

# Strengthening ecological connectivity in the Dulombi-Boé Tchetché complex (DTB)

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10556

**Countries**

Guinea-Bissau

**Project Name**

Strengthening ecological connectivity in the Dulombi-Boé Tchetché complex (DTB)

**Agencies**

IUCN

**Date received by PM**

3/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/24/2020

**Program Manager**

Jaime Cavelier

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF

### Part I – Project Information

#### Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-1-20

This GEF7 BD/LD project to enhance connectivity in the Dulombi-Boe-Tchetche Complex (DBT) and reduce degradation and fragmentation of its ecosystems is welcome. This project could be an interesting follow up of GEF4 and GEF5 projects which helped to create the terrestrial DB National Park and the Bioguine Fondation (#3575 and #5368).

There are far too many objectives in Table A. This is a reflection that the project is trying to do too much for the overall Objective of the project. The GEF suggest simplifying the project as much as possible so the resources can deliver tangible and measurable results on the ground. Use only the most relevant BD and LD Objectives (and indicators). Suggest selection of LD-1-3 in Table A (Forest and Landscape Restoration).

The sum of the Objectives under BD and LD in Tables A and D is not consistent. The sum should be the same for LD (\$2.7 million) and BD (\$2.0 Million).

4-23-20

The Project is selecting LD-1-3 (\$1,800,000) on Restoration, but there is no Target associated with these investments (Indicator 3 Area of land restored). Since Restoration is at the core of Component 2 and mentioned 60 times in the PIF, it is obviously very relevant to the proposed activities and deliverables of the project. Use LD1.1. objective on SLM and keep LD2.5 as deem appropriate with the level of investment in these two objectives. Double check the LD Objectives to set use of funds and contributions to Core Indicators

LD-1-1	Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through Sustainable Land Management (SLM)
LD-1-2	Maintain or improve flow of ecosystem services, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people through Sustainable Forest Management (SFM)
LD-1-3	Maintain or improve flows of ecosystem services, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people through Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR)
LD-1-4	Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape
LD-2-5	Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN

## Agency Response

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The target objectives have been reduced. Only 2 BD and 2 LD objectives are now targeted by the project (BD 1-1, BD 2-7, LD1-3, LD2-5)

The sum of the Objectives under BD and LD in Tables A and D have been harmonized

04/24/2020 - IUCN

LD 1.1 has been added and amount distributed among 1.3 as well. Indicators have been adjusted accordingly. An area of 75K has been included under 3.2 while 70K maintained in 4.3

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

**Component 1**

The description of the Component under the Alternative Scenario is a sign that the associated outcomes need to come into focus and the number of outputs reduced. Suggest having a single outcome with outputs that reflect the necessary interventions to achieve the Objective (*Improved and sustained the ecological connectivity of the DBT Corridor and related transnational protected areas of Niokolo-Koba (Senegal) and Badiar (Guinea) by strengthening biodiversity conservation and improving sustainable land use*).

There are far too many soft targets for a \$1M (i.e. *Mapping; Management plans* (What about implementation? What is the land tenure situation of these lands and who ensures implementation of these plans?); *Enhanced law enforcement monitoring* (this requires Investment); *IUCN Green List Process* (what are the associated GEBs? Is this necessary?); *Cooperation protocols; Joint management committee; A multi stakeholder dialogue framework, monitoring' Political and institutional platforms established*). Request the re-formulation and the reduction of outputs to better reflect the expected results of activities (Including but not limited to 1.1.3, 1.2.4, 2.1.1, and 2.1.2). The GEF recommend removing the outputs related to IUCN Green List (1.1.4, 1.1.5) as this is not the best use of GEF resources.

**Component 2**

Technical Assistance only for restoration of degraded land and ecological corridors? Where is the funding coming from for implementation of the restoration when all the co-financing is in Recurrent Expenditure? If Restoration will be used, please elaborate on the meaning of the term in the context of this project.

Reconsider the development of the Financing mechanism for the complex, unless a clear path has already been defined and likely to succeed. Starting from scratch is unlikely to deliver tangible and durable results.

The GEF recommends including an outcome or output on Land Degradation Neutrality. Guinea Bissau was part of the GEF/IUCN LDN Target Setting Programme.

### Component 3

Reduce the budget for the component (\$900,000 or 20%) and adjust the outputs that are useful and justifiable. No need to spend nearly \$1M when the implementation of the project will require as many fresh funds as possible.

4-23-20

### COMPONENT 1

The Budget for the Component (\$1,500,000) appears to be insufficient to carry out the 5 outputs, especially considering the scope of Output 1.1.2 At least 3 protected areas demonstrate improved management effectiveness and governance equity (through METT and related tools, benchmarked to the IUCN Green List Standard)

This is what is being proposed for this output

*Finally, Component 1 will focus on strengthening the capacities of park rangers and technicians from different institutions with a focus on the effective management of protected areas, the restoration of forest landscapes, the conservation/restoration of watersheds of main rivers, and the dynamics of habitat conservation of transnational vocation. It will also strengthen the capacities of park rangers and technicians on law enforcement and wildlife monitoring at the DBT complex and target ecosystems. Regarding the transnational dimension, capacity building on the shared governance of transboundary ecosystems will be addressed and will contribute to the removal of barriers to ecosystem-based monitoring of conservation policies.*

Since all the co-finance is in Recurrent Expenditure, the \$1.5 million will be used to carry out all of the activities listed above.

Suggest reducing the number and scope of the capacity building outputs (1.1.1; 1.1.3; 1.1.4 and 1.1.5) and concentrate the resources for “Investments: for Output 1.1.2.

Should Output 2.1.3: *Financing mechanism for the complex developed in collaboration with stakeholders (Government, Communities, Private Sector) supporting BioGuinée and other funding mechanisms for the protected area system in Guinée-Bissau* be part of Component 1 instead?

### COMPONENT 2

This is the project of Restoration and LDN.

LDN concept and targets are mentioned here and there, but concretely, the targets themselves are never described (i.e. Not clear is the selected corridor is a LDN target and in which measure this project will significantly contribute to the LDN targets). There are several capacity building activities, but the whole strategy is not clear (Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2 don't seem to deliver much in relation to the targets). Make explicit the relationship of the proposed interventions with the LDN Targets for GB. <https://knowledge.unccd.int/home/country-information/countries-having-set-voluntary-ldn-targets/guinea-bissau>

### COMPONENT 3

Reduce the budget significantly (No need to spend nearly ½ million dollars in these activities when there is so much need in Components 1 & 2).

## Agency Response

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The revised component 1 now has 1 outcome. The outputs of this component have been reformulated. The revised project now has 4 outputs instead of 10 initially. The outputs on green list have been replaced by an output on PAs management effectiveness and governance. 500,000\$ have been added to the budget of this component.

All the soft targets as mentioned in the review have been transformed into outputs that will effectively generate GEBs, focusing on implementation of measures enhancing natural resources management, and not only assessments. However, it should be noted that the management plans under output 1.1.1 will have an element related to assessing the situation, management practices and gaps related to the selected ecosystems.

Component 2:

Sorry for the oversight, this will be mainly investment and has been modified accordingly in the portal. Most of the restoration work is to be done under the baseline and the co-financing. The GEF project will contribute to restoration partly, and play a role of coordination among all the projects and initiatives as described in the revised description of the baseline. But the LD funding will play a role in restoring land under component 2 mainly. This will be done in a participatory manner in the productive landscapes that are outside of the PAs within the concerned corridor. Under output 2.1.2, the support provided by the project to value chains, giving more emphasis so mainstreaming biodiversity then in the baseline scenario and related projects, will enhance their effectiveness, reduce the pressure these are putting on natural resource. Hence not undermine the restoration work that will undertaken under the baseline activities and co-financing done through MDB funded projects (IFAD, AfDB) that are part of the baseline, PAPBIO and the Guinée\_Bissau Terra-Ranka Programme.

The financing mechanism isn't new and starting from scratch. Component 2 will support BioGuinée Fund in reaching out more to the private sector and enhancing the enabling environment for further private sector investments once the project ends. This is new and additional to what BioGuinée Fund is already doing. As a result, BioGuinée Fund is expected to bring \$2,724,000 in co-financing to the project, which will support the development of the private sector, particularly promotion of ecotourism, scientific tourism and carbon market ?

One outcome and three outputs are included on Land Degradation Neutrality. The outcome will strengthen national measures to Achieve Land Degradation Neutrality (NDT) by the year 2030, in particular restoration of forest ecosystem.

Component 3:

1 output added on Monitoring LDN targets; the budget of the component have been reduced (from \$930,000 to \$430,000)

04/24/2020 - IUCN

Component 1 has been restructured focusing on 3 outputs. 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 are on investments and 1.1.3 is now on the policy and regulatory framework, including collaboration of stakeholders. Feasibility will be further assessed during the PPG stage.

Component 2 budget has been increased while component 1 and 3 have been slightly reduced. So the largest part of the GEF funds is going to investments.

We have decided to maintain output 2.1.3 as part of component 2. Component 1 is aiming at supporting policies, guidelines and management plans, which will lead investments in restoration and conservation. Component 2 is about investments, including the work on a financial mechanism that will support partly what will be done in component 1.

#### Component 2

Component 2 has been restructured and simplified with one output mentioning explicitly the LDN targets set by Guinée-Bissau. See also edition of the text in the description of the component. Detailed activities will be provided during PPG phase.

#### Component 3

The budget has been reduced and reallocated to component 1 (see above).

#### Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4-1-20

If the co-financing is in Grants, aren't they Investment Mobilized?

Please elaborate (or reconsider) on the MAVA co-financing at CEO endorsement and project execution, as the MAVA Foundation will stop their activities in 2022.

#### Agency Response

04/16/2020 - IUCN response



No, the co-financing is not investment mobilized. It is recurrent expenditures that will serve as the baseline for the GEF project.

In its exit strategy for 2022, MAVA is working increasingly with IBAP as the focal point for the implementation of activities in Guinea Bissau. IBAP being identified as the executing agency for the project, explains the fact that MAVA has been retained as a co-financer. Even though it will cease activities in 2022, these activities will continue through IBAP who will take over from all the achievements made by MAVA from 2023

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

The amounts (and total) are not consistent between between LoE and Table D

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IUCN	GET	Guinea-Bissau	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	2,000,000	180,000	2,180,000
IUCN	GET	Guinea-Bissau	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	2,773,100	249,579	3,022,679
Total GEF Resources(\$)					4,773,100	429,579	5,202,679

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Project Preparation (a)	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (b)	Agency Fee (c)	Total (d)=a+b+c
IUCN	GEFTF	Guinea Bissau	Biodiversity	50,000	1,864,000	209,910	2,123,910
IUCN	GEFTF	Guinea Bissau	Climate Change	50,000	959,000	109,360	1,118,360
IUCN	GEFTF	Guinea Bissau	Land Degradation	50,000	1,864,000	209,910	2,123,910
<b>Total GEF Resources</b>				150,000	4,687,000	529,180	5,366,180

4-23-20

The amounts for Project and PPG in Tables D and E don't match the LoE. Please square the figures

#### D. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IUCN	GET	Guinea-Bissau	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	2,000,000	180,000	2,180,000
IUCN	GET	Guinea-Bissau	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	2,773,100	249,579	3,022,679
Total GEF Resources(\$)					4,773,100	429,579	5,202,679

#### E. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required ☒

PPG Amount (\$)      PPG Agency Fee (\$)  
150,000                  13,500

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
IUCN	GET	Guinea-Bissau	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	62,852	5,657	68,509
IUCN	GET	Guinea-Bissau	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	87,148	7,843	94,991
Total Project Costs(\$)					150,000	13,500	163,500

|

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area	Amount (in US\$)			
			Project Preparation	Project Financing	Fee (Grant + PPG)	Total
GEFTF	IUCN	Biodiversity (BD)	75,423	2,400,000	222,788	2,698,211
GEFTF	IUCN	Land Degradation (LD)	74,577	2,373,101	220,291	2,667,969
<b>Total GEF resources</b>			<b>150,000</b>	<b>4,773,101</b>	<b>443,079</b>	<b>5,366,180</b>

### Agency Response

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

A revised letter of endorsement is submitted. In coordination with the OFP, the STAR has been allocated to BD and LD focal areas. The STAR allocation being flexible, \$1,118,360 from the CCM focal area has been reallocated to this project (\$544,059 to LD and \$ 574,301 to BD).\_

04/24/2020 - IUCN

The amounts have been revised in the portal to match the LOE. There was a difference of 1\$.

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Yes. It is \$150,000 for a project of more than \$3M.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

The value of 438,705 ha is included under the two main indicators (1.2 protected areas better managed and 4.1 area under management for BD). Please review.

What are the investments to be made to claim the 438,705 ha Dulombi-Boe-Tchetche under improved management?

LD should have, at a minimum, a target under the indicator 4.3 (area under SLM in production landscapes). The indicator 3 could also be considered (restoration).

**Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The data has been completed in the portal and aligned with the GEB section.

The project combined activities, which will encompass better management of productive landscape and improved management of protected areas, will reduce deforestation, biodiversity loss and land degradation. In addition, the investments will develop the private sector and generate resources to better manage the natural resources and biodiversity of the 438,705 ha of DBT.

**Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Please point to Table G or upload if missing.

**Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The table G does not show in the portal. It can now be found in the revised PIF in word template, which has been updated to this resubmission.

**Part II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Consider the STAP primer on the Theory of Change (<http://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>) to improve the rationale for the problems, the barriers and the proposed solution (result framework).

**Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The theory of change has been attached to this submission and referenced in the section describing the project and the activities, which will be supported by the project.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Baseline Projects, strictly speaking, are the projects that will take place in the geography, whether or not this GEF project gets approved. These are the projects on which the GEF project will stand and provide incremental funding to deliver GEBs. The other projects may be put under a subheading “Background Information”.

Please explain the relevance of the The PAPBio programme of the European Union (EU) on mangrove restoration, as the DBT complex is mainly an inland protected area with woodlands.

Please explain the relevance of SPWA in the baseline. This was a GEF4 Programmatic approach. The main country-based project for Guinea Bissau ended in 2014 (#3575, with UNDP, to create the DB National Park).

### **Agency Response**

The PAPBio is indeed working on the coastal line but it is linked to the DBT complex and the corridors concerned by the project. The objective of the current approach is to restore ecological corridors and the DBT complex is linked to the coastal line of Guinée-Bissau, which is why the PAPBio is relevant and fully part of this project’s baseline.

The SPWA project is not part of the baseline. It is however a basis for this project. The GEF 5 UNDP project, which the project will build on has been moved to section 6 on coordination

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**



**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

See comments above

Clear

**Agency Response**

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Proposal lacks alignment with UNCCD's LDN concept.

There is no mention whatsoever of UNCCD related plans and strategies in the respective PIF sect

**Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The alignment with UNCCD's LDN process have been developed; we also added 1 outcome and outputs on LDN targets

**5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Please clearly list and describe the Baseline Projects (as defined in this review) so it is possible to elaborate on the incremental reasoning.

**Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

In the revised PIF, a section on incremental has been further detailed.

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

#### Global Environment Benefits

Please provide a list of the GEBs associated with LD and BD investments, and make them consistent with the Core Indicators. Please reduce or remove information on the other benefits.

Notes on GEBs as currently presented:

- i) *Integration of 3 ecological corridors into IBAP's PAs management strategy and important ecological habitat in unprotected areas management.* This is an activity.
- ii) *Conservation of 296,188 ha of forests and habitats in protected areas.* Suggest listing the Protected Areas here as well as in the Core Indicators. Separate from the following GEB
- iii) *The conservation/restoration of 142,518 ha of forests and habitats adjacent to protected areas,*
- iv)) *Strengthening the governance and sustainability of 3 protected areas (Dulombi, Boé, Tchetché).* This is an activity not a GEB. What are the associated interventions proposed in this project?
- v) *Increasing the potential for carbon sequestration and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.* Suggest removing
- vi)) *Restoration of corridors of mobility of threatened species between different national and international protected areas. Is this different from iii)? What species is this referring to? Is this to be monitored?*
- vi) *Reduction of ecological fragmentation and restoration of ecological connectivity between the three parks and between Guinea Bissau, Guinea and Senegal.* There is an apparent overlap with vi)
- viii) *Sustainable access to ecosystem services through the promotion of agroforestry and the introduction of nature-based solutions.* What are the proposed interventions to claim this GEB?

ix) *Arresting land degradation through SLM and SFM good practices*. This is an activity. Please relate to the Core Indicator.

### **Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

This section have been reformulated and improved accordingly, mentioning strictly global environment benefits that are consistent with the indicators mentioned.

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Information about sustainability is almost absent. To be reinforced (capacities, financing mechanisms, law enforcement...).

### **Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

This section have been reformulated and improved

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

### **Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

The proposed table identifies most of the key-institutions at national level. Please complement and elaborate stakeholders on the ground. local communities, NGO's names, farmer organizations, cooperatives, and others as relevant.

The GEF recommend borrowing some strategies for developing partnerships from the STAP document: "Multi-stakeholder dialogue for transformative change" (<http://www.stapgef.org/multi-stakeholder-dialogue-transformative-change>).

**Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The paragraph on stakeholders have been complement and strengthened. A multi-stakeholder's platform will be established and supported to stimulate engagement of actors on the project, and in fine their contribution to the transformational change

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Gender issues are absent from the text and the result framework. The GEF requests to revise the document and include aspects related to inequalities between men and women, and other vulnerable groups. Include reference that these aspects will be developed during the PPG.

## **Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

An output on gender strategy included in component 3. Other reference on gender included on stakeholder engagement; further development on inequalities between men and women to be developed at PPG stage

### **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

The “private sector” is named without further information. Please elaborate as appropriate.

## **Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The section has been revised. The private sector remains a lot related to smallholders and the project will aim at structuration and organization. In addition, one key feature of the project will be to support bringing in more investments and private sector into the sustainable practices that will be mainstreamed through the project area. This is part of the project exit and sustainability strategy. Support to Bioguiné will contribute to put in place new private sector related to valorisation of all conservation efforts by promoting ecotourism, scientific tourism and carbon market.

### **Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Cleared

## **Agency Response**

### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

Cleared

## **Agency Response**

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

To justify the use of LD \$2.7 million, please refer to the National Action Programme (NAP) under UNCCD, as well as the LDN targets.

## **Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

Reference made to the National Action Programme to combat desertification and the LDN targets.

#### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

As suggested above, reduce budget for Component 3. Select only a few activities.

#### **Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

Number of outputs reduced from 5 to 3

#### **Part III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

The LoE mentions “climate change adaptation” but this is not mentioned in the title (Portal). Please confirmed with the GEF OFP the expected scope of the project and modify either title or LoE..

#### **Agency Response**

04/16/2020 - IUCN response

The scope of the project on LD and BD is confirmed with the OFP. A revised endorsement letter is submitted

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4-1-20

No. Please address outstanding issues.

The GEF remains available for consultation prior to re-submission. That may save time.

4-22-20

Returned to the Agency following a request by email.

4-23-20



Please address issues under Items 1, 2 and 4 and re-submit.

4-24-20

No. Please address financials in Tables A, D and E

4-24-19

The PIF is recommended for Technical Clearance

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**PIF Review****Agency Response****Additional Review (as necessary)****PIF Recommendation to CEO****Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

CONTEXT: The government of Guinea Bissau has established new protected areas, including the Dulombi-Boe-Tchéché complex that consists of two national parks and ecological corridors. In order to protect a more representative sample of key habitats, efforts made in recent years consisted in developing the national parks of Boé and Dulombi on the country's mainland, close to the border with Senegal and Guinea. These parks now offer protection for a remarkable biodiversity such as lions, chimpanzees, elephants and a Ramsar site, called Wendu Tcham, that is home to major waterbird populations, .The Instituto da Biodiversidade e das Areas Protegidas (IBAP) has been working in close collaboration with many partners to manage these areas, including the Fondation BioGuinée, now at the capitalization stage, which will provide an essential sustainable funding tool for the proper management of protected areas. Presently, the threat to biodiversity in the DBT corridors is mainly due to competing use for natural resources. Unsustainable agricultural practices, timber and non-timber products exploitation, extensive animal husbandry and beekeeping, have resulted in biodiversity loss and fragmentation of ecosystems and habitats (savannah, forests and wetlands). They have also generated negative effects as uncontrolled deforestation, and the depredation of plant and animal species, land degradation. The original habitats have been transformed, mainly the forest habitats and wetlands in grasslands and savannah of monocultures in vast spaces of the DBT. These challenges are responsible for the deterioration of ecosystems and environmental imbalance.

PROJECT: The objective of the project is to improve and sustain the ecological connectivity between the Dulombi Boé and Tchetché (DBT) Complex and related transnational protected areas of Niokolo-Koba (Senegal) and Badiar (Guinea) by strengthening biodiversity conservation and improving sustainable land use. The project will enable the establishment of an ecosystem favorable to the mobility/return of animal species, the conservation of biodiversity and the permanence of species flows as well as the provision of various ecosystem services to the populations. The project has the following components and outcomes: COMPONENT 1. Governance and stakeholder's capacity building (Outputs 1.1 Design and implement management plans of main ecosystems using landscape and socio-ecosystem approach; 1.2. Improved management of at least 3 protected areas; 1.3 Updated Policies, laws and regulations, on biodiversity conservation and land / forest management through participatory approach. COMPONENT 2. Management and restoration of ecological connectivity corridors and wildlife mobility (Outputs 2.1. Land and ecosystem restoration activities in selected corridors; 2.2. Value chains development of priority NTFPs; 2. 3: Financing mechanism for the complex developed for the protected area system in Guinée-Bissau. 2.4 Enabling environment to support voluntary LDN target implementation. COMPONENT 3. Monitoring, evaluation, knowledge management and sharing.

RESULTS: The project will result in the improve management of at least 296,188 ha in 3 protected areas under improved management effectiveness and governance equity in the Dulombi-Boé Tchetché complex (DTB). It will also result in 40,000 ha of forest and forest lands restored, and 105,518.00 ha of landscapes under sustainable land management.

INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY AND POTENTIAL FOR SCALING UP: The project's innovation rests in the corridor approach it foresees for the DBT complex. There are no initiatives aiming at supporting ecological connectivity between protected, non-protected or productive landscapes yet. The project's innovation is also related to supporting the crowding in of more investors into activities that will generate global environment benefits in corridors and the vicinity of protected areas. The project will achieve this by mobilizing the experience and expertise of Guinée-Bissau in natural resources management, and existing mechanisms such the BioGuinée Fund. This will ensure on one hand the paradigm shift promoted by the project by having sustainable financing to support the ecosystems restoration, conservation and management developed and enhanced by the project. On the other hand, it will help communities and potential private partners to continue to invest in good practices aimed at managing ecosystems in a sustainable manner. This project will have the potential of being replicated in the Country on other complexes but also at the regional level in other neighboring countries.

CO-FINANCING: In the amount of \$8.8 million in Recurrent Expenditure is provided by The Government, the GEF Agency, and NGOs.