



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

GEF ID:	9760		
Country/Region:	Congo DR		
Project Title:	Mai-Ndombe REDD+ Integrated Project (GEF)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	160182 (World Bank)
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; BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$6,210,046
Co-financing:	\$32,420,000	Total Project Cost:	\$38,630,046
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Karin Shepardson

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	Yes. However, please identify the Aichi targets that this project will help to achieve and the indicators that will be used to track them. March 23, 2016 Addressed.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	The project is developed under the national REDD+ strategy. However, an explanation on how the REDD+ strategy fits with the NBSAP	

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
		(biodiversity) and the NDC (Climate change mitigation) will be welcome to justify the use of BD and CCM resources March 23, 2016 Addressed.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Addressed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Addressed. However, the parent program (FIP) was also addressing private sector activities to reduce fuel wood emissions and promote small scale agroforestry systems to reduce land-use emissions. How these aspects will be addressed in the Mai-Ndombe province? March 23, 2016 Addressed.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	No. - In the GEF data sheet, please explain and justify the use of \$700,000 on the first line of the Component 1 for the Plateau District. - Management costs represent 6.88 percent of the project grant (\$400,000). Please reduce them under	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>5 percent, or \$290,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the table F, "9.6 millions metric tons" is mentioned under the Corporate Result 4: 1) please explain at least in an annex the assumptions, the reasoning, and the calculations to obtain this number and 2) please express the result in tons of CO₂e (direct and indirect). - We understand that the WB uses the EXACT-Tool: please, provide the full Exact-tool in annexe. - Three protected areas are potentially be targeted by this project with only \$1 million of GEF resources: the Tumba Ledima Natural Reserve, the Salonga National Park and the Oswe Hunting Reserve. Please, be informed that a \$6 million PIF is under development for the Salonga NP. Moreover, several donors supports this NP through WWF. It is recommended to complete the analysis of donors and partners on these three protected areas and better focus the resources. We suggest to avoid dispersion of resources, if possible increase the resources, and focus on protected areas where there is a strong need. Please, correct. - Please, provide more geographical information on the targeted Indigenous People Managed community forest concessions where 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>GEF resources will finance biodiversity conservation priorities. - Cofinancing from the FIP is \$14.2 million in the table C: do these resources correspond to the FIP contribution to the IFLMP's first component (PIREDD) on a total of \$36.9 million?</p> <p>March 23, 2016 We do not find the requested information to justify the carbon benefits specifically related to the GEF funded activities and as reported in the GEF datasheet (9.6 M tCO₂). To help understand the GHG impact of the GEF contribution, please, describe the forests and other landscapes that are targeted (including their surface) and their situation without the GEF project (baseline). Describe then the planned activities and the expected results for each kind of targeted area (including the carbon benefits).</p> <p>March 29, 2017 Thanks for the clarification. It will be useful to provide better quantification at CEO endorsement. Addressed.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs	Yes.	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	considered?		
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, however, there is problem on the first line of the Table D: please check and confirm the BD amount.</p> <p>March 23, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<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	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>Not yet, please address the comments above.</p> <p>March 23, 2017 All the comments have been addressed, but one: please provide the elements to figure out the carbon calculations.</p> <p>March 29, 2017 The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 09, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 23, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 29, 2017	

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		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	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.