

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

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**  
10384

**Countries**  
Senegal

**Project Title**  
Land Degradation Neutrality for biodiversity conservation, food security and resilient livelihoods in the Peanut Basin and Eastern Senegal (Dékil Souf)

**GEF Agency(ies)**  
FAO

**Agency ID**  
FAO: 673241

**GEF Focal Area(s)**  
Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**  
Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

# PIF

## Part I – Project Informatic

### 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

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2, 2021**

The project was resubmitted as a MFA (LD and BD) FSP.

The project is potentially acceptable under LD1.1 (SLM) and BD 1.1 (mainstreaming). However, some questions below may invite the Agency to revise this strategic positioning:

1. As the project includes the reinforcement of the institutional and technical capacities related to LDN, the LD 2.5 objective could be triggered for a few hundred of thousands of dollars (partially in the component 1, see outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.2.1; also some activities under 3.1.1 and 4.1.3).

2. Most of the project fits into the LD1.1 Objective, but it is surprising that the project does not have any targets related to SLM (Core indicator 4.3). Moreover the high numbers under 4.1 (improved management for biodiversity) are questionable when there are large areas of agriculture and annual crops.

2. The project is developed under BD1.1, but the benefits for a global important biodiversity is not demonstrated.

**October 23, 2019:**

Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

April 2021

1. Thank you for the suggestion. The LD-2-5 programme has been included.
2. The project contributions to core indicator 4 sub-indicators has been reconsidered. The positive impact of the project's activities on tropical shrubland and forests within KBAs has been identified under CI 4.1. The area considered under CI 4.3 references the cropland and grassland where SLM is introduced.
3. More explicit reference to the BD of global significance is made, referencing the KBAs Delta du Saloum and Niokolo-Koba within or buffering the project landscapes.

## 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

April 20, 2021

Addressed.

April 2, 2021

The proposed PIF is robust and we are not seeing major obstacles for its technical clearance. However, Senegal has benefited of several GEF and LDCF projects, on sustainable land management and restoration, including in the Groundnut Basin over the last fifteen years. We cannot conceive a new project on the groundnut basin without taking the lessons, even roughly at PIF level, from past and on-going projects. See especially the #2511 on the groundnut basin, #2268, #3386, and #4080 (on ecovillages); from the LDCF: #5566 and 5867; also on-going projects as the #9134 under the RFS with IFAD and UNIDO.

Based on our knowledge of the SLM portfolio, we would like to see a strategic thinking reflected in the result framework about aspects related to sustainability including access to 1) finance, especially microfinance (notably once the project will have closed), 2) knowledge with the development of sustainable peer exchange mechanisms, and 3) the importance of empowerment of women groups (the point is to go beyond gender equality and propose specific support to women groups, notably to have access to finance, knowledge, and other project resources). This last point was considered as a critical point of success in previous SLM projects in the groundnut basin, in addition to measures to fight inequalities, discrimination (access to lands for instance), and ensure a right representation of women in project entities

measures to fight inequalities, discrimination, (access to lands for instance), and ensure a right representation of women in project entities (steering committee, working groups, project team).

#### Component 1

- "inadequate governance institutions" constitute a barrier which is unclear. We don't know exactly what this driver entails and the activities proposed in the project to remove it remain vague. Clarification on this aspect would be useful (driver and project response).
- Output 1.1.3: excellent to include an output to strengthen NRM governance, including customary and formal management.

#### Component 2

- Output 2.1.1: OK for a capacity building program if an emphasis is put on sustainability and mechanisms that have a chance to last beyond the project duration, using existing mechanisms and platforms, structuring peer-to-peer exchanges, etc. Please confirm.
- Output 2.2.1: Will the participatory integrated land use plans be developed and implemented? Can you clarify the conditions of implementation and enforcement (training, monitoring, contribution from national budget, sustainability...).
- Output: 2.2.3. OK for improving seed/seedling production capacity: here again, please emphasize the sustainability aspects building on existing mechanisms and platforms.

#### Component 3

- Output 3.1.1: OK for market based incentives, but please emphasize the need to develop specific mechanisms for women. This output is the right place to show that gender issues are fully mainstreamed. Please, correct.

Output 3.1.2. OK for an inclusive financial mechanism and training program, but here again, show that specific attention will be paid to women groups. Can you elaborate on the kind of financial mechanism you are considering?

Output 3.1.3: OK for a strategy to improve local value chains, but here again, emphasize the specific role of women along the selected value chains.

Output 3.1.4.: We can understand the interest and need for microprojects, but we would like to see a strategic framework and specific guidelines borrowed from past evaluations (reflecting the key aspects of microfinance for instance). It is also probably the right vehicle to directly target women groups. Please, revise.

Outputs 3.1.5. and 3.1.6 : these outputs are formulated as outcomes. Please provide a formulation as outputs reflecting the expected results and the value for money: what kind of support is planned for the considered enterprises and explain the logics around the mangrove areas (by the way, check if these mangroves are classified as KBA, it may help to justify the BD1.1 objective and the use of BD resources).

- Can you please clarify what "Local economy around mangrove areas revitalized" means?

#### Component 4

- Outputs 4.1.3 and 4.1.4 are much more than KM and could be included in the component 1 on dissemination.

- The KM budget is blurred because of four outputs. How much is linked to outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2?

## **Agency Response**

April 2021

Thank you for the question. We acknowledge that the country has benefited from several GEF and LDCF investments, as well as inputs from other resource partners, specifically on sustainable land management and restoration, including in the Groundnut Basin. Various lessons can be drawn from the completed project to ensure the success of this one. Though a review on those past initiatives have been made, we missed to clearly highlight them.

Please, consider the table on the key take-home messages/lessons for each of the past projects that have informed PIF design and will further orient work to be delivered during PPG and project implementation.

Various context specific options have been tried and tested in the past focusing particularly on women empowerment in the agricultural sectors, considering the large participation of women in these sectors. These development options aimed at removing barriers to women participation in SLM activities, such as access to land, technical training and equipment, and access to credit. The project is addressing these barriers. It will furthermore invest in awareness and advocacy on gender equality and women empowerment, facilitating active participation in decision-making.

### **Component 1**

- Inadequate governance institutions - This has been amended to read “weak capacity of the institutions and poor governance”. Capitalizing on lessons learnt, the proposed intervention will tackle those issues.
- Output 1.1.3 – Noted with thanks.

### **Component 2**

- Output 2.1.1: - This is confirmed. Further elaboration is also provided for the sake of clarity.

- Output 2.2.1 - Clarification is now provided in the revised PIF.

- Output: 2.2.3. - Additional detail is provided on the sustainability aspects in the revised version

### Component 3

- Output 3.1.1 – Thank you for the much appreciated input. The gender equality and women empowerment ambition of the project has been stepped up as a result. Note that for this output in particular, the project will work with women and youth groups to address barriers that limit their participation in SLM activities, such as access to land, technical training equipment, and credit. The project also promotes the allocation of land to women groups, and trains and supports these groups to access and manage microcredits to develop income generating activities.

Output 3.1.2. - The gender gap in financial inclusion represents one of the main barriers not only to women's empowerment in rural contexts, but also to their involvement in SLM. The project will work on various mechanisms to help close this gap, including 1) providing critical information for policymakers on the main barriers and prevailing gender bias in accessing finance, and facilitate measuring progress; 2) generating valuable market information about potential business opportunities for women; 3) targeting capacity-building needs to enhance financial literacy for women and women groups; 4) providing technical support, capacity-building and back-stopping to activities related to commodity production, enhancing market access and access to finance in consultation with FNDASP as targeted partner in this output; and 5) strengthening existing and creating new women-based saving groups and credit associations.

Output 3.1.3 – Please, consider the clarification provided on how women will benefit from work on value chains.

Output 3.1.4. – Proposals at PIF stage stem from a rapid assessment of lessons and experience. During PPG, a detailed review of existing financial products and preparation of micro-project models piloted in previous project will be conducted and context appropriate options conducive to women empowerment will be selected for upscaling.

Outputs 3.1.5. and 3.1.6 - Please, note that these outputs have been eliminated as they were already covered under other outputs.

### Component 4

Outputs 4.1.3. and 4.1.4 are now considered in Component 1.

Consequently, the budget for component 4 is related to KM, learning and communication only.

## Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the**

c. 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**

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2, 2021**

Co-financing looks promising at this stage with relatively high level of investments mobilized. The numbers do not seem to correspond to what is presented in the baseline scenario. It would be useful for a better understanding if the information could be aligned or an explanation of differences provided..

Please do your best to maintain the cofinancing from FAO. To be confirmed at CEO endorsement.

**October 23, 2019:**

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

April 2021

The figures have been doublechecked and appear coherent. Please, note that in table C, investments have been pooled per source of finance. The footnote to table C references the single projects/programmes. These are further developed in the baseline scenario section. When describing each project/programme, the overall investment is mentioned, in addition to the portion that has been mobilized as co-finance. Please, also note that the baseline investments descriptive section does not consider the recurrent expenditures, but only develops the mobilized investment.

FAOs cofinancing references 2 investments that will be delivered by 2025. These investments are relevant in the current context of the Covid-19 pandemic and fully aligned with national priorities, and therefore unlikely to be redirected or reprogrammed. With a solid presence in Senegal, and a large portfolio of work on LDN, SLM and BD mainstreaming, FAO confirms at this stage the ambition of the identified contribution.

## 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

April 2, 2021

No objection in the portal.

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2, 2021

No objection in the portal.

October 23, 2019:

Yes, the budget required for the proposed project is \$3 million and total budget available is \$11.14 million. cleared.

Agency Response



## Agency Response

### The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2, 2021

Addressed.

October 23, 2019:

Yes, the budget uses \$3 million from the LD focal area and total budget available from this focal area is \$5.19 million. cleared.

## Agency Response

### The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not applicable.

## Agency Response

### The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not applicable

Not applicable.

**Agency Response**

**Focal area set-aside?**

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

Not applicable.

**Agency Response**

**Impact Program Incentive?**

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

Not applicable.

**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**

**April 2, 2021**

A PPG of \$150,000 is allowed for PIFs under \$6 million.

A list of studies and assessments financed under the PPG will be expected at CEO endorsement.

**October 23, 2019:**

Yes, the PPG requested is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

April 2021

Please, consider the suggested baseline assessments to be carried out during PPG.

**Core indicators**

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

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

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2nd, 2021**

- The Annex C on core indicators is missing.

In continuity of observations made in the item 1, part I:

- We regret for a project mainly developed under the LD1.1 objective to not find targets under the core indicator 4.3 (SLM), and find very high number under 4.1 (improved management for Biodiversity). In regards to high coverage of agricultural lands, including annual crops, we think that the use of the target 4.3 would be more appropriate. Please, correct.
- Please, detail the benefits for biodiversity for 400,000 ha (4.1) .
- More explanation is needed to explain how you can target 400,000 ha of improved sylvo-pastoral dominant land-use systems in the groundnut basin.
- The text says "The project will directly support implementation of measures on 12,000 ha of agriculture and forest lands using "reduce" and "reverse" responses, 10,000 and 2,000 ha". This is not consistent with the restoration core sub-indicators as estimated in the core indicator table. To be revised.
- Among the impact indicators identified during PIF formulation, it is written that "for agriculture, the amount of carbon avoided will be 2,533,530 tons CO2 eq and the accumulated carbon avoided over the period 2010-2035 will be a total of 56,751,484 tons CO2 eq". It is unclear how these estimates are related to the project results. To be clarified and revised.

**October 23, 2019:**

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

April 2021

- Annex C has been uploaded in the Portal as separate document (in addition to the information directly inserted in the Portal).
- Core indicator 4 has been revisited and the reasoning provided.
- In order to clarify the BD benefits of global significance, the positive impact of the project activities on the KBAs within or buffering the project target areas has been further developed.
- The figures for the different land uses (280,000ha ag land, 60,000ha grassland, 60,000ha tropical forest /shrubland) in the mixed-use project target areas are proportional to the overall land uses in the 4 landscapes deducted from satellite imagery.
- The inconsistency has been addressed.
- The error and overall language have been updated.

## **Project/Program taxonomy**

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

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

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2nd, 2021**

Yes, but the annex C on taxonomy is missing. Please, complete.

**October 23, 2019:**

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**April 2021**

The worksheet has been uploaded as separate document in addition to the keywords selected from the dropdown lists in the Portal.

## **art 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**

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2nd, 2021**

The problems are well described.

We faced one difficulty with the following sentence: "Main causes of degradation refer to 'overexploitation of vegetation', 'crop management' and 'natural'. 'Overgrazing', is an important cause in the sylvo-pastoral land use systems..." to be modified.

**October 23, 2019:**

Please follow the template for an easier reading putting the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed under the same section with the adequate title.

### **Agency Response**

April 2021

The text origin is from an outdated LADA report. To avoid any potential confusion, the text has been removed from the PIF and will be revisited during the PPG.

## **2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?**

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

**April 20, 2021**

The justifications and explanations are welcome.

Addressed. to be confirmed during the PPG.

**April 2nd, 2021**

- Please, include an analysis of past and on-going SLM projects in Senegal to build this project on lessons and best practices.

- Where are the "hot spots" of land degradation identified in the assessments made by the government? Do they correspond to the targeted landscapes to justify their selection?

## Agency Response

April 2021

- A rapid assessment was carried out during PIF design, and lessons had been included also resulting from consultations with partners. During the PPG, the project team shall endeavor to engaged actors of those past initiatives in the series of consultations, to ensure lessons are well taken into account in the design and avoid pitfalls from previous projects.
- We acknowledge that the "hot spots" of land degradation identified in the assessments made by the government do not entirely overlap with the proposed intervention. As per the LDN report the Brightspot is located at Kamb in the Ferlo sylvo-pastoral zone (region of Louga) at Latitudes 15°20'34" et 15°36'13' W ; Longitude 15°30'12" et 15°30'80" N; the Bright & hotspot is located at Mbar Diop in the Peanut Bassin (region of Thies) at Latitudes 16°49'38" et 16°46'00" W ; Longitude 15°00'40" et 15°03'05" N; the hotspot is a classified forest located at Pata in the Casamance region of Kolda at 13°18'0" N and 15°7'60" W in DMS. The source of the hot and bring spots are "Land Degradation Assessment (LADA)" which was conducted in 2010 and is currently out of date. The discussions during the stakeholder consultations confirmed that the LDN TSP hot spots to do entirely represent the most recent priorities of the Government and local communities. The consultations focused on the narrowing down the landscape selection criteria and selecting larger landscapes that represent the priorities of the country. The project will revise the data and information of land degradation (Output 1.3.1), which will in turn serve as a basis for the LDN action and investment plans (Output 1.2.1).

### 3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2nd, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2nd, 2021

See item 1, Part I.

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

April 2nd, 2021

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

April 20, 2021



Addressed.

**April 2nd, 2021**

- We explained in the item 6 part I the need to (probably) increase the targets under 4.3 (SLM) to justify this project mainly developed under the LD.1.1 objective related to SLM in productive landscapes.

- About Biodiversity, there is no demonstration or details about the global important biodiversity that is taken into account - more vegetation in productive landscapes is not enough to justify the use of BD resources. Either you are able to characterize this global important biodiversity - by showing that the targeted landscapes include a Key-Biodiversity Area (KBA) for instance (See [KeyBiodiversityAreas.org](https://keybiodiversityareas.org)), or you can demonstrate that the proposed practices in productive landscapes can benefit to adjacent protected areas/KBA. If you cannot make such demonstration and the government confirms his interest for a \$5.78 million project, we can discuss other options as using the marginal adjustment to transfer BD resources to LD.

**October 23, 2019:**

Yes, cleared.

### **Agency Response**

April 2021

- Action has been taken to redress this mismatch.

- Please, note a map was updated to visualize the interlinkages between the natural land home to BD of global significance (Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs)) and the production land in the project landscapes. It should also be noted that at national level there is a network of classified forests important for biodiversity, plant and animal species. This information has been added in the map. The project will support the conservation of these KBAs/classified forests through decreased fragmentation (and increased connectivity) and decreased degradation of habitat through increased productivity on production land around those classified and improved landscape management.

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

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

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2nd, 2021**

There is a strong SLM portfolio in Senegal, not only from GEF and LDCF btw. Some weaknesses from past projects were connected to the lack of continuity and actions with financing mechanisms, especially microfinancing, the lack of sustainability of capacity building and exchange mechanisms, and not enough focus on women groups - essential vulnerable groups in the agriculture sector .

- We invite the GEF Agency to revise this section putting the emphasis on 1) the sustainability of financing mechanism, 2) the sustainability of peer exchange mechanisms, and 3) a strategic focus on women groups because they have a key role related to SLM and suffer from discrimination and inequalities.

- It is mentioned in these sections that the project will involve the stakeholders at all level, from local to national and international: We suggest revising this aspect. In this COVID-19 time, we recommend counting mainly on local and national expertise, eventual from the region, but the intervention from international experts should not be preferred.

## **Agency Response**

April 2021

Please, consider the rapid assessment of the lessons from main past SLM investments in the Groundnut Basin. The project proposal has been slightly amended to embed some of the relevant lessons. Nevertheless, further detailed information on successes and failures will be collected and analyzed during PPG to avoid pitfalls and build a stronger and more sustainable project.

Please, consider the updated section on innovation, sustainability and scaling up.

It is a principal of FAOs modus operandi to engage expertise at the level closest to the field (subsidiarity principle). The project will prioritize local and national expertise over international expertise, not only to manage Covid-19 containment measures, but also to maximize learning (access to context specific lessons working with local research institutes for instance), engagement and ownership. Furthermore, the project benefits from a solid technical team (in part international) based in Dakar's sub-regional and national FAO office.

## **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**

April 2nd, 2021

April 21st, 2021.

Addressed.

October 23, 2019:

The map provided is unclear and we don't know what kind of geo-referenced data is provided. Please complete adequately.

**Agency Response** Please, consider the updated PIF.

## 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**

April 2nd, 2021

An annex details the consultations that took place between January 27 and February 4, 2021 (date and venue of meetings, number of participants, main outcomes), as well as the validation workshop on February 11, 2021.

Cleared.

**Agency Response**

## 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**

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2nd, 2021**

We provided several comments related to gender issues with the importance of women groups in SLM and the need to fight discrimination. Please, include these aspects in the PPG.

#### **Agency Response**

April 2021

Thank you and very much appreciated. Please, consider the increased gender ambition of the project.

#### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

**April 2nd, 2021.**

to be developed in the PPG.

#### **Agency Response**

April 2021

This is confirmed by the Agency.

## Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

April 2nd, 2021.

Addressed

Agency Response

## 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

April 20, 2021

Addressed.

April 2nd, 2021

As mentioned in several items above: 1) A rapid analysis of the past SLM portfolio is needed to build this project on lessons and best

practices and 2) coordination mechanisms with other projects will be developed during the PPG.

### **Agency Response**

April 2021

Thank you. 1) Please, see additions made to the PIF as a result of the desk review, and the experience with a number of these SLM projects. 2) The Agency confirms that during the PPG institutional arrangements will be developed, including the coordination mechanisms with other projects to maximize coordination, complementarity and learning.

### **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**

April 20, 2021

Addressed. to be confirmed at PPG.

April 2nd, 2021

The main national strategies and plans are mentioned. However, we would have expected a deeper analysis the LDN targets in the groundnut basin if possible. Please, confirm.

### **Agency Response**

April 2021

The proposed PIF puts forward the multi-layer multi-stakeholder baseline analysis that will serve as a basis for proposal development. In this analysis, satellite imagery and stakeholder consultations will particularly address this issue. At the stage of PIF development, the Groundnut Basin does not have the LDN targets. However, dedicated targets and investment plans are envisaged under Output 1.2.1.

## **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**

**April 20, 2021**

Addressed.

**April 2nd, 2021**

At PIF level, we need to figure out the main lines of KM and the budget. There is a component including KM aspects. \$810,000 are assigned. It is a significant amount, but aspects beyond KM are included. More information is needed on the logic and structure of this component, as well as the specific budget assigned to KM activities. Please, clarify.

**October 23, 2019:**

Yes, the KM is provided by the component 4 of the project. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**April 2021**

Though a detailed budget, including KM budget, will be confirmed during PPG, the KM section in the PIF has been updated to better isolate and appreciate the KM and learning activities of the project.

## **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 2nd, 2021

Addressed

Agency Response

art 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

April 2nd, 2021

A letter of endorsement signed by the current GEF OFP is available (March 12, 2021) with the project name, the STAR amounts, and the selected agency (FAO).

October 23, 2019:

The letter of Endorsement from the country's GEF Operational Focal Point is missing. Please upload this letter in the Portal.

Agency Response Please, consider the updated PIF and supporting documents.

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**

Not applicable.

**Agency Response**

**EFSEC 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**

**April 23, 2021**

The point has been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.

**April 22, 2021**

Please address the following comment from the quality control:

On Environmental and Social Safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is still identified as high in the FAO's Project Risk Certification attached. In the PIF Section 9 on ESS Risk in the portal the overall risk is identified as medium. FAO states that "considering the nature of the project, the technical project design team, led by the Lead Technical Officer, discussed reclassification with the FAO ESS-Unit. This latter agreed to classify the project as a medium-risk project, as no harm from the project on the PA in question is expected". Please ask FAO to provide if available the updated Project Risk Certification and ask whether there are any changes on the Reference Guidance and Additional Description regarding the various land restoration activities on production land in the buffer zone, particularly related to "A full environmental and social impact assessment is required"

**April 20, 2021**

All points are addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.

**April 2nd, 2021**

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

**October 31, 2019:**

Considering the following information received on October 31, 2019 by the agency:

- 1- The new OFP hasn't been appointed yet and therefore the Letter of Endorsement can't be signed;
- 2- The country wants to change the LD budget allocation and the kind of project from FSP to MSP;

The project submission is sent back to the agency.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

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

- Check the list of studies and assessments made at PPG.
- Check the gender action plan, how gender issues are mainstreamed in the project, and if specific actions are defined for women groups.
- Check how the microfinancing aspects are included in the project design and for sustainability.
- Check the strategy for KM and capacity building (notably peer exchanges and visits), and its sustainability aspects.
- Confirm cofinancing, the ratio of investments mobilized, including cofinancing from FAO.
- Detail the implementation arrangements and the role of key stakeholders.

**/iew Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/31/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/2/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

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