



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: FULL-SIZED PROJECT

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: LDCF

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Ecosystem-Based Adaptation targeting vulnerable communities of the Upper Guinea Region			
Country(ies):	Guinea	GEF Project ID:	5382
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5176
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment, Water and Forests	Submission Date:	12 Nov 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change	Project Duration (Months)	84 months
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	n/a	Project Agency Fee (\$):	760,000

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
CCA-2 – Increasing Adaptive Capacity: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level	<p>2.1: Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced threats at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas</p> <p>2.2: Strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate-induced economic losses</p> <p>2.3: Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level</p>	<p>2.1.1: Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated</p> <p>2.1.2: Systems in place to disseminate timely risk information</p> <p>2.2.1: Adaptive capacity of national and regional centers and networks strengthened to rapidly respond to extreme weather events</p> <p>2.3.1: Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities</p>	LDCF	4,000,000	57,090,000
CCA-1 – Reducing Vulnerability: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level	<p>1.1: Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas</p> <p>1.2: Reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors</p>	<p>1.1.1: Adaptation measures and necessary budget allocations included in relevant frameworks</p> <p>1.2.1: Vulnerable physical, natural and social assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability</p>	LDCF	4,000,000	57,090,000
Total project costs				8,000,000	114,180,000

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: To reduce the vulnerability of local communities in the Upper Niger River Basin to the additional risks posed by climate change and build their general resilience through an ecosystem-based approach that focuses on watersheds, land-use practices and adaptive capacity.

Project Component	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
-------------------	------	-------------------	------------------	------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Project Component	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
1. Strengthening the resilience of vulnerable communities to climate in selected sites through an ecosystem-based approach	Inv / TA	<p>The climate resilience of natural resource dependent livelihoods in project sites is ensured by securing the continued stream of essential agro-ecological and hydrological services upon which they depend – <i>this will be evidenced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of project beneficiaries, including the proportion of women and the percentage of the overall target population, whose vulnerability is reduced, as a result of the project. - The effectiveness of adaptation actions implemented in strengthening resilience, as independently assessed by evaluation work, among them: (a) those that relate to beneficiaries' 'knowledge and understanding of climate risk' at the regional level (Kankan & Faranah) and in project zones; and (b) 'Demo activities aimed at vulnerability reduction and resilience strengthening with focus on natural and social assets' - The type and extent of assets strengthened and/or better managed to withstand the effects of climate change, among them the surface of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Degraded land rehabilitated; (b) "Abandoned" land (or land under long-term fallow) are reforested or recuperated to resemble more natural habitats using an ecosystem-based approach; (c) Wetlands re-wetted; (d) Riverbanks in critical river meanders; and (e) Land subjected to climate adaptive bushfire management. <p><i>(see Project Logframe and Tracking Tool for more details and metrics).</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1 Climate adaptive landscape planning for resilience for the Project Zone is developed in a dynamic and participative fashion.</p> <p>Output 1.2 The institutional architecture for implementing the Climate Adaptive Landscape Plan, resulting from Output 1.1, is strengthened including through training, and partnerships to be forged in support of it, in particular at the local level.</p> <p>Output 1.3 Climate adaptive watershed rehabilitation is carried out in critical sites in the Upper Niger River sub-basin, from a baseline of limited investments in watershed management that are often 'climatically vulnerable' – <i>more specifically including the following on the ground investment activities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3.1. With target communities plan local level watershed rehabilitation activities in line with climate adaptive landscape plan 1.3.2. Riparian vegetation/ gallery forests rehabilitation. 1.3.3. Construction of swales, bio-swales, check-dams and small multi-purpose reservoirs, as appropriate. 1.3.4. Effort on identifying and developing local innovations. 1.3.5. Implement community research approach, tracking intervention impacts and promoting learning. <p>Output 1.4 Land-use practices are adapted to face climate change challenges, from a baseline of generally resilient ecosystems being gradually degraded – <i>more specifically including the following on the ground investment activities:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1.4.1. Adaptive bushfire management. 1.4.2. Improvement of soil management and erosion control. 1.4.3. Re-introduction of locally adapted crops varieties. 1.4.4. Climate adaptive rehabilitation re-wetting of selected wetlands. 1.4.5. Enhancing agro-pastoral resources. The project will 	LDCF	6,362,500	90,172,500

Project Component	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
			<p>disseminate techniques for techniques for</p> <p>1.4.6. Adoption, by both sedentary and transhumant herders, of livestock breeds/races that are endemic to the region.</p> <p>1.4.7. Implement community research approach, tracking intervention impacts and promoting learning.</p>			
2. Capacity building and information systems for integration of climate change adaptation into national / regional / local management plans, policies and practices	TA	<p>Climate adaptive management of ecosystems is integrated into key local and regional planning and policy-making processes – <i>this will be evidenced by:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The number of plans/ processes developed and strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures, which go from none, or with the existence of Local Development Plans that do not reflect climate risks or resilience-building strategies, to having 22 plans / processes developed and strengthened to identify, prioritize and integrate adaptation strategies and measures - A relevant geographically based information system, with focus on the Upper Niger River Basin, generates various derived knowledge products (still to be defined and quantified) and it is and maintained through a functional partnership. - Improved capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures, benefitting 16 institutions: (a) at the sub-national level: 2 Prefectures, 4 sub-prefectures with each 8 villages; and (b) 2 at the national level: the Ministry of Environment, Water and Forests, and the Department of Meteorology. <p>(see Project Logframe and Tracking Tool for more details).</p>	<p>Output 2.1 Climate risk management and resilience are integrated into natural resource management planning & budgeting carried out by relevant ministries, prefectures and sub-prefectures in the Upper Guinea Region.</p> <p>Output 2.2 A geographically based information system for climate information services in the Upper Niger River Basin is established at and maintained through a functional partnership.</p> <p>Output 2.3 Local weather stations in Faranah, Kouroussa, and Kankan are rehabilitated and are able to develop and disseminate early warning products to evaluate existing and new climate data.</p> <p>Output 2.4 Ecological, economic & social benefits [generated by the project] are documented in the project zone through learning and feedback, using modern, innovative and locally adapted means of communication.</p>	LDCF	1,262,500	13,404,500
Subtotal					7,625,000	103,577,000
Project Management Cost (PMC) ¹				LDCF	375,000	10,603,000

¹ To be calculated as percent of subtotal.

Project Component	Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
Total Project Cost					8,000,000	114,180,000

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Cofinancing	Name of Cofinancier	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Government	Programme de Productivité Agricole en Afrique de l'Ouest PPAAO/WAAPP 1C Guinée, Ministère de l'Agriculture	Grant	9,000,000
Government	METAGRI, Direction Nationale de la Météorologie, Ministère de Transport	Grant	100,000
Government	Projet d'Appui au Secteur Agricole en Guinée (PASAG), Ministère de l'Agriculture	Grant	16,000,000
Government	Programme National d'Appui aux Acteurs des Filières Agricoles (PNAFA)	Grant	89,030,000
Government	Institut de Recherche Agronomique de Guinée, Ministère de l'Agriculture	Grant	50,000
Total Cofinancing			114,180,000

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES (\$) REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount(\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
UNDP	LDCF	Climate Change	Guinea	8,000,000	760,000	8,760,000
Total Grant Resources				8,000,000	760,000	8,760,000

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table.

PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	996,708	2,000,000	2,996,708
National/Local Consultants	1,337,500	5,000,000	6,337,500

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

A summary of what changed since the PIF is provided below.

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
<p><u>Project context</u> The PIF was approved by the LDCF Council in mid-2013.</p>	<p>Long time elapsed since Council approval. The context changed. This was considered.</p> <p>Guinea has since been affected by an Ebola outbreak with global ramifications, and which has significantly affected the country's economy, its conditions as both aid and investment recipient, and, not least also, people's overall resilience. The impact of the Ebola outbreak is also the pivotal cause behind the significant delay in project development.</p> <p>It was finally possible to carry out site level consultations in 2015 and develop the project. Still, these consultations were, to a large extent, curtailed by access restrictions imposed by health quarantine and by possible risks to travelling PPG consultants. UNDP made sure to support the PPG team throughout the process and to keep them informed of known risks.</p> <p>In spite of all odds, the project document has been fully developed and validated. It mobilized an impressive amount of support and co-financing. It was also nationally endorsed in a workshop in August 2015.</p> <p>The project's situation analysis takes the impact of Ebola fully into consideration. So does the project strategy, which proposes that communities directly impacted upon by the Ebola outbreak and individual survivors should be specifically targeted under food-for-work schemes foreseen for key activities under Outputs 1.3 and 1.4.</p>
<p><u>Project Sites:</u> Only indicatively defined.</p>	<p>Sites within the project zone were defined and their choice validated. Local stakeholders were consulted. Their views and interest in the project helped shape the final choice. This is discussed at length in the PRODOC (refer to chapter 1.6 Introduction to the Project Zones).</p>
<p><u>Co-financing</u> An indicative amount of \$27.6 million had been foreseen at PIF stage, much of it would come from the baseline.</p>	<p>A total of \$114 million has been mobilized, which is more than 4 times the initially foreseen amount. Of this, only \$9.0 million represents co-finance that forms part of baseline investments. The remainder of the co-finance has been directly leveraged by the project.</p>
<p><u>Project Strategy:</u> Outputs described with some indications on activities.</p>	<p>Through site visits, stakeholder consultation and validation with key stakeholders, the project strategy is now fully developed and activities described.</p> <p>Feasibility assessments were completed and with due environmental and social safeguards applied to the proposed activities. Refer to UNDP PRODOC Part 2 and to the results application of UNDP's Environmental and Social Screening (ESSP) in PRODOC Section 2.6 <u>Risks and Safeguards</u>.</p> <p>Although still very much in line with the original strategy, the current outline of outputs and activities has some differences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After careful consideration, the project zone has been refined and mapped out in more detail. It will now focus on two areas within the buffer zone of the Upper Niger National Park. • The pilot activities under Output 1.1 and 1.3. have been refined and adapted to local needs based on key findings from the field mission. This includes a focus on watershed and forest management as well as agricultural activities • Given the fact that Guinea and the project zone in particular were hit hard by the recent Ebola outbreak, this is reflected in the overall project strategy, in particular with regards

Original project design in PIF	Adjustment/improvement made at CEO Endorsement
	to the stakeholder involvement plan.
<u>Risk Analysis:</u> Cursory analysis based on assumptions and with limited stakeholder consultation.	<p>Thorough risk analysis was carried out and the corresponding management response has undergone stakeholder scrutiny.</p> <p>Also, potential risks and impacts related to the following topics have been considered through the application of UNDP's Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP). The following was queried:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principle #1 on human rights, Point #8 on whether local communities or individuals, given the opportunity, raised human rights concerns regarding the Project during the stakeholder engagement process; • Principle #2 on gender equality and women's empowerment more generally, where a positive gender bias in favour of women's empowerment has guided the project; and • Principle #3 on environmental sustainability, where issues on whether any project activities: (a) are proposed within or adjacent to critical habitats and/or environmentally sensitive areas, including legally protected areas; (b) involve harvesting of natural forests, plantation development, or reforestation; (c) involve significant extraction, diversion or containment of surface or ground water; and (d) potential outcomes of the project would be sensitive or vulnerable to potential impacts of climate change – and the answer was yes to those. <p>Safeguards that apply to risks and impacts flagged above through the SESP exercise were duly incorporated into project design. Refer to PRODOC Section 2.6 <u>Risks and Safeguards</u> for more details.</p>
<u>Other aspects</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicators are fully developed • Management arrangement developed • Inventory of NGOs and preliminary capacity analysis conducted • Project consultants' TORs developed

Refer to PRODOC, Section 2.4 Design Principles and Strategic Considerations for more details.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions

N/A. There are no major changes since the PIF stage.

Yet, refer to PRODOC Section 1.1.5 Policy, legislative and regulatory context, reproduced below for a reference.

This project is fully consistent with, and supportive of, national development strategies such as:

- The **National Agricultural Investment and Food Security Plan 2012-2016 (PNIASA)** was approved by the Government in December 2012. The PNIASA aims for Guinea to achieve a 6 percent growth rate in the sector and attain the MDGs. The Government intends to implement this plan in order to ensure food security and position Guinea as an exporter of agricultural products. Six priority investment programs have been identified in the PNIASA: (i) sustainable development of the rice subsector; (ii) diversification for food security and the population's nutrition improvement; (iii) promotion of agricultural exports and agribusiness, (iv) integrated natural resource management; (v) institutional capacity building; (vi) coordination of PNIASA's implementation.

- The **National Environment Policy** (*Politique Nationale de L'Environnement*), adopted in 2012, addresses issues related to the conservation of biodiversity, the exploitation of natural resources and the fight against desertification, all of which are highly relevant to climate change adaptation activities.
- The **Programme D'Action National de Lutte Contre la Desertification** identifies several issues related to the management of land and natural resources and aims to contribute to the sustainable management of land, forests and pastures through the implementation of various programmes.
- The **National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan** (2002), or NBSAP, includes measures to achieve a sustainable use of natural resources and conservation of biodiversity and aims to establish good management and conservation practices as well as safeguarding biodiversity and ecosystems in Guinea. It also recognizes the role that biodiversity and ecosystems play in climate systems, and acknowledges the importance of intact agro-ecological and hydrological systems for sustainable development.
- A **new NBSAP for Guinea**, which takes the 2010 Aichi Biodiversity Target into account, is currently under preparation and it is bound to remain as a key national policy document on biodiversity and ecosystems for the next 10 year. It is in the final stages of development and undergoing technical review. The new NBSAP will focus on the interface biodiversity and development. More specifically, it stresses the importance and value of ecosystem services in Guinea's economy, while also pointing to the fact that several of these services are likely to be negatively affected by climate change. The new NBSAP also points out to the need to expand the protected surface and enhance the management effectiveness of existing protected areas.
- The **National Policy for Agricultural Development** (*Politique Nationale de Developpement de l'Agriculture vision 2015*) aims to reduce poverty and increase food security in Guinea. The PNDA has been translated in regional action plans of which the implementation is based on the decentralization and deconcentration. With the adoption of the local Government Code in 2006, the Government of Guinea has transferred to Local Governments, i.e. locally elected entities (in Guinea, these are Communautés Rurales de Développement or CRD and Urban Communes or UCs) responsibilities for domains retained in combating poverty and promoting local development such as management of local development projects, land use planning, agriculture development, environmental protection and sustainable management of natural resources, coordination of investments and development activities, promotion of local economic development, inter-community affairs and decentralized cooperation.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities

The links to the GEF focal area strategy were thoroughly described in the PIF and remain valid – hence, **not applicable (NA)** / will not be repeated here. They are included in PRODOC Section 2.2 *Project Rationale and Policy Conformity*

See also Section 3.1 *Programmatic Links*.

A summary of eligibility criteria and priorities is provided below. Refer to PRODOC Section 2.3.2 *Country eligibility*.

The Republic of Guinea is a party to several international Conventions, including: (i) the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) since 1981; (ii) the RAMSAR Convention since 1992; (iii) The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) since 1993; (iv) The United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) since 1997; (v) The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) since 1994; and (vi) The Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal since 1995.

The Government of Guinea became a signatory to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992 and is classified among the non-Annex I parties. Guinea developed and submitted their National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) in 2007 and is entitled to benefit from the LDCF for the implementation of NAPA priority measures. In implementing priority interventions identified in the NAPAs, the project is consistent with the Conference of Parties (COP9) and also satisfies criteria outlined in the UNFCCC Decision 7/CP.7 and GEF/C.28/18. It also responds to Decision 1/CP.16, which invites Parties to enhance action on adaptation by

“building resilience of socio-ecological systems, including through economic diversification and sustainable management of natural resources”. The project has been endorsed by both the national UNFCCC and GEF focal points.

The project responds to urgent and immediate adaptation priorities and actions identified in the Guinea NAPA.² This project is specifically aligned with and supportive of the NAPA’s objectives: i) development of appropriate technologies for adaptation, with a focus on anti-erosion practices (3.2.); ii) development of an early warning system (3.8); iii) promotion of [bush]fire management techniques (4.1.); iv) integrated management and improvement of small hydraulic structures (7).

A.3. The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage

NA (No changes since PIF approval.)

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address.

The UNDP PRODOC provides a country-specific analysis on underlying financial, economic and policy drivers behind the current situation of climatic vulnerability that prevails in the country and in the project zones in particular. The project justification is underpinned by technical reports, contextual analysis and application of the Climate Change Adaptation Tracking Tool).

The problem that the project seeks to address is thoroughly described in the PRODOC, in particular in Part 1 – *Situation Analysis* and Part 2 – *Project Strategy*.

A summary of the overall strategy is provided in [Part I, Table B](#) of this document. It is outlined in narrative form below.

For an analysis of **the baseline project**, refer to PRODOC, Section 1.4 *Baseline Analysis*, which includes the following sub-sections:

- 1.4.1 *The status quo of ecosystem/NRM management in project sites*
- 1.4.2 *The project’s development baseline*
- 1.4.3 *National Level Response to Climate change*

Refers also other relevant sections in the PRODOC’s background and strategy parts, in particular: Section 1.1 *The project’s development context*, 1.2 *Climate Change Context* and 1.3 *Barriers Analysis and Long Term Solution*.

These are summarised below with excerpts from the PRODOC.

Problem General Statement

The services rendered by ecosystems sustain the livelihoods of more than half a million people in the Upper Niger River Basin, where poverty is prevalent and the economy is based on agriculture. Ecosystems provide these local communities with food, shelter, fibre, firewood and medicinal plants. They also render regulating services linked to water flows and purification, soil retention, nutrient recycling and protection against storm surge. Climate change affecting the Upper Niger Basin will result in higher temperatures, increased evapo-transpiration and changes in the rainfall regime. These conditions will threaten the continued stream of benefits from ecosystem services, particularly with respect to water security. It will also increase the risk for bushfire. Communities, whose livelihoods depend on ecosystems services and who live close to fire-prone areas, are vulnerable. In the baseline scenario, investments in watershed management are limited and generally not ‘climate-proof’. Also, prevailing land use practices are gradually degrading ecosystems that are generally resilient—their function and structure has been maintained under the current level of threat.

² Available from the UNFCCC website [[Link](#)].

Although there is a strong baseline investment in rural development programmes, if climate change adaptation is not part of development efforts, this global-level threat will constitute an overriding stressor that will push ecosystems beyond their tipping point.

This project is slated to address the additional risk posed by climate change to vulnerable communities in the Upper Niger River Basin through an ecosystem-based approach. It will enhance ecosystems' resilience and strengthen their functionality across the landscape, as a climate change adaptation measure and with a clear additionality vis-a-vis the baseline. It will focus on watershed management and land-use practices on the ground. The project will also build the capacity of relevant stakeholders to change course and adapt to a climatically challenging future. In this manner, vulnerable beneficiary communities, who depend on ecosystem services for their livelihoods, will become more resilient to climate change.

More Specifically

Although the use of these natural resources and ecosystems services in the project zone have undergone a certain degree of degradation over the years, the current regimes pertaining to natural and social assets in project sites have so far managed sustain a stream of services to the majority of resource users. E.g. every year during the dry season, lakes and water channels become the primary source of freshwater for communities and their livestock. The flood plains and riparian borders are also generally resilient to the natural variations in water levels. Riparian forests also play a key role in maintaining soil fertility and avoiding the erosion of riverbanks, besides sustaining important ecosystems. The river system itself sustains several production systems generally based on the availability of surface water all year round: livestock, irrigated crops and freshwater fishing, which are essential for communities' food security for the local economy.

Climate change effects such as higher temperatures, marked changes in precipitation and in the rainfall regimes, and a significant decrease in surface runoff will result in increased incidence and intensity of bushfire, water scarcity and significant changes to water flow regimes in key water bodies. The latter may include both flooding and the complete cessation of dry season flows. These impacts will create vulnerabilities that are either climate-driven or that will be exacerbated by climate change.

Although agro-ecological and hydrological systems in project sites hang on fragile balance due to a gradual degradation that the systems are experiencing, these same systems are currently resilient. Furthermore, in spite of widespread poverty, it can be said that communities in both project sites are currently maintaining their livelihoods within a coping range. However, with the effects of climate change, both the agro-ecological and hydrological systems and people's livelihoods will reach a tipping point. If left unchecked, climate change will lead to a rapid—and perhaps irreversible—collapse of agro-ecological and hydrological systems in project zones. With climate change, the vast array of services rendered by these systems will breakdown and so will the viability of livelihoods that they sustain.

The preferred solution proposed by project is to reduce the vulnerability of Guinea, especially the three prefectures Kankan, Kouroussa and Faranah in the Upper Guinea project zone, to the impact of climate change with a focus on the management of natural and social assets in the project sites. Combined with vulnerability reduction measures, the project will also strengthen the resilience of both these livelihoods and of agro-ecological and hydrological systems to withstand additional climate stressors.

Because of the uncertain nature of climate change, it is imperative to enhance the ability of ecosystems in Upper Guinea to absorb expected and unforeseen changes without disrupting the flow of goods and services that are so essential for securing livelihoods. The debate on the likely tipping points for ecosystem services is still ongoing and data to determine such points is not available. Still, it is safe to assume that the Upper Guinea Region ecosystems do not have the reserves required to cope with the additional stress emanating from climate change – unless resilience, adaptability and transformability are significantly boosted. At the same time, 'resilience science' is new and systematic approaches to build ecosystems' and people's resilience needs to learn from practical, on-the-ground experiences. **The preferred solution** proposed by the project is to reduce vulnerability of local communities in the Upper Guinea Region by enhancing the functionality and resilience of ecosystems so they can withstand additional climate stressors and continue to supply a wide range of services under conditions of climate change. Extensive and

demonstrative experience with climate adaptive techniques are needed at scale to have a transformational effect on livelihoods. A precautionary approach which includes the rehabilitation of ecosystem services is warranted, alongside with an adequate package of capacity building services to support and sustain adaptation measures.

The **financial baseline** is fully described in the PRODOC, where Table 4 provides a summary of the programmes and their contribution.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning

The development and financial baseline for each of the components, and the adaptation alternative facilitated by the project are thoroughly described in the PRODOC Section 2.1 *Project Objective, Outcomes and Outputs/Activities*, which also presents how the expected outcomes will be achieved.

Annex 4. *Additional Cost Analysis* provides a summary and it is reproduced below.

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	Alternative (A)	Project and Additional costs (A-B)
Outcome 1: The climate resilience of natural resource dependent livelihoods in project sites is ensured by securing the continued stream of essential agro-ecological and hydrological services upon which they depend	Efforts to strengthen livelihoods not considering climate risks or adaptation needs Planning and finance not taking into account climate risks and adaptation potential, esp. at sub-national levels <u>Baseline Finance:</u> \$74.0 M, Of which \$9.0 M contributes to the project's co-financing	- Dissemination of ecosystem-based adaptation techniques and technologies, involving community in decision-making and building local capacity; on the basis of solid development and livelihoods investments, with which the project will collaborate and foster synergies. - Over time, the EBA model demonstrates a cost-effective way of building natural and social assets, many with multiple benefits; - Focus on women as major actors in the regions <u>Costs of the alternative Comp. 1</u> LDCF + Baseline + co-financing net of baseline TOTAL: \$170.5 M	LDCF + co-financing mobilized beyond the baseline: <u>Additional Costs:</u> LDCF: \$6.363 M Co-financing net of baseline: \$90.173 M TOTAL: \$96.535 M
Outcome 2: Climate adaptive management of ecosystems is integrated into key local and regional planning and policy-making processes	Climate change adaptation is not sufficiently mainstreamed into key sectoral planning and investment frameworks <u>Baseline Finance:</u> \$57.0 million	- Engagement with local and regional authorities with respect to the decentralized planning and budgeting processes - Integration of this component with the national PEI program in a synergetic way. <u>Costs of the alternative Comp. 2</u> LDCF + Baseline + co-financing net of baseline TOTAL \$71.6M	LDCF + co-financing mobilized beyond the baseline: <u>Additional Costs:</u> LDCF: \$1.262 M Co-financing net of baseline: \$13.355 M TOTAL: \$14.617 M
PM	n/a	<u>Mgt Costs of the alternative</u> LDCF + co-financing's management costs net of baseline TOTAL \$11.0M	<u>Additional Costs:</u> LDCF: \$0.375 M Co-financing net of baseline: \$10.602 M TOTAL: \$10.977 M
TOTAL	<u>Baseline Finance:</u>	<u>Costs of the alternative</u> LDCF + Baseline + co-financing net of baseline	<u>Additional Costs:</u> LDCF: \$8.000 M Co-financing net of baseline: \$114.130 M

Cost/Benefit	Baseline (B)	Alternative (A)	Project and Additional costs (A-B)
	TOTAL \$131.0 M	TOTAL \$253.1	TOTAL: \$122.130 M

A.6. Risks

A more thorough risk analysis than that of the PIF has been carried out during the PPG. It is presented in PRODOC Section 2.6 *Risks and Safeguards*. A summary Risk Matrix is reproduced herein. Refer also to PRODOC Annex 1: *Risk Analysis*.

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
<u>ORGANISATIONAL</u> Low capacity of local authorities and staff of decentralized institutions to support sustainable management of natural resources <u>LEVEL:</u> MEDIUM	The project intends to strengthen capacities of local authorities through training and will invest, where possible and through implementing partners, in awareness raising campaigns, building local capacities, introducing alternative technologies and production methods. The project will work with other projects and programmes active at project site level on a plethora of sustainable livelihoods activities.
<u>STRATEGIC</u> Low political will of Prefectures authorities to adjust adopt landscape governance through planning and policies, strategies and programmes <u>LEVEL:</u> LOW	Involvement of key political players on both national and regional level to ensure opportunities and benefits from mainstreaming climate change adaptation into broader policy frameworks are understood and used accordingly. They will be trained and capacitated as a measure to instigate their interest in the project and foster support.
<u>ORGANISATIONAL</u> Low commitment of targeted vulnerable rural communities <u>LEVEL:</u> MEDIUM	A participatory approach, including site-visits, interviews and consultations with local communities to identify needs and assess priorities will be applied to the project.
<u>ORGANIZATIONAL</u> Women's engagement in leading change and in land-use practices, which is encouraged by the project, may be constrained by types of behaviours are generally considered acceptable, appropriate or desirable for women in a mostly Muslim society <u>LEVEL:</u> LOW	The project aims to specifically engage women in its implementation and as beneficiaries as a means of fostering gender equality in the share of development and adaptation benefits. The community-based EbA demonstrations are planned to be carried out through "food for work" type of designs and approaches. It is clear that a special design is needed to ensure that such an approach will be culturally acceptable.
<u>OPERATIONAL</u> Targeting Ebola survivors may build barriers <u>LEVEL:</u> LOW	Similarly the focus to empower Ebola survivors as project beneficiaries and parts of the "food for work" implementation approach can create barriers due to the social stigma attached to Ebola-survivors. The project design has built in a dedicated planning and consultation activity under component 1 in this regard.
<u>POLITICAL</u> Guinea is currently recovering from several years of civil rests and political instability. While the situation is currently calm, the political and social situation is still fragile <u>LEVEL:</u> HIGH	First of all, the advice from UN Security in situations of tension and insecurity will be respected to the letter. The Regional Bureau for Africa within UNDP also steps in and supports Country Offices to assess project specific risk and propose measures. One recommendation may be to change the modality to direct implement
<u>REGULATORY</u> Inadequate land and forest regulations	The project will support the development of community based forest and watershed management plans that will regulate the access and use of natural resources. These

IDENTIFIED RISKS, CATEGORY AND RISK ASSESSMENT	MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>could create disincentives to sustainable and long-term land-use planning at the community level and be an obstacle to the adoption of climate resilient management of natural resources</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u> <u>LOW</u></p>	<p>custom laws will compensate the absence of appropriate land and forest regulations. Also the experience and knowledge generated from their application could promote the strengthening of the regulation framework at national level necessary to promote sustainable and long-term land-use planning at the community level. Finally, the project will collaborate with other initiatives focusing on the policy reform.</p>
<p><u>FINANCIAL</u></p> <p>Guinea is a least developed country and among the ten poorest countries in the world. This means that there are only very limited financial resources available. Combined with bad infrastructure, this increases overall project delivery costs and poses extra challenges</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u> <u>MEDIUM</u></p>	<p>The project will need to allocate sufficient funds to the implementation of specific activities and manage the project in such a way that these challenges will be addressed without jeopardizing the overall success.</p>
<p><u>FINANCIAL</u></p> <p>Guinea has been hit by an Ebola outbreak that has resulted in economic isolation of the country and the region. It also means that most development aid has been re-channelled into emergency Ebola projects, leaving other sectors unattended. If the ebola outbreak cannot be contained, it is likely that international actors will disappear from the scene.</p> <p><u>LEVEL:</u> <u>HIGH</u></p>	<p>The project seeks to align itself with overall development priorities and projects, including emergency aid for people affected by the Ebola outbreak. Ebola survivors that may live in the project area will be specifically targeted to become implementing partners of project components, esp. outputs 1.3 and 1.4.</p> <p>Overall the UN System and other cooperation partners in Guinea are advocating to start moving into a new stage in managing the crises and preventative measures will be more strongly supported. As Ebola transmission from apes (chimpanzees) to humans can be linked to ecosystem degradation, a project like the current can help in supporting ecosystems rehabilitation and improvements.</p>

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

NA (no changes since PIF).

Else, refer to PRODOC Section 1.5 *Stakeholder Analysis* and to Section 1.3.4 *National Level Response to Climate change*. In the latter, the link and coordination arrangements with other relevant GEF financed initiatives is outlined.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 Stakeholder engagement in project implementation

A thorough stakeholder engagement plan is included in the PRODOC, see Section 1.5.

B.2 Socio-economic benefits at the national and local levels, including gender dimensions considerations

And how these will support the achievement of global environment / adaptation benefits

A thorough analysis of benefits and gender is included in the PRODOC.

Refer to PRODOC Section 2.8 *Gender Considerations and Other Project Benefits, including Innovativeness, Sustainability and Replicability*, reproduced below.

The gender dimension is fully integrated into the PRODOC, in particular in the description of activities. For a specific discussion of the gender topic, refer also to PRODOC Section 1.1.5 Culture and Gender.

Excerpts from these sections are reproduced below.

In addition, UNDP carried out due diligence prior to PRODOC clearance and screened the project for potential social and environmental negative effects. Refer to PRODOC Chapter 2.6 Risks and Safeguards for a presentation of the UNDP Environmental and Social Screening Procedure applied in March 2015.

The Niger river is a source of identity for the entire region and the source of the river is of high significance to the people living in the project zone, the Upper Niger River Basin in Guinea. These people are mainly comprised of the Malinké, with an influx of immigrants and refugees from neighbouring countries in the 1990s. The traditional agricultural and cultural practices of local people vary from those of the immigrants. Traditionally, the people in the region practiced agriculture, collecting and hunting in the forests with a low importance given to livestock. The spiritual importance of forests is reflected in several ritual sites and forbidden forests in the project zone.

Gender differences in labour force participation are not as wide in Guinea as they are in many other African countries, yet there is still a moderate gender gap. Women's labour force participation rate was 79 percent in 2009, compared to a rate of 89 percent for men. Women who are economically active are more likely to work in the informal sector and less likely to be wage employees than men. They are less likely to occupy senior and skilled positions, more likely to earn less in income, and are less likely to have sufficient access to various inputs with which to improve their productivity. The reasons for women's lower economic opportunities are numerous and may include greater 'time-poverty' due to their domestic responsibilities, lower levels of education, and cultural biases which accord a lower social standing to women.

Climate resilience building is particularly important amongst vulnerable groups. In Guinea, where 85% of the population are of Muslim faith, women's role in society is determined by strong social norms based on cultural and religious traditions. More specifically, women do not have land tenure rights under customary laws. Fetching water and collecting wood are daily chores that are normally assigned to women in rural contexts, though they may have little say in decisions about the availability and use of key resources such as water and forest. This could limit women's overall influence in decision-making that is relevant for activities on the ground under Component 1. Furthermore, women's general stand in society is constrained by their limited access to schooling and training, which contributes to limited access to leadership positions. As stakeholders, this could constrain their ability to have a say in a number of activities under Component 2. In general, women are considered a vulnerable group in Guinean society.

Addressing these constraints rooted in gender disparities and promoting gender equality in the design of this project, guided by national policies, is thereby necessary and has been ensured. Although a small contribution to overall empowerment and emancipation at society's level, these gender considerations and empowerment in this project help Guinea implement its commitments under e.g. the Convention on the Elimination of all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). Doing so is furthermore in line with both government policies, among them the 2011 National Gender Policy (*Politique Nationale du Genre*), and UNDP's with programme for the country.

Getting women actively engaged with hands-on EbA and natural resource management programmes has necessitated special attention and programming efforts to design activities in which rural women will be engaged, and the project has deliberately foreseen the specific representation of women in technical platforms and teams. It is important that all project design innovations, including the possible establishment of a "food for work" type approach be implemented and monitored with gender considerations in the cultural and country context. Various indicators will also be monitored according to gender. In the composition of project teams, equal opportunities will be offered. The Box below summarizes some important gender considerations.

Box. Examples of gender focused project design and implementation

The project will make a defined contribution to women's empowerment at the local level, defined as the "*sum total of changes needed for a woman to realize her full human rights – the combined effect of changes in her own aspirations and capabilities, the environment that surrounds and conditions her choices, and the power relations through which she negotiates her path.*"[*]
This will be achieved in a manner with which women can feel comfortable, given their own social, cultural and religious context. In other words, through agency, relations and structures - the project will make a contribution to all three dimensions:

Relations: Power relations through which she negotiates her path

Examples:

- Being involved in local decision-making processes
- Getting recognized (by external groups) as an important stakeholder in natural resource management and adaptation
- Having their issues and ideas heard through a local adaptation process (using good practice in participation)

Agency: Changes in her own aspirations and capabilities

Examples:

- Knowledge of climate trends
- Access to appropriate measures (incl. technologies) for adaptation
- Access to income-generating employment via the HIMO approach**; and, when women are able to earn an income, their families are more likely to benefit

Structures: Environment that surrounds and conditions her choices

Examples:

- Gender equitable adaptation planning at local level (and support from national and regional level to implement these plans)

Notes:

- * Borrowing from Care International's definition of gender empowerment.
See e.g. <http://www.care-international.org/what-we-do/our-focus-on-women-and-girls.aspx>
- ** HIMO refers to "Haute Intensité en Main d'Œuvre" or labour intensive works.

Gender marking will apply to this project. Refer to PRODOC Chapter 3.1 Programmatic Links for further details.

B.3. Cost-effectiveness reflected in project design

Cost-effectiveness is enshrined in the project strategy and its choices since Work Programme entry. The cost effectiveness analysis has been further developed during the PPG and it is incorporated in the PRODOC.

For a summary, refer to PRODOC Section 2.7 Cost-Effectiveness, which is reproduced herein.

A number of design options were considered for the project before the final design was proposed.

Under *Component 1. Strengthening the resilience of vulnerable communities to climate in selected sites through an ecosystem-based approach* four outputs are mentioned. The project design is built on strategic design considerations such as cost effectiveness of demonstration interventions and up-scaling potential to upper governance tiers by being situated in two neighboring project regions and having selected pair dos RDCs per sub-prefecture. The project has selected only two demonstration areas, minimizing logistics and other costs of engagement. Regarding output 1.2, a stakeholder needs assessment will ensure products are well targeted to needs, and for example low cost options are explored. The project is looking for innovative and locally suitable communication channels to disseminate information, e.g. the existing daily radio shows on environmental affairs and climate change. Training materials will be developed which do not rely on holding a training event. Interventions under outputs 1.3 and 1.4 are labor intensive. A project implementation strategy has been designed that will provide “food for work” opportunities for local people, targeting especially women and communities affected by Ebola. A careful design of the “food for work” approach is followed to ensure that no marginalization of women will take place, given socio-cultural and religious norms.

Under *Component 2. Capacity building and information systems for integration of climate change adaptation into national / regional / local management plans, policies and practices* four outputs are planned. Component 2 contributes to GEF5 CEO Endorsement Template-February 2013.doc

the improved targeting of adaptation measures and increase the likelihood that measures will minimize costs. Furthermore the project is working very closely with government and extension services, trying to strengthen the mechanisms that are already in place. The measures under Component 2 are designed to strengthen donor and government/ministry coordination and more generally coordination amongst actors at a regional scale. Ecosystem-based adaptation approaches deliver a range of benefits and co-benefits. This puts it in an advantageous cost-benefit situation when compared to other solutions to climate change (e.g. infrastructural). As compared to other options, including non-EBA, the proposed alternative stands out as the most cost-effective and confirms the strategic choices made at concept/PIF stage.

C. BUDGETED M & E PLAN

The project's M&E Plan is thoroughly described in the PRODOC Chapter 6 - *Monitoring Framework and Evaluation*. For more detail, refer to *Monitoring and Evaluation Plan and Budget*. The table below provides a summary.

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager PMU (Project Management Unit) UNDP CO, UNDP GEF	Indicative cost: \$20,000	Within first two months of project start up with the full team on board
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	UNDP GEF RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members. PMU, esp. M&E expert	To be finalized in Inception Phase and Workshop. Specifically include "soft" and qualitative approaches such as story telling in design.	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation	Oversight by Project Manager PMU, esp. M&E expert Implementation teams	To be determined as part of the Annual Work Plan's preparation. Indicative cost is \$50,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
ARR/PIR	Project manager PMU UNDP CO UNDP RTA UNDP EEG	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Review	Project manager PMU UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: \$40,000 Specifically include "soft" and qualitative approaches such as story telling in design	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Terminal Evaluation	Project manager PMU UNDP CO UNDP RCU External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : \$40,000 Specifically include "soft" and qualitative approaches such as story telling in design	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager PIU	Indicative cost per year: \$3,000 (\$21,000 total)	Yearly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ Excluding project team staff time	Time frame
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly for UNDP CO, as required by UNDP RCU
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 171,000	


PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S)

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Ahmadou Seybourey Touré	Executive Director of Funds	Delegated Ministry of Environment and Forests	04/03/2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Adriana Dinu Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF		11/12/2015	Fabiana Issler Regional Technical Advisor, Ecosystems & Biodiversity, Africa, UNDP-GEF	+251-911-432003	fabiana.issler@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

(Either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Refer to specific sections and pages in the PRODOC for the Project Results Framework:

Chapter 3:	<u><i>Project Results Framework</i></u>	pages 75- 80
	3.1 <u><i>Programmatic Links</i></u>	
	3.2 <u><i>Logframe</i></u>	

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

(From GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comments at PIF Stage

Comments	Responses	Document reference
<i>Comments from Germany - Jul 2013</i>		
<p>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p> <p><u>Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With regards to the first component, Germany kindly asks to further clarify the process for the intended landscape planning (Output 1.1). We strongly recommend realizing mapping and planning exercises within or at least in concordance with existing administrative borders to facilitate later-on consideration in decision-making processes as well as in implementation. For example, we kindly ask UNDP to clarify why the Climate Adaptive Landscape Plan should be realized at the Upper Niger Basin Landscape level. What are the advantages and are there any disadvantages? What alternatives have been considered? With regards to the same component, institutional architecture (Output 1.2), our understanding from the description in 38. is that existing institutions should be involved in the implementation of the Plan mentioned before (e.g. existing local CBOs). We absolutely agree with this and we would like to recommend evitating foundation of new institutions. Germany welcomes that the proposed project will support mainstreaming EbA in the Upper Guinea 	<p>During the PPG phase, the project zone, including administrative entities therein included, has been further defined. So have the institutional stakeholders have been identified, who will be vital in realising the landscape planning. The Upper Niger River Basin in Guinea has been chosen, as its ecosystem is providing vital services to humans in West Africa, and the ecosystem-based adaptation approach prioritised to target key zones within the Upper Niger River Basin. Restoring ecosystem service in near the source of the Niger River is bound to have positive implications for the region as a whole, given the importance of the basis for West Africa. Within Guinea, the project zone straddles different administrative regions (prefectures) that will be included in the project activities. The principle that mapping and planning activities should be carried out within or at least in concordance with existing administrative borders to facilitate later-on consideration in decision-making processes and implementation is acknowledged and applied.</p> <p>An inventory of existing NGOs and CBOs in the project zone has been developed during the PPG phase, including a preliminary analysis of capacities with the aim of including the existing civil society organisations in the project activities and strengthening their capacities through involvement in project activities.</p> <p>The project will be applying a multi-stakeholder approach in its</p>	<p>PRODOC Section 1.6 Introduction to the Project Sites and 2.5 Project Goals, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities</p> <p>PRODOC Annex 2: Preliminary NGO registry for the project zone</p> <p>Section 2.9 Stakeholder Analysis and Part 5</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
<p>Region through its second component and more particularly through Output 2.1. However, the output only refers to integrating climate risk management and resilience into natural resource management planning & budgeting. This is important to secure EbA options in the face of increasing impacts from climate change on natural systems. In addition, we would recommend also considering mainstreaming of EbA in traditional and vulnerable sectors like water and agriculture, which often have not yet identified adaptation options at all and if they have, natural solutions (EbA options) are often not considered.</p>	<p>activities, including representatives from key government sectors such as water and agriculture, that will play an important role in implementing project activities and designing policy responses on the local and national level.</p>	<p>Management Arrangements</p>
Comments from the US - Jun 2013		
<p><u>The United States welcomes this project concept.</u></p> <p>With a view toward further strengthening this PIF, we would like to request that UNDP, as it prepares the draft final project document for CEO endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify how it will communicate results, lessons learned and best practices identified throughout the project to the various stakeholders both during and after the project; Expand on how it will ensure the sustainability of climate change adaptation education for the various stakeholders mentioned; Engage local stakeholders, including community-based organizations and women in both the design and implementation of the program; and, <p>We appreciate that UNDP has crafted the proposed project to explicitly build off of the activities and expected outcomes of existing, ongoing programs. This will not only avoid duplication of program objectives but it will help UNDP take advantage and leverages resources beyond the baseline projects. We also appreciate UNDP's desire to collaborate with USAID's Environmental Governance Program as well as the US Forest Service's STEWARD program on related project elements, given that both projects target many of the same districts, and we look forward to further clarification on how UNDP will facilitate</p>	<p>Communication of results, lessons learnt and best practices will be part of the project activities as specified under Output 2.4. This will include documentation of ecological, environmental and social benefits and distribution to a wide audience through innovative means of communication, including the use of web-based and mobile phone technology.</p> <p>The project's approach of implementing pilot activities in the project zone, coupled with targeted capacity building for stakeholder groups will create a sustainable pool of educated stakeholders that will act as multipliers for their peers.</p> <p>Stakeholder involvement will be based on a multi-stakeholder approach, focusing on women representation. The pilot activities in the project zone will also focus on women representation as well as other vulnerably groups (youth, ebola survivors, etc.)</p>	<p>PRODOC Output 2.4.</p> <p>PRODOC Section 2.2.4 Design Principles and Strategic Considerations</p> <p>PRODOC Part 2. Project Strategy</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
coordination and knowledge exchange between the projects.		
<i>Comments from the GEF Secretariat – 16 May 2013</i>		
Project Design		
<p><i>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</i></p> <p>Update 5/16/2013: The expected outputs have been clarified sufficiently for this stage, providing an adequate indication of the kind of activities that will be conducted and broadly what results are expected. [...]</p> <p>By CEO endorsement, please specify in detail the kind and number of outputs.</p>	<p>A detailed description of project outputs, their budgets and the implementation strategy are included in the PRODOC. The expected results are also clearly stated and for several activities metrics of success have been provided. All of this is incorporated in the project strategy, in its budget and in the logframe.</p>	<p>PRODOC Section 2.5. Project Goals, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities</p> <p>PRODOC Part 4 Total Budget and Workplan</p> <p>PRODOC Section 3.2 Logframe</p>
<p><i>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</i></p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly provide detailed justifications in support of the additional cost reasoning.</p>	<p>A thorough additional cost analysis has been carried out, with updated baseline investments, their role in the project and the additionality provided by the project and its co-financing. This is the core of the project strategy. Refer to PRODOC Section 2.5 (<i>Project Goals, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities</i>).</p> <p>Refer also to PRODOC Section 1.4.2 (<i>The project's development baseline</i>) for its calculus.</p> <p>Finally, refer to PRODOC Annex 4. (<i>Additional Cost Analysis</i>) for a summary of the key project's adaptation benefits identified and the cost reasoning behind them.</p>	<p>PRODOC Sections:</p> <p>2.5 Project Goals, Outcomes, Outputs and Activities.</p> <p>1.4.2 The project's development baseline f</p> <p>Annex 4. Additional Cost Analysis</p>
<p><i>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</i></p> <p>Yes. Engagement with relevant stakeholders, including CSOs and rural populations is sought throughout the duration of the project. Recommended Action: By CEO endorsement, and related to question 9, please ensure how gender balance in public participation will be supported.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement, and related to question 9 [on socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project], please ensure how gender</p>	<p>Climate resilience building is particularly important amongst vulnerable groups. In Guinea, where 85% of the population are of Muslim faith, women's role in society is defined in the context of gender-based relations shaped by cultural and religious traditions. More specifically, women do not have land tenure right under customary laws.</p> <p>In terms of getting engaged with a hands-on EbA and natural resource management programme, this has ramifications. Special programming efforts are on designing activities in which rural women can be engaged, and the project foresees local advocacy work to ensure the specific representation of women on technical platforms and teams. It is important to stress that all project design innovations, including the</p>	<p>Various sections, but see in particular PRODOC Section 2.8 Gender Considerations and Other Project Benefits, including Innovativeness, Sustainability and Replicability</p>

Comments	Responses	Document reference
balance in public participation will be supported.	<p>possible establishment of a “food for work” type approach, will be implemented and monitored with gender considerations in the cultural and country context.</p> <p>Where relevant, project indicators are gender disaggregated (e.g. Indicators #1 and #9).</p> <p>A Stakeholder Engagement consultancy will have a specific focus on gender.</p> <p>Finally, under PRODOC Section 3.1 (Programmatic Links), “Gender Marking” applies as a pro-active mode of monitoring gender balance in a project.</p>	
<p><i>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)</i></p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please consider carefully the option of direct implementation modality for the reasons stated, given the importance of country-drivenness with LDCF projects, and the risk of loss of some potential cobenefits, such as strengthening national institutions and capacity.</p>	<p>UNDP would like to clarify:</p> <p>Within UNDP’s management arrangements typology, “direct implementation modality” (or “DIM”) means that UNDP will implement the project itself, i.e. ‘directly’, assuming full responsibility for it and without necessarily involving governments. However, DIM applies to exceptional cases, e.g. global projects or for countries in crisis.</p> <p>DIM does not strengthen national ownership and applies only in exceptional situations.</p> <p>This project will not apply DIM, but rather “NIM” (or National Implementation), as the modality of choice. NIM means that UNDP engages a national entity through a Project Document, holding this entity accountable for delivering on the project outcomes. Through NIM, UNDP ensures country-drivenness and the strengthening of capacity of national institutions.</p>	PRODOC Part 5. Management Arrangements

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF PPG ACTIVITIES AND FINANCING STATUS

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$200,000

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Technical review (PPG Activity A) and National Validation (PPG Activity D)	150,000.00	132,765.60	17,234.40
Institutional arrangements, monitoring and evaluation (PPG Activity B)	30,000.00	11,419.83	18,580.17
Financial planning and co-financing investments (PPG Activity C)	20,000.00	17,307.23	2,692.77
Total	200,000.00	161,492.66	38,507.34

If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLows (IF NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT IS USED)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA