



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

**PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project**

**TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Mano River Ecosystem Conservation and International Water Resources Management (IWRM) Project			
Country(ies):	Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	4953
GEF Agency(ies):	IUCN (select) (select)	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Other Executing Partner(s):	<p><b><u>Executing Agency at regional level:</u></b> Mano River Union (MRU)</p> <p><b><u>Executing Agencies at national level:</u></b></p> <p><b><i>Côte d'Ivoire:</i></b> Direction de la gestion et de la protection des ressources en eau (Ministère des Eaux et Forêts);</p> <p><b><i>Guinea:</i></b> Centre Forestier de N'Zérékoré, Ministère de l'Environnement, des Eaux et des Forêts;</p> <p><b><i>Liberia:</i></b> Forestry Development Authority;</p> <p><b><i>Sierra Leone:</i></b> National Protected Area Authority (Ministry of Agricultural Forestry and Food Security).</p>	Submission Date:	2016-06-03
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration(Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	633,636
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-3 (select)	Outcome 3.1: Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem based management of water bodies and local ICM principles.	Output IW 1: Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Actions Programs are prepared	GEF TF	2,134,204	15,433,217
(select) BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes that integrate	Output BD 1: Regulatory frameworks and dissemination best practices	GEF TF	2,701,173	13,652,475

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	biodiversity conservation	for production sectors (mining, fisheries, forestry and agriculture)			
(select) LD-3	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities.	Output LD 2: INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested	GEF TF	449,693	13,652,475
(select) SFM/REDD+ - 1	Outcome 1: good management practices applied in existing forests	Output SFM 1: Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management, separated by forest type.	GEF TF	1,051,294	13,652,475
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
(select) (select)			(select)		
<b>Total project costs</b>				6,336,364	56,390,642

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<b>Project Objective: Conservation of the Upper Guinea forest ecosystem</b>						
<b>Project Component</b>	<b>Grant Type</b>	<b>Expected Outcomes</b>	<b>Expected Outputs</b>	<b>Trust Fund</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)</b>
Component 1 Integrated Forest Ecosystem Management	Inv	Outcome 1.1: Transboundary natural resources in the Upper Guinea forest ecosystems are managed in a sustainable manner, involving local communities.	Output 1.1.1. Site-specific guidelines for restoration of productivity of tree-based systems produced to promote the use of best practices in forest and landscape restoration interventions and sedentary agricultural practices in the main production sectors affecting forest ecosystems  Output 1.1.2. Training systems established for farmers on how to improve management practices to meet certification programs  Output 1.1.3. Improved management of agriculture activities within the vicinity of protected areas  Output 1.1.4.	GEF TF	4,000,000	35,608,180

			Integrated land use plans developed to enable the generation of sustainable sources of income from different restoration interventions			
Component 2 Sustainable Management of Transboundary Waters	Inv	Outcome 2.1: Water resources are managed at the regional level based on a high level intergovernmental agreement  Outcome 2.2: Strengthened government agencies and institutions for transboundary water resource management	Output 2.1.1: National Inter-Ministerial Implementation Committees established and operational  Output 2.1.2: Improved capacities to prepare TDA and SAP  Output 2.2.1: Awareness raised on transboundary and environmental issues  Output 2.2.2: <i>The regional Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan (SAP) with initial actions are prepared and the SAP adopted at ministerial level</i>  Output 2.2.3: IW learn products generated and disseminated to a broad community of local, national and regional stakeholders  Output 2.2.4: Financial resource mobilization strategy developed and implemented	GEF TF	2,034,633	20,782,462
	(select)			(select)		

	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
	(select)			(select)		
				Subtotal	6,034,633	56,390,642
				Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>	(select)	301,731
				<b>Total project costs</b>	6,336,364	56,390,642

### C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Liberia, Guinea	In-Kind	45,686,290
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	WA-BiCC / USAID	In-kind	10,000,000
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	ROAM-CI/IUCN-UNEP-DFID	In-kind	307,772
Other Multilateral Agency (ies)	MRU/Secretariat	In-kind	106,580
GEF Agency	IUCN/BRIDGE Initiative	In-kind	290,000
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
(select)		(select)	
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			56,390,642

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
IUCN	GEF TF	International Waters	Regional	2,136,364	213,636	2,350,000
(select)	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Sierra-Leone	900,000	90,000	990,000
(select)	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Sierra-Leone	150,000	15,000	165,000
(select)	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Liberia	900,000	90,000	990,000
(select)	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Liberia	150,000	15,000	165,000
(select)	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Guinea	900,000	90,000	990,000
(select)	GEF TF	Land Degradation	Guinea	150,000	15,000	165,000
(select)	GEF TF	(select)	Regional - SFM	1,050,000	105,000	1,155,000
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
(select)	(select)	(select)				0
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				6,336,364	633,636	6,970,000

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

### F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	1,074,000		1,074,000
National/Local Consultants	492,100		492,100

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT?** No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>**

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

No change from PIF. See section 4.5 of the Project Document for further details.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The GEF project – that was formulated under GEF-5 – is aligned with the following Focal Areas Objectives and Outcomes: i) IW-3 Outcome 3.1: Political commitment, shared vision, and institutional capacity demonstrated for joint, ecosystem based management of water bodies and local ICM principles; ii) BD-2 Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes that integrate biodiversity conservation; iii) LD-3 Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities; and iv) SFM/REDD-1 Outcome 1: Good management practices applied in existing forests.

To align with the development period for the PIF, the GEF-5 tracking tools were used for this project.

A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage:

The “Mano River Ecosystem Conservation and International Water Resources Management (IWRM) Project” has emerged from a previous initiative undertaken by the African Development Bank (AfDB) in the frame of the “Mano River Forest Ecosystems Conservation Program”, MARFOP (2010-2012). At that time, in close collaboration with the Secretariat of the Mano River Union, a Project Identification Form (PIF) and a Project Preparation Grant (PPG) have been prepared by the AfDB in the intent to request for GEF co-funding opportunities. The PIF had been approved by the GEF in June 2012. This project was also relying on 2 other AfDB projects, the “Sustainable Management and Development of Mano River Basin Project” and the “Capacity building and institutional strengthening for peace, effective governance, sustainable socio-economic development and regional integration” project. In the meantime, AfDB was asked by its Member States to re-allocate its funds to infrastructure projects. Due to the fact that baseline project and activities identified by AfDB at PIF stage had change, the AfDB could not design the project for CEO endorsement anymore. In 2015, and after consultation with the 4 countries involved in the project (Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra-Leone) and the GEF Secretariat, AfDB contacted the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), which had activities in the region to check its willingness to take over the implementation of the project. The project, for which the PPG had not started, was transferred to IUCN in August 2015.

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

The main comparative advantages of IUCN to implement this project are threefold. First, as a Union of government and NGO Members, Commissions and Secretariat, IUCN aims to influence impact – on improving people’s rights and livelihoods and conserving species and healthy ecosystems – by generating and using knowledge, influencing policy and by demonstrating solutions to biodiversity conservation and hence sustainable development challenges. Therefore, IUCN has a comparative advantage to work through a large spectrum of stakeholders to achieve field results that are used for policy influence from local to international and vice-versa. It gives greater emphasis to understanding drivers of loss of biodiversity and the benefit it provides to people, building from its existing work in agriculture, cities<sup>4</sup>, and economics<sup>5</sup>, and finding ways to integrate policy recommendations so as to reduce the pressures that these drivers are putting on the natural environment and biodiversity.

Second advantage is related to delivering conservation results and learning. Over several decades and by virtue of its Union structure, members of the Union, Commissions or the Secretariat have showed capacity to demonstrate rights-based conservation and nature-based solutions and then influence its other members and partner organizations to scale up successful approaches. The learning and evidence from successful conservation and sustainable management actions are used to communicate and generate successful approaches and to influence partners’ own actions and the policy contexts in which they are working.

Thirdly, IUCN has been working with various governmental agencies in the four countries and the Secretariat of the Mano River union to promote sustainable management of forest and water resources through capacity development and institutional setup actions. During the past three years, IUCN supported the establishment of inclusive governance frameworks for transboundary water resources management in Sierra Leone and Guinea, the generation of science-based information on biodiversity hotspots in the Upper Guinea forest ecosystems (including the four countries), of processes to identify forest restoration opportunities in Côte d’Ivoire, and of the integrated water resources management in the Niger basin in Guinea. All these works are being deployed through regional perspective of the shared forest and water resources management.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

At PIF stage, the baseline projects identified were the “Mano River Ecosystems Conservation Programme (MARFOP)” to be funded by AfDB (USD 10.5 million) and the “Sustainable Management and Development of Mano River Basin Project” to be funded by the African Water Facility (USD 2.2 million). As the MARFOP project did not materialize due to reorientation of investments at the AfDB (see description above), a new baseline had to be identified.

The baseline activities are described and explained in the project document attached to this CEO endorsement request: See sections 3.2 (Page 18) and 3.6 (Page 36) of the Project Document.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

According to the change in the baseline and the projects related to it (see above), the incremental reasoning has changed. The main difference is that the projects, which constitute the baseline, have changed. However, the global environment benefits associated to the project remain the same. The revised incremental reasoning and the expected global environment benefits from this project are described in section 4.7 (Page 70) of the Project Document.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

See section 4.4 (Page 64) of the Project Document.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

See section 3.6.3. (Page 46-47) of the Project Document.

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

See section 6 of the Project Document

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

- Contribution of the project to sustainable development: Sustainable Development Goals addressed by the project, development of sustainable livelihoods (certification system, NTFPs...);
- Promotion of gender equality at the local scale (gender sensitive training activities monitored thanks to the integration of gender-disaggregated indicators in the logframe, no training activities will take place without a certain percentage of participation of women (percentage to be determined for each country at baseline);
- Contribution to environmental protection and improved quality of life for rural communities: description of the ecosystems targeted and expected benefits of the project (restoration of ecosystem services...) at the local scale and at the ecosystem scale (downstream communities);
- Reduction of climate risks such as droughts and floods through improved water management and climate-resilient livelihood development seeks to differentiate at the local scale (climate resilient livelihoods, infiltration, improved management techniques enable improved resilience to droughts) and at the regional scale (improve water stream regulation leading to reduced flow speed and reduce damaged because of sediments);
- Mitigation through degraded land restoration, agroforestry and sustainable land use planning.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Most of the proposed activities build on technical and ecosystem-based approaches already implemented with success in the region. The project will apply technology and competences transfer approach to adapt to the local conditions so as cost of developing such developing is reduced. The proposed activities often consist in up-scaling these approaches to broader areas or to other prioritized sites in MRU. For instance, the project capitalizes on the following approaches:

- Local operating organizations (eg: Rainforest Alliance and others – see section 6 of the project document) will provide technical assistance for the development of certified agroforestry products;
- The WA-BiCC/USAID project plans to implement the same technical approach about forest conservation and land use management plans in the buffer zones of the same targeted protected areas;
- BRIDGE approach on IWRM will duplicated in other transboundary basins, identified as priority basins by the main regional cooperation institutions (ECOWAS, MRU). This approach will be further implemented on the ground.

This strong technical basis and the already demonstrated efficiency of the proposed approaches will insure the effectiveness of the project interventions.

In addition, the proposed intervention strategy and the nature of the activities further strengthen the project effectiveness:

- Forest restoration is far less expensive than hard infrastructure and requires less maintenance. It also provides multiple benefits in the project intervention sites and beyond, compared to hard infrastructures;
- All the activities related to enabling framework have low costs while their benefits are expected to be major and at the large scale. This is the same for the training activities.
- The knowledge generated will guide the implementation and trigger larger scale investments at the regional level.

Finally, the extensive and intense consultation process and stakeholder involvement in the design phase shall ensure a strong local ownership of the project, which is key for sustainability.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:**

See section 7 of the Project Document.


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Mrs Alimata B. Koné	GEF operational Focal Point Permanent Secretary of the GEF National Commission	MINISTRY OF ECONOMY AND FINANCE, CÔTE D'IVOIRE	04/20/2012
Mr. Touré Ahmadou Sebory	GEF operational Focal Point General Director of the GEF General Directorate	MINISTRY OF FOREST, WATER AND ENVIRONMENT, GUINEA	12/30/2011
Mrs Anyaa Vohari	GEF operational Focal Point Director	ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY, LIBERIA	04/04/2012
Mr. Kolleh A. Bangura	GEF operational Focal Point	ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY, SIERRA LEONE	03/07/2012

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Jean-Yves Pirot		03/06/2016	Jacques Somda		jacques.somda@iucn.org



Date: 3 June 2016

To: The GEF Secretariat  
Washington, DC 20433

**Subject: GEF Project Agency Certification of Ceiling Information**

Per Council requirement for GEF Project Agencies, I am pleased to inform you that:

- (a) the value of the largest project implemented (or executed) by IUCN to date is USD 27.4 million<sup>5</sup>; and
- (b) the total value of all projects under implementation by IUCN as of the end of FY 2015 was USD 366 million.<sup>6</sup>

I certify that the GEF financing currently being requested by IUCN for the project, “Mano River Ecosystem Conservation and International Water Resources Management (IWRM)”, in the amount of 6,336,364 USD, is lower than the largest project that IUCN has implemented (or executed) to date.

I further certify that the total amount of GEF financing currently under implementation by IUCN plus the requested GEF financing for the above mentioned project does not exceed 20 percent of the total amount of all projects that IUCN had under implementation as of the end of FY 2015.

Sincerely,



Jean-Yves Pirot  
GEF Coordinator  
IUCN

---

<sup>5</sup> This amount excludes co-financing.

<sup>6</sup> In support of these statements, a copy of (a) the signed loan/grant agreement for the largest project implemented (or executed), and (b) a list of all projects (together with their amounts in US dollars) need to be sent via email, under a separate cover, to the GEF Secretariat at [Project\\_Agency@theGEF.org](mailto:Project_Agency@theGEF.org). These supporting documents will be treated as confidential and will not be shared with any parties external to the Secretariat. The PIF will not be approved in the absence of these supporting documents.

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

See section 2 of the Project Document

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

*At PIF Stage.*

<b>STAP</b>	
<p>General observations. The PIF outlines many anthropogenic threats to the remaining forest ecosystem, and to the livelihoods of the communities associated with the river basin and contains the principal hypothesis that by developing alternative means of income generation forest regeneration will occur. The PIF does not contain any objective evidence that such an intervention could be made to work, indeed it is just as likely that for example, pressure on the forest would be maintained and degradation continued. Regarding stakeholders, it is not clear from the PIF what community land rights exist in order to underpin the proposed certification approach to forest products and presumably also watershed services. To enable the basis of a market-led approach, as is implied, the fundamentals regarding rights to resources and their management would need to be clearly set out.</p>	<p>Developing alternative means of income generation will not be enough to forest regeneration. Additional activities such as training, dissemination of best practices, and awareness raising on sustainable forest and water ecosystem management are complementary to provide evidence that the alternative means of income can help regenerating forest ecosystem which in turn will provide more services to local community at medium to long term. <u>Please refer to section 3.6.3 of project document</u></p> <p>During the project preparation and in consultation of stakeholders at national and local level, the certification approach appears difficult to apply given the current context. Instead the project will focus on training farmers on practices that can latter lead to certification when land tenure become favorable. <b>In fact land right issues could not properly integrated in the project and given the political issues in relation to land and forest resources, it was suggested to undertake training on best practices of land management before proposition any certification approach.</b> <u>Please refer to section 3.4 of project document.</u></p>
<p>The incremental reasoning of the project also relies on ecosystem valuation and the development of integrated land use plans. Ecosystem valuation varies hugely and the methods in use range from hedonic pricing to contingent valuation. The way that values are assigned affects the results fundamentally, as does whether a land-user or societal perspective is adopted. The project proponents need not only to describe the methods that will be used but also supply the scientific rationale for how "valuation of ecosystems provides opportunities for incorporating biodiversity into integrated land use plans." (pp.11-12)</p>	<p>The economic valuation is no longer application to the project. Development of land use plans will build on the current land situation to develop integrated and sustainable land use plans that balance the need for biodiversity conservation and community livelihood. <b>Taking into consideration the various sectors on the ground, and pressing needs of improved knowledge, capacity and livelihood systems, developing integrated land use plans will be more effective for changes, rather than the ecosystems valuation..</b> <b>See section 3.4, output 1.1.4 in project document.</b></p>
<p>In similar vein, the incremental reasoning includes the implementation of 'best practices' for production activities that currently threaten the forest. This begs the fundamental questions: best practices for whom? How will they be identified? What criteria will be used? What database source will be employed? STAP suggests that reference to an approach such as provided by the GEF-financed LADA and WOCAT projects would provide ideas for making the forest protection component of the project rather more realistic. It would give the evidence-base that difficult methodological issues have been thought through and that experience elsewhere has been consulted.</p>	<p><b><u>The best practices for production activities are context-specific, and the project will support the identification and promotion of such farmer-led best practices</u></b> <u>Please refer to section 4.3 in project document, output 1.1.1</u></p>
<p>Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) is the expected result of effective river basin management, and STAP welcomes the investment being made by the African Development Bank and others to rehabilitate the Secretariat of the Mano River Union. The PIF proposes a three year project, with outcomes that are unlikely to be</p>	<p><b><u>We have expanded the duration of the project to 4 years, in order to be able to prepare the STAP and the SAP with initial actions. The SAP with initial actions will be validated by the minister and set the basis for the preparation of the full SAP.</u></b> <u>Please refer to section 4.3. in project documents, Output</u></p>

<p>achieved within that period especially given the time lag that would be expected in order to bring the Secretariat and its operations into effective status.</p>	<p><u>2.1.2</u></p>
<p>Component 1. (Integrated ecosystem management). The baseline activities proposed appear to impose demarcation of forest areas for conservation and its subsequent guarding implying that communities may be displaced. If so then the GEF increment is proposing to invite communities (whether outside or formerly inside the forest units) to either co- manage the forest or to delegate community management, it is not clear which is being proposed. In addition a number of relatively top-down interventions are proposed, backed by incentives which are stated to be increased revenues from sustainable economic activities. Unfortunately the PIF does not indicate even in general terms what these activities might comprise, apart from the Liberian example regarding forest certification.</p>	<p>Based on the consultation conducted during the preparation phase, this component has been reoriented to address ecosystem management through the development of agroforestry to restore functionality of degraded forest ecosystems, promote forest-friendly agriculture, generate diverse products and services from restored lands and forests, and protect habitats, corridors, etc.</p> <p><u>Please refer to section 4.3 in project documents, outcome 1.1.</u></p>
<p>Component 2. (Sustainable Management of Transboundary Waters). The description of the baseline activities does not allow STAP to understand what baseline actions are to be undertaken to achieve 'water resources management' or 'improving management of freshwater resources'. If the project intends to conduct a transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA) and generate a strategic action program (SAP) in accordance with GEF practice then the baseline activities associated with TDA-SAP would need to be integrated into the baseline actions. Otherwise the GEF increment would be superfluous regarding the targeting of priority actions based on sound science. The PIF narrative does not mention use of a TDA-SAP approach. This mentioned solely in the Focal Area Strategic Framework (Section A.), and this is not carried forward into the Section B. Project Framework. The Component 2 narrative goes on to describe a range of possible actions, but none are justified or prioritized with reference to baseline information. In any case the implied TDA approach would need to be implemented before deciding on actions (SAP) to address the pressures that would be documented through a TDA.</p>	<p>The baseline for the preparation of the TDA and SAP with initial actions has been improved, and included in the section B.</p> <p><u>Please refer to section 3.6.1 in project document</u></p>
<p>Section B.3. (Socio-economic benefits). This section contains a range of asserted results, including for carbon benefits, largely unsupported by the previous Component narratives. Regarding communities it is unclear what criteria would be used to select communities for support, not is it clear what the relationship is between community forests and protected forests and from where forest products would originate. In developing further these aspects of the project, STAP draws the attention of the proponents to its GEF guidance on community forest management and on certification; both documents are available through the STAP website.</p>	<p>Provisions have been made to support socioeconomic benefits through Piloting and sustaining on-the ground best practices on agroforestry and other sustainable land uses.</p> <p><u>Please refer to section 4.1 in project document</u></p>
<p><b>GEF Secretariat Review at PIF stage</b></p>	
<p>Question 11 on baseline projects</p>	<p><u>Please refer to section 4.7 of the project document.</u></p> <p>Given the time laps between the PIF reviews (2012 – 2016) the baseline projects have changed (see section A of the CEO endorsement request above). During project</p>

	<p>preparation, most of the work has consisted in updating the baseline projects and activities on which the GEF project will be aligned. This is detailed in section 4.7 of the project document.</p>
<p>Question 17 on the role of CSOs</p>	<p><u>Please refer to section 3.5 and 6 of the project document</u></p> <p>The project has been prepared in a highly participatory manner with the involvement of CSOs at all stages leading to the finalization of the project document and the CEO endorsement request. The project will use an approach based on the involvement of CSOs and all relevant communities during project implementation. Most of the activities related to forest and ecosystems management will involve CSOs. However, the stakeholder analysis (section 3.5) recognizes that the presence of stakeholders at local level is sporadic. Local NGOs are not so active and not really present on the ground in the buffer zones. On the other hand, the efforts from local NGOs and civil society have been mainly oriented towards the fight against Ebola. Recognizing the need to have civil society as an integral part of the response to environmental threats, the capacity building activities, which are an integral part of the project, will work towards strengthening the role of local communities and civil society organizations involved in the buffer zones and the vicinity of the forest ecosystems concerned by the project.</p>
<p>Question 19 on proper coordination with other related initiatives</p>	<p><u>Please refer to section 3.6</u></p> <p>Since the PIF was approved in 2012, there has been a substantial change in the context related to the preparation of the project. In fact, most of the projects and initiatives proposed for partnership in the PIF review sheet have been closed. Also, the Ebola outbreak in the region has substantially diverted aid flows and activities. However, a large part of the work undertaken during the preparation has been to reconnect with stakeholders involved in forests and water ecosystems management activities on the ground. This has enabled to identify synergies and meet the recommendations made in the PIF review sheet.</p> <p>As recommended in the review sheet prepared at PIF approval, a strong partnership has been established with the USAID funded activities on the ground. This has materialized with the involvement of the USAID funded West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change project (WA-BICC) which is co-financing the GEF funded project to be implemented by IUCN. Also, the project will build on the STEWARD program supported by USAID despite the fact that this initiative was ended in 2016 as planned.</p>
<p>Question 20 on development of appropriate partnerships (especially for SFM activities)</p>	<p><u>Please refer to section 6 of the project document.</u></p> <p>During project preparation, the project has built strong synergies with NGOs and partner institutions involved on the ground on forest ecosystems related work. All these institutions and the role they are expected to play in the project implementation are described in section 6 of the</p>

	project document.
Question 25 on co-financing	Given the change in the project baseline, the reorientation of aid flows and activities on the ground due to the Ebola outbreak in the region, the level of co-financing had to be adapted.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>7</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 250,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Scoping and Consultation, Project components design: Data gathering and analysis (firm contract and Workshops)	212,000	177,684	34,316
Environment and social analysis (ESMS consultant and stakeholders consultation)	20,000	0	20,000
Monitoring and evaluation and communication, PPG coordination and project management (IUCN Missions)	18,000	14,050	3,950
<b>Total</b>	250,000	191,734	58,266

<sup>7</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA