



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

GEF ID:	<b>9515</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Congo DR</b>		
Project Title:	<b>The Restoration Initiative, DRC child project: Improved management and restoration of agro-sylvo-pastoral resources in the pilot province of South-Kivu</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,600,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$12,381,530</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$16,131,530</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Christophe Besacier</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>July 1, 2016 UA:</p> <p>The PPG is within the allowed limits and it recommended for CEO approval.</p> <p>The parent PFD was approved by Council June 8, 2016.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	The targets of this TRI child project have considerably been reduced. Justifications are given and are acceptable.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The result framework follows the PFD framework with four technical components on policy development, implementation of restoration, Institutions/Finance/upscaling, and Knowledge.</p> <p>The formulation of some outputs should be revised (1.2, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.3). If needed, refer to the OECD guidelines (<a href="https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf">https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf</a>): the outputs should reflect the results of activities, be specific, measurable, and quantifiable. They should help to figure out the value for money. For instance, "barriers to promote FLR identified" is not an output, as well as "priority zones identified, or "sustainable livelihoods developed", "training" ... are not outputs. Please, revise.</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		February 23, 2018 Addressed.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>- Based on the whole result framework and the budget, we appreciate the coherence between outcomes, outputs, activities and financing. Roughly, the budget is composed of international consultants (12%), national consultants (18%), contracts, including micro-projects for local communities (24%), travel (5%), training (20%), and materials/equipment (21%).</p> <p>- However, a section is lacking to explain the cost-effectiveness of the project (justifying the proposed approach in comparison with other project implementation modes). Please, complete.</p> <p>- Request for CEO endorsement: Section 112: It is mentioned that FAO is the Implementing Agency and will also act as executing agency under a direct execution implementation modality. This option is not aligned with the GEF Policy document (GEF/C.41/06/Rev.01): the usual project implementation mode is a clear separation of Implementation/Supervision and Execution Functions. Please, clarify and revise.</p> <p>- Section 122, p35: "The PMU staff will be recruited by FAO and will report to the FAO budget holder". We invite the GEF Agency to make a clear distinction between Implementation and Execution. We do not encourage the GEF Agency to recruit on its own the Project Management Unit. The legitimate institutions (MEDD) should be involved and empowered. Please, clarify.</p> <p>- The cofinancing ratio is in average of 1:3.4. However, for the management costs, the</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>cofinancing ratio is 1:0.17, highlighting that the GEF is more or less financing alone the project management. Please, clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the opposite way, the component 1 is financed by cofinancing at a height of \$3.4 million, with \$445,500 from the GEF (1:7.7).</li> <li>- The financing of the component 4 seems high (\$707,950) in regards to the expected outputs. Moreover, the output 4.2 (long term strategy) seems a duplication with the outputs 1.1 (Provincial Restoration Strategy) and 1.3 with the development of forest and landscape restoration plans. We suggest to focus the component 1 to reinforce institutions capacities, including the development of plans and policies, and focus the component 4 on knowledge aspects. If the institutions are reinforced, with the development of reforestation plans in South Kivu (ROAM) and with development plans for Kabare and Ngweshe Chiefdoms, we make the assumption that the monitoring aspects will be included. Last, training activities on monitoring are also included in the outputs 3.1 and 3.2.</li> <li>- We recommend to reduce the financing of the component 4 and assign more resources to concrete landscape and forest restoration activities and/or sustainable livelihoods, especially for vulnerable groups (indigenous people, youth, extreme poor, and pastoralists), and sustainability aspects among these vulnerable groups (governance, capacity building). The experience of FONAREDD and DGM could help to set up and implement a plan to improve the role of Indigenous People and other vulnerable groups in forest governance.</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		February 23, 2018 Addressed.	
	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)	Risks and mitigation measures are identified. However, there is no mention of environmental or ecological risks (climate change, natural hazards, invasive species, fire, etc.). It is pretty surprising for a landscape and forest restoration project... Please, advise.  February 23, 2018 Addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes, letters of cofinancing are available.  Please, complete the letters in French with a non-official translation, as this is the practice.  February 23, 2018 Addressed.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes  EXACT Tool: Thanks for the annex 11 explaining the reasoning and the assumptions. These estimates look acceptable. However, please consider the following points: - For the indirect estimates, we would recommend to reduce the project duration to 2-3 years instead of 5. It is up to you to decide when the indirect benefits can actually be considered after the beginning of the project, but in general, it is never before 1-3 years of implementation. It should not change much the results, but the reasoning would be more robust and logical.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- In the TRI Consolidated Tracking Tools, we wonder why you didn't inform the carbon benefits in the table named "LD_GEBs and social benefits" as you have correctly informed the other tables.</p> <p>- Please, check that the number of ha and carbon tonnage are coherent between 1) the result framework, 2) the EXACT tables, and 3) the TRI consolidated Tracking Tools.</p> <p>February 23, 2018 Further exchanges took place by email. Thanks for the clarifications. Addressed.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument</i> : Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>A list of baseline or parallel projects is available. However, there is no proposed mechanisms or clear outputs on how the different projects may work together. If these mechanisms (common steering or technical committees, common missions, knowledge sharing mechanism, etc.) are not included in the project document, there is little chance synergy/coordination/exchange will happen. Please, complete.</p> <p>February 23, 2018 Addressed.</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes	
	10. Does the project have	Yes	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	No PIF per se, but the project document reflects what was agreed at PFD level.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	Yes Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	Council comments were made at PFD level; those relevant for this project have been responded by the GEF Agency.  Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>The project cannot yet be recommended for CEO endorsement. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>In the CEO Request Template:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please revise the table E and the Corporate Result 1: provide only the number of ha where Global Important Biodiversity will be maintained (the KBNP).</li> <li>- Include a table of responses to STAP and Council Members comments.</li> <li>- Provide the geographical coordinates of field sites.</li> </ul> <p>February 23, 2018 All comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for clearance and ready for Council information.</p>	

<sup>3</sup> 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.



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	January 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 23, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		