



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

GEF ID:	9383		
Country/Region:	Benin		
Project Title:	Sustainable Forest Management and Conservation Project in Benin central region		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3; CCM-2 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,627,226
Co-financing:	\$15,930,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,557,226
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Leandre Gbelli

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Template, part I: This PIF is a Multi-Focal Area Project, not a LD one. Please, correct. - Table B: the total of cofinancing (\$15,930,000) does not match with the sum of the different components (\$17,360,000). Please, correct. - Please, include the Aichi targets the project will help to achieve, and the indicators that will be used. 	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design		<p>April 6, 2016 Not addressed. And there are new items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A tracked change version would be appreciated, or at least a document highlighting the changes. - Part I, Project information: 1) include the FA that are considered (the line is empty); 2) the Project ID is missing; 3) the date of (re)submission has not been updated. - Table A: The SFM incentive is too high. With the proposed STAR allocations(\$1,751,484), a maximum of \$875,742 can be triggered, meaning a ratio of 2:1. Please, correct. Please note that this modification is going to impact the tables B and E. - Table D: There are miscalculations in the last column: 1) on the first line, we should read \$945,250 and not \$950,000; on the third line, \$502,625 and not 505,500. However, please make this table consistent with the table A, after modifications. <p>July 7, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Addressed.	
	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	No.	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>- There is a list of problems, direct and non-direct drivers, socio-economic trends, and environmental pressures, but we do not see an analysis of drivers and barriers the project will face.</p> <p>- We do not know the "Noyau region" in Benin. Are you referring to the former departments of Collines, Zou, and Atlantique who received a support from the PAGEFCOM 1? We understand the agency wants to add the departments of Borgou and Donga. Please, clarify.</p> <p>- Some elements of sustainability are proposed. We did not find elements related to innovation and scaling up. Please, complete.</p> <p>- p 5, last section: "the spread of the Sahelian desert into the Southern agricultural lands"? Do you have a reference to support this assertion?</p> <p>April 6, 2016 Thanks for the improvements, but some problems persist:</p> <p>- The mentions of Noyau Central, Noyau Forests, or Noyau area are still present. Clarify what these</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>expressions mean.</p> <p>July 7, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - p8: the breakdown of resources in the text does not fit with the result framework (table B): please, clarify. - The GEF can help to develop the network of protected areas on areas where GEB are demonstrated. You can refer to the KBAs from IUCN. - The list of risks and mitigation measures should be completed with potential environmental risks, including climate change. - We would like to see main results and lessons from the PAGEFCOM1 before deciding how to use GEF resources. Lessons from the PAMF may also be useful. - We invite the Agency to double check the GEF5 project #5215 developed by the World Bank under the SAWAP/GGWI (GGW: Forests and Adjacent Lands Management Project, GEF \$5.5 million; cofinancing \$46 million). The project included a technical assistance to update and implement the management plans of the three forest reserves initially financed by AfDB (Agoua, Monts-KouffÃ©, and Wari-Mar). Please, confirm there is no duplication of efforts. 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>April 6, 2016 - Sorry, but the demonstration is not made on the non-duplication: the three forest reserves of Agoua, Monts Kouffe, and Wari-Marou ARE located in the departments of Zou, Collines, Borgou, and Donga. We repeat that the GEF5 #5212 project aimed to implement 16 management plans developed under a precedent GEF project, and update the management plans of these other forests which received a support from the African Development Bank in 2007.</p> <p>July 7, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>The result framework presents 12 outcomes and 17 outputs. There is the same number of outcomes and outputs for the first two components which are the most important: there is apparently a misunderstanding of what outcomes and outputs are. Please refer to the definition on the link below: http://www.oecd.org/development/peer-reviews/2754804.pdf - Outputs should be expressed the results of activities: they should be very concrete and, if possible, quantified (# of ha, # of training, # of participants, # of plans, of studies,</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>etc). The formulation of outputs should help to figure out the value for money. It is not the case for the time being.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcomes should express the consequences, the effects of the outputs. - For the component 1, the same language is found for the outcomes and the outputs (increase in area, improved management, reduced rates, increased capacity...). Please, revise. - There are duplication of outputs between the first two components (1.2 and 2.2 for instance). - The different categories of protected areas in Benin are included in the Act of 2004 on nature protection: please refer to the appropriate categories. The mention of "protected areas" or "wild parks" is confusing (notably because the second category does not exist in Benin). - Same comment for Forest Management Plans: please use an acceptable definition in the context of Benin. Different expressions are used and are confusing. <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need a better site description of what will be financed by the PAGEFCOM2, and how the GEF resources will be additional and will 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>help in producing Global Environment Benefits. Outreach and awareness activities are not in general key GEF activities. The reasoning to train local communities on ecological tourism concepts is not convincing. The eligibility is not demonstrated.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outputs 1.1, 1.2., 1.3 and 1.4 should be reformulated. <p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The additional role of GEF resources should be demonstrated (is the role of the GEF to implement of SFM plans formulated under PAGEFCOM1?). - We do not understand what activities the GEF will finance under the outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4. <p>Component 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We need basic information on GHG emission mitigation. For example, how did the project set a target of 10,000 tonnes of CO2 emission reduction? What are the assumptions and parameters of estimation (we need detailed calculation in the CEO Endorsement Request stage)? - In addition, please provide information on carbon monitoring in Benin, notably from other initiatives, focusing on the incremental value of 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the GEF investment."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sustainability seems an issue for all outcomes/outputs. <p>April 6, 2016 Thanks for the modifications and the net improvement. However, please make the text in the PIF coherent with the result framework. p.14: Some activities mentioned in the text are barely not eligible if there is not a demonstration of additionality and sustainability (outreach, awareness). Please, refer to the activities proposed under the GEF6 BD1 program 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, note that afforestation should be financed by the baseline project (cofinancing), but not by the GEF. - In past GEF projects, a model of AVIGREF was developed to manage natural resources in a sustainable way. We do not know if the model can be applied in the considered departments, but the possibility should be studied in the PPG. - p14, fourth section: where is the science behind this idea to make these departments attractive for species from the Northern national parks? It seems quite unrealistic to transform half of Benin in a wildlife corridor with a \$2.6 million project. However, 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the migration from buffalos from the other side of the Mono river stays an option.</p> <p>- p14, fifth section: We do not understand the activities that are proposed. We suggest to simplify.</p> <p>Chapter 1.4), p13 and 14: we suggest to not repeat the information provided in the precedent pages and check that the information is at least coherent with the result framework and the rest of the text. A table would be useful to understand the baseline scenario, the project without the GEF, and the added value of the GEF activities.</p> <p>Section 1.5, p15: the information related to carbon storage and avoided deforestation is not enough robust in the proposed description to trigger the SFM incentive. Carbon information is also requested to justify the CCM resources. This information (the reasoning, the logics, the range of values) is expected at PIF level. We need to understand the targeted natural habitats, the nature of interventions, the baseline situation, and the expected final status translated in tons of CO2. The use of a simple tool, as EXACT, is recommended. The GEF Secretariat stays available to discuss further this</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>point.</p> <p>- We understand that any possible coordination will eventually be explored during the PPG. However, please revise the text p18 and 19.</p> <p>July 7, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>There is no socio-economical aspects or mentions of CSO. However, the PIF mentions that a stakeholder engagement strategy will be developed at PPG and "oversight committees" will be established at beneficiary level. It is surprising that with the cumulative experiences of the PAGEFCOM1 and the PAMF in the Monts Couffe and Wari-Maró, it is not possible to provide more accurate elements, even at PIF level. Please, improve this section.</p> <p>July 7, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>Yes.</p> <p>A total of \$2 million of STAR resources have been endorsed by the GEF OFP, including: BD \$1 million; CC \$470,000; and LD \$530,000 (Project grant + PPG + fees).</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	Yes	
	<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"> Focal area set-aside? 	<p>The project triggers \$1 million from the SFM incentive.</p> <p>July 7, 2016 Please, note that the SFM resources cannot be guaranteed for the time being and may be adjusted at Work Program Inclusion.</p>	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the issues raised above.</p> <p>April 6, 2016 Thanks for the significant improvements. However, the PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above. We suggest to organize a phone conference before any new submission.</p> <p>July 7, 2016 All points have been addressed. The PIF is technically cleared.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, please address the following points: - Detail the GEB and the way to</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		measure them; - Include a comprehensive risk assessment (notably the potential risks associated to forest plantations; we would prefer to see these activities clearly financed by the cofinancing); - Confirm the cofinancing; - Confirm the monitoring and assessment program (baseline, indicators, methods). - Detail the implementation arrangements with local communities and CSO. - Please, ensure a good coordination with other donors and partners (GIZ on the Mono river for instance, WB/PGFTR2, etc.).	
Review Date	Review	February 19, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 06, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 07, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review

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

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.