

# Integrated Landscape Management Gambia (INLAMAG) Project

**Review PIF 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**

3/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/21/2020

**Program Manager**

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

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

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

- The Land Degradation Focal Area is a financial mechanism to support the implementation of country engagements under the UN Convention to Combat Desertification: the focus is on two dimensions: 1) production landscapes in drylands and 2) smallholder farmers; these two dimensions should contribute to generate global environment benefits and fight poverty. The agriculture models promoted should generate multiple environment (and social) benefits, as ecological intensification and climate smart agriculture – intensive agriculture and monocultures do not enter these definitions. Please, confirm, and remove mention of non-eligible ecosystems and value-chains (wetlands, mangroves, coastal and marine ecosystems, oysters, intensive monoculture, etc.)

- If the project is confirmed as mix of integrated landscape approach, SLM and LDN, we suggest to develop this LD project under LD1.1 (SLM), LD 1.4 (integrated landscape), and LD2.5 (LDN). This last objective is mainly focused on the institutional framework and capacity development for LDN (and SLM), and should not exceed a few hundred of thousands of dollars. The two other objectives are more related to investments or a mix of technical assistance and investment to develop an integrated landscape approach and implement SLM. Please, clarify.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

### **Agency Response**

**Response 1:** As per recommendation, and consistent with the GEF-7 LD programming directions, all the allusions to intensive agriculture, mangroves and monoculture, non-eligible ecosystems and value chains have been removed. This is reflected in the proposed project logical framework where the project has been focused on LD1.1, LD1.4 and LD2.5.

**Response 2:** The project framework has been modified and components rephrased to reflect LD1.1, LD1.4 and LD2.5 priorities. This is in confirmation of the fact that this project is a mix of integrated landscape approach, SLM and LDN.

The level of resource allocation has also consequently, been adjusted as recommended.

### **Indicative project/program description summary**

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

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

General comments

- The result framework is too broad and address to many issues and value chains: rice, horticulture, vegetables, poultry, game farming, oysters... Some of these value chains are not eligible, and the meaning in terms of GEB is not clear for others (see below). The result framework needs a deep revision to reflect a GEF reasoning (baseline/cofinancing/added value of GEF activities for GEB).

- We invite the GEF Agency to refer to the STAP primer of Theory of Change to explain how the proposed approach will contribute to transformation and sustainable change: <http://www.stapef.org/theory-change-primer>.

Result Framework

- The formulation of outputs should follow the OECD guidelines on evaluation and result based management in practice at the GEF: outputs should reflect the results of activities, be specific, if possible quantified and reflect the value for money of the activities.
- ALL OUTPUTS NEED TO BE REFORMULATED (they are expressed as outcomes).
- Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, and 1.1.6: To improve the institutional framework related to LDN, please apply and refer to the two STAP guidelines on LDN: GEF/STAP/C.57/Inf.02 ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.STAP\\_C.57.Inf\\_02\\_Land%20Degradation%20Neutrality\\_Guidelines%20for%20GEF%20Projects.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.STAP_C.57.Inf_02_Land%20Degradation%20Neutrality_Guidelines%20for%20GEF%20Projects.pdf)) and GEF/STAP/C.57/Inf.03 ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.STAP\\_C.57.Inf\\_03\\_Guidelines%20for%20the%20application%20of%20the%20Scientific%20Conceptual%20Framework%20for%20LDN.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.STAP_C.57.Inf_03_Guidelines%20for%20the%20application%20of%20the%20Scientific%20Conceptual%20Framework%20for%20LDN.pdf))
- Output 1.1.2: in addition to the reformulation for a more specific output (too vague, too many stakeholders), we would like to better understand the strategy for farmer capacity building and the concerned stakeholders. Under the GEF LDFA, if we understand the intention, preference should be given to farmer associations and cooperatives to reach a maximum of farmers and for sustainability.
- 2.1.2: rehabilitation and restoration of wetlands are not eligible in a LD project.
- Afforestation: except in particular conditions that should be described (fight against wind erosion for instance, agrosylvopastoral systems), afforestation is not financed by GEF resources, and especially when it is about exotic species. Please, confirm.
- Please, explain the kind of model promoted for the rice value chain – creation of dykes, earthwork, water management, and the use of fertilizers for a monoculture are not generating global environment benefits. If we understand the need for local consumption, it does not make a GEF eligible approach. Please, clarify.
- In opposite, all aspects related to diversification, resilience, agro-sylvo-pastoral systems, tree cover improvement, natural regeneration, agroforestry... are potentially welcome.
- 3.1.1, 3.1.3, and 3.1.4: Please explain the plan for all these value chains and in which measure these outputs will help in generating GEB. It may be better to use cofinancing for most of them. The focus of the LDFA is on drylands – activities in wetlands, oyster, etc, are not eligible. Please, explain the GEF reasoning to justify activities related to poultry and game farming.

April 2020

Addressed.

## Agency Response

**Response 3:**

As recommended, the results framework has been reworked to streamline it – the outputs have also been reduced consistent with the changes and adjustments that have been made to components that reflect LD FA objectives. The outputs have been rephrased to include numbers where applicable.

A paragraph has been added to explain the overall logic of the project; summarizing the goal/ intended impacts, the intervention outputs and the assumed causal pathways. Indicators have been alluded as well as associated risks - consistent with the general logical flow of the Theory of Change as proposed by STAP. The paragraph appears is the second before the last where component description starts.

The theoretical logic of this project on which the Theory of Change will be built is it seeks to create an enabling environment for an integrated landscape approach in support of SLM and LDN mainstreaming and implementation in The Gambia. This is its goal. Working backwards, this goal will be achieved through supporting the creation of an enabling institutional and policy environment for SLM and LDN (building capacities of stakeholders, policy mainstreaming – component 1); implementing SLM and LDN using an Integrated Landscape Management approach (concrete hardware activities such as agroforestry practices, assisted regeneration of socioeconomically valuable species etc –component 2); Livelihoods and food security of land users (concrete hardware activities); and knowledge management through which lessons will be disseminated to stakeholder to inform scaling up and replication of good practices. Since the government led and validated the LDN voluntary targets, and has demonstrated commitment to the fight against land degradation through various national policies, the project assumes that there is enough political will to mainstream and implement the LDN agenda and SLM in the country. It is also assumed that communities will support and be involved in the decision-making processes that will lead to the identification and promotion of appropriate SLM practices. Additionally, the project is also cognizant of social, economic, political and environmental risks, which it will duly consider in the course of its development.

**Response 4:** The outputs have been reformulated as recommended and where possible, activities have been quantified. Equally, the proposed financial values have been adjusted to reflect the value for money.

**Response 5:**

Comment well noted, reformulated as recommended

**Response 6:**

Comment well noted, and reformulated as recommended

**Response 7:**

Comment well noted, and reformulated as recommended. List of stakeholders has been trimmed, and in the description of component 1, it has been mentioned that project will work with community based organisations to build capacities of local communities. At other levels, a multi-stakeholder coordination platform will enhance capacity development.

**Response 8:**

Revised as recommended, and wetlands have been removed

**Response 9:** Afforestation has been removed as suggested. Land rehabilitation of agrosilvopastoral landscapes has been maintained

**Response 10:** value chains have been dropped from the project, with a focus on mixed agriculture (crop and livestock systems) to sustain food production and livelihoods through SLM, and improving the living conditions of affected populations by addressing their socio-economic needs. The creation of dykes is an important SLM practice (for both water and soil).

**Co-financing**

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

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

**Agency Response**

**GEF Resource Availability**

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

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

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

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

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

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

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

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

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

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

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

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

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

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

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

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

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

## **Agency Response**

Core indicators

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

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

- Once the result framework will have been revised, please confirm the core indicators (3.1: 2,000 ha of agricultural lands restored; 3.2: 3,000 ha of natural grass and shrublands restored; 4.3: 1,700 ha under SLM). As it is recommend to develop the project under the LD1.1, 1.4, and 2.5 objective, we may expect more areas under SLM (core indicator 4.3).
- About the core indicators related to carbon: Please note that you should apply a 20-year period (and not a 5-year period). Please provide a note explaining the reasoning and the assumptions for the carbon balance.

April 18, 2020

- We take note of the revised indicators (3.1: 10,000 (agriculture lands restored), 3.3: Shrubs and grasslands restored 4,500ha; 4.1: 22,000 ha; 4.3: 22,000 ha - Please, confirm these values are those obtained by the GEF grant + cofinancing, or revise.
- The number of beneficiaries (less than 10,000) seem quite low in comparison with 58,500 ha restored or under better management, while the average farm size is under 2 ha. Would you have an explanation?
- You did not include a 20-year period for carbon calculation.
- An annex with the reasoning and the assumptions would be welcome, especially because the values seem quite high.

April 20, 2020

There is still a discrepancy between the PIF and the core indicators in the portal: Under the core indicator 4: the PIF mentions 22,000 ha under SLM (4.3); however in the portal, in addition to these 22,000 under SLM, there are also 22,000 ha under 4.1(management for BD). The total under the indicator 4 is then 44,000 ha. Please, correct.

## **Agency Response**

**Response 13:**

As recommended and following the adjustments and revision of the results framework, the core indicators have been adjusted, giving a total of 36,500 ha from 6,700 ha. The emissions to be avoided have equally been adjusted by proportion from 582,609 to 3,173,914 t CO<sub>2</sub> GHG emissions mitigated (the estimate will be confirmed at PPG).

**Response 14:**

The suggestion is well noted, and an explanation will be provided following the confirmation at PPG as suggested under response 13 above.

**Responses 20 April 2020****Response 14a:**

Clarification sought is well noted, and this is to confirm that the revised indicators reflect the investments from the GEF grants as well as the cofinancing

**Response 14b:**

Clarification sought is well noted. The number of beneficiaries which should have been revised in the last iteration of review responses has not been adjusted upwards – 9,041 women (59%), and 6,159 men (41%), giving a total of 15,200 beneficiaries. The estimate of beneficiaries is based on the demographics in the 11 selected districts.

As in each household, there is on average 6 people per household, indirect beneficiaries are 91,200 beneficiaries

**Response 14c:**

Recommendation well noted, and the 20-year period has been added.

**Response 14d:**

Suggestion well noted. As briefly alluded to in Response 13 above, the estimate value of 3,173,914 t CO<sub>2</sub> is derived by proportion from the initial estimate of 582,609 t CO<sub>2</sub> that was based on 6,700 ha under improved SLM. The estimate value of 3,173,914 t CO<sub>2</sub> is due to the increased number of ha from the initial 6,700 ha to 36,500 ha. The increase from 6,700 ha to 36,500 ha is within the same landscapes, and therefore, the 3,173,914 t CO<sub>2</sub> as an extrapolation derived from the initial estimate is reasonable. The assumption here is that the production landscapes and the SLM practices/land use will remain the same (see footnote 3 in the PIF). However, as indicated under Response 13, this will be confirmed at PPG.

**Response 21 April 2020:**

Inputs by error has been removed

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

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

## **Agency Response**

### **Part II – Project Justification**

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

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

To be revised.

We support the implementation of the LDN targets in a number of regions in The Gambia, and you are welcome to use the available analysis and information to rephrase this section.

The proposed analysis is too broad. We are not seeing the logics between the problems, the barriers, and the proposed solution.

The focus on rice is disputable from a GEF point of view, as food security and nutrition are not enough to justify the use of GEF resources if there is no global environment benefits.

You need to rethink in term of ecosystem services provided by production landscapes. This is why the preference would be to focus on diversified sylvo-agroecosystems to promote multiple ecosystem services (carbon, water, biodiversity), improve resilience and diversify the sources of incomes of local communities.

The only justification to work partially on the rice value chain might be the role of ricefields to protect lands from flooding and from erosion. In terms of agriculture, the GEF promotes ecological intensification and climate smart agriculture - these aspects seem absent from the reasoning.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

## **Agency Response**

**Response 15:**

This section has extensively been reworked and shortened to give a fairly brief country context and then the LDN context in The Gambia.

**Response 16:**

As in response 15 above, this section has extensively been reworked. Threats have been maintained and some sections have been improved while removing all that has to do with wetlands. Following from threats, barriers have also been reworded to clarify the link with proposed components. The description of the components provides additional clarity on the link between the barriers and the components and the rationale behind the proposed interventions. The components are conceived as direct interventions to address the barriers.

## Barriers:

1. Inadequate harmonized capacities, policy and institutional mechanisms for effective mainstreaming and implementation of SLM and national LDN targets
2. Lack of opportunities for SLM-related market-oriented alternative livelihoods
3. Inappropriate land management systems exacerbated by lack of land policy

## Components:

1. Enabling environment for SLM and LDN mainstreaming and implementation
2. Implementation of Integrated landscape planning and management to reduce land degradation
3. Promote SLM for Climate Smart Agriculture for improved agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management
4. Project Monitoring the Project's Contribution to Neutrality

**Response 17:**

See response 10 above regarding the drop of value chains and rice production. The project has been revised to focus on crop and livestock systems

**Response 18:**

Comment well noted. The selection of some of the aspects of the project components reflects country-level aspirations and priorities for the project that were expressed by the country during consultations. Sylvo-agrosystems have been included in component 2.

**Response 19:**

Comment well noted. Please, see response 10.

**2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEF and LDCF projects in The Gambia are mentioned in the coordination section, but are absent from the baseline situation. Please take stock of the MFA, LD, and adaptation projects, notably from UNEP, FAO, and AfDB. And include lessons at PPG.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

**Agency Response****Response 20:**

Comment well noted, and the following projects have also been included in the baseline situation: Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change in the Gambia (2014 – 2018); Improving Water Availability in The Gambia’s Rural and Peri-Urban Communities for Domestic and Agricultural Use (2019 – 2023); and Land/Seascape planning and restoration to improve ecosystem services, and livelihoods, expand and effectively manage protected areas (2017 – 2023). The comment on including lessons at PPG is well noted and appreciated.

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

See comments on the result framework.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

### **Agency Response**

#### **Response 21:**

Comment well noted. Please, see responses 15 and 16 above

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

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

See recommendations in the cell 1 to better aligned the project.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

### **Agency Response**

#### **Response 22:**

Reformulated as recommended to reflect LD-1-1, LD-1-4 and LD-2-5 programming priorities

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

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

No. The proposed solution is too broad, addressing too many ecosystems and value chains. To be revised.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

## **Agency Response**

### **Response 23:**

Comment well noted, and the reasoning has been revised

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

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

In the section on GEBs, please focus on the explanation and justification of core indicators and how you reach these proposed targets.

April 18, 2020

The numbers in the portal are not coherent with those mentioned in the text: 44,000 ha of terrestrial lands under better management, out of protected areas, and 14,500 ha of restored lands in the portal versus 36,500 ha under better management in the text (Chapter 6). Please, correct.

April 20, 2020

See the item 6 on the core indicator. Point not addressed. You need to remove the 22,000 ha under 4. 1 (management for BD), the total under the core indicator 4 should then be 22,000 ha, meaning 22,000 ha under SLM (core indicator 4.3).

## **Agency Response**

### **Response 24:**

Comment well noted, and information has been added in the theoretical logic of the project which includes a graph adapted from STAP's guidelines for LDN project development. At the start of the section on GEBs, sentences have also been added to reiterate the focus and the how the proposed targets will be reached through the proposed suite of interventions.

### **Response 24a - 20 April 2020:**

Request to correct well noted and appreciated. At PIF stage, the total area under improved management is 36,500 ha, a culmination of area of land restored of 14,500 ha (component 2), and area of landscapes under improved practices of 22 000 ha (component 3).

### **Response 21 April 2020:**

Inputs by error has been removed

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

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

- Please, revise the sections on innovation and sustainability when the project will have been revised.

- Scaling up: The implementation of LDN at scale needs to catalyze other donors and partners. Some aspects may go beyond this project, but the LDN related outputs should help implementing the right institutional framework and multiple stakeholder platforms to catalyze more resources and scale up the results. Please, revise the appropriate outputs, and revise this section.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

**Response 25:**

Comment well noted, and as advised, sustainability and scaling up have been revised to accommodate the changes that have been made. We feel that the innovation section fits fairly well with the changes that have been made.

**Response 26:**

Comment noted. As per recommendation, the section has been revised following the adjustments in the frameworks

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

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

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

Addressed.

## Agency Response

### Stakeholders

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

- There is a comprehensive list of stakeholders and potential partners. However, we want to see a better alignment between the result framework and the stakeholders to engage, especially to better understand the capacity building strategy for smallholder farmers.

- The importance of stakeholders on the ground (farmer organizations, cooperatives) should be better highlighted. The capacity building strategy should rely on them, for instance through the development of multiple stakeholder platforms. Please, clarify, and modify.

April 18, 2020

Following the GEF policy on stakeholder engagement, GEF agencies must **provide a description of the consultations that took place during the project identification phase**, with Civil Society Organizations and Private Sector Entities... Please, detail the nature of events, who came? how many participants? for which results?

April 2020

Addressed.

## Agency Response

### Response 27:

Comment well noted – at this stage of project development, the stakeholders highlighted in the table are all connected to the thematic areas of this project, and most of them have been consulted on the development of this project. Strategically, at PPG stage, the list of stakeholder will be streamlined to fit them within what will be agreed upon at PPG as the project directions. At this stage, it is better to have a broad array of stakeholder that are relevant, and at PPG, the revised table will present only those who will be associated, including mechanism of engagement and capacity development strategy.

**Response 28:**

Comment well noted, and component has now included an output on strengthening community-level agric cooperatives. The use of community-level cooperatives is highlighted in component 3 as a capacity building strategy to ensure sustainability at local level.

**Response 28a - 20 April 2020:**

Because of the nature of this project and the negotiations with the government the preceded the conceptualization of the project, stakeholder consultations were carried out in two phases: in 2019 and in January 2020. Additional detailed information has been added in the annex section of the PIF as an extension of the section on Stakeholders in the main text. About 560 were met, that is, 300 in 2019 and 260 in 2020. Where possible, lists of participants in meetings are attached to the PIF as annexes, including pictures during the meetings. Finally, a table has been added with brief details of thematic results from the consultations with different stakeholders.

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

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

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

There is a section on gender. However, elsewhere in the text and the project framework, there is no mention of inequality and vulnerable people.

To be revised.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

**Agency Response****Response 29:**

Comment well noted, and now it has been included in the project framework and component description (component 3)

**Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Risks**

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

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

To be completed:

- Please, refer to the following GEF guidelines: GEF\_C.57\_Inf.05\_Guidelines on GEF's Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards. We take note of the types and levels of risks and potential impacts, but please provide the overall project risk classification.
- The notion of Indigenous Community Conservation Area (ICCA) is mentioned in the result framework. For this reason, we suggest including a point on Indigenous People in the risks
- During the PPG, develop a risk analysis and at CEO endorsement, please, provide a comprehensive risk assessment with mitigation measures.

April 18, 2020

Due to the COVID-19 situation, we invite IFAD to check how this evolving situation may affect the beneficiaries, indigenous people, and the project. Please, identify mitigation measures, using the response offered so far by IFAD.

April 2020

Addressed.

## Agency Response

### Response 31:

The project seeks to support the implementation of an LDN agenda, rehabilitating degraded lands. It will build capacities, build platforms, and engage many stakeholders, including local communities. The project is rated low in terms of ESS. At PPG, a thorough assessment of ESS will be provided as required.

### Response 32:

Comment well noted, and a risk on IP is included

### Response 33:

Noted with thanks, and will be considered during PPG as advised

### Response 33a - 20 April 2020:

Invitation well noted and appreciated. Given the unpredictable evolution of COVID-19, and based on the lockdown that has been experienced thus far, we esteem the risk to be Medium to High. A set of plausible mitigations has been included in the table of risks.

## Coordination

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The project will be implemented by IFAD. The project will be executed by the ROOTS project management unit. A list of GEF and LDCF project is mentioned and coordination mechanisms will be developed at CEO endorsement.

Addressed at PIF level. To be detailed at CEO endorsement.

**Agency Response**

<b>Response 34:</b> Noted with thanks
<b>Response 35:</b> Noted with thanks, and as suggested, it will be detailed at CEO endorsement

**Consistency with National Priorities**

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

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

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

**Knowledge Management**

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

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

To be revised after the application of STAP guidelines on LDN.To be revised after the application of STAP guidelines on LDN.

April 18, 2020

Addressed.

**Agency Response**

**Response 36:**

Comment well noted, and this section, as component 4, has been revised following STAP guidelines – focusing on verification of project’s contribution to neutrality in terms of land cover changes, land productivity and carbon

**Part III – Country Endorsements**

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

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

Yes.

**Agency Response**

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

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

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

NA

**Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

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

The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.

April 18, 2020

Thanks for the significant improvements. Some items were not however addressed. Please see the review above.

April 20, 2020

All points are addressed, but one. Please correct the core indicators and the table F in the portal.

April 20, 2020

Thanks for the revised PIF, however a last reading showed that some points addressed in the review are not correctly reflected in the text, especially about 1) the drop of value chains and rice production, 2) the agreed targets, and 3) the only use of STAR allocations (there is no LD set aside resources in this project) : please, see pages 12, 15, 17, and 18; see also the section 5) on Global Environment Benefits.

April 21, 2020

All points are addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance, as well as the PPG.

April 22, 2020

Quality Control: we take note of the letter signed by the Minister in charge of the environment confirming the allocation of \$5.3 million to IFAD. However, following GEF policies, please, provide a letter signed by the GEF OFP highlighting 1) the date, 2) the project title, 3) the name of the GEF Agency, 4) the total STAR resources with the breakdown between the project grant, PPG, and fees.

April 23, 2020

We acknowledge receipt of a letter of endorsement signed by the GEF OFF. However, for the time being, and even if there are calculation errors in the letter, please strictly apply the mentioned amounts for the project grant, the project fees, and the PPG. Please note that no fees are included with the PPG, for a total STAR amount of \$5.3 million.

April 24, 2020

Corrections were entered into the portal, strictly following GEF STAR amounts mentioned in the letter of endorsement.. The PIF is recommended for clearance, as well as the PPG.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

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

- 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.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

GEFID 10572 - Integrated Landscape Management Gambia (INLAMAG) Project

Cover Memo

Context

Agriculture and natural resources (ANR) activities constitute the principal source of livelihoods for most Gambians. More than 500,000 smallholder farmers participate in agriculture and natural resources production. Most of them are very poor and also net food purchasers. About 70% of the predominantly rural labor force is employed in the ANR sector, contributing between 20% and 25% to GDP and generating 40% of total export earnings, and an estimated two-thirds of total household income.

The integrity of land in The Gambia is threatened by natural causes as well as anthropogenic factors. In recent years, the country experienced successive droughts, as well as floods and wind storms, resulting with massive crop losses.

The project aims to address the challenges of land degradation in The Gambia, particularly those linked to deforestation, poor soil management and constraints of alternative and diversified livelihood incomes. The project will see to address capacity, policy and institutional inadequacies, weak land use planning and extension services and support the diversification of livelihoods.

Project

The proposed project aims to create and strengthen an enabling environment for upscaling an integrated landscape approach to support the LDN agenda implementation in eleven districts of The Gambia. It is based on the following technical components: 1) Enabling environment for SLM and LDN mainstreaming and implementation (capacity development plan, knowledge platform, land-use planning); 2) Implementation of Integrated landscape planning and management to

reduce land degradation (conservation agriculture, natural regeneration, community monitoring); 3) Promote SLM for Climate Smart Agriculture for improved agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management (agroforestry, integrated crop-livestock systems, participatory SLM plan), and 4) Project and LDN Monitoring.

This project built on lessons from a past IFAD project and was designed with cofinancing from the Resilience of Organizations for Transformative Smallholder Agriculture Project (ROOTS, \$28.2 million), financed by IFAD and AFD.

#### GEF7 Strategies

The project has been developed under three coherent LD objectives: LD1.1 for SLM, LD1.4 for Integrated landscapes, and LD2.5 on LDN.

#### Global Environment Benefits

The project should deliver multiple global environment benefits based on 36,500 ha of land under improved management in contribution to the nation's 109,900 ha LDN target (33.5%), including 3.1 million tons of CO<sub>2</sub>e calculated on a 20-year period, and benefiting to 15,200 people.

#### Country priorities

The proposed project is embedded in the national development aspirations and is consistent with national strategies and plans of The Gambia, and especially the NAP under UNCCD and LDN Targets.

#### Innovation, Sustainability & Scaling up

The project is innovative proposing a comprehensive approach for LDN for the country and specific districts, combining planning, capacities, knowledge, and series of concrete actions on the ground.

Sustainability is anchored in the project supporting key stakeholders at different levels – national institutions, community-level farmer groups, farmer field schools, and mainstreaming LDN in the development agenda and national policies.

Scaling up: The cofinancing will help to multiply the project effects. The project will seek to attire additional investments to scale up LDN in other districts.