



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

GEF ID:	5547		
Country/Region:	Congo DR		
Project Title:	Community-Based Miombo Forest Management in South East Katanga		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2; CCM-5; LD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,533,333
Co-financing:	\$10,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,683,333
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Jean-Claude Nguinguiri,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	8/25/2013 JS JM UNCCD: Date of Signature: October 14 1994; Date of Ratification: September 12 1997; Effective Date: December 11 1997 Yes. DRC is a party to UNFCCC.	
Resource Availability	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8/25/2013 JS JM Yes.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
Resource Availability	• the STAR allocation?	8/25/2013 JS JM The project was identified in the NPDF and programmed with STAR allocations: LD \$700,000; CCM: \$2,700,000; SFM/REDD+ \$1,133,333	
Resource Availability	• the focal area allocation?	8/25/2013 JS JM	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	8/25/2013 JS JM \$1,133,333 is requested from the SFM/REDD+ incentive. This is the maximum possible with the use of \$3.1 million from the BD and CC STAR allocations, applying the 3:1 ratio.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	8/25/2013 JS JM The project is aligned with the CCM results framework and will contribute towards CCM-5. The project is aligned with the LD2 strategy and the SFM strategy.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	8/23/2013 JS JM Yes. The project is consistent with the priority actions on reducing land and forest degradation, and rehabilitation of degraded landscapes identified in the DRC's national communication to UNFCCC. The project will also contribute to the development of the REDD+ strategy and will inform the revision of the legislation on the rights of local communities over forests. The project is relevant with the NAP (UNCCD). The project was identified in the NPFE	

<p>Project Design</p>	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>8/23/2013 JS JM Yes. The baseline scenario consists of encouraging reforms in the 2002 Forest Code to improve community engagement in forest conservation, progress made on its national REDD+ program and the two pilot miombo forest restoration projects. a) lack of miombo forest management systems, and: b) lack of proven productive sustainable agricultural systems. The demand for food fuels for urban centers has been identified as the main driver for miombo degradation.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>8/23/2013 JS CCM No. Please provide FA breakdown of the indicative grant amount, so that comments aligned with the respective grant amount could be made. Overall, please define project measures that would address each of the identified drivers (or barriers). Also, please describe the project measures, for example community based forest management, sustainable agriculture, sustainable fuel collection, REDD+ and also the specific measures that will be taken therein, through each, to reduce emissions for example increasing soil carbon, reducing N2O emissions from agricultural practices. Component 1: Please specify what proportion of the 80,000 ha forest will be used for consumptive use including fuel, agriculture etc and please support the rationale for the adequacy of the size of the specified area given the demand of forest goods. Focus on the community based forest management is appropriate. However, the component does not</p>	

from the urban centers. Please clarify the community willingness and financial viability of initiating a fund using revenue from the forest goods.

The first component is addressing key issues in continuity of REDD+ efforts in the country, notably land planning issues, community engagement and participation in REDD+, involvement of CSO, and decentralized authorities (province). We appreciate that the more than \$3.3 million. are planned for this key component.

DRC is a UNREDD partner country. In the context of component activities, please explain the work that has been already accomplished in the country regarding REDD+. Please describe the activities the proposed project intends to implement and clarify on their coordination or linkages with the ongoing or past work in the field.

Component 2: Please explain what potential interim legal tools could empower pilot communities in the interim period before MCNET's new legal system takes shape and how the project will make them effective.

The second component seems appropriate if it deals with the legal framework at the Katanga Province level and the way to empower local communities in this specific case. Any other legal framework related to REDD+ should be covered by the baseline scenario and the cofinancing. Please confirm.

Component 3: For the third component, we do not understand why this project should cover \$800,000 of KM, dissemination and monitoring. Please consider to reduce this amount, explain the incremental reasoning, and provide elements about the baseline scenario.

8/29/2013 JS JMS

Adequate explanation is provided for the PIF stage. At CEO endorsement stage please describe how other drivers are being addressed through activities through other partners so that it could be understood the overall impact of the proposed project given the variety of drivers.

Thank you for the clarifications regarding zoning. By CEO endorsement stage please clearly distinguish activities that will be undertaken in the community forests vs in the village lands and also clarify on role of the project in implementation of the zoning plans and articulation of activities allowable within each landuse type.

By CEO endorsement the GEFSec expects clarity on the ways the proposed project will influence the communities decide on use the land in a sustainable fashion regardless of the purpose (fuel, fodder for example).

By CEO endorsement please clearly identify what the "appropriate measures" regarding interim legal measures would be and the details of their content.

	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>8/23/2013 JS CCM No. The preliminary calculations are appreciated. However, please clarify which carbon pools (above ground/below ground) in the miombo would be protected and monitored through the requested funds. Please calculate the CO₂e emissions reduced accordingly. Also, it is unclear whether the project measures will be adequate to conserve the entire 20,000 ha of fully stocked woodlands. Please provide realistic assumptions and related calculations.</p> <p>8/29/2013 CCM JS Please note the carbon pools clearly in the calculations provided by the CEO endorsement. To clarify, the realistic assumption was related to the success of the project with respect to protecting the entire carbon stock (100% of 15-19tc/ha or some proportion of it?). Please consider using such assumptions in the CEO Endorsement Request.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>8/23/2013 JS CCM No.</p> <p>Public participation is identified as a key element of the project. CSO, private companies, and traditional authorities are identified.</p> <p>Considering that local communities are</p>	

		<p>of the project their (including traditional authorities) role and priorities have not been fully identified or integrated into the project design.</p> <p>As the success of the project is contingent upon the involvement and cooperation of the local communities, these elements need to be identified at the PIF stage itself.</p> <p>8/29/2013 JS JMS The clarification is adequate for PIF stage.</p>	
	<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>	<p>8/23/2013 JS JM Yes. At CEO endorsement, include a comprehensive risk analysis.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>8/23/2013 JS CCM No. Please identify REDD+ related activities in the country and partner organizations.</p> <p>8/29/2013 JS The clarification is adequate for PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency 	<p>8/23/2013 JS JM</p> <p>The project will be highly innovative for the Katanga province, DRC, and the African countries concerned by miombos, with a high potential for scaling up.</p> <p>The project will be considered through the REDD+ and the decentralization agendas to ensure a sustainable approach.</p>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	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?	<p>8/23/2013 JS JM No. Based on the revisions for section 7, the funding and co-financing will be revisited. Funding for component 2 seems too low and that for component 3 is deemed too high.</p> <p>- Please revise the nature and financing of the component 3 on KM (see cell 7).</p> <p>8/29/2013 JS JMS Recommended change has been made.</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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>8/23/2013 JS JM No. Please see comment for section 7 and also please clarify what the co-financing from Africa Minerals will be contributing towards.</p> <p>Due to the multiple partners on REDD+ in the Congo Basin, the cofinancing should be much higher than 1:2. Please, complete the baseline scenario, involving more cofinancing. A ratio of 1:3 should be the minimum and 1:4 will be acceptable.</p> <p>- Please confirm that all partners who are</p>	

		<p>reputational risks for the GEF (private sector, mining sector, logging and wood products business, NGOs). Please check the recent history of these companies/partners in the country or the sector.</p> <p>8/29/2013 JS JMS The explanation provided is adequate for the PIF stage. The concerns will be revisited at the CEO endorsement stage. The minimum cofinancing of 1:3 is expected.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	8/23/2013 JS CCM The management costs are low; around 5.2 percent.	
	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?	8/23/2013 JS JM PPG of \$150,000 is requested.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAD?		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>8/23/2013 JS JM No. Please see comments for sections 7,8,10, 12, 16, 17 and 18.</p> <p>8/29/2013 JS JMS Yes. Issues raised in the first review have been addressed adequately for the PIF stage. The PIF is recommended for clearance. For CEO endorsement, please, check the points summarized in the cell 25.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>At CEO endorsement, please:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describe how other drivers are being addressed through activities through other partners. - Clearly distinguish activities that will be undertaken in the community forests vs in the village lands and also clarify on role of the project in implementation of the zoning plans and articulation of activities allowable within each land-use type. - Provide clarity on the ways the proposed project will influence the communities decide on use the land in a sustainable fashion regardless of the purpose (fuel, fodder for example). - Clearly identify what the "appropriate measures" regarding interim legal measures would be and the details of their content. - Note the carbon pools clearly in the calculations provided by the CEO endorsement. To clarify, the realistic assumption was related to the success of the project with respect to protecting the entire carbon stock (100% of 15-19tc/ha 	

		<p>consider using such assumptions in the CEO Endorsement Request.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At CEO endorsement, include a comprehensive risk analysis. - Detail the implementation arrangements and the role of local communities, including traditional authorities. - Confirm the cofinancing. - Include a M&E plan. - Ensure there is no reputation risks for the GEF and its partners in this operations potentially involving the private sector on sensitive issues (mining, logging and wood products business, etc). Please check the recent history of these companies/partners in the country or the sector. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 26, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 29, 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.**