

Land Degradation Neutrality for biodiversity conservation, food security and resilient livelihoods in the Peanut Basin and Eastern Senegal (D?kil Souf)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10384

Countries

Senegal

Project Name

Land Degradation Neutrality for biodiversity conservation, food security and resilient livelihoods in the Peanut Basin and Eastern Senegal (D?kil Souf)

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

6/15/2022

Review completed by PM

8/26/2022

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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
June 29, 2022

Yes, the project is aligned with LD1.1 (SLM), LD2.5 (LDN), and BD1.1 (mainstreaming).

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

June 29, 2022

No substantial changes in the project design from the PIF.

Agency Response

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

July 15, 2022

Addressed.

June 29, 2022

- Cofinancing from the PCAE: please, provide an informal translation in English of the letter of cofinancing. As the other letters are in .pdf, it would be useful to use the same common PDF format, rather than a photo.

- Cofinancing from FAO: Please explain the connection between the current GEF project and the SIDA Financed project "Global Transformation of Forests for People and Climate: a focus on West Africa"; please detail the role of the \$2 million from this project that are considered as cofinancing.

Agency Response

- Co-financing letter PCAE: A translation has been provided in Annex 16 and the format changed for coherency.

- Co-financing FAO: Thank you for this comment. The contribution of the FAO "Global Transformation of Forests for People and Climate: a focus on West Africa" project has been clarified. The following text has been added to the previous description in the Baseline Project and Sources of Co-financing section: "In particular, the project will tie

sustainable agricultural interventions into the activities carried out on sustainable forest management, to ensure complementarity and to ensure that agricultural practices support the sustainability of forests and their biodiversity. Encroachment has been an issue, and this project will serve to reinforce the practices put forth by the baseline, while demonstrating sustainable livelihoods without the erosion of forest resources. The amount of co-financing for the project proposed by the GEF is USD 2 million. It is anticipated that this baseline initiative can scale up public awareness on sustainable land use to create a favorable threshold upon which the GEF initiative can take place. The USD 2 million co-financing will provide drivers, vehicle rental, fuel cost, land logistics around pilot presentations (communications, facilitation of experts, follow up with community members on activity delivery), as well as baseline activities on sustainable forest management.?

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

June 29, 2022

Addressed.

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

The status and utilization of the PPG is reported.

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

July 15, 2022

Addressed.

June 29, 2022

The identified targets at PIF level are confirmed at CEO endorsement. A slight adjustment has been made with 12,000 ha of agricultural lands restored (3.1) rather than 9,000 ha of agricultural lands + 1,500 ha of forest lands (3.2), and 1,500 ha of natural grass and shrublands restored (3.3).

- If a summary of assumptions used in EX-ACT is available, please include the full EX-ACT annex.

- Please, check the project document, table 10, p90. there is a typo on the carbon calculations (the gains are not 283,797 tCO₂-e).

Agency Response

- Please, find the exact calculation sheets now uploaded into the Portal.

- The typo has been corrected.

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

June 29, 2022

Addressed.

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

June 29, 2022

Addressed.

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

June 29, 2022

Addressed.

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

June 29, 2022

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 29, 2022

Addressed.

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

Addressed.

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

July 15, 2022

Addressed.

June 29, 2022

In the project document and the portal, there is a rationale on innovation and sustainability (4.7.1 and 4.7.2). We suggest including a 4.7.3 on scaling up. This way, there will be three sub-titles coherent under the 4.7. "Innovativeness, Sustainability, and Possibility of Scaling up".

Please revise.

Agency Response Thank you for this comment. A new sub-section on Scaling up, 4.7.3 has been added.

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

June 29, 2022

Yes. More than a Gender Action Plan, gender issues are mainstreaming in the result framework and the project mainly targets women.

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

June 29, 2022

There is a willingness to engage the private sector. The private sector will have a role of demonstration by innovation.

Different suppliers of biological inputs, solar energy systems, and seeds/seedlings are named, without being selected, but the selection will be decided at the implementation stage.

Addressed.

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

Addressed.

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

July 15, 2022

Addressed.

June 29, 2022

The project will be executed by three partners (ANCAR, FNDASP, CSE) under the authority of the Ministry of Agriculture, chairing the steering committee.

The role of cofinancing in the PMC and to cover the project team needs to be clarified.

There is an elaboration of possible coordination with other projects (GEF and non-GEF).

Agency Response

The following clarifications have been added to the roles financed by co-financing. There are two roles that will be supported by co-financing alone?this is (1) an overall Value Chains Expert and (2) Local Regional Support. The first position will be financed by the ?Resilience and Intensive Reforestation Project for the Safeguarding of Territories and Ecosystems in Senegal? project managed by the FAO and the latter by the Ministry of Agriculture and rural Equipment (MAER). The following text has been added to the project document in the Baseline Projects and Sources of Co-financing section:

?RIPOSTES will also be responsible for co-financing a Value Chains Expert position for the project. This role will involve ensuring alignment between the two projects, ensuring that negative private sector impacts relating to pricing distribution and marketing do not occur, and overseeing the growth of value chain development with an adaptive approach. This role will also facilitate subject matter experts.? The following text has been added to page 64:, with regards to the second position: ?This project will also finance a logistics position for the project. This will involve arranging local level visits, community consultations, follow-up with communities to ensure that activities were well understood and socialized, and liaising with the project coordinator to plan calendar of events (carried out by ANCAR).?

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, the project will contribute to the implementation of the LDN targets and other restoration initiatives (national targets of 2 million ha restored, or 10.39%). The BD mainstreaming aspects of this project are compatible with Senegal NBSAP.

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

June 29, 2022

There is strategy and an approach to capture lessons and knowledge, notably with the establishment of the Gender and LDN Quality Circle Observatory as an institutional mechanism for boosting and monitoring progress at the local level and throughout the project intervention areas.

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

Two ESS documents are logged in the Documents Tab.

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

June 29, 2022

There is a budget of \$222,625 for M&E, representing 3.85% of the project grant.

Agency Response

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

June 29, 2022

Yes.

The proposed project will contribute to improving the socio-economic conditions of small farmers and pastoralists, rural households in targeted vulnerable areas, providing knowledge, expanding SLM practices, promoting diversification, improving food security, improving the market system, reducing social tensions between farmers, agro-pastoralists, and pastoralists... Gender mainstreaming will strengthen the empowerment of women and youth.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 15, 2022

Addressed.

June 29, 2022

Annex E: Budget

- The budget includes a position of Regional Project Assistant we do not understand and that is not referred in the project document. The budget is covered by the four technical components + the pmc: Please justify and provide the terms of reference.
- Please, explain the role of cofinancing for pmc: are there any positions covered by cofinancing?
- \$8,000 per year (\$40,000) are planned for ?spot-checks?. Please, justify and detail this expense. Please, confirm the non-duplication with GEF Agency fees and pmc.
- \$85,000 is planned for an audit. It seems overpriced in comparison with other GEF7 projects. Please, justify the amount.
- \$20,000 are planned for international travels. Please, justify and explain this item (for who, for what).
- \$50,000 of ?computers, laptops, peripherals for KM? are planned under the component 4 (KM). Please, explain the specific role of these items under the component 4 and the difference with usual IT equipment. It seems to us that this kind of expense should be covered by pmc. Please, justify or correct.

Agency Response

Regional Project Assistant: Please, see TORs attached. Note that this person contributes to the proper delivery of a number of technical components, in addition to the management support provided. This is the reason why costs are covered by technical components and PMC in a proportional fashion. Kindly note that the following text regarding the role of the Regional Project Assistant has been added to the prodoc, on page 137: ?The National Coordinator will also be supported by a **Regional Project Assistant**. Given that many of the project management aspects will be taken on by the Coordinator, the Regional Project Assistant will support some of the technical aspects of this project to ensure smooth implementation. Primarily, this position will require

technical knowledge on biodiversity to ensure that biodiversity is well-integrated into LDN, SLM, livelihoods and value chain development activities. This technician will also focus her/his time in the field rather than the capital, to ensure momentum, troubleshooting and ongoing support to local communities. The role will require production of biodiversity content, support for biodiversity activities, monitoring of biodiversity results and engagement of communities on biodiversity priorities. The administrative and management aspects of this role will involve overseeing the implementation of biodiversity-related activities and observations, organization of community meetings/consultations, and dissemination of biodiversity knowledge products. Terms of reference are provided in Annex 18.

- PMC co-financing: Please see response above.

- Cost of annual spot checks: FAO's due diligence for the management of Operational Partnership Agreements foresees annual audits and spot checks (frequency depending on the operational risk level of the partner) of the Operational Partner, or partners. Spot checks and audits are managed by an external independent service provider, at a fixed cost, depending on geography. For this project, with 3 operational partners, 6 spot checks annually are needed. Costs of spot checks and audits are not paid out of the fees, in line with provisions of the GEF guidelines of program and project cycle policy. Fees cover financial oversight and control actions carried out by FAO Budget Holder, including field visits, review and clearance of progress reports procured by the partners, and more.

- Audit costs: The same logic applies to audits, which are carried out on an annual basis. Costs of audits are high considering the fact there is more than 1 operational partner. However, costs of spot checks and audits have been re-calculated due to the concern raised, as follows:

	PREVIOUS BUDGET USD	REVISED BUDGET	REVISED ESTIMATES for Moderate risk OPs
SPOT-CHECKS	40,000	67,500	Budget to review at each SC: range 100-250K 2250 each x 3 OPs? 2 SC per year (moderate risk)= 13,500 x 5 years in total
AUDIT	85,000	52,500	Budget to review at each A: range between 100-250 and 250-500K 3500 each x3 OPs? 1 A per year=10,500x 5 years
total	125,000	120,000	

- International travel: The international travel is the cost of the evaluators for mid-term and final evaluation. This is why the cost is entirely represented under M&E budget.

- KM IT costs: This budget line has been amended. The intention of this KM IT is to provide the KM and reporting IT equipment for facilitated LDN monitoring, reporting and verification.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 15, 2022

Addressed.

June 29, 2022

Annex A:

- We are not seeing the different targets in the table while they should be included in the result framework. Please, correct.

- The result framework is getting out of the page, beyond the margins in the portal. Please, correct.

Agency Response

Project targets: Please, do double check and confirm proper visualisation of the results matrix. Annex A has 3 columns pertaining to project targets at the outcome level, including one on baseline, one on mid-term targets and one on final targets. These targets are also reported in table B of the CEO ER and throughout the project document.

Layout: The Portal is not always user friendly. We've tried to address the issue for proper visualisation of the table.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 29, 2022

We are taking note of the comment from Germany and the request to remove a GIZ-funded project from cofinancing. We will ask for further information about the context of this request. We also take note that FAO responded to this comment and found other cofinancing partners.

The other comments from Germany are addressed, as well as the comment from Canada.

Addressed.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Addressed.

Agency Response

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

July 15, 2022

Addressed.

June 29, 2022

- Status and Utilization of the PPG: The GEF does not finance "general operating expenses". Please, revise the table in the annex C (status of PPG). The amount of \$3,085 under the category "General Operating Expenses"(5028) is not eligible.

Agency Response The misalignment has been corrected.

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

August 26, 2022

Responses have been provided to the three questions below. The project document and the information in the portal have been updated.

Project Coordinator	per	5	65,000	25,598	60,000	50,000	54,500	74,375	60,527	325,000	88,732	113,134	123,134	
Regional Project Assistant	per	5	50,000	27,597	62,500	21,250	87,403	11,250	40,000	250,000	73,814	67,468	108,718	
Accountant/Secretary	per	5	40,000	0	0	75,000	75,000		50,000	200,000	63,334	73,332	63,334	
6300 Sub-total GOE budget				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL				1,227,195	2,333,073	1,265,750	461,903	222,625	275,527	5,786,073	1,430,547	1,503,101	2,635,426	217,000

Table B - Execution Functions eligible for funding by the GEF portion of PMC¹⁰²

Staffing costs, including:

- Project manager;
- Project assistant technical specialist(s);
- Procurement specialist; and/or
- Financial specialist.

Annex 18. Terms of References:

Project Coordinator

Position: Project Coordinator

Reports to: Project Steering Committee

Regional Project Assistant

Position: Regional Project Assistant

Reports to: Project Coordinator/Project Steering Committee

July 15, 2022

The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

June 29, 2022

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/29/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/15/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/15/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/26/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations