

Climate-resilient Banjul: Enhancing Urban Resilience in the Greater Banjul Area (CLIMB)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID	11532
Countries	Gambia
Project Name	Climate-resilient Banjul: Enhancing Urban Resilience in the Greater Banjul Area (CLIMB)
Agencies	UNEP
Date received by PM	9/19/2025
Review completed by PM	
Program Manager	Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji
Focal Area	Climate Change
Project Type	FSP

PIF
CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes. Given the project's activities include co-benefit delivery towards biodiversity, suggest selecting biodiversity as a minor contribution.

Cleared

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

a)The climate problem and proposed adaption solutions/benefits are well presented. However, please ensure the Project summary is more concise and within the 250 limit. the summary is currently too long.

GEFSEC 11/3/2025

Thanks for the revision. Cleared

Agency Response

Response13/11/2025

Project summary has been revised to fit the 250-words limit.

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

. GEFSEC 10/9/2025

a) Not yet. Please only state the project objective in the relevant subsection under the projection description overview section. The long text, which is a repeat of the project summary is not necessary.

b) Yes. Please check the numbering, unclear why the outcomes are numbered 1.1. 2.1, 3.1.... likewise the outputs. Text for component 2 is incomplete, "Increasing resilience through integrated ecosystem-..."

c) Gender dimensions are incorporated in components 1 and 2. Component 3 is dedicated to knowledge generation and sharing.

GEFSEC 11/3/2025

a-b) comments not addressed in the official CEO document. Kindly address

b) component 2 still incomplete " Increasing resilience through integrated ecosystem"

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

In the Project Description Overview table: Please include the expected outcome and outputs for the M&E component. In addition, the M&E costs represent 2.7% of the sub-total. The recommended threshold for projects above \$10 million is 2%. Please revise.

Project Components	Component Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Co-Financing(\$)
Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)						
M&E	Technical Assistance			LDCF	336,000.00	1,000,000.00
				Sub Total (\$)	12,094,037.00	31,659,194.00

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

On gender: Some gender-related comments have not yet been addressed. We request that, since the project integrates strong women's empowerment and gender equality aspects, the Agency ensures that monitoring and evaluation (M&E) includes reporting on practices that advance gender equality and women's empowerment in the PIRs, MTR, and TE, going beyond gender-disaggregated data. Please also include plans to report on the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency Response

Response01/12/2025.

Expected outcome and output for M&E added to the project overview table.

On M&E costs, refer to para 19 in the operational guidance which says that the cost of monitoring and evaluating activities depends on project characteristics, however past trends can inform Agencies? M&E budget preparation.

We know that Gambia requires support with capacity development in the M&E sphere from our implementation of the GCF project and previous LDCF project implementation, The baseline study led by an international consultant will also be used to establish the data gathering plan. The mid-point results verification will provide further capacity support as well as check results measurements.

We have taken out the final results verification exercise with the assumption that enough and capacity and mentoring support will have been provided at the baseline and mid-point stage so that the M&E officer can produce final results measurement competently. The M&E is now USD1000 more than was approved at PIF (USD300,000).

Response13/11/2025

a) A short and precise project objective has been provided.

b) The numbering has been updated for all components.

Response 08/12/2025

We have inserted a paragraph under paragraph 216 with details about monitoring the gender action plan and a paragraph at the top of the table in Appendix 6.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

a) Fairly. We appreciate the narrative on the evidence-based and detailed global context of the challenge. However we recommend condensing this section to information most relevant to The Gambia's context, to improve clarity and strengthen the project rationale. The country context needs to be further expounded, providing more evidence of the climate impacts and vulnerabilities on the GBA urban system, people and livelihoods as well as the need for ecosystem based adaptation. The information as presented in the official CER document is missing key information which we note in the prodoc.

b) Not fully. We note the attached stakeholder analysis and engagement plan in the supplementary document (Appendix 5d). The analysis suggests two private sector stakeholders will be engaged in the project including the Gambia Chamber of Commerce, and the recycling associations and companies. Explicit description of the role of the stakeholders in the respective components/activities would be useful. the private sector seems to be primarily positioned as a stakeholder and with limited evidence of financial engagement. The private sector has the potential to contribute to facilitating urban EbA related enterprises or management of green infrastructure etc.. Reframe the private sector role to emphasize potential as both implementation partner and financier of scalable, market-linked adaptation solutions, where feasible.

GEFSEC 11/3/2025

a) Key information that supports the rationale still missing in the CER

GEFSEC 11/17/2025

a-b) Thank you for additional information and elaboration on the climate rationale for urban interventions in GBA, as well as clear definition of the private sector role in the project.

Cleared

Agency Response

Response 13/11/2025

a) The Portal entry has been updated with country-specific information on The Gambia and the GBA.

b) The role of the private sector is elaborated in the project description section in various occasions:

- Under Output 2.3, Paragraph 154 makes specific reference to partnership with private sector companies and related associations on waste management, as well as the Chamber of Commerce.
- Output 2.4 also closely linked to private sector, e.g. paragraph 162 states that "to ensure sustainable livelihood activities introduced under Output 2.4 are commercially viable in the long term, the proposed project will implement measures to enhance market linkages and establish long-term partnerships between local producers and consumers, thereby strengthening value chains for goods and services derived from sustainable livelihood practices. To this end, the project will build on the transactional networks and public-private partnerships (PPPs) already set up by the ongoing GCF EbA project, ensuring efforts are not duplicated but rather synergized to maximize impact and promote environmentally sustainable and economically viable value chains in areas like organic agriculture, sustainable fisheries, plastic pollution management and the crafting of goods from sustainable materials?"
- Output 2.5 Engages with the private sector both as beneficiaries of the financial mechanisms as well as provider of investment for scaling up EbA interventions. (paragraphs 165 to 167)
- In addition, paragraph 172 outlines how private sector would play a role both in implementation and scaling up investments across the outputs of component 2. Table 9 provides a very detailed overview of potential private sector investment opportunities of each project intervention under Component 2.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the

GEF guidelines?

- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**
- i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**
- k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**
- l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

- a) Yes. We note the schematic diagram of the ToC (including the assumptions and barriers) got moved to the end of the original CER document (pg41-43). please address.
- b) Not fully. The project document suggests alignment with ongoing initiatives such as the West Africa Coastal Areas Management Program (WACA) in the project summary. Please further elaborate how the project will build on ongoing and previous GEF and non-GEF initiatives.
- c) No. The document is missing description of the project components, outputs and activities in the official CER document. Also describe why the project approach has been selected over other potential options. Kindly address
- d) No. Please describe incremental cost reasoning/ additionality of the project clearly defining the added value of the GEF/LDCF intervention. Also, succinctly describe the adaptation benefits
- e) Not yet. Please describe the socioeconomic benefits
- f) Yes
- g) Yes. The project design combines policy, spatial planning tools and ecosystem based adaptation solutions to enhance urban resilience in GBA
- h) Not yet. As per comment in 4b above, clearly describe the role of stakeholders within the components
- i) Yes. The gender analysis (appendix 5b) is detailed and identifies gender differences, gaps, and opportunities directly linked to the project's objectives. The project activities includes gender-responsive capacity building, inclusive urban planning, and women-focused livelihood and finance interventions (as detailed in the results framework)
- j) No. The components need to be described including activities on knowledge management, articulating how knowledge and learning would be captured and disseminated as well as communication strategy.
- k) Not yet. Please reference any policies, regulations or subsidies that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed
- l) Yes, the project has strong transformational and innovative potential, as it introduces ecosystem-based and nature-based infrastructure solutions into urban planning, through a gender-responsive governance framework, and proposes to pilot a financial mechanism for scaling EbA.

These interventions can shift how urban resilience is conceived and financed in The Gambia and elsewhere on the continent. No explanation on scaling up opportunities. Please include a sub-section in the project description to articulate concrete pathways or replication mechanisms to scale up and sustain project results.

GEFSEC 11/17/2025

- a) We note the ToC in the CER after annex 1, please amend
- b) Thank for elaborating project's alignment with ongoing investments in Table 1.
- c) Components and rationale for preferred solution further elaborated. We however note that project description section, including details of the components and proposed outcomes got moved to the end of the CER document, after the annex 1. Please check and address.
- e) We note reference to the proposed qualitative benefits of the project through the Core Indicators metrics, however it would be helpful to further elaborate the socioeconomic benefits of the project.
- h) We note the identification of key stakeholder and the stakeholder engagement plan. However, suggest to clearly outline the specific and differential roles of key stakeholders, including NGOs, CSO and local community organizations related to project components and outputs as well as project plans to engage and consult these different groups in project implementation.
- j) Thank you for further elaborating how the project will capture and disseminate knowledge in component 3
- k) Noted.
- l) Thank you for additional information on project's transformative design and efforts to enhance opportunities for scale up

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

There's no indication of how comments provided on November 17th have been addressed. Please review, address comments and provide a response below, specifically comments a, c, e and h. In addition, we note that CEO Endorsement Request Portal view, which is the document webposted after endorsement has an issue that requires fixing: after Annex I (responses to comments from SATP), there are several pages of duplicative narrative - please amend.

Agency Response

Response13/11/2025

- a) The ToC is now at the beginning of the project description section starting from paragraph 83.
- b) Information added to Table 1 (overview of baseline projects and additionality) on the City-Link Ostend-Banjul Sustainable City Development project and the NAP project. In addition to the table, there are specific references on how the project will build on ongoing and previous initiatives under various outputs, which include:
 - ? Output 1.3, paragraph 112 and Activity 1.3.1): collaboration with WACA project.
 - ? Output 1.4, paragraph 114, 115: collaboration with WACA project.
 - ? Paragraph 136, explaining how a detailed assessment under the WACA project contributed to identifying potential project sites

? Paragraph 162, Output 2.4: ?To this end, the project will build on the transactional networks and public-private partnerships (PPPs) already set up by the ongoing GCF EbA project?, as well as Activity 2.4.6

? Output 3, Activity 3.1.4: (Paragraph 182) ?Host joint workshops, conferences and seminars for various stakeholders in collaboration with partners to train stakeholders on how best to use EbA information portal established under the project entitled ?Large-scale ecosystem-based adaptation in the Gambia River basin? (2017?2025)?

c) Refer to the sub-section Preferred Solution underneath the future scenario on paragraph 64. Additional information under paragraphs 127-132 and Table 4 where the economic appraisal results are discussed.

d) The incremental cost reasoning/additionality of the project is provided in the respective subsection. Table 1, column ?Additionality of the proposed LDCF project?. The adaptation benefits to be delivered with the project are also elaborated upon throughout the project rationale and project description, e.g. paragraph 65, 147, 132-133, Table 1 column 3, etc.

e) The socioeconomic benefits have also been outlined in paragraph 220.

h) The role of the stakeholders has been clarified in the component?s description. Paragraphs 109-110, Activity 2.1.4 and 2.2.4. In addition, the Stakeholder Engagement Plan provides more information on the roles of the stakeholders during implementation.

j) A description of the components including activities on knowledge management has been provided. Component 3 starting from paragraph 179 to 184 and 207 provides a comprehensive description of knowledge management activities. In addition, Annex 15. Knowledge Management and Communication Strategy provide further details.

k) The subsection on alignment with national policies has been provided. Paragraph 208 provides information on alignment with national priorities.

l) Information on scaling-up opportunities has been provided in the project description and paragraph 200 to 204, and paragraph 185 to 191 on sustainability, replicability, Innovativeness.

Response 08/12/2025

(a) This was an issue with the portal that has been resolved with ITSOP GEF Portal technical team support.

(c) This was an issue with the portal. It has been resolved with support from the ITSOP GEF Portal technical team. The CEO Endorsement was reissued on 5 December 2025 by the IT team and it had no duplicate text after Annex ISTEP responses table.

(e) We have added two more paragraphs under paragraph 221 in the CEO ER.

h) Additional inputs on how the various key stakeholders will be involved in the project at output level has been provided in the engagement plan. We have added the text additions in green. The previous table had become corrupted so we had to re-insert the table. Further refinement of specific roles will be done in the inception phase and monitored over the course of implementation to maximize value addition for attaining project results.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been

included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

a) Yes

c) Not yet. Please describe how the project will coordinate/coordinate with ongoing GEF/non-GEF financed projects and programs in the project area. The project suggests "Opportunities will be explored for co-location of activities, knowledge-sharing, and coordination on regulatory, technical, and institutional efforts".. kindly provide more details specifying the relevant projects/programs.

GEFSEC 11/17/2025

Thank you for additional information on coordinating with other initiatives.

Agency Response

c) Information on how the project will coordinate with ongoing GEF and non-GEF initiatives has been provided in Table 1.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

a) Yes

b) Yes

In the META information table, mark "true" for "This Project is explicitly related to the formulation and/or implementation of national adaptation plans (NAPs)" - given that the project aligns with Gambia's priorities indicated in its NAP document

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

Comment not addressed. Please ensure META information table is filled correctly. "This Project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector" should also be marked as "true"

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

Thank you. Cleared

Agency Response

Response01/12/2025

META information updated by marking the option "True" on linkages with NAP.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

a) Yes

c) Yes

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

We note the ESS rating is medium, however the rating of the Environmental and Social risk category is rated ow. Please ensure these two ratings are aligned as per guidance in the GEF Risk Appetite (GEF/C.66/13).

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

Addressed. Thank you

Agency Response

Response01/12/2025

The ESS rating at screening is moderate and that is aligned to Annex F in the CEO ER. After application of risk mitigation measures, the rating has been deemed low, kindly consult Table 7 in the ESMF. We have amended the risk rating in Table 10 to 'moderate' (pre-mitigation measure application).

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Not yet. Please describe alignment with Gambia's NAPs, NDCs, urban strategies and other relevant plans

GEFSEC 11/17/20205

Thank you for describing reference to Gambia's climate change and development strategies. Given this is an urban project, it would be useful to see how the project aligns with current urban plans/policies etc.

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

We note reference to Gambia's urban development policies and priorities. Cleared

Agency Response

The alignment of the project with national plans, strategies and urban plans has been described in paragraph 208.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

No. We note the attached safeguard risk identification form. Please attach full/comprehensive ESMP/ESMF safeguard instrument

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

Policy comments: We note that UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF) and stakeholder engagement plan, and an overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate.

a. Para 52 of the CEO Endorsement said that "The majority of the population in the GBA can be classified as Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs), particularly in peri-urban and rural areas where livelihoods remain closely tied to natural resources. Many IPLCs engage in small-scale agriculture, fishing, and informal trade, which are increasingly threatened by climate change. In these communities." However, SRIF said no Indigenous Peoples in the project area. Please revise SRIF and include potential impacts on Indigenous Peoples from the project, particularly related to their access to natural resources.

b. Both PPG stakeholder engagement (Annex 5c) and Stakeholder engagement plan (Annex 5d) does not specify engagement with IPLCs and persons with disabilities. Please clarify consultations with representatives of IPLCs and persons with disabilities and explain how the results of consultations were reflected in the project design.

c. Please ensure that IPLCs and persons with disabilities are part of project decision making body and involved in the project not only as beneficiaries, but also as partners during project implementation.

d. Please also provide further information of Free, Prior, and Informed Consent with IPLCs if they are present in the project areas.

e. Please also consider integration of traditional and local knowledge into the ecosystem-based approaches in the project.

f. Please provide clear monitoring indicators of meaningful engagement of IPLCs and persons with disabilities in project implementation and decision-making body.

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

Cleared

Agency Response

Response01/12/2025

a) In the context of The Gambia, ethnic groups such as Mandinka, Fula, Wolof, Jola and others are indigenous to the region but do not meet UN criteria for "Indigenous Peoples," as they do not constitute territorially distinct or politically autonomous minority groups. Therefore, ESS7 within the SRIF is not formally triggered. That being said, the project engages IPLCs in the broader CBD sense, i.e. natural-resource-dependent communities. We have now added text acknowledging potential impacts on these communities, and included corresponding mitigation measures. These considerations are now reflected under ESS6 and ESS7.

b) Because IPLCs constitute the mainstream resident population in all project target areas, they were engaged continuously and extensively throughout the PPG phase as demonstrated in the annex about PPG stakeholder consultations, and their inputs directly shaped the project design. During the PPG phase, no consultation was held with a specific organization representing persons with disabilities. However, PWDs were considered a priority vulnerable group in the design process and are explicitly integrated into the project's Gender Action Plan (GAP).

c) The project indeed seeks for the involvement of the IPLCs and persons with disabilities in decision making processes. In this regard, the "Output 1.2 Community engagement and participation framework developed and implemented for inclusive and gender-responsive urban planning" aims to include the IPLCs and persons with disabilities to be part of the urban planning through the Community Engagement and Participation framework. To make this more explicit, the wording has been clarified in para 109. References can also be found in made in para 111, 112, 119, 137, 177, 206, 208 d, 88, 69). The ESMF further states that IPLC will be provided with tools that integrate traditional ecological knowledge, community-based ecosystem restoration guides, and participatory monitoring frameworks combining traditional and scientific indicators. Noting that climate pressures and rapid urbanization are eroding the ability of IPLCs to manage natural resources sustainably, strengthened local governance and support for community-based adaptation will be critical for enhancing resilience. One of the key recommendations made in the ESMF to deliver long term environment and social benefits is to ensure inclusive participation, especially of women, youth, persons with disabilities and IPLCs, in the planning and implementation of EbA, livelihood activities and urban resilience measures.

d) Since IPLCs in The Gambia do not meet the criteria of Indigenous Peoples under UN, FPIC is not required for this project. However, the project maintains a commitment to inclusive, participatory, and informed consultations throughout implementation, particularly with resource-dependent communities, women, youth, and other vulnerable groups. Should any activity during implementation reveal context-specific circumstances where FPIC-like processes are appropriate, the project will apply enhanced engagement protocols consistent with UNEP safeguard requirements.

e) A reference to the integration of traditional and local knowledge into EBA is now included under Output 2.3, para 151, 182, 184 relating to activity 3.1.3 and 3.2.2.

f) Regarding meaningful engagement of IPLC, the project does not have a separate "IPLC subgroup" as such, but all stakeholder groups identified during project preparation, including resource-dependent communities, women's groups, youth groups, and local leaders, will continue to be meaningfully and actively engaged during implementation. Because IPLCs form the general population, their engagement is tracked through the project's broad stakeholder-engagement indicators

Regarding meaningful engagement of PWD- While no PPG-stage consultations were held specifically with disability-rights organizations, PWD are recognized as a key vulnerable group in the project design and will be explicitly included in consultation processes during implementation. The project's GAP already contains specific monitoring indicators related to accessibility and inclusion of persons with disabilities, e.g. i) # of green spaces designed with documented input from women, youth, elderly, and people with disabilities; % of green spaces that meet basic accessibility criteria for persons with disabilities; % of participants in knowledge-sharing activities who belong to other marginalized or vulnerable groups (e.g. persons with disabilities, elderly, informal workers)

Updated SRIF have been attached. We have also uploaded the ESMF.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

Please upload and submit the confirmed letter of cofinancing support from the World Bank (WACA) amount of USD 10,000,000.

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

The letter of co-financing from the World Bank is not a commitment as it states "Specifically, this co-financing is not a financial commitment but rather a complementing effort from the WACA project toward this new project". I suggest removing this from the cofinancing table and keep it in annexes.

Agency Response

Response 01/12/2025

Co financing letter for WACA project has been uploaded

Agency Response 08/12/2025

We have removed the WACA co-financing from the financial tables and maintained in the appendices. The co-financing figure remains as it was at PIF approval.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based

interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

(a-c) Yes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Yes, coordinates are provided

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

Under annex E, please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place. Please enter them in their respective fields. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format (e.g., for Washington DC, Latitude 38.89511 and Longitude -77.03637).

GEFSEC 12/4/2025

Addressed. Cleared

Agency Response

Response 01/12/2025:

Project site coordinates have been entered in respective fields using the decimal degrees format.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

a. Please upload a word document, in Annex G, rather than an image because the image is not properly converted to PDF resulting in the loss of a section of the budget in the CEO Endorsement request portal view - we can't calculate the percentage of personnel vis-a-vis the total cost.

ANNEX G: BUDGET TABLE

Please upload the budget table here. ⓘ

Please explain any aspects of the budget as needed here

ECR/Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (USDeq.)					M&E	PMC	Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency)
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Sub-Total					
Procurement of equipment for	Equipment for mangrove replanting and wetland restoration (Output 2.1.1)		190,000.00		190,000.00			190,000.00	EE	
	Equipment for protective measures preforestation and erosion control (Output 2.1.1)		260,000.00		260,000.00			260,000.00	EE	
	Equipment for the multi-use green spaces and community market areas (Output 2.1.2)		950,000.00		950,000.00			950,000.00	EE	
	Equipment for SuDS (Output 2.1.3)		2,019,000.00		2,019,000.00			2,019,000.00	EE	
	Equipment for rainwater harvesting systems and water		1,558,000.00		1,558,000.00			1,558,000.00	EE	
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Inception Workshop						15,000.00	15,000.00	EE	
	Closing Workshop						15,000.00	15,000.00	EE	
	Training on climate change, and natural	15,000.00			15,000.00			15,000.00	EE	
	Document was last saved: Just now									
	Policy workshops (Output 1.1.2)	50,000.00			50,000.00			50,000.00	EE	
	Workshops and policy dialogues (Output 1.1.3)	15,000.00			15,000.00			15,000.00	EE	
	Trainings on LRMP implementation	35,037.00			35,037.00			35,037.00	EE	
	Training capacity building sessions on sustainable									

b. The column 'Responsible Entity' includes an acronym 'EE' - assuming EE means Executing Entity, the listed executing agency is National Environment Agency (NEA). Please correct and include NEA in each activity they will receive funds to execute or clarify what EE stands for.

c. We noticed that an International Chief Technical Advisor has been charged to the components and UNEP is expected to receive funds for this position. If this is the case UNEP will be considered to co-execute this project. Please clarify given that the institutional arrangement section in document states NEA is the sole executing agency). Otherwise, the

appropriate procedures are required for a dual role of implementing agency to be justified and which exception applies, Support Letter from OFP etc. We also note that there are a Project coordinator and a Chief Technical Adviser. Most non-UN Agencies include only one managerial/technical position in projects. Please merge these two positions in one - also clarify which activity the salary of the redundant position will be reallocated.

Consultants	Project Coordinator	53,524.80	107,049.60	53,524.80	214,099.20		53,524.80
	International Chief Technical Advisor	80,000.00	92,000.00	80,000.00	252,000.00		
	Eba and Climate Resilience Expert		80,000.00		80,000.00		
	Sustainable Livelihoods Expert		70,000.00		70,000.00		
	ESMP Expert	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	75,000.00		
	Gender Specialist	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	60,000.00		
	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist				-	144,000.00	
	Communications & Knowledge Management Expert			165,600.00	165,600.00		
	Communications and Awareness Raising Expert	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	75,000.00		
	Community Engagement Expert		80,000.00		80,000.00		
	Finance and Procurement Expert				-		144,000.00
	Senior Project Assistant						126,000.00

d) Project Coordinator and International Chief Technical Advisor are being charged to a component. Per Guidelines, the costs of whichever position is left (see above point) must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. The project's staff could be charged to the project's components with clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines) but we did not find any TORs.

e) There are two positions that look alike: communication & KM expert and the communication and awareness raising expert - please merge these two positions in one.

Consultants	Project Coordinator	53,524.80	107,049.60	53,524.80	214,099.20		53,524.80	267,624.00	EE
	International Chief Technical Advisor	80,000.00	92,000.00	80,000.00	252,000.00			252,000.00	UNEP
	Eba and Climate Resilience Expert		80,000.00		80,000.00			80,000.00	EE
	Sustainable Livelihoods Expert		70,000.00		70,000.00			70,000.00	EE
	ESMP Expert	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	75,000.00			75,000.00	EE
	Gender Specialist	20,000.00	20,000.00	20,000.00	60,000.00			60,000.00	EE
	Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist				-	144,000.00		144,000.00	EE
	Communications & Knowledge Management Expert			165,600.00	165,600.00			165,600.00	EE
	Communications and Awareness Raising Expert	25,000.00	25,000.00	25,000.00	75,000.00			75,000.00	EE
	Community Engagement Expert		80,000.00		80,000.00			80,000.00	EE
	Finance and Procurement Expert				-		144,000.00	144,000.00	EE
	Senior Project Assistant						126,000.00	126,000.00	EE

Agency Response

Response01/12/2025

- Word version of the budget table Annex G has been uploaded.
- Amendments made to include NEA on activities they will receive funds for.
- International Chief Technical Advisor position now under NEA.

On the CTA and Project Coordinator, we prefer to maintain the two positions as they play separate roles as outlined in the ToRs for each position in Appendix 5, attachment 5f. Based on experience in LDC settings, a CTA provides advisory inputs which will raise the strategic impact of the project and is critical to achieve effectiveness and efficiency while the project coordinator is focused on the day to day management of the project. In project situations where we have not had a CTA (a very limited number) we find that UNEP ends up stepping into the execution role and that breaches the boundary between execution and implementation.

- d) ToR for the Project Coordinator in Appendix 5 Attachment 5f does include component specific deliverables which is inline with the guideline for positions charged to both components and PMC. The CTA remains as originally planned, separate from project coordinator and fully charged to components only.
- e) The Communication and KM expert is a PMU officer who will focus on overall delivery of Component 3: Improving knowledge management and information dissemination and supervise the consultant work on awareness raising. The two positions are best kept separate for better delivery on results.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 10/9/2025

Not yet. The official CER document ([FSP CEO endorsement document](#)), which forms the basis of the review is missing key information compared to the project document ("[11532_CEO_CCA_UNEP_Gambia_for_submission](#)"). Agency needs to harmonize and ensure all information is reflected in the official CER document to ensure appropriate review and feedback. If there are challenges, agency is required to notify the Secretariat.

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

Contingent on addressing all comments and reconciling the CER document and Prodoc information. The CEO Endorsement Request Portal view, which is the document webposted after endorsement has one issue that requires being fixed: after Annex I (responses to comments from Council), there are 30 pages of duplicative narrative on the project description

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 11/21/2025

As the project integrated strong women's empowerment and gender equality aspects, the Agency is requested to ensure that under M&E, practices in advancing gender equality/women's empowerment are included in PIRs, MTR and TE (including going beyond reporting on gender-disaggregated data). Please also include plans to report on the implementation of the Gender Action Plan. Under KM, please ensure that lessons learned and best practices on gender equality

integration and promoting women's empowerment are included in knowledge products and widely disseminated.

9.3 Review Dates

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Approval Response to Secretariat comments

10/10/2025

11/21/2025

12/4/2025