legislation). The project will also focus on those communities where there is already

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		is the main component) will be implemented in the meantime. Please clarify. 2- Component 2 includes south-south exchanges. While other important investments on the ground are foreseen (such as the establishment of training centers), this kind of activity can be relatively expensive, especially for exchanges with Latin America. Please precise approximately which part of GEF fund in the component 2 is expected to be used for this activity and how it will be managed to ensure the achievement of the other proposed activities. 3- Global Environment Benefits are estimated. Please indicate the methodology used and the assumptions made for the calculation (area of avoided deforestation, area and level of forest degradation before and after the project, ...) 4- Please explicit the acronyms the first time they are cited (such as R-PP). 5- Please correct acronyms "FLEFT" in paragraph 43. 11 April 2018	experience with farmers organization or cooperatives, as well as strong commitment and interest on conservation and sustainable use of forest resources and new business development. 2. South-South exchanges will not involve significant numbers of people travelling. FAO will use its existing network of technical regional advisors in the LAC region to better target experts and experiences while it will also make use of its existing South-South collaboration platforms that currently rely on webinars and conference calls to complement the few in-person exchanges that will be organized. It is expected that not more than 20% of the component budget will be used for South-South exchanges. 3. The carbon calculations were derived using the Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT). A footnote added to the corresponding project target in section F. Detailed calculations and assumptions will be provided in the full project document. 4. Done, acronyms fully described the first time they are used. 5. Correction made.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Thank you for the clarification and correction. Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	26 March 2018 None of the boxes yes/no related to the inclusion of indigenous people is checked. Please consider this option too. 11 April 2018 Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.	9 April 2018 Correction made, box checked.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	23 March 2018 The country hasn't programmed anything yet in GEF-6. This proposal is using exactly all the country STAR allocation of $6 million. Nevertheless, the fees exceed for $2.25 the authorized limit of 9.5%. Even if the difference is relatively very small, this has to be fixed to be accepted by the Trustee. Please correct the fees accordingly. 11 April 2018 Thank you for the correction. Cleared.	9 April 2018 The fee error has been corrected.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	• The focal area allocation?	23 March 2018 The country makes use of its full flexibility capacity, transferring $1 million from LD to CC and $2 million from BD to CC. Cleared.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	27 March 2018 Not yet. Please address the comments above. 11 April 2018 Yes, the project is now PM recommended for clearance and PPG.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] 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.