



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4953		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cote d'Ivoire, Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone)		
Project Title:	Mano River Union Ecosystem Conservation and International Water Resources Management (IWRM) Project		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3; BD-2; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$250,000	Project Grant:	\$6,336,364
Co-financing:	\$56,390,642	Total Project Cost:	\$62,977,006
PIF Approval:	April 20, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Somda

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Three letters of endorsement are available from Guinea, Sierra Leone, and Liberia.</p> <p>We take note that Cote d'Ivoire will not commit STAR allocations. However, a letter of endorsement is necessary to reflect their buy-in.</p> <p>Depending on the project budget evolutions, the letters of endorsement should be adjusted.</p> <p>April 17, 2012</p>	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>We take note of the interest of Cote d'Ivoire, confirmed by email exchanges with the OFP and AfDB. We understand that the OFP is preparing a letter of endorsement and that we will receive a letter by the June Council. Please confirm.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 A letter of endorsement from Cote d'Ivoire has been included in the package. Cleared.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	<p>The AfDB is a privileged partner of the Mano River Union countries in agriculture and nature resource management. The project is built on the top of significant support programmes for the conservation and the sustainable management of the Mano River Forest Ecosystem.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	<p>- IUCN took over the AfDB and has a comparative advantage to work on rivershed approach and NRM. - IUCN will support Mano River Union to ensure execution of administrative and financial matters and will assist in key technical and scientific issues. - IUCN will also support countries on technical issues and capacity building, well fitting its comparative advantage. Cleared.</p>
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>The project fits with the Agency's program. However, there is no information on staff capacity in the region. Please, clarify.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 Cleared.</p>	<p>IUCN has a regional bureau in Ouagadougou and already supports the MRU within the BRIDGE AFRICA project. IUCN is well positioned to support the four countries (Cote d'Ivoire, Sierra Leone, Guinea and Liberia) and the Secretariat of the Mano River, thanks to its current presence with the BRIDGE AFRICA project, or the ROAM (in Cote d'Ivoire), and its</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			long term investments in the region. Cleared.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	Guinea: BD: \$990,000; LD: \$165,000 Liberia: BD: \$990,000; LD: \$165,000 Sierra Leone: BD: \$990,000; LD: \$165,000 Please, consider the STAR allocations include the GEF grant, agency fees, and any PPG if needed. If a PPG is needed, please reduce the project grant from the requested budget.	No change since the PIF. Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	BD: \$2,770,000 LD: \$495,000 IW: \$1,100,000 SFM: \$1,050,000 If a revised reasoning is provided to support a TDA/SAP process, the IW support could be up to \$2,500,000 (fees included).	Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	The project is triggering the SFM incentive with \$1,155,000. The total of STAR allocations used in this project is \$3,465,000. The ratio is 3:1. This is acceptable if all STAR allocations are well used on	Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>forest issues. Please, confirm, or reduce the SFM part.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>(4/18/2012 IW/ah): Table A - please revise to use the wording of the GEF IW results framework. No creativity needed/appreciated here. It is better to use the exact wording.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Addressed.</p>	<p>Addressed, but please, remove the reference of GEF6 strategies. The project should respond to GEF5 strategies (CEO endorsement, p5).</p> <p>November 11, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>This point will be reviewed after revision of the incremental reasoning and the project framework.</p> <p>(4/18/2012 IW/ah): for IW objective 3 has been appropriately identified in table A.</p> <p>Section A 1.1: Please provide a stronger case and link to the IW strategy: The sentence starting "Finally the project through its international waters component..." does not link well to the IW strategy and furthermore the sentence does not seem to make sense. In addition, the next sentence overstates the results of the IW component of the project. The IW component of the project supports foundational activities which will contribute to identifying root causes and priority action needs to enhance water quality and competing</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>water use in terms of quantity; the project in itself though will not lead to "increased water quality and quantity". Please strengthen this section.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>A deeper analysis of existing planning tools and national strategies will probably permit to reinforce the justification of the choices made for the project. Please revise.</p> <p>(4/18/2012 IW/ah): the section is fine, but it would be helpful if the team could send an electronic copy or link to the Mano River 2009-2013 Strategic Action Plan and the Mano River Union Natural Resources Management Strategic Plan to us for information. There are references to it in the document, but no summary.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 Please address the point related to IW.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Addressed.</p>	<p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>A better argument needs to be developed to prove the added value of the regional approach.</p> <p>A deeper analysis of national or regional planning tools is necessary to justify the reasoning and the activities.</p>	<p>The project will support foundational capacity building and institutional reinforcement for regional ecosystem management of transboundary water systems (IW) (Mano River Union, National inter-ministry committees, line ministries, Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis, and subsequently Strategic</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>April 17, 2012 Addressed.</p>	<p>Action Plans). The project will support the restoration of training systems in countries for government agencies, institutions, and farmers. Cleared.</p>
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The importance and role of transboundary water (not only watershed) management could be more clearly integrated in the 'storyline' and justification of the project. - The TDA/SAP type process is well formulated for the AfDB funded baseline project, but its objectives and impact less clear within the description of increment in component 2. This issue should be seriously taken into consideration and be reflected upon in the next iteration of this. - The forest sector is a very complex one in the region. However, many partners, as the European Union, have supported the governance sector, the trade, and/or the local and regional private sector that is very active beyond the countries that are involved. Please, provide a rapid appraisal of these initiatives and make sure that the component one is designed in good intelligence with these existing initiatives. - Key baseline projects are described with potentially real cofinancing opportunities. However, a deeper 	<p>Yes. The problems, threats, and barriers are identified, as well as the baseline projects.</p> <p>The maps are really good and helpful tool to understand the project. Could it be possible to include a map with the main existing and planned corridors?</p> <p>Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>analysis is needed to identify the gaps and barriers that the project will address to justify the GEF increment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The section B2 is relatively weak to demonstrate the incremental reasoning, especially to convince about the multi-focal area nature of what is being proposed. - By not demonstrating links between the two baseline investments at regional level, the GEF increment also appears to be separate for the land-based focal areas and IW. This does not make sense for a project that is advocating regional integration under the Mano River Union umbrella. - For natural resource management, the MARFOP seems mainly focused on materializing a network of protected areas, supporting ecological centers, supporting the existing institutions, and replanting some areas. It is difficult to figure out the reasoning that leads to the proposed outcomes and outputs. Please, develop the reasoning. <p>April 17, 2012 We take note that many elements will be addressed during the PPG (sustainability, coordination with other initiatives, partnerships). Please, could you remind us the status of the TDA/SAP approach. We thought that initial work was undertaken in the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>2000's. Please, clarify.</p> <p>(4/18/2012 IW/ah): it is somewhat surprising that future changes in water availability/quantity is mentioned, yet there is no mention of water quality concerns or actions to address these despite the mining activities in the basin. Please address.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>IUCN focuses on deploying nature-based solutions, as cost effective contributions to global challenges in climate, food and development.</p> <p>However, a section developing the cost-effectiveness of this specific project is missing, explaining how the project design has been decided, in comparison with alternative approaches.</p> <p>November 10, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>No. Please, revise the section B1 and B2.</p> <p>We do not see the added value of LD resources or activities that clearly fit with the GEF5 strategy.</p> <p>See comments made on activities in the cell related to the project framework.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 We thank the Agency for the thorough</p>	<p>- It would be useful to have clearer delineation and picture of complementary activities between the WRCU/ECOWAS project (pg. 42), the WA-BICC project (p. 44), and the present GEF project.</p> <p>November 11, 2016 Addressed. We recommend to provide an updated information about the complementarity of these different projects in the future Project</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>revision of the logical framework. Under the component 1, we understand that the incremental use of GEF resources will focus on 1) the development of integrated land use/management plans, 2) the dissemination of best practises for production activities, and 3) the reinforcement of capacities at a landscape level.</p> <p>Further information and analysis from the MARFOP are needed to complete the demonstration (we will be pleased if you can share a project document).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is the enabling environment enough strong to propose land use/management plans? - Provide elements of sustainability for the productive activities with farmers. - See if you can bring scientific evidence (from the MARFOP) about the feasibility and the efficiency of economic alternative and livelihoods. If not, please, confirm that you will confirm the scientific rationale during the PPG. - We believe that agroforestry is a potential response in the buffer zones of protected areas (as mentioned in the section B3). At PPG level, please develop a feasibility study on this option. <p>(4/18/2012 IW/ah): The summary para at beginning of section B2 still reads confusing and does not really go along with the much clearer incremental</p>	<p>Information reports.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>reasoning of each component. The para provides little reasoning for IW fund contribution.</p> <p>Furthermore, as commented on earlier, the project will in the long-term contribute to global benefits such as improved water quality and enhanced water availability , but not lead to this outcome directly. This seems outside the scope of the project as described..</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>- The project framework has the merit of simplicity. However, if we understand well the information provided on the baseline projects, we will suggest to have four/five components:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Component 1) on nature resource management. However, the scope of outcomes, outputs, and activities needs to be revised based on a better analysis and reasoning. - Component 2) on transboundary watershed planning. That will help to provide a more obvious link between the water resources and forest ecosystems. This will also help to align the baseline investments more constructively and demonstrate the integrated approach that is being advocated for the transboundary resources. In its current form, the framework does not demonstrate Integrated Water Resource Management as implied in the project title. 	<p>The project framework is clear, but some changes are needed:</p> <p>Project costs management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the complex context of the Mano river basin and associated countries, we could accept an increase of project costs management, if you can justify an itemized budget. - The formulation of outcomes 1.2 and 2.3 is not acceptable in technical components. <p>(11/11/2016): Comments not addressed in the project document and just removed from table B. Please address. We are happy to discuss if guidance is needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The formulation of outputs 1.2.1, 2.3.1 (project progress towards monitored and evaluated), and 2.3.2 is not acceptable in technical components.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Component 3) on the TDA/SAP - Component 4) on Monitoring and evaluation, if needed; - Component 5) on management costs, if needed. <p>Comments on the existing framewok:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development objective needs to be revised. It is not clear what the objective of the project is (transboundary water management and conservation of the Upper Guinea Forest Ecosystem) for what ?) <p>Component 1: The consistency between the outcome (transboundary ecosystem are managed in a sustainable manner), the outputs (legal and regulatory frameworks, certification programs, integrated management planning, and monitoring), and activities described in the text is not convincing. We suggest to analyze deeper the baseline information and to apply some outcomes/outputs inspired by the GEF5 strategy on BD, LD, and SFM. The section B.2. needs to be completely revised.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, develop further the output linked to "harmonized legal and regulatory framework": on what? what "harmonized" mean? - Do you think that the budget and the time frame are reasonable to imagine the establishment of forest products certification? - The output on management planning 	<p>(11/11/2016): Comments not addressed in the project document and just removed from table B. Please address. We are happy to discuss if guidance is needed.</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are not seeing enough concrete scientific or mapping monitoring/assessment activities to measure the expected global environment benefits. Please, clarify. - Some interesting activities (1.9, 1.13) and indicators are proposed (# of ha of forests restored, #of ha under certification, #of ha under SLM, SFM...), but more information on the baseline data, the methodology and the tools would be appreciated. - Could a measure of resilience be integrated in the result framework (see RAPTA from the STAP for instance, or MPAT from IFAD, or IIED)? - In the component 1, we would recommend to make a clear distinction between agroforestry (=agriculture under a tree cover) and forest restoration. If there are some common functions, there are also significant differences notably in terms of biodiversity. <p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - You mentioned the example of the Volta basin with a TDA/SAP started in 2005 and a SAP approved in 2013 (8

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>enabling the generation of sustainable income from forest products and agroforestry is not clear and convincing. Please, give more information of what you mean, and what are the activities behind.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We do not understand the prioritization of activities and how the project is going to provide alternatives to activities such as poaching, logging, mining. <p>The nature of activities is dubious and the sustainability of the approach needs to be developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The activities related to advocacy, communication, outreach, and school curricula may overload the scope of the project or are baseline activities. - The final indicators proposed are 1) increased incomes from sustainable activities and 2) increased forest coverage. We have difficulties to see how the proposed activities are going to impact these two indicators. <p>Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The outcome needs to be revised. Please, refer to the GEF 5 IW framework (see IW objective 3 outcomes). - Output indicators should be more clear in what is delivered and be quantifiable. Please use the GEF IW results framework as reference of type of outputs. Also, the text description of activities within component 2 does not seem to be reflected by the output 	<p>years). Is it reasonable to propose a TDA and a SAP in two years with \$2 million?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The outcomes and activities especially around the TDA-SAP approach require time to be carried out. We would suggest to consider extending project implementation beyond 3 years and design the work plan accordingly. - Please look for consistency across table B, the project results framework, and the component description: For example, the component text now indicates that there will be one overall TDA and SAP for all four river basins (incl. the Mano River) with sub-basin section within them. Yet the RF indicator shows a number of 4 TDAs and SAPs. Another example, (in reverse) the Results Framework (p.10) lists the "number of intergovernmental agreements on regional water resources management" (also referred to in PIF table B) yet the component text is silent on the matter. - IW Learn tools: please include in text (p.62) and result framework: website, minimum of two experience notes, and participation at biannual GEF International Waters Conferences. - Mobilization of Financial Resources: The RF currently lists the "rate of funding needs covered by donors" as indicator. It seems more logical to turn that around and look at the ramping up of country contributions by countries to cover core costs. That also need

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>indicators. For example, as functional inter-ministerial committees are part of the GEF finance as described in the text, then this should be reflected as output indicator (this also is line with the GEF 5 IW results framework, which is good).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The activities linked to communication and awareness on water quality assessment are somehow difficult to understand as priorities for this project. Please, justify or more surely, remove them. - The AfDB water resources project seems to cover much (or all ?) of the support to the development of a Transboundary Diagnosis Assessment and Investment plan as per the description of the AfDB project on page 7. This contributes to somewhat unclear and weak description of the GEF finance for project incremental activities in component 2 (on page 8). What is GEF financing and what is baseline? Please clarify. IF in fact the GEF grant contributes to the TDA and SAP/investment program formulation and adoption, then please insert this as output indicators in the project framework. A commitment of the project to formulate and adopt a TDA/SAP identifying and tying together priority actions on IWRM + NRM would be a strong argument for the IW grant. - Reference to project contribution to water quality control: as written it 	<p>definition of "core costs" and if that pertains to the Regional Water Basin Authority to be established under the MRU (see pg. 42/legal framework) or MRU itself – given that the Water Authority is only to be established (by 2018 for Adoption by Heads of State).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There should be a logical link on the formulation of the SAP informing the mandate and functions of the Water Authority. Please comment. - The degree of how the river basins to coastal link is to be covered in the TDA/SAP or covered by other efforts is unclear. Page 44 lists this both as a gap (top of page) and not a gap (bottom of page). Even if this is covered to some degree in the GCLME SAP this certainly would need updating by now. - There is no clear mention of considering groundwater and conjunctive planning and management of surface and groundwater. - Please be more clear on how the adoption of the Mano River SAP (on ministerial level?) will be packaged with the other basins given that there will be one over all TDA –SAP framework (see page 60/ 2.2.2). - All TDA/SAPs should consider climate change and resilience measures. Please mention in the RF. - The formulation of the TDA/SAP needs to involve/consult with clearly not only the water sector, but also related both water using and dependent sectors such as agriculture, energy, agro- and

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>appears that much of the 'barrier' to better water quality management seems to be mainly an awareness and outreach issue that the project is addressing by promoting a list of issues (see pg 9; first para; list of item i to iv). Is this really the case? it seems surprising and really not clear what 'promoting water quality control' or 'promoting water treatment' will actually do.</p> <p>- Please insert in the project overview/problematic a clearer summary on what the key water quality issues are in the basin and based on that rethink what the appropriate measures for water quality control are in the Mano river and how the project can address these.</p> <p>- The last para in component 2 "The GEF funding for this component 2 will allow: (i)" till end of that para seems full of general wording, but has no specificity to what this actually means in terms of what the project does.</p> <p>- While there seem to be substantial activities and funds dedicated to knowledge dissemination (i.e up to a max. of 5 %), please explicitly mention dedicating at least 1 % of the grant to IW Learn activities, such as produce a couple of experience notes, produce a website according to IWLEARN guidance as well as participate in regional and the biennial IW</p>	<p>other industry/private sector operations (incl. mining), fisheries and /or other (as relevant). Right now the text under Output 2.1.2 (pages 59 and also 2.13 on page 61) appears very focused on the water sector.</p> <p>- TDA/SAP development (p.61): we strongly suggest to involve regional AND national consultants in the formulation.</p> <p>(11/11/2016): Component 2: Most comments have been sufficiently addressed. Please address the remaining 4 comments:</p> <p>1. We welcome the revision of the project duration to 48 months. We caution though to be entirely non-committal on the SAP side and stopping with a draft/preliminary SAP with no endorsement and hence no endorsement for action. By experience it would be better to use the momentum created through the TDA and SAP formulation process and develop a full SAP, but only agree on a limited set of 'initial actions' - basically agreed low hanging fruits/win-wins. In that sense it still a 'preliminary' set of actions endorsed by ministers yet recommendations for further areas to be addressed and a with a commitment of a target timeline to do so. An endorsed SAP and initial - even if limited - action program endorsed by ministers is a powerful tool to maintain a momentum and to attract follow-up finance (see also intent to organize a donor conference).</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>conferences during the project lifetime.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 We thank the Agency for the revisions. See the previous cell (13) to provide some needed elements on 1) the enabling conditions of the institutional and capacity framework, 2) the scientific evidence that makes the project feasible, and 3) the sustainability of the approach.</p> <p>(4/18/2012 IW/ah): component 2 (IW): The current write-up and outcomes and outputs are much more clear and aligned with the GEF IW strategy. There are a few items that we would like you to address in the resubmission:</p> <p>(1) as written the logical sequence of the TDA-SAP approach is not clearly reflected or rather reversed : The sequence should be to develop, in a participatory manner, the TDA. The TDA should be formally reviewed and adopted on national & regional level. The SAP formulation will build on the analysis carried out in the TDA and identify priority actions & investments. Again, the SAP needs to be reviewed and adopted on national & regional level. The AfDB funded project to develop a pipeline of bankable interventions should - in that logic - take account of and build on the TDA/SAP process. Please make sure that the write-up reflects this thinking.</p>	<p>2. Please include the SAP (with initial action plan) adoption by ministers in the Result Framework of the project document (in line with table B where it IS mentioned).</p> <p>3. Please reformulate the title of the outputs for TDA and SAP (output 2.1.2 and 2.2.1) and drop wording "for the protection of international water and biodiversity". The TDA and SAP address a much wider range of cross-sectoral issues to balance water uses across sectors leading to sustainable management of resources and in line with development and poverty aspirations of the region. The component text in itself is addressing this well (no changes recommended), yet the output title appears to peg these documents as singly environmentally focused and separate from wider development planning which they should not be.</p> <p>4. The comment on groundwater is not addressed. The prodoc itself raises the concern on overexploitation of limited groundwater resources (page 23 - climate threats). We agree that due to the limited groundwater resources the focus should remain on surface water - as you suggest - yet caution to simply 'dropping' attention to groundwater governance and sustainable management. It should be addressed within the TDA and SAP.</p> <p>In addition, please simply note that the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(2) Component 2 (i), pg. 10: this activity should aim at building capacities for both, the formulation of the TDA AND the SAP. Please add 'the TDA' both in the project framework and in the text. Enhanced experience for participatory planning mechanisms could be part of this foundational work for TDA/SAP formulation.</p> <p>(3) Comp 2 (ii), pg. 11: TDA and SAP should be developed in participator fashion and ADOPTED. Right now the component talks about "dissemination", which sounds somewhat top-down and may risk to give the impression that the preparation will not include extensive national and regional consultations already. Please add the 'adoption of the TDA and SAP" both to the project framework and component text.</p> <p>(4) Link to Mano Natural Resources Management Strategic Plan: Please note, that there is no overview of the Mano River Union Natural Resources Management Strategic Plan or the process leading up to it given anywhere in the PIF. Please provide a copy to us and please explain in the PIF how the GEF funded TDA and SAP would link to and build on this existing NRM strategic plan. Will these two strategic action plans build on each</p>	<p>TDA in its nature as an often detailed technical document is often not very suitable for 'adoption' at ministerial level. The ministers may want to officially 'take note' of it in minutes of a meeting, but it is often difficult for them to endorse all details of this type of technical document. The SAP is of different nature as it forms a commitment for cooperation and action on regional and national levels and hence needs signatures by the ministers. You may want to consider this in the final document.</p> <p>December 13, 2016 The points have been addressed, but one related to carbon estimations and calculations.</p> <p>Please complete the SFM tracking tools with the carbon value. Please, include a text to explain the reasoning for carbon: the project area is huge (181,800 ha), but only a part of the component 1 (\$4 million) will serve to SFM/SLM actions on the ground. The rest is devoted to planning, capacity building and KM. The baseline situation should be described, as well as the deforestation rates. Depending on the nature of the different concrete interventions (agroforestry, SFM, restoration, (re)plantation) and the targeted areas in ha, the carbon gains could be estimated. The data can also be improved at inception and later at mid-</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>other and/or will they be integrated and how. It needs to be assured that the GEF funded SAP will not result in any duplication of efforts.</p> <p>(5) component 2 (iii) - please edit text on page 11 to include participation of local stakeholders not only in the TDA, but also the SAP.</p> <p>(6) the text (pg 11) states clear activities related to IW learn on knowledge sharing and dissemination (up to 5 % of GEF grant will be allocated to this). Please reflect this as a distinct output in the project framework (table B).</p> <p>(4/19/2012):</p> <p>For component 2 IW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please edit the text on the output related to the awareness raising program. Provide more information (size of the program, scope, indicators, outputs, and activities). - Please, reword the output related to the TDA and the SAP in the table B. Mention it will be "adopted at ministerial level". You also can remove "disseminated", as the formulation process itself has reached all the stakeholders. - In the table B, about the output related to IW learn products: please rephrase it 	<p>term project.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in " IW learn products generated and disseminated (website, participation to the biennial IW conference, knowledge products).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please reword outputs in table B and in text to say 'adoption of the TDA and SAP". In the text please make clear that adoption means adoption at ministerial level. - In the table B, please, add at least one output related to the outcome "5 transboundary watershed identified and targetted for SAP implementation". Complete with a text in the appropriate section. - In the section B2, it is mentioned that "the project will allocate a maximum of 5 percent of the IW budget to IW learn activities". Please confirm that the minimum will not be under 1 percent. <p>April 20, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The project is triggering the SFM incentive. Please, provide the reasoning and the way to calculate the given number (40 million tons of CO2). Confirm that more accurate numbers will be provided at CEO endorsement, for instance using a Tier2 approach (see IPPC guidelines). Gains in carbon can be justified either by reforestation or avoided deforestation. - The distinction of baseline and increment in terms of IW support needs strenghtening (see also cell. 14). 	<p>No.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>April 17, 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - For the carbon benefits: 30,000ha times 141 tC/ha times 3.667 to convert to CO2 is 15.51 tCO2. The calculation is made as the project will reduce deforestation to zero. Usually, a deforestation/degradation can be reduced, halved for instance, but to reduce to zero is difficult. Please, confirm. - Is the 141 tC/ha only aboveground tree carbon? - What type of systems are funded to improve on these estimates during the project? <p>April 19, 2012 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>The section B3, in relation to the question of socio-economic benefits, is empty or proposes a very generic text. Please, provide more details on the expected social and economic benefits. Include gender issues in the Monitoring plan.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 Addressed and developed in the PPG.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>- A very generic information is provided. In the text, it is explained that all activities will be participative with a central role of local communities. We have difficulties how the four proposed outputs for natural resource management, very institutional, as well as water resource management plans,</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>will involve local communities.</p> <p>- Please, develop the role of CSO in the project.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 Please reinforce this point at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>Please, provide a full risk analysis at CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>- The Invasive Alien Species risk is identified in the ESMS part (Appendix 9) but it does not seem included in the core of the project document. We would recommend to clearly include this risk and associate mitigation and monitoring measures, notably related to reforestation, enrichment, and "natural" regeneration.</p> <p>November 11, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>- There has been a lot of work done in the region on certification, with various degrees of successes. Please, confirm that key partners on the issues will be associated (TROPENBOS, WWF's GFTN for instance) and explain how you will take lessons from these experiences.</p> <p>- The European Forest Institute provides a support to Liberia for the implementation of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA). Please, explain how the work proposed in certification is articulated to the FLEGT/VPA approach.</p>	<p>Yes. The project is connected with the main investments on the same theme (BRIDGE Africa, ROAM, CEPF), all of them connected to IUCN.</p> <p>Question: Is there any initiative or partner measuring the quality and quantity of waters upstream and near the end of the Mano River? is it a possible measure to include in the project to detect changes? or is the project too small and the river under too many pressures to have a chance to detect a change due to project interventions?</p> <p>November 11, 2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- It is mentioned that the project will take benefit form the GEF SIP/Terrafrica network. It is difficult to figure out how it is possible when none of the countries were involved in that program? Please, clarify.</p> <p>- USAID and the US Forestry Program worked together to support the Land Rights and Community Forestry Program. After a first phase started in 2007, they are now taking lessons before starting a second phase. We will invite AfDB to coordinate their efforts with them. Please, confirm.</p> <p>- The STEWARD program supported by USAID, USFWS, USFS, etc, has invested a lot in transboundary conservation and sustainable employment linked to natural resource conservation. Its phase III, until 2015, seeks to promote and strengthen activities in support of natural resource management with interventions focused around priority transboundary protected areas of Sierra Leone, Liberia, Guinea, and Ivory Coast. How the GEF project might take lessons from this program, notably for the component 1.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 Please reinforce this point during the PPG.</p>	Addressed.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	We understand that the Mano River Union should be the main executing partner for this project and that makes	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>sense for the aspects linked to transboundary water management issues.</p> <p>However, please confirm how you want to develop and implement activities at national level and who are the legitimate partners. You mentioned the experience of the MARFOP with national entities and international partners (IUCN, CIFOR, ICRAF, CIFOR, and WPF), but the implementation arrangement are not described.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 We take note of the explanations and the expected reinforcement of the MRU for regional management of the river basin. However, for NRM/SFM activities on the ground at local level, please develop appropriate partnerships with some of the existing initiative. This point is expected at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some slight adjustments have been made on the table A. - The table B keeps the same formulation of outcomes and outputs. - The main change is the nature and level of cofinancing: from the MARFOP (\$10.5 million) and the SMDMRBP (\$2.2 million) to the WA-BICC (\$10m) and other minor contributions (FDA, ROAM, WRCU, and BRIDGE Africa). - The reasons for change are explained. We understand the difficulty to identify new cofinancing opportunities in the post-Ebola context.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	under 5 percent.	The management costs stays at 5%.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>- Please, explain the consistency between the table A and B or each focal area. For instance, the numbers for the IW funds in table A/B and table D should match (\$952.380 vs. 1 million). Also, co-finance numbers in table A and B should match.</p> <p>- Co-financing ratio for IW component is somewhat low at 1:4 and not clear how it adds to four million (as the AFDB baseline funds and co-finance to that project is given in the detail, it would be good to mention what the 'other' part of the co-finance (i.e. the rest of the US\$ 4 million) is made up off).</p> <p>April 17, 2012 Addressed.</p>	<p>- Most of the cofinancing (>\$10 million) is linked to the component 1 related to integrated forest ecosystem management. The cofinancing in the component 2 is very limited (\$790,000 from WRCU and BRIDGE). We understand the post-crisis context and one outcome of this project will be to propose a financial resource mobilization strategy. However, two questions are legitimate :</p> <p>- How do you define the additional role of the GEF investment if the cofinancing is almost absent?</p> <p>- What are the measures to make the GEF investments sustainable?</p> <p>November 11, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>A better cofinancing can be expected with further analysis of existing initiatives in the region.</p> <p>There is no indication of any government co-finance. This should be addressed and at least show some indicative in-kind co-finance. Please address.</p> <p>April, 19 2012 We take note of the cofinancing ratio of</p>	<p>- The letters of cofinancing are missing.</p> <p>- The comment made at PIF about the lack of government co-finance is still valid. Please, address it.</p> <p>November 11, 2016 The point is not addressed. The annex 7 is empty.</p> <p>December 13, 2016 Two letters of cofinancing are still</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		around 1:4. Please, be aware that the average under GEF5 has been around 1:5, and it is expected at CEO endorsement that AfDB will be able to provide a better ratio with cofinancing from each government and potentially from other partners (the US for instance).	missing. December 16, 2016 Addressed.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes.	We acknowledge that IUCN brings an interesting cofinancing with the WABICC project. See item 25 though.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes. December 13, 2016 Please complete the SFM tracking tools with the carbon value. Please, include a text to explain the reasoning for carbon: the project area is huge (181,800 ha), but only a part of the component 1 (\$4 million) will serve to SFM/SLM actions on the ground. The rest is devoted to planning, capacity building and KM. The baseline situation should be described, as well as the deforestation rates. Depending on the nature of the different concrete interventions (agroforestry, SFM, restauration, (re)plantation) and the targeted areas in ha, the carbon gains could be estimated. The data can also be improved at inception and later at mid-term project. December 16, 2016 Addressed.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors		See item 14.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and measures results with indicators and targets?		November 11, 2016 Addressed.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>STAP comments were responded at PIF level. But it is recommended to update the responses due of the time and the changes since PIF approval.</p> <p>November 11, 2016 We take note of the mention "done" in the table of response. However, the annex B has not changed.</p> <p>December 13, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		No comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address comments raised above.</p> <p>April 17, 2012 The PIF has significantly improved. However, please address the remaining points above.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Please address the pending comment in the cell 14. Upon receipt of a revised document, it will be recommended for clearance.</p> <p>April 20, 2012</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		All points have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please, provide clear outcomes/outputs/activities/indicators. Provide detailed implementation arrangements. Develop a M&E plan. Develop the role of local communities, NGO/CSO, and professional organizations on the ground. Include gender issues. Develop sustainability aspects. Include information on how the GEB will be measured. Confirm cofinancing. Confirm the coordination with other initiatives (notably phase III of the STEWARD program, Peace Parks, USAID/USFS country level activities, etc.).	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		Addressed.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		Not yet. We thank the Agency for the very good project package. Please, address the points above and we will be pleased to recommend it for CEO endorsement. November 11, 2016 Please address the pending comments in the items 14 and 25. Please, also provide revised documents in tracked changes or highlighting the changes to facilitate the review (request for CEO endorsement and project document).

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>December 13, 2016 All points have been addressed but two (See items 14 and 25). Upon receipt of the missing letters of cofinancing and clarifications on carbon measurement, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>December 20, 2016. All points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 12, 2012	June 23, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 17, 2012	November 11, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		December 13, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		December 20, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	The PPG is framed to deliver key information that is needed to prepare the final project document: 1) baseline data for the TDA and the SAP, 2) an institutional analysis, 3) sectoral studies, 4) environmental and social assessments, 5) stakeholder consultations, and 6) Climate change impact analysis. However, it will be useful for a good understanding of the process and the outputs to remind the main expectations of the PIF that was approved in June 2012. The project is actually very ambitious, as there is one sub-component at national level to strengthen the management of transboundary natural resources for sustained ecological benefits and improved livelihoods for the forest adjacent communities. There is another component to support foundational capacity building and

institutional reinforcement for regional ecosystem management of transboundary water systems. National inter-ministry processes will contribute to development and the adoption of TDA and SAP.

We will need more information to figure out how the proposed PPG will address all the issues raised in this multi-focal area PIF.

Please check the points raised in the cell. 31 (items to consider at CEO endorsement). It is expected to find these points addressed in the project document. Thanks to confirm that these points will be addressed.

Please, remind in the PPG some responses you made to the STAP. We understand for instance that a draft project will be shared with the STAP.

As AfDB did for other GEF projects, \$1,000 are planned to finance some communication documents. However, please clearly confirm that no GEF resources are used for PPG coordination and/or management. Thanks.

(COMMENT IM, 7/20/2012):

Please provide some additional information on preparatory activities for field based elements of the project - for example the 100,000 hectares of forests and 100,000 hectares of production landscapes under sustainable management by communities. If it is included in the management plan the Project Management Specialist is to develop, this needs to be expanded to give a little more detail.
October 18, 2012: Addressed.

(COMMENT IM, 7/20/2012):

Please provide additional detail of preparatory works for the land certification elements and particularly the supply chain aspects as this relates to the aim of increasing annual incomes
October 18, 2012: Addressed.

(COMMENT IM, 7/20/2012):

The request in the PIF review to make clear GEB baselines and measurement at CEO Endorsement has not resulted in any specific activity in the PPG - please identify preparatory activities.
October 18, 2012: Addressed.

(COMMENT IM, 7/20/2012):

Finally there was an agreement to share the project document with STAP for a

formal review in advance of seeking CEO Endorsement. This has been confirmed in the agency response. Please include a specific Task for the TL.
October 18, 2012: Addressed.

(Ah 6/14/2012) -SECTION B : the described activities under item 1 in preparation of the TDA and SAP are unclear and do not relate logically to the project outputs and hence project activities to be designed during the PPG, e.g.:
- The project was approved to cover the entire Mano river basin and it is not clear what the activity to "identify the water resources on which the TDA will be undertaken" is therefore answering. Please also note that gathering of data for the TDA is part of the project and not part of project preparation. Furthermore, the SAP will build on the transboundary diagnostic analysis of issues and the existing Mano Natural Resources Management Plan and is to be developed in participatory and transparent process. In that view one would expect that project design (PPG phase) would design a process and define stakeholder involvement mechanisms rather than only focusing on baseline information, while the baseline of and link with existing actions is of course important.

(Ah 6/14/2012) -SECTION B - Component studies:

a. capacity needs assessment: this is mentioned yet needs to be clear that capacity strengthening and the capacity needs assessment will include institutional, policy/regulatory, and human capacity needs at regional AND relevant national levels.

(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012):

Comment above addressed. Yet please look at text of PPG description paragraph 2: is capacity building on the range of issues described really meant to be part of the PPG or is this meant to read 'capacity building needs assessment' instead of 'capacity building'?

(AH October 18, 2012): Addressed.

b. there is no mention of designing the awareness raising program

(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012): previous comments on designing the awareness raising program (as part of component 2) not addressed. The agency response notes that this is included in the PPG annex, yet it is not apparent from the PPG document we received (see also comment re. the same in Q 2).

(AH October 18, 2012): Comment addressed and is part of task of communication expert.

c. there is no mention to develop the composition and role/terms of the interministerial committees

(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012): addressed/included in one of the consultant TORs.

d. there is no mention to design the scope of work and the process of the TDA and subsequent SAP development.

(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012):

It is noted that a design of a stakeholder process is now part of the PPG annex. Yet overall it is still not apparent what is being done under the PPG. Kindly expand somewhat on the short-hand language of 'developing a framework for TDA and SAP' ; is that to mean the process for each, an outline, ... ?

While doing so it would be useful to show that the strategic action plan (SAP) will build on/emerge from the analysis of transboundary diagnostic analysis (TDA). Also we would recommend that all data gathering for the TDA be part of the project, not project preparation.

(AH October 18, 2012): Addressed. We also take from the agency response that there is common understanding that data and information gathering for the TDA will be part of project implementation and not project preparation.

(Ah 6/14/2012) -Environmental and Social Analysis:

The term used "full environmental and social analysis in section B is somewhat confusing as it would suggest a full EIA compared to a environmental and social management framework commensurate with the project activities (see Annex A). Clear and consistent language aligned with the AfDB safeguards framework and environmental rating of the project should be provided.

(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012): EIA - the agency response clarifies that the EIA is meant to address the AfDB safeguard's requirements (note though that the PPG Annex/TOR is still confusing on the scope of work). PLEASE NOTE though that GEF finance, i.e.. the PPG, cannot be used to finance EIA/safeguards requirements. This would need to be covered through sources of co-finance. Please amend the PPG accordingly.

(AH October 18, 2012): Addressed - the agency response confirms that the safeguards work will be financed through AfDB co-finance in the respective PPG activity (i.e. not financed by GEF PPG funds).

Please, proof-read the document, there are many typos that might be confusing.

	(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012): Comment/typos addressed.
2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>- Table E: there is a discrepancy between the number of days for international consultants and the information available in the annex A (46 versus 34 days). Based on the proposed budget, we guess that 34 days at 3,000\$ per week might be the right information for a total of \$102,000. (COMMENT 7/20/2012): Comment addressed.</p> <p>- Could it be possible to have a total PPG amount that is the same in the tables B, C, and D, and E. \$250,000 are mentioned in the table B and E. \$250,001 are mentioned in the tables C and D. \$1 is an acceptable mistake, but it will be better if we can avoid it. Then, with an amount of either \$250,000 or \$250,001, please adjust the fee calculation that should be exactly 10 percent.</p> <p>(COMMENT 7/20/2012): addressed everywhere except in table C - still \$250001. It would be good if that could be changed for consistency reasons (while obviously this is a very minor issue).</p> <p>(October 18, 2012): Comment addressed.</p> <p>- Annex A: Among the tasks to be performed for the international team leader, we find "design a comprehensive full project document". We are worried with this formulation as the PPG should be used to deliver the different tools and sections that are needed for a final project document, but it is expected that the Agency will be committed for the consolidation and the finalization of the final document. Please, revise.</p> <p>- We acknowledge that gender issues are well included in the project preparation. However, is it justifiable to propose 16 weeks of a gender specialist? It might be considered out of proportion in comparison with other specialists.</p> <p>(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012): this has been addressed in Annex A/column for PW. Please change in text in last column of Annex A, i.e. "16" should read "12" (2*6=12). In addition, please note that table E/budget local staff weeks need to be changed accordingly (e.g. Annex A local consultant time was reduced by 4 weeks, but table E was not - 66 weeks vs 62 weeks).</p> <p>(October 18, 2012) - Explained in agency response. The additional 4 weeks of</p>

		<p>local consultant time can be found after the table in Annex A. Addressed.</p> <p>- The distinction of the terms of reference of a "environmental specialist" is not clear in comparison with those proposed for the forest conservation and management specialist, the team leader/Ecologist, and the socio-economist. Please, justify.</p> <p>- We acknowledge the table D showing the resources by focal areas. However, please, provide the breakdown per country. We would like a confirmation that the sum of the project grant with the PPG will not exceed the resources endorsed by each country (we find some confusing information in some letters of endorsement, see the letter from Guinea for instance, where the PPG financing is not detailed).</p> <p>(COMMENT 7/20/2012): the breakdown and confirmation in the agency response is noted and conforms to endorsement letters for BD,LD, SFM.</p> <p>- (AH 6/14/2012): There is no provision in Annex for a communications/outreach specialist to design the awareness raising program and learning components under component 2.</p> <p>(COMMENT AH 7/20/2012): comment above not addressed; yet the agency response notes the addition of a communications expert for 4 weeks. This is peculiar. Please check if the right version of the PIF was submitted. If this expert was meant to be included, this would also explain the discrepancy in local staff weeks noted above.</p> <p>(AH October 18, 2012): Explained in agency response. The additional 4 weeks of local consultant time and description of tasks for the communication expert can be found after the table in Annex A. Addressed.</p>
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>	<p>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</p>	<p>7/20/2012: The PPG cannot be recommended yet. Please clarify outstanding points above.</p> <p>October 18, 2012 Please note that the PIF and PPG review that is attached to the information package is not the more recent one. Please use the more recent document for further use. Please, note that some points were included in the last round of comments. These comments will be checked at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>That said, the PPG is recommended for approval.</p>
	<p>4. Other comments</p>	<p>October 18, 2012</p>

		Please check the PIF review and the cell 31 where several points are mentioned and will be checked at CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 18, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.