

GEF Council Meeting  
November 10 – 12, 2009

**INFORMATION DOCUMENT**  
**ON**  
**PROGRAMMATIC APPROACHES LED BY THE WORLD BANK IN**  
**WEST AND CENTRAL AFRICA**

**(Prepared by the World Bank)**

### Summary

The GEF Strategic Program for Sustainable Management in the Congo Basin (CBSP) was approved at the November 2008 Council for a total GEF contribution of US\$ 54,725,097 for the development of 13 projects (5 regional, 1 transboundary, 7 national). On the date of September 15, 2009 – 10 months after the program approval – all 13 PIFs have been approved for a GEF amount of US\$49,632 million, representing 99.76% of the programmed total GEF grant (US\$49,750 million). Final adjustments will be made with the approval of last PPGs. The provisionary co-financing at PIF level is US\$167,587 million (ratio 1:3.38). One project has already been CEO endorsed.

The GEF program in West Africa- Sub-component on Biodiversity (SPWA) was approved at the November 2008 Council for a total GEF contribution of US\$ 39,520,000 for the development of 21 projects (3 regional, 1 transboundary, 17 national). On the date of September 15, 2009 – 10 months after the program approval – 1 project has been CEO endorsed, 16 PIFs have been approved for a GEF amount of US\$28,821 million, representing 80.22% of the programmed GEF project grant (US\$35,927 million). The provisionary co-financing at PIF level is US\$101,016 million, representing 88% of the targeted ratio (ratio 1:2.81).

These programmatic approaches for the Congo basin and West Africa region appear to be a useful tool in light of both the resource constraints in each country within the region imposed by the RAF and, the need for stronger regional integration given the common challenges that these countries face. Emerging lessons will be taken into account to reinforce similar approaches under GEF5, to secure larger scale sustained impact on the global environment by integrating it into national and regional strategies by way of internal and external partnerships.

## **Introduction- Recalling the background of both programs in Central and West Africa**

1. The GEF Council reinforced the programmatic approach in the GEF portfolio by endorsing a revised policy document in April 2008<sup>1</sup>. The GEF programmatic approach is defined as a partnership between GEF partners to secure a larger scale and sustained impact on the global environment. Based on the GEF/C.33/6 document, the key elements of the GEF programmatic approach can be summarized as follows: be consistent with GEF focal area strategies, offer an added value for the GEF network and its partners, be country-owned, emphasize the GEF catalytic role on leveraging additional financing from other sources, and be based on an open and transparent process. The agreement on the above elements is reflected in a Program Development Framework (PFD) submitted to the GEF Council by a leading program agency.

2. The introduction of a complex Resource Allocation Framework (RAF) in July 2006 and the under-programming situation observed at mid-term GEF4 RAF allocation provided both an opportunity and a need to assist countries amongst the poorest to synergize their efforts in meeting common challenges in terms of the global environment and sustainable development.

3. The World Bank, owing to its significant portfolio and experience in West and Central Africa on biodiversity and forest issues, took the lead to assist these countries in developing programmatic approaches to support these thematic areas. Two Program Framework Documents (PFD) were approved by the GEF Council in November 2008: *A Strategic Program for West Africa<sup>2</sup> -subcomponent on biodiversity (SPWA) led by the World Bank and the GEF Program on Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin (CBSP)*. During program preparation, The World Bank agreed with the GEFSEC to inform the Council on the current status of each program one year after its approval<sup>3</sup>.

4. This document highlights the promising results in term of collaborative work and programming of GEF resource, given that 100 percent and 80 percent of GEF resources respectively have been programmed for the CBSP and the SPWA, with a co-financing ratio of approximately one (GEF dollar) to three (donor dollars). It will be important to ensure timely delivery of the project documents. Emerging lessons from the development and implementation of these programs will be critical in reinforcing similar approaches under GEF5.

5. For each program, this document recalls the process, the main objectives, the current status of GEF resource programming (PIF and project status), and the provisionary trends of the result based framework based on the information available in PIFs. Under each component, main projects and activities are highlighted to capture the substance of interventions.

---

<sup>1</sup> - GEF/C.33/6, *From Projects to Programs: Clarifying the Programmatic Approach in the GEF Portfolio*.

<sup>2</sup> -. The overall Strategic program for West Africa also includes an Energy component which is being led by UNIDO

<sup>3</sup> - Since the work program was closed on September 14, this document reflects the current status of programs ten months after their approval (from mid November 2008 to mid September 2009).

## **Strategic Program for Sustainable Forest Management for the Congo Basin**

### *Collaborative work towards a programmatic approach*

6. The GEF Strategic Program for the Congo Basin aims to strengthen sustainable management of forest ecosystems as a contribution to the conservation of the globally relevant biodiversity and ecosystem services, maintaining a solid foundation for the region's sustainable development.

7. The program was launched in February 2008 at Libreville, Gabon, where Ministers from the region endorsed the Program Framework with the Declaration of Libreville. The Program was refined through a series of national consultations in a fully participatory manner. Steering committee and side meetings were held in Libreville, Johannesburg and Douala in April and June, 2008, taking benefit of other events (AMCEN, and the regional GEF constituency meeting) taking place simultaneously. This collaborative effort between recipient countries, GEF Implementing agencies, GEF Secretariat, and key regional partners, as the COMIFAC, resulted in the program framework for the Sustainable Forest Management for the Congo Basin (CBSP), and was approved by the GEF council in November 2008.

8. The Program is consistent with the strategic objectives formulated in the GEF Biodiversity and Climate Change Strategies, as well as with the Convergence plan axis. The program is built on the three following components: (1) conservation of key biodiversity areas by strengthening the regional network of protected areas, (2) sustainable management and use of natural resources in the production landscape; and (3) strengthening of the institutional and sustainable financing framework for sustainable ecosystem management.

### *100 percent approval of PIFs within first 10 months*

9. The 13 PIFs included in the Program Framework Document (PFD) have been cleared for work program inclusion: US\$ 49.6 million of GEF resources have been programmed, corresponding to a 100% of engagement. The provisional co-financing is of US \$167.5 million. The ratio is 1 to 3.4, which is slightly more than anticipated (1:3) at conceptualization stage.

10. Based on the available data at the PIF development stage and the design of the projects as reflected in the result based management framework, the GEF program for the Congo Basin is going to:

- Improve the Protected Area management effectiveness in more than 14 terrestrial and 5 coastal (mangroves) protected areas for coverage of 9 million ha (component 1 of the Program); At least, five protected areas will be created;
- Mainstream biodiversity conservation in productive landscapes in more than 2 million ha (component 2 of the Program).

- Develop the financial sustainability of protected area management in 5 projects and reinforce the policy and legislative frameworks to support mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in productive landscapes in 6 projects (component 3 of the Program).

*How the projects will fit the program*

11. The component 1 on the Protected Area management effectiveness under the CBSP has been designed to provide opportunities to strengthen the national protected area system in countries which have not yet received strong support of the GEF (Central Africa Republic and Equatorial Guinea). Additional support to specific areas not covered earlier but critical to the protected area systems will be developed in DRC and Cameroon as a follow up of existing WB and GEF efforts and/or to fulfill gaps in the networks. The Maiko national park in DRC is for instance a very high biodiversity value area but has not received adequate attention (as compared to other sites such as Virunga and Garumba supported by a GEF3 project). Its rehabilitation is a strong priority and through this project an opportunity will be further created to reinforce capability and the credibility of the national institution in charge of protected areas, the ICCN. Similarly, the Ngoyla-Mintom is a pristine rainforest block of high biodiversity value, and a corridor between different protected areas in Cameroon, Gabon, and Congo. The creation of a new protected area within the Ngoyla-Mintom forest is considered as part of a more comprehensive spatial planning approach fostering public-private partnerships. Particular attention will be given to indigenous issues as this area is also the home of Baka and Bakoya pygmies.

12. The component 2 on “mainstreaming” will be addressed in as a complement to the protected areas projects. In Cameroon and DRC for instance, protected area projects will be complemented by developing natural resources sustainable use approaches in buffer zones and pilot financing mechanisms (REDD, PES, conservation concessions). Collaborative work, community participation, indigenous issues, and sustainability will be at the heart of these projects focusing on mangroves in Republic of Congo and Cameroon. A regional approach for a better understanding of the status of wildlife populations and the impact of bushmeat strategies has been developed by FAO. The project is based on pilot actions based on community wildlife management, awareness, and the building of monitoring and regulation systems of the bushmeat trade. Notably, the UNEP project on sustainable timber management will provide a regional focus on key issues including illegal logging, harmonization of forest policies in Central Africa, and market incentives.

13. Under the component 3, innovative financial mechanisms will also be explored in different projects. The World Bank Project on REDD will have a key structural role in developing partnerships with the FCPF and other partners like the UN-REDD and AFD. UNDP will provide support to Gabon to develop a Payment for Environmental Service project on the Mbé river basin. Significantly regional approaches to support financing of protected areas and on the sustainable management of bushmeat will be developed through UNDP and FAO respectively. Every regional project will involve the COMIFAC and the Congo Basin Forest Partnership on their respective role of regional coordination and facilitation thus ensuring regional integration within the program. And to ensure overall that the regional coordination role of the COMIFAC is met, a MSP has been designed to focus on building COMIFAC capacities.

## **Strategic Program in West Africa Program (SPWA): Sub-component on Biodiversity**

### *Fostering the country ownership with the programmatic approach*

14. In West Africa the programmatic approach aimed to bring about significant global environmental benefits in the region in the areas of both biodiversity and climate change along with various local environmental and developmental benefits through two subcomponents – Biodiversity and Energy. The immediate aim is to assist countries in the region to build projects based on their identified priorities in order to enhance the implementation of their biodiversity and climate change strategies and policies. Practical and action-oriented projects with measurable impacts were encouraged under the program. Given its comparative advantage and its significant share in the overall GEF portfolio, the World Bank took the lead role to prepare and submit the programmatic framework document for the biodiversity subcomponent of the West Africa Program. The other subcomponent on Energy is led by UNIDO. Only the subcomponent on biodiversity is being reported upon in this document.

15. The programmatic approach has provided a framework for dialogue between countries, agencies, and the GEF Secretariat with a trifold advantage to build a country driven process while at the same time reduce agency transaction costs and gain better predictability. It is noteworthy to mention that after two years of GEF4, not a single project had been approved in the climate change focal area from the countries in this region<sup>4</sup>. Although biodiversity projects and enabling activities were at concept development stages, albeit few. The GEF Secretariat has played a catalytic role to initiate this process.

16. The West Africa program is the result of a collaborative process started in mid-2008. The feasibility for this program was explored during GEF constituency meetings in Accra, Ghana, and Banjul, The Gambia, and during the April 2008 Council meeting. The CEO formally launched the preparation of a program in Bonn on May 28, 2008 with ministers and heads of delegations from the region attending the 9th Conference of the Parties of the UN Convention on Biological Diversity. To ensure country ownership, heads of delegations willingly committed themselves in prioritizing the needs and sent their priority project concepts to the GEFSEC following an *ad hoc* template. The GEF Secretariat reviewed the concepts and worked with the countries and agencies to ensure that the GEF requirements were met. Team work and collaboration was noteworthy, involving the countries, GEF Agencies and the GEF Secretariat, to prepare Project Concepts and Project Identification Forms (PIFs), and to develop the overall program document. Another set of follow-up consultations was held, once again taking benefit of other meetings (AMCEN meeting in June 2008, Sub-regional Workshop of the GEF Focal Points from West and Central Africa at Douala, 18-19 June 2008) being held at the same time. The ministerial endorsement meeting in Cotonou, Benin, took place on 25-26 August 2008. Ministers adopted a declaration acknowledging the consultative nature of the program development

---

<sup>4</sup> Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Cape Verde, The Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Nigeria, Niger, Sierra Leone, Senegal and Togo. Chad joined the program after the first official meeting in Bonn, May 2008.

process and endorsing it fully. The ministerial session was preceded by a technical review of the program attended by the GEF Focal Points, representatives of ministries, and some partners.

*Improving project design on biodiversity conservation in West Africa*

17. Biodiversity conservation is a difficult challenge in Africa: How to protect the biodiversity in an environment where most of the people are living directly from the use of natural resources? This is particularly true in West Africa which is the poorer part of the poorest continent and where environment is facing increasing pressures (habitat loss, over-exploitation, climate change, etc). The GEF Strategic Program is therefore based on three objectives to address this situation with: 1) the development of protected areas networks, 2) the sustainable use of natural resources in buffer zones, and 3) the poverty reduction among communities living in the surroundings of protected areas.

Twenty one projects designed under the three objectives have been selected for a total GEF financing of \$36,927 million to scale-up biodiversity conservation in West Africa while capitalizing on socio-economic benefits from sustainable use to support poverty alleviation and growth. They include 11 Full-Size Projects and 10 Medium-Size Projects. Three projects include a regional dimension. The first discussions with partners led to a provisionary co-financing of US\$115million.

18. Another rationale for this program is to improve tangible results on the field. After informal discussions, a meeting was held in Barcelona in November 2008, as a side event of the IUCN Congress on Protected Areas. Best practices and pilot cases were discussed (highlights are available on <http://www.papaco.org/>). Recommendations were completed with results from PIR, AMR, and various GEF evaluation reports. Guidelines for GEF project implementation on protected areas in West Africa are included in Annexure 1 of this report. A significant number of PIFs and PPG have made reference to these guidelines.

*Approving 16 PIFs among 21 under the Program in ten months*

19. On the date of September 15, 2009 (the November WP was closed September 14, 2009): 80.22 percent of the GEF resources have been engaged with the clearance of 16 PIFs for an amount of \$ 28,8 million (on \$35,9 million programmed) and a co-financing of \$101 million. The co-financing ratio is 1:3.5 in the range of what was initially expected in the PFD (1:3.2). These figures should be confirmed at CEO endorsement. Based on the information included in the PIFs and referring to the result based management framework included in the PFD, the following points are noted:

- The management effectiveness will be improved on more than 11,8 million ha with field investments on more than 28 terrestrial and 5 coastal/marine protected areas. At least, seven protected areas will be created and a network of sacred sites will be carried on in Benin.
- Activities on the field will be developed on more than 17,8 million ha for mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in productive landscapes and develop sustainable livelihoods for local communities in the surrounding and buffer zones of protected areas;

- Mechanisms for the financial sustainability of protected areas will be explored in 5 countries (Benin, Nigeria, and Guinea Bissau, e.g.). Policy and Legislative frameworks on mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation in productive landscapes will be reinforced in at least 6 countries.

*Giving substance to the program in tangible result oriented projects*

20. Projects under the SPWA are building on past GEF experiences while integrating some innovative approaches and addressing new challenges. Reinforcement of protected area networks is one typical activity for GEF grant that helps foster long term national efforts (Cape Verde, Ghana, and The Gambia). Liberia is a motivating example where partnerships with local and international NGOs are developed in synergy with bilateral cooperation (USFWS, FFI, and CI). Some countries are ready to explore sustainable mechanisms to finance their protected area networks with the establishment of trust funds (Benin and Guinea Bissau), and with innovative partnerships with the Private Sector (Mauritania and Nigeria). Different ways are also being explored to improve biodiversity conservation in other sectors, as in Guinea with the mining, or Nigeria and Mauritania with the oil and gas sectors. Similarly, the notions of corridors and the sustainable use of natural resources in buffer zones and between protected areas are a necessity to improve local livelihoods, involve local communities in sharing benefits of protected areas, and enlarge the functionality of areas for species who migrate or have large territories (gazelles and elephants, for instance). Special attention is given to the preparation phase of such projects in Niger, Mali, and Chad, as the feasibility of such ambitious approaches needs to be verified. This notion of corridor will also be tested at a transboundary level between Cote d'Ivoire and Ghana. A pilot Medium Size Project developed by FAO in partnerships with local NGOS and linking with companies could be the beginning of a more ambitious investment with other partners interested in such approaches in the Upper Guinea Hotspot (STEWARD and CEPF). Last, but not least, climate change will be a cross sector issue influencing all GEF BD Strategic Programs. A promising project will promote a participatory approach for biodiversity conservation and low carbon development of pilot Ecovillages in the vicinity of protected areas in Senegal. UNEP will play a scientific role with a regional project to assess climate risks and changes, and its impacts on the conservation strategies of representative ecosystems and biodiversity in West Africa.



## **Annex 1: Guidelines for GEF project implementation under the SPWA and the CBSP (December 2008)**

1. The objective of this document is to provide guidelines to improve GEF4 project design and implementation under its programmatic approach in West and Central Africa. It draws on good practises and lessons learnt in GEF operations.
2. Key elements for the guidelines herein are based on the analyses of the regional Portfolio, documents review and the detailed PIR (Project Implementation Review) reports mainly on Biodiversity issues with a focus on West and Central Africa. They are also built on experiences of BD projects in other parts of Africa (Madagascar, Mozambique, Kenya, South Africa). When appropriate, lessons learnt from other focal areas were also drawn upon (International Waters in Senegal, Chad, or Sustainable Land Management projects). The referenced documents and projects are listed at the end of this document.

### **Background**

- Guidelines to improve GEF project implementation on Protected Areas were suggested by IUCN during the West Africa Program meeting in Cotonou in late August 2008. The proposal was later debated during a meeting held in Barcelona in the margins of the World Congress in October 2008 (cf. [www.papaco.org](http://www.papaco.org)).
- Strategic Programs were adopted by the GEF Council for West Africa and the Congo basin. These Program Framework Documents are the results of consultative processes between countries, the secretariat and GEF agencies, and partners (NGOs, bilateral agencies). The programs were launched in Libreville in February 2008 for the Congo Basin and in Bonn in May 2008 for the West Africa one.
- The next challenge is to ensure a good and immediate follow up to facilitate project design and implementation. A schedule has been prepared with GEF agencies to deliver the first MSPs before a 12 month period and some FSP before 18 months. In any case, all project documents should be ready within 22 months. One of the concerns expressed by the CEO on both programs is to come up with options to achieve tangible, on the ground results.
- Key elements which form the basis of these guidelines are classified in the following manner based on the project cycle: prerequisite, project preparation, project implementation, and sustainability elements. Depending on the available information, technical points were also

considered. These elements can provide guidance or help for a **flexible reasoning** during project preparation and implementation. Information in the two boxes focus upon regional projects and conflict situations. This last box was prepared with other sources than the PIRs.

### **Prerequisite (general context, political will, enabling environment, outcomes)**

#### *General considerations*

- **Long-term engagement** is critical for sustainability. Are the conditions favorable for a long term involvement (institutional stability, multi-donor support, and motivating previous experience, etc)?
- Conservation objectives cannot be dissociated from **poverty reduction/local development activities** in the poorest part of the poorest countries. This statement is in line with all guidance, orientations, and policies of GEF Agencies and partners. The GEF CEO insists on this statement during the finalization of the program (Cotonou, August 2008). It is important to remind that GEFSEC will check on how this aspect will be taken into account, as historically, a certain number of protected areas were not well received by local populations.
- Conservation in protected area could not be separated from natural **resource based income generating activities**. These activities consisted in general of: (i) a transparent mechanism for sharing the revenues derived from hunting and tourism, (ii) direct employment of local populations in park management activities, (iii) controlled access to and use of natural resources following an agreed upon sustainable use plan, and (iv) financing of targeted community development initiatives, including the provision of social infrastructure, and small grants for income generating activities. (NB: New mechanisms for sustainable financing will be tested in GEF 4 (REDD, trust funds, private-public partnerships, payment for ecosystem services).
- Some biodiversity projects built partnerships with other sector projects (agriculture, small grants, and community based projects). The basic principle is good but it is important for the Biodiversity projects to delineate the scope of certain activities as other kinds of projects do not focus necessarily on nature resource activities. The Bank team is indeed planning a more in-depth review of small grants and their contribution to biodiversity conservation.
- Is there a strategy for sustainability of the small grant component? Is the small grant approach a way to improve responsibility and involvement of local communities? Is there a monitoring mechanism to measure the

contribution of this SGP to biodiversity objectives? What kind of other indicators are measured (gender, sector, poverty alleviation)?

#### *Enabling environment*

- *The implications of political-economic changes must be assessed, even for environmental projects.* This point was raised in IW projects: any change at national or regional level could bring both opportunities and challenges for GEF project implementation.
- Has the Government, through the Minister of Environment, shown his support to the project? Visit, speech, letter, memo, exchange with GEF project partners?
- Are biodiversity issues included in national processes? Is the project linked with PRSP agenda? Is there a significant financial support from the National Budget?
- *Degree of involvement/appropriation by the State:* What is the level of involvement of State agencies? Is the legal and regulatory framework sufficient? Is the National Strategy on Protected Areas well appropriate by the government?
- Is there a favourable context to solve any potential conflicts between institutions (Forests *versus* environment, or environment *versus* fisheries)?

#### *Champion*

- Projects addressing issues such as biodiversity conservation need a **specific national anchor agency and champion** in order to succeed. Is there a person, an agency who could play the role of champion?
- Conditions that need parliamentary and cabinet approvals should be avoided as pre-effectiveness conditions/triggers, as they are likely to delay the start of project implementation.

#### **Biodiversity conservation in fragile countries and conflict-affected situations**

- Conservation efforts are only as sustainable as the social and political context within which they take place. The weakening or collapse of socio-political frameworks during wartime can lead to habitat destruction and the erosion of conservation policies. In some cases, reduced resource exploitation or altered settlement patterns may also confer an occasional and opportunistic gain for biodiversity conservation.
- One of the main messages is to do all that is possible **to maintain a continuous involvement** on the field even if turmoil conditions limit conservation activities: maintain capacities, sustain relationships and respects of partners, provide technical support, and maintain a sound

funding base during and after conflict. This is an opportunity to incorporate biodiversity conservation in military, reconstruction and humanitarian programs in conflict zones.

- During conflicts and fragile situations, local communities often become more dependent on natural resources. At the same time, the disappearance of the State weakens control systems. This is one of the arguments **to work closely with traditional authorities** which stay in place even in case of conflict.
- This is particularly true for fragile or post-conflict situations: **Logical frameworks need to be simple**, focused, and reasonable in regards to conditions and capacities.

Source: ACE/UNEP, WB working papers (WBDERG, CSAE, PRIO), Conservation Biology

## **Project design and preparation**

### *Project*

### *design*

- These are not new lessons but they warrant repetition: Logical frameworks are often too complex, unfocussed, or over ambitious (above all for MSP). There is a need therefore (1) to focus on **one achievable objective** with a limited number of outcomes, outputs and activities, (2) to keep the project design **simple and focused**, and (3) for close supervision to ensure more effective implementation of projects.

### *Scale of work*

- Field interventions need to be adapted depending on the available amount of resources and priorities identified. Experience shows that spreading resources thinly across too many sites or too large areas (large catchment areas, big corridors between protected areas) usually does not result in a quantifiable impact on the ground. At the same time sometimes needs warranty coverage of many sites at one time to bring about initial momentum in the project and future follow-on activities. Therefore projects need to focus on the most reasonable ways to produce tangible results on the field.
- Limited resources can indeed be a limiting factor to address correctly problems at a transboundary or ecosystem level or when there are difficulties on the field (problem of access e.g.)

### *Time frame*

- Activities related to biodiversity conservation should have a practical and realistic time frame.
- Several projects have encountered delays and slow implementation (regional projects, Ghana, e.g.). When project preparation becomes too long, different risks can appear which can compromise all the process (Cote d'Ivoire).

### *Information, Communication, and Awareness*

- A clear **communication strategy** that provides operationally relevant information to beneficiaries and all stakeholders on a strategic basis should be a key implementation tool.
- **Access to the information** is also a concern. The use of information technologies is suggested very early in project implementation; such as web sites and electronic storage of project documents.
- Is the project designed to generate awareness on the importance, and need to protect natural habitats and species by community members? Is the project going to increase the sense of ownership and willingness of local communities by sensitizations campaigns, joint and collaborative approaches to project activities?

### *Capacity building*

- Is the project going to contribute to reinforce national and local capacities? State Agencies, decentralized bodies, local NGOs, social and professional associations, traditional groups, etc? Is there a **strategic approach of capacity building**? (With the identification of training needs, definition of the change, identification of training opportunities, training program design)? One of the weaknesses raised in different projects is the addition of training courses without a strategic vision beyond the project cycle.
- **Capacity-building and institutional development strategy at local level** is a one of the conditions for a greater coordination. Participatory Management Committees at local levels are useful for a better coordination on the field and incorporation of technical, scientific and traditional knowledge. Of course, these elements of capacity building and coordination must not eclipse the role of the central authority.
- Many countries are in the process of **decentralization**. The involvement of decentralized structures of the Government in the management of wildlife and natural resources becomes essential. However, the problem of

capacities is often more serious in decentralized bodies than at central level.

- **“Institutionalization”**: in many cases, the Government alone does not have the capacity to effectively manage protected areas. The legitimacy of the protected area management at the local level could be anchored by giving an active role to local populations in the development of effective biodiversity conservation systems and in the sharing of benefits. Different experiences have produced encouraging results and should be replicated (AGEREF in Cote d’Ivoire and Burkina Faso, AVIGREF in Benin).

### *Partnerships*

- Most of the civil servants working in the nature resource sectors have experience with natural resource administration but relatively few have experience in Nature Resource management in the field. Is there a **technical partnership** to palliate possible limitations of State Agencies (memorandum of understanding, agreements, and conditions of project implementation)?
- Facilitating partnerships between government conservation bodies and locally/regionally based international conservation NGOs can help lay the foundations for long term working relationships, which help promote ongoing capacity building and bring about long term conservation outcomes.
- **Partnerships** between Government, local communities and public/private actors provide a successful model for wildlife and protected areas management. Partnerships is a key at different levels:
  - among national institutions (between environment and Forests, fisheries, Administrations, Universities)
  - from the national level to the local level with communities, public/private sectors.
  - with technical partners.

### *Monitoring*

- While monitoring and evaluation in individual projects has improved, it continues to be an area in need of greater improvement. A good site-specific, socio-economic and biophysical baseline is essential to measure impact. The paucity of appropriate baseline data and indicators is raised in many evaluation reports (regional, BD, LD, etc). The establishment of baseline during the Full Project Document preparation should be the rule.

Indicators, methods, sampling sites, and budget should be available for a comparison at the end of the project.

- Is the baseline correctly designed? Data, methods, indicators, sampling stations are enough accurate for a repetition at the end of the project?
- Are monitoring data and methods going to be used beyond the project by the executing agency?
- Two elements are assets for a strong ownership: 1. the involvement of a national or local university, 2. the involvement of local communities or groups in implementing the monitoring program.
- For a GEF grant, the period under which monitoring of the site is done to measure the project's impact, especially on biodiversity conservation projects, should extend for a longer period of time.
- How to monitor impacts of small grant programs in relation with biodiversity conservation: environmental impacts? Economic impacts? Sustainability of these activities?

#### *Community approaches*

- The question of **bottom-up approaches, community process and empowerment** is raised. The word "community" appears a loose term, overused and usually ill-defined. A certain number of community based approach seem to create additional administrative structures financed by projects but where real stakeholders in term of land tenures, rights, and uses are not involved (pastoralists, hunters, traditional hunters). Of course, to work directly with traditional authorities is difficult because of the lack of capacity and the difficulty to identify the right persons (Ghana). The involvement of national, local NGOs, or social-professional groups is desirable. This kind of approach needs time -more than the 3-4 years of a project-, and probably additional information on the structure of these groups (comparative studies). This point could be initiated in regional projects under the Strategic Program for West Africa. A larger project could be designed on this idea under GEF5.

#### *Property and access rights*

- Property and access rights are a key issue responsible of reorientation of site activities (Gambia) or serious delays in case of justice procedures (South Africa).
- Are the **land tenure and use rights** issues clear?

- Are the **zoning issue** adapted to the situation (simple system *versus* complex situations)?

### **Focus on Regional projects**

- **Coordination** is a potential concern for regional projects in the area because of the weak capacities and the weak communication systems. A full time project manager located in the region is one of the options to coordinate/communicate regularly with project partners in each country and support the implementation of activities in each country/project site.
- The need of each country differs greatly even in a sub-region like West Africa. These country-needs require different responses and in such cases regional projects should take these differences into account and adapt the project and its implementation to bring in synergies. The concept of “**comparative advantage**” should be used in designing regional projects to build on the strengths of each country and include resources for sharing good experiences across countries/region.
- Developing regional approaches when there is a clear link (geographical, thematic, or both) between countries within a region is more effective in terms of both coordination and ownership. For instance, countries with common borders will work easily on transhumance in sahelian zones; or there will likely be more interest in neighboring states to work together on marine and coastal issues than countries with nothing in common (ecological, social, cultural, etc). Transactions costs however need to be evaluated to assess the added value of a regional approach.

### *Gender mainstreaming*

- Approximately 98% of rural women classified as economically active are engaged in agriculture and are the primary food producers in many parts of the world. Women make up 60% of the world’s 1.2 billion poor. The percentage of women below the poverty line has increased by half since the 1970s, while the comparable figure for men is 30%. These realities need to be reflected in the GEF investments at all levels.

### *Project implementation and arrangements issues*

- Are the proposed **administrative framework and partnerships realistic** for the implementation? (*cf.* Liberia, Senegal, regional projects)



- **Team work:** How were the local communities and ethnic groups identified and involved in project implementation? Is there mechanism to develop a “community of interest” on the field (meetings, events, sharing of knowledge, team work on the field, etc)
- **Scientific Advice:** Is there a partnership with national and/or local scientific institutions (University, Institutes)? The involvement of a national university has two associated advantages: 1. this is an opportunity to strengthen national and local capacities for monitoring on technical issues where state agencies capacities are lacking, and 2. this is an option for the sustainability of the approach promoting national and local partnerships (Zambia).

### **Sustainability**

- **Sustainability** should be taken into account in early stages of projects. Theoretically, the project should focus in its last year on consolidating the “deliverables” as opposed to supporting new activities. Experience shows that this recommendation has remained mainly theoretical because usually the last year for the project is considered the last chance to “spend the money”. However, project managers should concentrate on assessing what the project delivered so far and ensure the long-term sustainability of these achievements.
- How the capacity building is going to be developed after the project? Mentors, network of professionals, training strategies and opportunities? Are there any strategic partnerships with key stakeholders (private logging companies, bilateral cooperation, NGOs, e.g.)
- Is this project entering into a long term strategic programming?
- A link between communities and **rural financial institutions** to ensure regular source of funding and financial support for livelihood activities and non-forest activities is significant in sustaining alternative livelihood programs.

## **List of projects and documents used**

### WorldBank

- Ghana. Natural Resource Management
- Burkina Faso, Partnership for Natural Ecosystem Management Program (PAGEN)
- Benin – National Parks Conservation and Management Program
- Mozambique – Transfrontier Conservation Areas and Tourism
- Guinea Bissau
- Senegal
- Africa Region Portfolio Implementation Report

### *Other World Bank documents*

- The role of indigenous peoples in biodiversity conservation (May 2008)
- Biodiversity, Climate Change and Adaptation (October 2008)
- Small Grants portfolio review (draft, October 2008)

### UNDP projects

- Congo DR: Rehabilitation of ICCN
- Conservation de la Diversité Biologique par la Réhabilitation Participative des Terres

Dégradées dans les zones Arides et Semi Arides Transfrontalières de la Mauritanie et du Sénégal.

- Sustainable management of globally significant endemic ruminant livestock of West Africa
- Conservation and sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the Moyen-Chari
- Integrated Participatory Ecosystem Management in and Around Protected Areas,
- Conservation of the Biodiversity of the Nimba Mountains through Integrated and Participatory Management

## UNEP

- AEWA Flyways Project: “Enhancing Conservation of the Critical Network of Sites required by Migratory Waterbirds on the African/Eurasian Flyways (AEWA)”
- Coastal Resilience to Climate Change: Developing a Generalizable Method for Assessing Vulnerability and Adaptation of Mangroves and Associated Ecosystems
- Ecosystems, Protected Areas and People
- Building Scientific and Technical Capacity for Effective Management and Sustainable Use of Dry-land Biodiversity in West Africa Biosphere Reserves
- Botswana, Kenya and Mali: Management of Indigenous Vegetation for the Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands in Arid Zones of Africa
- Dryland Livestock Wildlife Environment Interface Project (DLWEIP) – Kenya – Burkina Faso

## **Lessons from GEF4 programs and towards GEF 5**

### *Synergy between biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, and adaptation issues*

- Climate variability and change can and does exacerbate a certain number of issues like land degradation and biodiversity loss. The current global focus on climate change and the availability of additional funds for adaptation provide an opportunity to develop a comprehensive risk management approach 1. coordinating efforts at national level between different focal areas, 2. developing multi-focal programs and projects.
- For instance, the links between biodiversity, coastal area management, adaptation, and International waters could bring to multi-focal area projects (eg Adaptation project on the coastal area in Guinea, the large marine ecosystem approach, etc) and the link between agriculture, land degradation, and adaptation (cf, portfolio in Sierra Leone, Mali).

### *Promoting programmatic approaches*

- GEF partners have embarked on a more strategic and programmatic approach to address biodiversity, Climate change, and desertification/land degradation issues (SPWA, CBSP, Energy component, TerrAfrica). The

lessons from these GEF4 programs will be used for resource programming under GEF5.

#### *Climate change Issues*

- Potential links with CDM projects (afforestation and reforestation).
- Efforts on monitoring and land use practises (slash and burn farming zoning, seasons for savanna fires, fuelwood, livestock grazing)

#### *Monetary issues*

- The depreciation of UD dollars had a great impact on projects. For instance, \$1000 (in 2000) are worthy 816\$ in 2008 – a loss of 20%. Could it be imaginable to raise MSP to \$2M?

#### *Limited GEF resources can still have a major impact*

- This is the case under the SPWA and the CBSP as most of the countries have access to group allocations - If the policy environment is conducive, and participants are committed, a great deal can be achieved with a relatively small financial allocation by leveraging local skills and resources and contributions from development partners.

#### *MSP versus FSP*

- A GEF MSP project does not provide resources required to address the underlying lack of capacity and low profile of some national institutions. Nevertheless, the MSP must serve as a catalyst, attaining concrete but limited results and laying the foundations for a follow up operation that will address the long term institutional issues required for sustainable protected area and biodiversity management

| PMIS               | Agency | Country                  | Project Title  | Status  | GEF        | cofinancing | Summary  |
|--------------------|--------|--------------------------|--|---|------------|-------------|--|
| <b>CONGO BASIN</b> |        |                          | Project+PPG (if approved)  |   |            |             |  |
| 3779               | WB     | Regional                 | Enhancing Institutional Capacities on REDD issues for Sustainable Forest Management in the Congo Basin           | PIF approved, PPG approved                    | 13,399,000 | 13,180,000  | The proposed project will provide a support to Congo basin countries to develop national policies and capacities, and contribute to the elaboration of methodologies to reliably measure carbon stored in forests and emitted from deforestation or forest degradation. Sustainable Forest Management Pilot projects will complete the approach at local level. The regional approach will foster coordination and "real time" knowledge sharing and dissemination among Congo Basin countries.  |
| 3822               | UNEP   | Regional                 | A regional Focus on Sustainable Timber Management in the Congo Basin   | PIF cleared (waiting for next WP) PPG pending | 3,636,364  | 6,000,000   | The project objective is to contribute to sustainable forest management through the harmonization of forest policies in Central Africa with a focus on illegal logging, market incentives and governance issues  |
| 2906               | UNDP   | Regional                 | Sustainable financial mechanisms of protected areas in the Congo Basin   | PIF approved, PPG approved                    | 8,521,818  | 50,600,000  | The goal of the project is to achieve long-term financial sustainability of national protected area systems in the Congo Basin. For that, the project aims to have in place capacity, institutional frameworks and model mechanisms for the long-term financial sustainability of PA systems and associated ecosystems within the Congo Basin. Pilot mechanisms will be tested at national, transboundary, and regional levels.  |
| 3777               | FAO    | Regional                 | CBSP Sustainable Management of the Wildlife and Bushmeat Sector in Central Africa                                | PIF approved, PPG pending                     | 4,245,452  | 6,000,000   | The objective is to develop an approach for the sustainable management of the wildlife and bushmeat sector in four countries of the Congo Basin (DRC, RoC, Gabon, CAR). The project is based on three main components with 1) the implementation of pilot actions on the field based on community wildlife management approaches and the development of alternative livelihoods, 2) the awareness of the population and key stakeholders through information dissemination and training, 3) a better understanding of the status of wildlife populations and the impact of bushmeat management strategies by building efficient mechanisms for monitoring and regulation of bushmeat trade at national and local level. The sub-regional level will be a key to harmonizing strategies and activities. |
| 3750               | UNDP   | Regional (Congo and DRC) | CBSP Catalyzing Sustainable Forest Management in the Lake Tele-Lake Tumba (LTLT) Transboundary Wetland Landscape | Council Approved - PPG approved               | 2,272,726  | 6,600,000   | The project aims to implement a strategy for the conservation and sustainable management of one of the world's largest swamp forest and the world's largest Ramsar site established in DRC in July 2008 with: 1. the adoption of a transboundary strategy for cooperation, 2.the implementation of community based management projects, and 3. the reinforcement of capacity of national agencies  |





|      |            |                   |   |                            |           |            |   |
|------|------------|-------------------|---|----------------------------|-----------|------------|---|
| 3772 | WB         | Congo DR          | CBSP Forest and Nature Conservation Project   | CEO endorsed               | 6,000,000 | 62,000,000 | This project aims to promote the protection and sustainable management of forest resources in DRC, by helping public institutions, civil society and local communities to implement new forest and nature conservation policies on the field. The project will aim to provide a support to a critical area (Maiko) and innovative field operations (conservation concessions, REDD).  |
| 3757 | UNDP       | Equatorial Guinea | CBSP Sustainable Forest Management in Equatorial Guinea for the Conservation of Representative Ecosystems and Globally Significant Biodiversity | PIF approved, PPG approved | 1,818,182 | 4,450,000  | The project will aim to improve management effectiveness of the forest protected areas network in Equatorial Guinea. Pilot sites will be selected during the preparation phase after discussions with partners.   |
| 3761 | UNDP/ UNEP | Gabon             | CBSP: Sustainable Management of the Mbe River Forested Watershed through the Development of a Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) Mechanism   | PIF approved, PPG approved | 909,091   | 2,950,000  | The Mbe River watershed is one of the most biologically diverse sites in Central Africa and is of global conservation significance. The catchment area provides functions and services which are economically and ecologically important (source of fresh water, electricity, soil fixation, silt filtration, flooding regulation). The project aims to develop a sustainable funding mechanism to secure the long-term protection of this crucial forested and high-value biodiversity conservation watershed.   |
| 3903 | UNDP       | Central Africa    | Strengthening protected area systems in Central Africa Republic   | PIF approved. PPG approved | 1,832,182 | 3,350,000  | The Project aims to conserve globally important biodiversity through strengthened co-management of a consolidated protected area network in the Central African Republic. This will be achieved through two complementary components: 1) an effective involvement of local communities in the management of the Protected Area system and 2) the implementation of effective, sustainable, and replicable models of community-based PA management. The two pilot sites are the Basse-Lobaye Biosphere Reserve and the Mourou-Fadama-Ndanda multiple use area. |
| 3960 | WB         | Regional          | Capacity building for Sustainable Forest Management   | PIF approved               | 815,000   | 1,107,750  | The project will provide a support to the COMIFAC to ensure its regional responsibilities in the GEF program.   |
| 3821 | FAO        | Cameroon          | Sustainable Community Based Management and Conservation of Mangrove Ecosystem in Cameroon   | PIF approved PPG pending   | 1,733,182 | 3,700,000  | The project will develop planning, management, and monitoring capacities, consultative mechanisms for the long term sustainability of the mangrove forest ecosystems and through participatory and inclusive participation of communities and other key stakeholders.   |



|                    |     |               |  |                                   |           |           |   |
|--------------------|-----|---------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| 4083               | FAO | Congo         | Integrated management of mangroves forest ecosystems in Congo                              | PIF cleared                       | 950,000   | 1,150,000 | The project objective is to strengthen national and local capacities to effectively manage mangrove forests. The project is build on three components: 1) design appropriate policies and regulations, 2) rehabilitate and manage mangrove forests improving local knowledge and skills, 3) Develop a collaborative management and sustainable use of mangrove forests and wetland resources in four pilot sites.   |
| 4084               | WB  | Cameroon      | CBSB-Conservation and sustainable use of the Ngoyla Mintom Forest                          | PIF cleared (waiting for next WP) | 3,500,000 | 6,500,000 | The project aims to establish a core protected area within the Ngoyla-Mintom forest through an integrated approach of land use planning, fostering public-private partnerships. The project is based on three components aiming to 1) promote SFM in the entire Ngoyla-Mintom forest block with a Master Plan on 988,000 ha, 2) make operational the core protected area on 160,000 ha, and 3) experiment a sustainable financing mechanism for the core area.  |
| <b>WEST AFRICA</b> |     |               |  |                                   |           |           |   |
| 3437               | FAO |               | Transboundary integrated Forest management project   | PIF approved                      | 1,045,000 | 1,240,000 | The project aims to establish a viable and sustainable transfrontier conservation area between forest reserves and protected areas in Bia, Goaso and Djambarakoru (in Ghana and Cote d'Ivoire). A bilateral framework will be established. SFM/SLM best practices will be promoted in Community Forests in 15-20 villages. The management effectiveness will be strengthened in 3 Protected Areas and surrounding areas (50,000 ha) and measures will be taken to reduce human-wildlife conflicts in 25 villages.   |
| 3817               | WB  | Guinea-Bissau | SPWA BD: Guinea Bissau Biodiversity Conservation Trust Fund Project                        | PIF approved                      | 950,000   | 2,900,000 | The project aims to strengthen the ongoing management and conservation of the network of parks and protected areas in Guinea Bissau by 1) consolidating capacities for the management of coastal and marine protected areas, 2) implementing four plans for endangered species implemented (chimpanzee, mangrove, hippo, and marine turtle), and 3) strengthening the Foundation for Biodiversity.  |
| 3837               | WB  | Liberia       | SPWA BD: Biodiversity Conservation through Expanding the Protected Area Network in Liberia | PIF Approved                      | 950,000   | 9,168,000 | This project is conceived as a pilot activity in complement of a REDD initiative in Liberia with the FCPF. The project provides a support to create two national parks on the Marshall Wetlands, south of Monrovia (50,000ha) and the Grebo Forests, bordering Ivory Coast (100,000ha). The whole GEF portfolio will provide a consistent approach on 6 major sites with 1. the strengthening of the national agency in charge of forests and its decentralized bodies, 2. site management planning involving communities, 3. development of a community livelihood program around protected areas, and 4. technical partnerships (US Fisheries and Wildlife Service, Conservation International, Fauna & Flora International). |

|      |      |          |  |                                      |           |            |   |
|------|------|----------|--|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------|---|
| 3760 | UNDP | Niger    | SPWA-BD Integrating the Sustainable Management of Faunal Corridors into Niger's Protected Area System                          | Council Approved PPG approved        | 1,768,182 | 5,200,000  | The project will materialize the creation of two new reserves (Termit, Tadress, and their buffer zones) and will establish the Northern Niger Faunal corridor to maintain the biological connectivity of protected areas in Niger's Saharan biome.  |
| 3763 | UNDP | Mali     | SPWA-BD Expansion and Strengthening of Mali's PA System  | Council Approved PPG approved        | 1,768,000 | 3,950,000  | The objective of the project is to establish three new protected areas in the Southwestern region in the Malian side of the Bafing-Faleme Transboundary reserve and define Buffer and Transition zones of both the Bafing-Famele and the Baoule Biosphere Reserves. An innovative landscape approach, involving local communities for the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources will be implemented. This zone is a transition area of very vulnerable ecosystems, with the last intact blocks of Western Sudanian Savannah, with one of the last colonies of Western Chimpanzees in West Africa, as well as the Western Eland. |
| 3781 | UNEP | Regional | SPWA Evolution of PA Systems with regard to Climatic, Institutional, Social, and Economic Conditions in the West Africa Region | PIF approved PPG approved            | 3,636,364 | 10,000,000 | The project aims to work on potential risks and changes on the conservation and sustainable management of representative ecosystems and biodiversity in the West Africa region. A vulnerability assessment and risk reduction strategies will be developed for existing protected area systems with a focus on climate change. Gap analysis, studies, and mapping for other kinds of risks will be prepared. All lessons will be incorporated to enhance the effectiveness of current protected area systems and selected protected areas in five pilot countries.  |
| 3836 | WB   | Ghana    | SPWA BD: Landscape Management and Biodiversity   | PIF Approved                         | 1,000,000 | 5,100,000  | The area is located in the northern region of Ghana, in the Upper West region which is a reasonably undisturbed sample of Guinea Savanna ecosystems. The project will support the implementation of management plans of the Gbele Resource Reserve and the wildlife corridors between Mole Park, Gbele park and Burkina Faso with the establishment of Community Resource Management Areas (CREMAs).  |
| 3770 | UNDP | Benin    | incorporation of sacred forests in the Protected Area system   | PIF approved PPG approved            | 1,100,000 | 4,070,000  | This project aims to promote the conservation and sustainable use of Benin's Sacred Forests as a network of community-managed areas incorporated into the national system of protected areas. The logical framework is based on three components with 1) the institutionalisation of Sacred Forests, 2) Piloting participatory community management plans for Sacred Forests, and 3) Engineering sustainable uses of wild resources.  |
| 4075 | WB   | Benin    | Ensuring the sustainability financing mechanism for national Parks in Benin  | PIF cleared, waiting for the next WP | 1,900,500 | 9,675,000  | The project aims to strengthen sustainable management of the Northern Benin Savannah Ecosystems areas through enhanced management capacity and the establishment and operation of a conservation trust fund for a long-term funding.  |







|      |      |           |   |                                      |           |            |   |
|------|------|-----------|---|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------|---|
| 4026 | UNDP | Togo      | Rationalising and strengthening the conservation role of Togo's national protected areas system | PIF cleared, waiting for the next WP | 1,222,200 | 3,000,000  | This project aims at reestablishing the Togo's protected area estate by 1) redefining and rationalizing the protected area estate, 2) reinforcing capacities of staff and protected area adjacent communities, and 3) developing an effective management on the Oti-Keran & Oti-Mandouri Complex in view to reconnect to the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) Complex.   |
| 3962 | WB   | Guinea    | Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Mining Induced Growth and Employment Project (BioMIGEP)           | PIF cleared, waiting for the next WP | 1,900,000 | 9,000,000  | The project aims to mainstream environmental aspects into the public-private dialogue for a mining-induced growth agenda. The incremental support aims to strengthen the enabling environment for mainstreaming biodiversity objectives in the local development planning process in the regions bordering the Nimba Mount.   |
| 3752 | UNDP | Cap Verde | SPWA-BD Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System                                    | PIF approved. PPG approved           | 3,287,000 | 14,245,000 | The project aims to consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde's protected areas system through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation.  |
| 4090 | UNDP | Nigeria   | Niger Delta Conservation project  | PIF cleared, waiting for the next WP | 3,610,000 | 6,150,000  | The project is based on three components to mainstream biodiversity management priorities into the Niger Delta Oil and gas Sector by 1) implementing a governance framework to reduce threats and risks linked to Oil and Gas operation in priority ecosystems on 4,6 million ha, 2) managing directly key biodiversity areas in the Niger delta on 46,000 ha, and 3) developing a financial mechanism to support biodiversity conservation and community based management activities in the Niger delta.   |
| 4080 | UNDP | Senegal   | Ecovillages   | PIF cleared, waiting for the next WP | 2,880,000 | 12,700,000 | The project aims to promote a participatory approach for biodiversity conservation and low carbon development of Pilot Ecovillages in the vicinity of Protected Areas in Senegal. The framework is based on 5 components to 1) improve the governance of biological resources and energy, 2) establish demonstration activities, 3) reduce greenhouse gas emissions in key sectors and develop strategy towards energy self sufficiency, 4) strengthen capacities for carbon sequestration (PES schemes, plant nursery, mangrove regeneration, and production of compost), and 5) monitor and assess the performance with a participatory approach. |
| 4081 | UNDP | Chad      | Generating incomes and economic alternatives in Managed Conservation Areas                      | PIF approved                         | 859,000   | 3,360,000  | The project aims to support the establishment of an effectively managed Protected Area network in Chad by (1) strengthening PA policy and planning framework; (2) reinforcing capacities for PA management, and (3) testing new governance approaches. The project is focused on three sites covering 100,000 ha (Ouadi-Rime-Ouadi Achim Faunal Reserve, Fada Archei Faunal Reserve, and a transboundary protected area between Chad and Cameroon, Sena Ora National Parks).  |

|      |      |              |  |              |           |           |   |
|------|------|--------------|--|--------------|-----------|-----------|---|
| 3961 | WB   | Gambia       | The Gambia Biodiversity Management and Institutional Strengthening Project                                 | PIF approved | 945,000   | 1,258,876 | This project will focus on 1) strengthening field effectiveness of biodiversity and Protected Area Management with a effort on the Tanji Bird Reserve and the Kiang West National Park, 2) developing a long term sustainable financing vision, and 3) developing capacities for management of Protected Areas and Biodiversity implementing recommendations of the Institutional Assessment completed in 2007. |
|      | WB   | Sierra Leone | Protected area management Project  | PIF pending  | 1,800,000 | 2,000,000 |   |
|      | UNDP | Burkina Faso | Management of Protected Areas and Corridors in the framework of the Decentralization and Rural Communities |              | 1,900,000 | tbd       |   |
|      | WB   | Regional     | Scaling up the impact of good practises in linking poverty alleviation and biodiversity conservation       |              | 800,000   | tbd       |   |
|      | WB   | Regional     | Capacity Building  |              | 800,000   | tbd       |   |
|      | UNDP | Mauritania   | Strengthening the mainstreaming of biodiversity in Mauritania's oil and gas sectors                        |              | 950,000   |           |   |

|    |              | <b>Congo basin</b> |             |
|----|--------------|--------------------|-------------|
| Nb |              | GEF grant          | cofinancing |
| 13 | PIFs cleared | 49,632,997         | 167,587,750 |
|    |              | 100%               | 112%        |
| 13 | in the PFD   | 49,750,088         | 150,000,000 |

The total will be modified when all PPG will be added

|    |                 | <b>West Africa Program</b> |             |
|----|-----------------|----------------------------|-------------|
| Nb |                 | GEF grant                  | cofinancing |
| 16 | PIFs cleared    | 28,821,246                 | 101,016,876 |
|    |                 | 80%                        | 88%         |
| 1  | Pending PIF     | 1,800,000                  | 2,000,000   |
| 4  | remaining PIFs* | 4,450,000                  | 0           |
| 21 | in the PFD      | 35,927,000                 | 115,000,000 |

\*: 1 should be submitted, 2 should be merged in a single MSP for KM and capacity building, one will depend on the situation in the country