



# Integrated Landscape Management Gambia (INLAMAG) Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10572

**Countries**

Gambia

**Project Name**

Integrated Landscape Management Gambia (INLAMAG) Project

**Agencies**

IFAD

**Date received by PM**

12/3/2021

**Review completed by PM**

5/25/2022

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

## PIF

### CEO Endorsement

#### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, the project is aligned with LD1.1 (agriculture), LD1.4 (integrated landscape), and LD2.5 (LDN enabling environment) objectives.

#### Agency Response

##### Project description summary

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 21, 2022**

The changes are reflected in the portal and the request for CEO endorsement. However, this last project package submission did not include a project document. We are unable to check whether changes were included in the project document. Please, provide a project document highlighting the changes.

**January 13, 2022**

- 1.1.2. One (1) open-access knowledge platform for landscape planning system developed for land-use decision-making, targeting, partnerships, research and resource mobilization: please describe the intention, the nature of activities under this output, as well as the sustainability aspects.

- As already requested at PIF level, please, clarify the non-duplication and the need for the two following outputs: 1.1.3 One (1) land use management plan is developed in cooperation with relevant national and international partners, leading to its effective implementation in support of SLM and LDN and 1.1.4. One (1) integrated watershed plan is developed for SLM and LDN, water user's management plan with clear cross-sectoral governance and implementation structures.

- Same question between the outputs, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, and 3.1.3. Participatory SLM plan developed on 15,000 ha . Please, justify the need for another SLM plan.

- Output 3.1.4. 1,000 Jambar cooking stoves distributed to 1,000 households: we would need more context to understand and agree on this output. Without a clear national and local strategy, without the ownership from local stakeholders, without a long-term visibility in terms of strategy and financing, it is difficult to accept this output as stand-alone activity. Please, clarify, or remove.

- 4.1.2 1 One LDN information hub operationalized as a mechanism for sharing and verification of monitoring data, including the dissemination of lessons learned to target audience. Please, explain this output and clarify sustainability aspects.

## Agency Response

January 24, 2022

- Request for additional information is well noted and appreciated. Under the description of component 1, output 1.1.2, additional information has been provided, including the sustainability of the platform.

- In response to the comment, please note that the need for output 1.1.3 has been given ? highlighting the national-level need for a Land Use Management plan, while output 1.1.4 has been deleted and part of what the envisaged achievement has been added to output 3.1.3.

It should be noted that in the context of The Gambia, there has not been any land use plan produced since 1985. Capacity has been lost overtime, and the institutional infrastructure for planning has not been given much attention. This has been accentuated by the lack of a functional land policy in the country. Moreover, land use planning and management is a multi-sectoral exercise: it requires an integrated and interdisciplinary approach that should include the public and private sectors, civil society, and

community leaders.[1]<sup>1</sup> This has so far been absent in the consideration of land use issues in the country. Therefore, the land use management plan at national level will support to close the capacity gap while remaining consistent with achieving LDN objectives.

-As noted above, part of output 1.1.4 has been merged with output 3.1.3

-The inclusion of the jambar as an activity was proposed and validated by stakeholders to catalyse efforts by the World Bank's work in the country, but also to support collaboration with GreenTech, a private sector in The Gambia. Additional information has been provided in the document to strengthen the case for the inclusion of jambars.

-As requested, the output has been explained, including clarifying the sustainability aspects. See page 28.

---

[1] See the World Bank report: Issues and Options for Improved Land Sector Governance in The [Gambia](#)

28 March 2022

The project document has been uploaded clean and in track changes

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

---

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 13, 2022**

Proofs of evidence are available. The breakdown between the IFAD grant and loan is included in the project document.

Cleared.

Agency Response  
**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **Yes**

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request **Yes**

Agency Response  
**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 13, 2022**

Adjustments have been made since the PIF. They remain realistic. Most of the changes are explained in the incremental reasoning upon the results from the PPG.

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 13, 2022**

Yes. The incremental reasoning is well summarized in the ToC.

Cleared.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**January 13, 2022**

Yes. There is a good analysis of the baseline situation, especially because of the strong IFAD portfolio in the country.

Cleared.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
**January 13, 2022**

Yes. The incremental reasoning is well summarized in the ToC.

Cleared.

Agency Response

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 13, 2022**

Yes, the project is anchored in the LDN framework aiming at achieving LDN in the West Cost, Lower River, and North Bank River regions (no net loss by 2030).

Cleared.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**January 13, 2022**

Yes. The incremental reasoning is well summarized in the ToC.

Cleared.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 21, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 13, 2022**

Section 67: no, this project is not the first one to promote a landscape approach and implement LDN on the ground (see GEFID 9772 ?Landscape Planning and Restoration to Improve Ecosystem Services, and Livelihoods, Expand and Effectively Manage Protected Areas? developed by UNEP). Please, revise the text.

Agency Response

As suggested, the text has been revised, acknowledging SLM aspects of other projects. Additional information has been added focusing on the project design within the context and focus on the specifics of the LDN agenda.

See paragraph 68.

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Agency Response

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**March 21, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 13, 2022**

It seems that there is a missed opportunity to 1) use the lessons and best practices from the past and current GEF and LDCF portfolio and 2) coordinate with UNEP and FAO using the same committee and institutional arrangements. Please, complete.

Agency Response As requested, additional information has been added to the portfolio of relevant GEF-financed projects to highlight coordination and lessons that are relevant to INLAMAG

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, with the LDN targets.

Agency Response  
**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, thanks to the synergy with the ROOTS project.

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 21, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 13, 2022**

In the M&E Plan, it is mentioned that the baseline data will be gathered in the first six months of the project and a budget of \$38,000 is assigned. We would like to remind that baseline data for monitoring are expected at CEO endorsement, and in any case before project inception. We used to accept baseline studies planned for the first year of project up to GEF3. Since GEF4, we are asking for baseline data at CEO endorsement. Please, correct.

Agency Response As advised, the item has been deleted from the M&E plan and financial resource allocation adjusted accordingly. The baseline data included in the document are based on the national studies conducted during the PPG. The baseline data will be confirmed during the inception workshop with all the stakeholders to ensure that any possible changes are reflected during the implementation stage.

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

## Agency Response

### Annexes

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 21, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 13, 2022**

### Annex C: Budget

- The budget includes a sub-contract with the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, and Natural Resources to restore and rehabilitate 12,000 ha of lands at the height of 1,444,171 US\$. Some details about the budget should be shared to understand the value for money of the proposed contract. Please, clarify.
- Same question about the contract of \$625,000 on community monitoring.
- Same question about the contract of \$688,749 on agriculture and agroforestry.
- We take note of the sub-contract of \$45,000 for the distribution of 1,000 jambar cooking stoves. However, we would need more information on the baseline situation, the role of cofinancing, and sustainability aspects of this activity that cannot be accepted if it is a stand-alone activity. Please, clarify.
- Please, explain the nature of the work under the activity ?development of an open access knowledge platforme for landscape planning (\$42,900).
- The costs of contracts for the Monitoring Plan (\$140,000) and the LDN information hub (125,000) seem overpriced. Please, explain the nature of the work.
- 3 project officers: please, clarify the role of these positions and why they are covered by technical components.
- It seems to us that the Office supplies (\$10,000) should be included in the pmc. Please, explain or adjust.

## Agency Response

We considered the unit cost to restore a hectare of land.

This cost is estimated to be USD 120.35 per ha. Planned restoration activities will include:

1. ? Community forest sensitization and identification of target sites
2. ? Award of Participatory community forest agreements to participating communities
3. ? Demarcation and development of maps
4. ? Institutional capacity building and community training on Community Forest implementation and other capacity building e.g forest protection
5. ? Restoration exercise (might involve cash for work)
6. ? Enrichment planting yearly

Explain the amount allocated to community monitoring?

We considered the cost of monitoring each ha from the community for a total of 12000 ha. That cost is estimated at USD 52.08 per ha. Community monitoring activities will revolve around:

- ? Strengthening of existing community forest committees to take up the monitoring roles.
- ? Training of committees on participatory monitoring, record keeping, report writing etc.
- ? Periodic regional engagements with other ANR stakeholders for sharing lessons and best practices, including xchange visits.
- ? Establishment of management committees
- ? Administrative costs related to the proposed agreement with MECCNAR, including monitoring

The amount allocated is the cost to put 5,000 ha of land under agroforestry and sustainable and diversified cropping systems. The cost per ha is 137.74 USD. Planned activities are:

- ? Fencing
- ? Seedling production/ procurement
- ? Planting exercise
- ? Seedlings for annual enrichment

? Community sensitization and training

See responses in output 3.1.4 page 27

Request well noted ? please, refer to the response under the request regarding 1.1.2 above (relating to information on the nature of activities under output 1.1.2 and the sustainability aspects).

Request noted and amount adjusted to 100000 for MP AND 90000 for LDN hub. Kindly note that International and local Consultant fees are based on current onsite costs. For the information hub equipment, training, try-outs are included

3 project officers (including Sustainable Land and Natural Resource Management Officer, Soil and Water Management Officer, Climate Smart Agriculture Officer) See TORS

Noted and done

#### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

#### **GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Four main comments were made at PIF level and have been addressed ( Confirm the result framework (cf. repetition of outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4; Confirm the core indicators + provide methodologies; Provide a comprehensive risk assessment, with mitigation measures; Detail the implementation arrangements).

Addressed.

Agency Response

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Please, note that Germany asked for a consultation of the project document. Once, technically cleared, the project will be provided for consultation for a 4-week period.

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**March 21, 2022**

Addressed.

**January 13, 2022**

Minor comments were raised at PIF level. We did not find the responses. Please, correct.

Agency Response Please, a separate STAP response matrix with responses is provided.

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**June 6, 2022**

The targets are now coherent between the core indicators 4 and 11 between the CI table and the result framework.

- Please, note that the target under 4.3 (SLM) is 36,500 ha and 12,000 ha under restoration (CI 3), for a total of 48,500 ha of terrestrial landscapes under improved management.

- The total number of beneficiaries is 9,608 with 5,715 women and 3,893 men.

Addressed.

**May 25, 2022**

•- The comment on Core Indicators has not been addressed": The inconsistency in reporting targets for core indicators 4 and 11 still exist in the core indicator table and results framework.

- Since our last review on April 5, 2022, please, note that the project cannot be CEO endorsed before June 3rd, 2022. please submit asap a request for extension.

**April 5, 2022**

Please address the comments below from the control quality:

1. Expected Implementation Start date has past ? please ask the Agency to amend:

<b>Submission Date</b> 12/3/2021	<b>Expected Implementation Start</b> 3/1/2022	<b>Expected Completion Date</b> 3/3/2027
<b>Duration ⓘ</b> 60 In Months		<b>Agency Fee(\$)</b> 441,418.00

2. Core Indicators (comments provided by Omid):

- The results framework target (annex A) indicates 48,500 Hectares total area under improved management. This is not aligned with core indicator 4 in the table as indicated 36,500.

- Kindly consider inserting in Annex A the Core Indicators used explicitly, particularly for core indicator 11. This will help ensure internal consistency in the project document, highlight that Core Indicators are part of the logical framework.

3. Status of utilization of PPG:

(i) Please request the agency to provide details on what was paid with the (a) International project document draft er 1, and (b) International project document draft er 2

(ii) The table is wrongly filled out: the budgeted amount must equal the amount spent to date + amount committed. In the Table the amount spent *is the same* than the amount committed ? it is unclear whether there is any unspent but committed amount ? please ask the Agency to amend.

**ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:**

The PPG resources were instrumental in the project development. The resources supported activities were required to enable the elaboration of the PIF to advance it into the Project Document which has been the basis for the CEO Endorsement document. In the course of the project preparation, there have been meetings that have been held to smoothen the project preparation process in terms of engaging with the government of The Gambia, engaging other project partners and engaging of consultants to conduct thematic studies to support the elaboration of the Project Document. Specifically, the following consultants have been engaged to support the development of the Project Document: Natural Resources Management Specialist; Land Specialist; Gender Specialist; and two International Project Document Drafters. Some of the PPG activities have been affected by the COVID-19 in the region, but also in The Gambia – for example, some physical meetings with the IFAD team and stakeholders in the country could only be had virtually. Movements have been restricted to a large extent, and therefore, partners have heavily relied on the use of virtual platforms to conduct meetings. The table below summarises the manner in which the PPG funds have been utilized.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 150,000			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Natural Resources Management Specialist	28,800	28,800	28,800
Land Specialist	26,000	26,000	26,000
Gender Specialist	24,000	24,000	24,000
International Project Document Draft er 1	35,600	35,600	35,600
International Project Document Draft er 2	35,600	35,600	35,600
<b>Total</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>150,000</b>

If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake exclusively preparation activities up to one year of CEO Endorsement/approval date. No later than one year from CEO endorsement/approval date. Agencies should report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

4. Budget table:

(i) Please fill in the column Responsible Entity to indicate which entity is responsible for which project activities.

(ii) There is field vehicle proposed under Goods in the budget table ? the preferred practice if for the co-financing resources to cover vehicles ? please ask the Agency to amend (see co-financing comment below).



**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/21/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/30/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/25/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/6/2022</b>

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**