



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5215		
Country/Region:	Benin		
Project Title:	Forests and Adjacent Lands Management Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	131051 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-2; SFM/REDD+-1; BD-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,555,556
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	\$5,555,556
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Salimata D. Folleya

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?		Addressed.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Addressed.	Addressed.
Resource Availability	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● the STAR allocation? 		Addressed

	<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"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		<p>- The project triggers the Sustainable Forest Management/REDD+ incentive mechanism in addition to Land Degradation and Biodiversity GEF allocations. Please, be reminded that the use of the SFM/REDD+ incentive needs to be justified with carbon benefits. In the final package, please provide a quantification of carbon benefits and the mode of calculation.</p> <p>January 25, 2012 addressed in the TT.</p>
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		<p>- In the GEF Data sheet, for the second table related to the GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK, please use the phrasing and the numbering available in the GEF-5 strategies for each outcome and output.</p> <p>January 25, 2012 Addressed. The table A has been updated with the right phrasing and numbering. However, please check with GEFOBS if the GEF annex template is acceptable.</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		<p>- In the GEF Data sheet, for the second table related to the GEF FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK, please use the phrasing and the numbering available in the GEF-5 strategies for each outcome and output.</p> <p>January 25, 2012</p>

			<p>updated with the right phrasing and numbering. However, please check with GEFOBS if the GEF annex template is acceptable.</p>
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>		<p>As this project is using STAR allocations for Biodiversity and Land Degradation, please, confirm that this project is aligned with national action plans for implementing the UNCCD (i.e. National Action Plan) and CBD (i.e. National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan). See Para 38 for instance.</p> <p>January 25, 2012 Addressed in the PAD (section 45).</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>		<p>- The aspects of sustainability are certainly not easily addressed in a context such as Benin. However, the lack of post-project strategies was already mentioned in previous GEF/WB projects. To the extent possible, please explore elements of sustainability for the management of gazetted forests, focusing on the potential innovative partnerships between the different stakeholders in the field, including the traditional authorities.</p> <p>- In terms of Forest Management Plan implementation, promoting local governance mixing the administration, the communes, the various professional and user associations, as well as the traditional decision making powers could be the main innovative element of this project. We hope that these elements of partnership will be secured in the final package.</p>

			Addressed.
Project Design	11. 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?		- The mid-term evaluation (November 2010) raised a concern about the quality of some Participatory Forest Management Plans. Since the restructuring, we understand that most of the Participatory Forest Management Plans have been developed in the last 12-18 months of the FALM project. Please provide information on the quality of these plans and ensure that they are fully operational. January 25, 2013 Addressed.
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?		Addressed.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		1. Component 1: per definition, the GEF grant should be incremental and finance additional activities. The GEF grant should focus on "additional" activities at the local level to implement the forest management plans on the ground. It is difficult to justify business-as-usual activities, as the activity 1.1 to build and restore annexed offices in Cotonou (See also the conclusions of the Terminal Evaluation of the National Parks Conservation and Management Project that raised serious concern over the use

			<p>potentially hurting the sustainability of the project's achievements after the project closure).</p> <p>2. Component 2: Please, clarify what is meant by "degraded surfaces" in the Para 58. Degraded surfaces are not eligible under the LD focal area per se if those areas are no longer being used by target beneficiaries. Please clarify why nearly 70% of GEF resources in this component is being directed toward "degraded surfaces" (activity 2.3), while management of forests (2.4) and improvement of agricultural practices (2.5) are allocated only a tiny fraction.</p> <p>3. Component 3: \$180,000 is programmed for this component related to Sustainable Fuel Wood Production and Marketing. It is not fully clear which activities will be undertaken to create ten rural wood markets and plant 150 ha of wood fuel plantations. Please, provide more information about the activities that are planned and what is meant by "private wood fuel plantations" (cf. annex I, p. 17).</p> <p>Component 4: Endowment of the Foundation: no comment, except that we regret that Benin has not allocated more GEF STAR resources.</p> <p>January 25, 2013 Addressed.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits</p>		<p>Addressed.</p>

	<p>16. 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>- We did not find particular mention of gender issues in the project activities or the monitoring aspects. Please, explain. We suggest including gender issues in the monitoring of the beneficiaries of income generating activities.</p> <p>January 25, 2013 Addressed.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>		<p>- In terms of Forest Management Plan implementation, the empowerment of community-based organizations and the participation of professional organization are welcome. The consultation of the beneficiaries of income generating activities as well as local governments as well is also welcome. We appreciate that the traditional authorities, notably the traditional hunters, are mentioned, as these organizations are enough strong in the area (for instance in the area of the three new management plans), and have a major role in natural resource management. We hope that these elements of partnership will be secured in the final package. It could be the main element of innovation and sustainability of this project.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>- The initial FALM project was planned for a 5 year-period. One year before closing, only five out of 14 Participatory Forest Management Plans of the Gazetted forests were done, mainly due weak institutional capacity, as mentioned in the 2011 PIR. For this reason, the project was restructured, simplified, and extended by 18 months</p>	

		<p>FALM and recent institutional and staff changes in the Ministry raise some alerts on the feasibility to implement this project on a three year period, as it is proposed. Please, justify. By the way, please note that the mention of four years can be found in some sections of the document (p33 for instance).</p> <p>January 25, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		<p>The project is developed under the SAWAP.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		<p>Innovation: In terms of Forest Management Plan implementation, promoting local governance mixing the administration, the communes, the various professional and user associations, as well as the traditional decision making powers could be the main innovative element of this project. We hope that these elements of partnership will be secured in the final package.</p> <p>January 25, 2013 Addressed.</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		<p>This project is developed under the GEF and WB Sahel and West Africa Program to Support the Great Green Wall Initiative (SAWAP). The Program Framework Document for the SAWAP was approved by the GEF Council in May 2011. There was no</p>

Identification Form). However, a one page summary was included in the PFD. Any change with the PFD and the project summary should be justified:

- o Change of baseline scenario: the initial targeted sources of cofinancing were the West Africa Agriculture Productivity Project (WAAP) and the Urban Environment and Disaster Management Project. This project is now an additional financing to the Benin Forests and Adjacent Lands Management (FALM, GEF3 project). Actually, these new arrangements fit even better with the overarching orientations of the GEF/WB Sahel and West Africa Program to Support the Great Green Wall Initiative. However, please include an explanation to clarify and justify the shift.
- o At the PFD level, all the LD allocation was programmed under the LD3 objective (competing use in the landscapes). We suggest to stay under a LD3 objective to avoid any additional justification. Moreover, part of the support under the component 2 deals with investments in improved agricultural practices and sustainable management of agricultural lands.
- o The project document does not include specific details on how the FALM will contribute to the SAWAP Key Performance Indicators (KPIs). At least three of the KPIs should be directly supported by the proposed project, and therefore should be highlighted to enable program level aggregation of outcomes. Please consider addressing this in the

			<p>SAWAP KPIs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increase in land area with SLWM practices in targeted areas, compared to baseline 2. Changes in vegetation cover in targeted areas, compared to baseline 3. Targeted institutions with increased adaptive capacity to reduce risks and respond to climate variability, compared to baseline 4. Change in carbon accumulation rates in biomass and soil, compared to baseline <p>FALM Outcomes and Indicators</p> <p>January 25, 2013 Addressed.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>		<p>- Component 5: Management costs: All other projects under the SAWAP applied management costs of five percent (Chad, Burkina Faso, or Togo). The GEF appears to be the main provider of the management costs with 10 percent of the GEF grant (9.89 percent). The Government of Benin provides \$1.89 million for the management costs, representing 5.65 percent of their parallel contribution from the PRSC. The agency should consider reducing the management costs supported by the GEF.</p> <p>- Per definition, the component 5 aims to ensure proper Project management and coordination. Is it justifiable to include technical assistance in this component (p4 ISDS)?</p>

			Point taken.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		<p>â,¸ In the final package, please provide the commitment letters of cofinancing.</p> <p>- In the GEF Data sheet, it appears that the \$2 million IDA grant has been omitted in the cofinancing. Please, correct.</p> <p>January 25, 2013 Addressed.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		Addressed.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>â,¸ In the final package, please include the tracking tools for Biodiversity, Land Degradation, and Sustainable Forest Management.</p> <p>January 25, 2013 Addressed. Thanks.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		- The global environment benefits are clear and monitored (number of additional hectares of forest or degraded forest under sustainable management, number of management plans effectively implemented of the 19 gazetted forests).
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		

Secretariat Recommendation

Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Suggestion for the text (PAD):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 2: Please refer to the outcomes and indicators provided in the GEF5 strategy, and include a description of global environment benefits relative to each focal area (Land Degradation, Biodiversity) and the SFM/REDD+ incentive. - Section 3: We suggest removing the mention "small" to characterize the country. - Para 5: Benin was not "selected" to be a part of the program. The GEF and WB Sahel and West Africa Program to Support the Great Green Wall Initiative is a country-driven program. The Government of Benin chose to engage with a willing commitment because they subscribed to the approach promoted by the program. Please, modify. - Incremental reasoning: the rationale for the additional financing is given from a country and a WB perspective (Para 12 and 13). Please include a reference to the incremental reasoning to show GEF perspective. The elements are available in the annex VI. 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>January 25, 2013</p> <p>All points have been addressed, but one.</p> <p>Upon receiving the GEF annex with the right format we will be pleased to</p>

			January 30, 2013 The Bank agreed with the content in the GEF annex, including the table B. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*		December 03, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)		January 25, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		January 30, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.