

Landscape Planning and Restoration to Improve Ecosystem Services, and Livelihoods, Expand and Effectively Manage Protected Areas

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9772

Countries

Gambia

Project Name

Landscape Planning and Restoration to Improve Ecosystem Services, and Livelihoods, Expand and Effectively Manage Protected Areas

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

5/30/2019

Review completed by PM

3/19/2020

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Formulation of outcomes and outputs has evolved, as requested at PIF level.

Changes are justified.

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The result framework is the same than at PIF level, with the same breakdown of resources.

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The breakdown of GEF resources has not changed and reflects what was approved at concept stage.

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The risk analysis was slightly completed since PIF, but stays very light. In addition, the result framework has not been modified or adjusted, neither the implementation arrangements.

- Did the risk analysis serve to identify mitigation measures which will be implemented?
- Did the risk analysis serve to the identification of factors impacting project scope definition, cost, schedule, contracting strategy and work execution plan?

September 3, 2019

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

30/08/2019

The risk analysis was slightly completed since PIF, but stays very light. In addition, the result framework has not been modified or adjusted, neither the implementation arrangements.

The risk analysis has thoroughly taken into account the climate, political and capacity risks. These risks were also used to review the logical framework and planned activities. Furthermore, the “Assumptions” in the log-frame were developed to be in concordance with the “Risks” defined in the table in A.5. The assumptions in the log-frame have been revised to further reflect on the risks. Examples that demonstrate the alignment of risks and assumptions:

Risk: Process in The Gambia to decentralize decision-making on resource management does not succeed

Assumptions: Decentralization processes will exist to support the implementation of SLM, INRM, and ILUPs.

Risk: Low priority and funding is given to biodiversity conservation due to lack of understanding of the economic benefits of conserving BD and ecosystem services.

Assumptions: Local communities will have incentives to support the establishment and management of protected areas

Risk: Climate change impacts, including declines in rainfall and increase coastal erosion as a result of sea level rise

Assumptions: Local communities gain knowledge on the impacts of climate change on SLM and INRM and improve decision-making towards better adaptation through SLM and INRM practices

Risk: Resistance and/or conflicts between community members related to resource access

Assumption: Local land tenure conflicts are resolvable

Risk: Power struggles among national partners lead to delays in decision-making

Assumptions: Willingness and capacity of institutions within the project to engage in collaboration through multi-stakeholder platforms

Risk: Livelihood dependency of resource users may be detrimental to conservation and sustainable land management actions

Assumptions: ■ Communities understand and adopt the long-term sustainability of INRM and SLM production systems as a driver of their production systems. ■ Local communities will share information regarding resource practices, economics, etc. Risk: Participation of some key stakeholders, particularly some important communities is not achieved; meaningful and effective partnerships not achieved. ■ Local populations are receptive to policy and regulatory prescriptions

Risk: Sectoral focus of government departments working on NRM may hinder a coordinated approach

Assumptions: ■ Communities support and collaborate with the project, while governments support and collaborate with local communities. ■ Institutional rigidities to cross-sector collaboration can be overcome

- Did the risk analysis serve to identify mitigation measures which will be implemented?

Yes, this has been addressed in Risk Table Section A.5 of the CEO Endorsement request but also some activities have been designed in that direction. Examples are: output 3.5 Indicator 12; Sustainable rice production in Component 3, of the Project Document

- Did the risk analysis serve to the identification of factors impacting project scope definition, cost, schedule, contracting strategy and work execution plan?

Yes, the risk analysis informed the project scope, cost, schedule and execution plan. For example, the risk related to political transition that brought high expectations among the population was experienced through the CSO participation. The CSOs expressed their desire to see things being done differently from the past. Stakeholders all agreed on the need to ensure effective participation during the project planning and implementation of activities. One local community's representative indicated that "this is the first time we have been truly consulted and participated in designing of development projects in our region". Section 2.5 : Stakeholders Participation has been developed in that direction.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

We thank the GEF Agency for the significant effort to bring multiple sectors and operators in cofinancing.

However, it seems that there are some discrepancies between the evidences and information in the portal:

- The letter from the Department of Community Development (Agriculture) mentions \$300,000 of cofinancing both in-kind and in cash. Without any information on the breakdown, we recommend to UNEP to consider it as a in-kind cofinancing and not in grants. The best solution would be to have a new letter from the Ministry, if possible.
- The cofinancing from EbA should be mentioned in-kind (\$5 million). Please, correct.
- The cofinancing from the Kuntaur Area Council should also be considered in-kind (\$500,000).
- The cofinancing from the FASDEP project does not mention the nature of cofinancing: in-kind or in-cash. Without a revised letter of cofinancing, we recommend the Agency to adopt a conservative approach and consider it as in-kind, except if you are able to submit a revised letter of cofinancing.

September 3, 2019

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

30/08/2019

Co-financing from the Department of Community Development; EbA; the Kuntaur Area Council; and FASDEP have been defined as “In-Kind” in the table in Section C, confirming evidence of co-financing.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

The project will be coordinated with several GEF and non-GEF projects, notably in collaboration with FAO.

- The cross-cutting and multi-disciplinary nature of the project is well explained, but not reflected in the project implementation arrangements. We understand the executing role of the National Environment Agency, but we do not agree with the potential passive role of other key-stakeholders on the ground and a limited role in consultative bodies (NGO, Academia, local authorities and leaders, traditional authorities, community-based organizations). Please, confirm the active role of implementation of these different entities (provide a budget). Please, reduce the use of consultants and temporary staff.

- We would like to see in the first Project Implementation Report (PIR) detailed information on coordination mechanisms and concrete exchange of services and knowledge.

September 3, 2019

Addressed,

Response to Secretariat comments

30/08/2019

The cross-cutting and multi-disciplinary nature of the project is well explained, but not reflected in the project implementation arrangements. We understand the executing role of the National Environment Agency, but we do not agree with the potential passive role of other key-stakeholders on the ground and a limited role in consultative bodies (NGO, Academia, local authorities and leaders, traditional authorities, community-based organizations). Please, confirm the active role of implementation of these different entities (provide a budget). Please, reduce the use of consultants and temporary staff

Response: Section 5, on Stakeholder participation and Table 3. An analysis of project stakeholders; provide clear role of each partner. We consider the use of the wording Participate or Lead or Support – are indication of active participation of the indicated stakeholders. UN Environment will ensure that the active participation, as demonstrated during PPG process, is maintained. The Project Technical Adviser will have this issue as part of his/her Terms of References.

The active role is now evident in the budget which pass from \$130,000 to \$2,287,860 See budget line 2100.

The consultants and temporary staff have been reduced from \$2,497,860 to \$300,000 See Budget lines 1200

We would like to see in the first Project Implementation Report (PIR) detailed information on coordination mechanisms and concrete exchange of services and knowledge

Response: UN Environment Project Task Manger takes note of such expectation and will ensure that the first PIR provides the requested information.

9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

In the project document, you mentioned that carbon benefits have been calculated over a period of 20 years (111,511 tCO₂eq): 1) Why not inserting these carbon benefits in the GEF core indicators? and 2) Could it be possible to receive the full EXACT tables to understand how you calibrated the reasoning, the parameters, and the assumptions?

September 3, 2019

Thanks for the change, but please check the information logged under the indicator 6.1: you mentioned a 10-year period and not a 20-year period. Please, revise.

September 4, 2019

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

30/08/2019

The value of carbon emissions avoided has been added to Core Indicator 6: Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated; sub-Indicator 6.1: Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the AFOLU sector.

The full EXACT tables, and the supplementary description of the computation process has been included to aid understanding of how the model was calibrated, the reasoning, the parameters, and the assumptions.

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

KM is mainstreamed in the project design with several outputs focusing on knowledge production (1.1, 2.1, 3.1, 3.3) and capacity building (1.3, 2.5, 3.6).

Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Addressed.

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement NA

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Not yet. Please address the comments above.

September 4, 2019

All comments have been addressed: the project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

However, the Quality Control highlighted the following issues. Please address the following issues:

1- The project was approved at PIF stage as a multifocal area project. Hence, there should be a BD component among the three objectives. However, in Portal, the project lacks the BD component. Please, amend.

2- Under the PMC there are ineligible expenses that should be charged to either the M&E Plan or to other project components: #1102, #1103, #2200, #4100, #5501, #5000.

3- On Core Indicators:

3.1. GEF Core Indicators 3.1 (4,800 ha of degraded agricultural land restored) and 3.3 (300 ha of natural grass and shrublands restored): Agency has not provided any explanation for these estimates and these results are not reflected in the project's results framework.

3.2 In addition, these activities/results are not reflected in the Ex-ACT tool that includes all the other land-based activities of the project. Please provide justification for these results and reflect them in the Ex-ACT accordingly.

3.3. GEF Core Indicator 6.1: Based on the review of the Ex-Act tool submitted by the Agency, the value for Core Indicator 6.1 is the annual value for GHG emissions (Agency has interpreted Ex-Act results incorrectly in the Supplement document). The GEF guidance states that the full 20-year value (2,230,210 tCO₂e) should be included. Please revise the indicator 6.1.

December 6, 2019

Addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

January 13, 2020

PPO reviewed the re-submission of ID 9772 – Gambia. Please see their observations below:

In summary, the comments provided on December 16th were not fully addressed:

1. On comment 1- below, still the Project Coordinator is charged to the Components instead of fully charging it to PMC (see screenshot below):

Project title:	Land/seascape planning and restoration to improve ecosystem services, and livelihoods, etc					
Project number:	CEO ID: 9772					
Project executing partner:	National Environment Agency					
From:	Expenditure by project component/activity (provide description)					
To:						
UNEP Budget Line	1	2	3	4	PMC	Total
10 PERSONNEL COMPONENT						
1100 Project personnel						
1101 Project Coordinator	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	100,000
1102 Chief Technical Advisor and M&E (International)	115,000	108,000	101,000	108,000		432,000
1103 Monitoring and Evaluation Officer	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000		72,000
1104 Project Assistant Technical Specialist					65,000	65,000
1199 Sub-total	153,000	146,000	139,000	146,000	85,000	669,000

2. Office supplies continued being partially charged to components instead of being fully charged to PMC.
3. Procurement process support (which is an executing function) was not removed neither explained.

50 MISCELLANEOUS COMPONENT						
5100 Operation and maintenance of equipment						
5101 Stakeholders consultations including gender and Indigenous and Local Communities Participation				0	25,995	25,995
5102 Procurement process support	0	0	0	0	30,000	30,000
5103 Accounting and Archiving Software software and gadgets	0	0	0	0	30,000	30,000
5199 Sub-total	0	0	0	0	85,995	85,995
5200 Reporting costs						
5201 Publication	5,000	1,000	5,000	0	10,000	21,000
5202						0
5203						0
5299 Sub-total	5,000	1,000	5,000	0	10,000	21,000
5300 Sundry						0
5301 Communication	5,000	0	4,030	0	5,000	14,030
5302 Office supplies	5,000	0	5,000	0	3,800	13,800
5303 Banking costs	0	0		0	0	0
5399 Sub-total	10,000	0	9,030	0	8,800	27,830

4. The indicators were addressed in the Core Indicator worksheet attached to the resubmission but not on the portal. Please, revise the targets submitted through the portal and delete the hectares under Core Indicator 5 and under sub-indicator 4.1 to ensure alignment with the corrected numbers.

February 20, 2020

- Except a mistake from our part, we cannot check the modifications in the budget, as we did not find any revised versions in the new submission, either a revised project document. If you add a M&E component, this new component should be reflected in all the project documents shared with the government (request for CEO endorsement, project document, budget, etc). Please, submit a whole project package highlighting the corrections.
- Except a mistake from our part, the numbers under the core indicators 5 and 4.1 have not been deleted in the portal. Please, correct.

March 19, 2020

Addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments

30/08/2019

UN Environment takes note of the review comments. We thank the Secretariat for the very useful review which has helped to strengthen the CEO endorsement package and provide valuable guidance (e.g. strengthening of key stakeholders' role) which will be considered during project implementation.

03/December/2019

On the comment *"The project was approved at PIF stage as a multifocal area project. Hence, there should be a BD component among the three objectives. However, in Portal, the project lacks the BD component. Please, amend."* – The BD Component is now included in the portal.

On the comment *"Under the PMC there are ineligible expenses that should be charged to either the M&E Plan or to other project components: #1102, #1103, #2200, #4100, #5501, #5000"*, the Annex F1, budget, has been revised to address the comment in line with Table B- Eligible Personnel cost and Eligible activities under PMC as described in GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01 June 9, 2017 - GUIDELINES ON THE PROJECT AND PROGRAM CYCLE POLICY

On Core Indicators: Core Indicators 3.1 and 3.3 have erroneously been included in the reporting. This has now been rectified and the core indicators now correspond to the project's result framework and to the Ex-ACT tool. The figure of 2,230,210 tCO₂e has been inserted against indicator 6.1.

22nd January 2020: UNEP Agency response to the January 13th PPO Review.

Taken note of the PPO comments and guidance and with reference to the GUIDELINES ON THE PROJECT AND PROGRAM CYCLE POLICY, document GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01 June 9, 2017, it becomes necessary to create an M&E component in the budget. Following discussion with GEF Programme Manager in charge of the project, it is acceptable to draw funds from other components approved in the PIF to source that new component. The revised budget, therefore now has an M&E component.

1. *On comment 1- below, still the Project Coordinator is charged to the Components instead of fully charging it to PMC*

Response: The cost related to the Coordinator position is now charged on PMC

2. *Office supplies continued being partially charged to components instead of being fully charged to PMC*

Response: The Office supplies are now charged on PMC as per the guidance

3. *Procurement process support (which is an executing function) was not removed either explained*

Response: The Procurement process is now removed. This function will be fulfilled by the Finance and Administrative Support Officers

4. *The indicators were addressed in the Core Indicator worksheet attached to the resubmission but not on the portal. Please, revise the targets submitted through the portal and delete the hectares under Core Indicator 5 and under sub-indicator 4.1 to ensure alignment with the corrected numbers*

Response: The suggested correction is done in the portal

UNEP RESPONSE 03 March 2020:

Comments: Except for a mistake from our part, we cannot check the modifications in the budget, as we did not find any revised versions in the new submission, either a revised project document. If you add an M&E component, this new component should be reflected in all the project documents shared with the government (request for CEO endorsement, project document, budget, etc). Please, submit a whole project package highlighting the corrections.

Response: The modified budget line is highlighted in the revised budget template. The revised project package is now also submitted. The new M&E Component is reflected in all the project package and share with the NEA as the Government Project Executing Agency.

Comment: Except for a mistake from our part, the numbers under the core indicators 5 and 4.1 have not been deleted in the portal. Please, correct.

Response: The numbers under core indicators 5 and 4.1 have been corrected in the portal

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Context

The Gambia is a country enclosed by the Atlantic Ocean in the west and Senegal on the three remaining sides. The Gambia is less than 48.2 km wide at its widest point, with a total area of 11,295 km² (comparable to Jamaica and Qatar). With a population of 1,856,417 million in 2013, the Gambia is one of the most densely populated countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (population density in 2013 was 176.1 per km²).

The Gambia's rural development and poverty reduction strategies emphasize the need to reverse stagnating agro-sylvo-pastoral productivity while safeguarding its rich natural resource base and unique biodiversity assets. Despite its limited size, The Gambia is endowed with rich and varied ecological systems belonging to the Sudano-Sahelian zone (riverine zone), the Sahel-Savanna zones, and the Guinea-Savanna zones or humid zones. The river Gambia (1,130km long) originates from the Fouta Djallon highlands in Guinea, surrounded by open woodlands, forested savannas, wetland ecosystems, grasslands, agricultural ecosystems, before opening into the Atlantic Ocean, with coastal and marine ecosystems. Ecosystem degradation and conversion, unsustainable agricultural practices, including overgrazing and bush burning are the main threats, completed by the increasing pressure on coastal and marine areas. Most of the project field-level activities will take place in the Kuntaur Local Government Area (LGA), located in the Central River region of the country.

The root causes of land degradation include inappropriate land use, increased competition over land, unsustainable agricultural practices, overgrazing, and deforestation. While efforts have been made at different levels to address some of these threats to the sustainable use and management of land and seascape resources, success remains patchy. Some of the key barriers to achieving meaningful progress in the sustainable management of land and seascapes in the Gambia include: (i) Inadequate land use and land right policies and lack of institutional capacity for land use planning. (ii) Absence of planning processes and local capacities/support to enable the integrated application of sustainable land management measures. (iii) Lack of experience and models for integrated land use planning and management that supports sustainable land management practices and reduces negative impacts on key biodiversity habitat from adjacent productive landscapes. (iv) Inadequate protection of marine and coastal ecosystems and lack of experience and capacity for marine protected area management.

Project

The objective of this project is to create an enabling environment for The Gambia in building national capacity to lead the reform of land use and marine spatial planning policies and to implement land/seascape level management that conserves ecosystem services in productive and protected land/seascapes.

The project will contribute to the removal of barriers to sustainable land management, biodiversity management, and integrated natural resources management in the Gambia by 1) Improving planning and enforcement systems to identify and address causes of land degradation and biodiversity loss; 2) Developing an enabling framework for the implementation of sustainable land management practices across landscapes; 3) Supporting the implementation of integrated land use plans and strengthening of protected area management to achieve sustainable land management and biodiversity objectives; 4) Expanding protected areas to encompass unmanaged ecologically important areas of The Gambia.

Global Environment Benefits

- Increase in protected areas coverage in the Kuntaur LGA with 10,000 ha;
- Increase in ecological connectivity covering 100,908 ha between and within different priority biodiversity habitats;
- Creation of four Indigenous Community Conserved Areas covering 10,000 ha;

- Creation of two new Marine Protected Areas covering 18,000 ha; etc.
- Carbon benefits from the project estimated in terms of lifetime direct as well as consequential GHG emissions avoided over a time horizon of 20 years are 111,511 tCO₂eq.

In addition to these landscape/seascape and land resources benefits, this project will contribute to gains in human and institutional capacity development.

GEF Strategies

The project fits with GEF6 LD and BD strategies.

Country priorities

This project idea was prioritized in the National Portfolio Formulation Document, with UNEP as GEF Agency.