



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

GEF ID:	9783		
Country/Region:	Guinea		
Project Title:	Integrated management of natural resources in Middle and Upper Guinea		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5677 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 3; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$7,060,274
Co-financing:	\$25,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$32,060,274
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	

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	- Table A: The right BD Objective/Program should be: BD1 Programme 2 - The Aichi targets are mentioned, but please complete with the indicators that will serve to track project's contributions to achieve the Aichi targets. March 30, 2017 Addressed.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the	- The project refers to 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
	recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	NDC, and NAP. There is a national plan to increase the coverage of protected areas in the country (25% by 2020).	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The drivers and barriers are well identified. However, we are not seeing how these barriers will fully be addressed by the proposed project and implementation by governmental bodies (ministry and OGUIPAR). - UNDP has a significant experience with the GEF on protected area and landscape approaches in West Africa (Niger, Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Benin, Guinea Bissau, Senegal, etc). This project in Guinea is a unique opportunity to take stock of lessons from the GEF/UNDP portfolio since GEF4 and the Strategic Program on Biodiversity for West Africa (SPWA), especially the modes of implementation. Please, take lessons from these project evaluation reports. - The importance of coordination with a number of GEF/UNDP projects is mentioned. However, older or regional projects should also be consulted for synergy and lesson sharing, especially those who faced challenges in project design or implementation (for instance: 1139/UNDP Mont Nimba, 	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>1431/UNEP/FAO Fouta Djallon; 4953/IUCN Mano River).</p> <p>- We would like to see more importance given to innovation in terms of partnerships, implementation arrangements, bottom up approach, financing sustainability, technologies... The project seems very top-down (ministry/agency/local commune), without addressing the needs for a true landscape approach (cross-cutting approach, agriculture/water/energy/forests/conservation, bottom-up approach, role of Farmer Organizations and CSO).</p> <p>March 30, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>There is an acceptable tentative of incremental reasoning. However, three aspects should be clarified at PIF level:</p> <p>- Global environment benefits: could you better explain how you calculated the CR4 of 7 million tCO₂e (and provide the full EXACT file). We take note of the conservative estimation in comparison with the potential 20 million tCO₂e over a ten year period. However, you have to describe the measures to improve carbon storage, reduce deforestation in the different landscape categories (corridors, classified forests, PA...),</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and justify how you calculated the proposed deforestation rates. Be also aware that GEF resources cannot be used for plantation of exotic species. Please, revise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The risks section should be improved, including the threats or potential modifications of the whole landscape by dams planned in the transboundary Bafing river sub-basin shared with Mali: Koukoutamba, Boureya and Bafassa are potentially very large and large dams that could strongly affected the landscape. We hope these will not be lethal risks for the project. Please, confirm, include mitigation measures in the risks section, and address these points in the PPG. - Even at PIF level, a minimum of information is needed about the level and the nature of cofinancing, as well as the level of dialogue with the different partners. For instance, \$20.3 million is mentioned in grants from UNDP and ministries (who often provide in-kind cofinancing): Are you comfortable about such cofinancing in grants? Have you already discussed with WCF, Guinee Ecologie, SEG? Are you comfortable with a level of \$2.7 million of cofinancing from them? 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 30, 2017</p> <p>Addressed at PIF level. During the PPG, please check the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Halving deforestation by 50% seems very ambitious. Is there any law enforcement they are providing to the project that would help reach this target? - Please describe their reforestation practice you inserted in the tool: is this 10,000 ha of reforestation in 10 years in former cropland? What type of plantation are you considering? Is it agroforestry? This practice is giving 2 million CO2-eq reduction, however there is no description of it. - If agroforestry is included, please include the module 3.2.2. 	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.1: Could you clarify the legal basis and eventually the experiences from previous "integrated governance platforms" in Guinee? - Output 1.1: Only administrations are mentioned in the project result framework (OGUIPAR, FSE, DEF): Are the beneficiaries and other partners involved and empowered (local communes, professional organizations, universities, research centers, NGOs...)? Communities are mentioned in the text (p10), but not technical partners as farmer organizations and NGOs. NGOs are 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>only mentioned as partners in the risks section (p 14-15). Please, clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.3: Please, clarify the project area and what you call "Bafing-Faleme Protected Area" and "Bafing-Faleme landscape": We understand that the project area takes a landscape comprising parts of the Bafing river sub-basin, a tributary from the Senegal river. In this area, the creation of the Moyen-Bafing National Park was announced by the Minister of Environment in June 2016. - Output 2.2: Confirm the area and the coverage. It seems to us that 315,200 ha is the core area of the Moyen-Bafing national park (and not the Bafing Faleme landscape or PA). - Output 2.3: Confirm the area and the coverage (national park, buffer zone, corridors, classified forests) - A more accurate map would be welcome. - Output 2.4: What do you mean by "an effective framework..." - It does not sound as an output (specific, measurable, reachable, delimited in time). Please, clarify and revise. - Component 3: we would like to see how you took the lessons from the GEF/UNDP project on Ecovillages in Senegal. From our perspective, we would like to see the different technologies and mechanisms 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>implemented in the same villages to really reflect an Eco-village concept, maximize the multiple benefits, and avoid dispersion.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>Not fully.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most of the preparatory work in the area has been done by scientists and NGO since the 70' and especially since the 2000'. We will appreciate to clearly see how universities, research centers, and NGO will be empowered and involved to support the governmental agencies to design and implement this project. An analysis of CSO and local stakeholders should be proposed to define their comparative advantage in supporting project design and implementation (Guinee Ecologie, CERE, Wild Chimpanzee Foundation, etc.). - Part I Project Information: Other Executing partners: Complete with non governmental bodies (professional organizations, NGOs, research centers,...). - Based on potential risks in the area, it is not only conservation NGOs who should be involved, but entities with competencies in Integrated Water Resources Management, SFM, energy, etc. - Have you identified potential partners involved in promoting low-carbon technologies: NGOs, SMEs? 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- Producer Organizations and their regional and national networks should be mentioned and included in the project design and implementation to lead SLM in production landscapes. The PO are potentially the key stakeholders for sustainability and scaling up of climate smart agriculture and/or agroecological intensification practices.	
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, the proposed GEF grant is within the available STAR allocations for Guinea (STAR: BD 3,100,031; CCM: 3,000,000; LD\$1,853,336).</p> <p>Requested resources (project + PPG + fees): BD: \$3,100,000; CCM: \$3,000,000; LD: \$1,850,000).</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	Yes, BD, CCM, and LD.	
	<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? 	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 30, 2017 All points have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date	Review	March 17, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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)		

CEO endorsement Review

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

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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		