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

GEF ID:	**9521**		
Country/Region:	**Guinea-Bissau**		
Project Title:	**Managing Mangroves and Production Landscapes for Climate Change Mitigation**		
GEF Agency:	**IUCN**	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):		**CCM-2 Program 4; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$137,614**	Project Grant:	**$3,298,304**
Co-financing:	**$41,146,220**	Total Project Cost:	**$44,582,138**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jean-Marc Sinnassamy**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jacques Somda**

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]		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and		

[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)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	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?		
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	July 1, 2016 UA: The PPG is within the allowed limits and it recommended for CEO approval. The parent PFD was approved by Council June 8, 2016.	
Review Date	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
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	March 14, 2018 - Table A and D: Please, strictly follow the programming of resources agreed at PFD level: $1,500,000 from CCM (+$135,000 of fees), $698,869 from LD (and $62,898 of fees), and $1,099,435 of SFM ($98,949 of fees). - You should be able to find the right numbers in the annex 7, but the letter of endorsement is currently still missing (highlighted in the previous review). March 30, 2018 - The table A is not correct. See the amounts for the LD programs. Please, correct. - In the Request for CEO endorsement, it is not correct to write	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		that there is no available annex B (p29) and that no review was done at PIF stage: A table of responses to STAP and Council members expressed at PFD level was included in the submission of February, 23 2018. This annex is a piece of the CEO endorsement package. Please, include this table of responses in lieu of annex B.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	- The project design follows the TRI framework and its four components on 1) policy development, 2) implementation of restoration initiatives, 3) Institutions, Finance, and upscaling, and 4) Knowledge, Partnerships, Monitoring, and Assessment. - Please, revise the formulation of the following outputs: 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2.2.1, 3.1.1, and 3.1.2. The formulation of several outputs is not correct (if needed, please refer to https://www.oecd.org/dac/evaluation/2754804.pdf). The outputs should be expressed, as far as possible, to reflect the results of the activities, be specific, measurable/quantified. Many of them are expressed as outcomes. March 14, 2018 Addressed.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	For the four technical components and the project management costs as well, it will help to explain how the cofinancing will contribute. For instance, the GEF budgets for the outcomes 1.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 4.1 are relatively low, it will help to explain what and how the cofinancing will intervene. Component 1 - The Component 1 should focus on policy development and integration as mentioned in the PFD to increase national and sub-national commitment to landscape restoration, design national and sub-national policy and regulatory frameworks supportive of restoration, SLM, carbon stock enhancement, and reduced GHG emissions from land use and agriculture. - The output 1.1.1 is potentially welcome (with a better formulation, as mentioned in the cell 2). The output 1.1.2 and activities related to knowledge should be transferred in the component 4 devoted to knowledge, partnerships, Monitoring, and assessment. - Clarify the activities behind "support to the Mangrove Law finalization and process". Provide a better formulation and detail the	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		output and the activities. - It is really difficult to consider the budget for the component 1 (activities 1.1.1.1, 1.1.1.2, 1.1.2.1, 1.1.3.2), mainly composed of staff time and DSA, without clear outputs, results, and activities. For instance, the activity 1.1.1.1 includes 320 days of DSA to identify and disseminate mangrove restoration opportunities. Without more background, it is just not acceptable. - The budget for the component 1 is relatively low, but we understand that some activities to improve the strategic and regulatory framework will be covered by the cofinancing (PADES) and a draft Mangrove law is available. Please, confirm. Component 2 - We appreciate that 60% of the project grant is focused on the outcome 2.1 for concrete restoration and rehabilitation activities. - However, the level of resources for the outcome 2.2 (sustainable livelihoods) is surprisingly low -$255,500-, raising questions about the commitment and empowerment of local communities, and about sustainability. Either you can justify that cofinancing (or parallel projects) will cover a large part of these	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Income Generating Activities, or you have to find a way to increase this sub-component. March 14, 2018 We are taking note of the clarifications. 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)	Yes	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	- Two letters of cofinancing are available: one from IBAP, the second from DGA. $41.146 million is a huge amount in kind. However, the cofinancing from IBAP is linked to a project financed by the European Union, and the cofinancing from DGA is linked to two projects financed by IFAD and BOAD. - The letter from DGA mentioned two projects: PADES and PASA Jovem. However in the project document, if the PADES is mentioned, we find the mention of the PPRFJ (French Acronym). Please, confirm the PASA Jovem and the PPRFJ are the same projects. Complete the list of	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		acronyms. - Include in the table of responses the currency rates you used to change the FCFA in US$. - The cofinancing amount for the component 4 is surprising: could you elaborate on these $3.5 million devoted to knowledge, partnerships, monitoring and assessment: origin of funds, to do what. March 14, 2018 Addressed.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	The TRI Consolidated tracking tools are available. However, address the following points: - Complete the page 1; - Include the carbon gains from the EXACT tools. - Include a temporary number of beneficiaries (to be confirmed). For the EXACT tool: The results seems globally acceptable. However, the following comments can be expressed: - Please, include an annex to explain the reasoning, the different project activities of landscape restoration, management, and protection, and justifiy the assumptions. - Why did you choose a 5+5 years	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		period for the calculation? We recommend a total of 20 years unless a different period "is deemed appropriate". If it is not the case, it would be recommended to extend the capitalization phase to 15 years (instead of 5); - Apparently, you did not fill the item 3.3.1 of the "Crop Production table" (it should not affect much the global result anyway but it allows to take into account the changes in the water regime and the impact of the amendments); - Please, include the carbon mitigation estimates in the TRI Consolidated Tracking Tools (it is mentioned " TBD at project inception using the EX-Act methodology"). - Please, check the coherence of numbers of ha and carbon in the result framework, the tracking tools, and the EXACT tools. March 14, 2018 While it is mentioned in the table of responses that the coherence of information has been checked, the carbon information in the tracking tools is still not coherent with the EXACT tables: Please, check carbon information in the LD (line 12) and SFM (line 21) tables. - The tracking tools in the last email	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		submission and those included in the project document are different versions. Please, update. March 30, 2018 Addressed.	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?	- Project document, p41: a list of on-going or planned GEF projects is mentioned. It is a first step, but it is not enough. Please, include the mechanisms or outputs you expect from a collaboration/synergy with these projects. If these mechanisms are not mentioned in the project document and negotiated with the concerned projects, there is little chance they will materialize later. Are you planning to have common steering or technical committees? Are you agreeing on a principle of reciprocity to participate in project coordination meetings? Are you planning common training or publications? Please develop. - We would like to ask the same question with the cofinancing projects -PADES, PPRFJ, and GCCA projects. -p15 Request for CEO endorsement:	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		the list of stakeholders involved in the project implementation stays vague, while a stakeholder analysis is expected at PPG level. Could you be more accurate and name the national, sub-national authorities, the NGOs, professionals, and different communities who will be involved in the different sites. March 14, 2018 Addressed.	
	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 descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	Addressed.	
	• STAP	Addressed.	
	• GEF Council	Addressed.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	The project cannot be recommended yet for CEO endorsement. Please address the comments above. - Also include a table of responses to STAP and Council Members'	

[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
		comments made at PFD. - Table E: Include the metric tons of CO2e mitigated; - Include one page to explain the reasoning and the assumptions related to carbon calculations (EXACT). - Table D: enter the right amounts per focal area and SFM. It is not correct to present this project fully financed by the SFM (Multifocal). Use the data from the table A. - Include the most recent letter of endorsement in the final package. - Provide the geographical coordinates of field sites. Thanks. March 14, 2018 The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, see the items 1 and 6.	
Review Date	Review	January 04, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 14, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 30, 2018	