



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

Review PIF 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**

3/20/2024

**Review completed by PM**

4/6/2024

**Program Manager**

Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

**GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET**

**1. General Project Information / Eligibility**

**a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?**

**b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 31 March 2024

Yes, the project meets the eligibility criteria and the Information table is correctly populated

Agency's Comments N/A

**2. Project Summary**

**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 results?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Not fully. Please revise the Summary to clearly outline the critical climate hazards (including current and future climate hazards) and their impacts (current and future impacts) on the population and ecosystem in the project area. Additionally, specify the primary objective in the Summary while establishing clear linkage to the anticipated adaptation benefits.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for revising the summary to reflect the climate rationale and anticipated adaptation benefits of the proposed project. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments  
**Response28/04/2024**

This is noted.

The summary has been revised to include the main climate hazards experienced in the region, as well as observed and projected impacts on the target population and ecosystems.

The primary objective of the project has been inserted into the text and the integrated approach employed by the project has been expanded upon, to establish linkages to anticipated adaptation benefits.

**3 Indicative Project Overview**

**3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?**

**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?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

a) Not fully. Suggest streamlining the objective that demonstrate the focus on scaling up urban ecosystem based adaptation. Note that green-grey infrastructure is considered a nature based solution (EbA).

b) In general, yes. The project components and outcomes need to be better complemented and interconnected to achieve the project objective.

- The integration of EbA (nature based solutions) in fostering urban resilience has significant potential, however the project design needs to be clear articulation that the activities can indeed deliver clear adaptation benefits for the target communities in GBA. The adaptation rationale for Output 2.4 (circular waste management to reduce urban pollution) for instance, needs to be further substantiated. Likewise the planned outputs on biofuels/charcoal training activities suggest mitigation and biodiversity benefits rather than adaptation. Also, reconcile the title statement for component 2 presented in the information table and the narrative in the project description section. Please note the distinction between grey infrastructure and green-gray infrastructure, these can't be used interchangeable as noted in the project objective and narrative of the project approach and outputs.

Component 3. We recognize the importance of leveraging financing opportunities including private sector engagement to scale up investment in nature based solutions however, component 3 and proposed outputs need be substantiated, with clear rationale and pathways to the adaptation benefits that will be delivered to the target beneficiaries. Under Output 3.1 Its not clear how and where the market linkages will be established within the GBA. There is a reference to leveraging the market linkages under the GCF landscape project which focuses on rural communities in Gambia; please clarify the

relevance and justification to the urban dynamics of this project. Is the aim to enhance rural-urban market linkages? Output 3.2 suggests introducing innovative financing mechanisms such as CSRs, climate insurance certification schemes and green bonds to upscale project interventions and investing in climate-resilient infrastructure. How will the results be measured within the scope of the proposed project? Similarly, output 3.3 proposes to catalyze investment by generating revenues from the public urban green spaces and ecotourism introduced in Component 2. Please clarify how these revenues will be generated? Are there anticipated charges for accessing the public spaces? The project also suggests allocating the revenue generated ecotourism to the 'Gambia Climate Change Fund', which was established in 2016. Who manages these fund?

The rationale and justification for design of component 3 is not clear and may benefit from a reduced scope with clear measurable impacts and complementarity to other project components. Ensure a consistent flow in the project design, showing clear linkages to the climate problem in the GBA, the drivers of the vulnerability in that context and how the proposed solutions will deliver adaptation benefits.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for revising project design and components to strengthen the climate rationale and establish clear linkages between the activities. Comment cleared.

### Agency's Comments

#### Response 28/04/2024

- a) This feedback is well noted. Thank you for the suggestion. The project objective has been revised and now reads as follows: 'Enhance the climate resilience of communities in the Greater Banjul Area by scaling up investments in urban ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) solutions.' Note that 'green-grey' infrastructure has been omitted, given that it falls under EbA.
- b) Thank you for the comment. We have reviewed the project logframe and made the following changes to various components, outcome and outputs to better align them with the overall strategy and objective of increasing resilience of communities in the GBA by scaling up investments in urban EbA solutions:

#### Component 2:

- Output 2.4. (circular waste management systems) has been removed. Instead, a reference to managing plastic pollution/ waste in particular 'which accumulates in waterways and increases flood risk in the GBA' has been added to Output 2.4 (former Output 2.6). Please refer to paragraph 93-95.
- Similarly, Output 2.5 (promotion of biofuels) has been removed and a reference to the promotion of charcoal alternatives has been added to the description for Output 2.2 on sustainable livelihoods instead, since shifting towards sustainable sources of energy will increase the viability of biofuel production as a livelihood activity, while simultaneously discouraging deforestation for charcoal production and providing adaptation benefits. Please refer to paragraph 88 for edited text.
- The title statement for Component 2 has been revised and reconciled across the document, as suggested.

- References to green and grey infrastructure and to green-grey infrastructure have been removed ? instead reference is made to EbA solutions.

#### Component 3:

- The scope of Component 3 has been reduced considerably. Component 3 has been removed entirely and replaced with an output under Component 2 which aims to review various innovative finance mechanisms and develop a financial mechanism for upscaling ecosystem based solutions piloted in the project. Please refer to edited text in paragraphs 95-96
- The results and measurement of the financial mechanism will be scoped and defined during the development of the mechanism during project implementation.
- By embedding the financial mechanism development output within Component 2 ? a stronger link is created between the piloting of EbA interventions that are to be upscaled.

Please refer to track change text for edits under section B.

### **3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

Overall, yes.

On gender, we note the the project's plan to strengthen an enabling environment for gender responsive and climate resilient urban planning and sustainable development as detailed in component 1. The project project also plans to develop a gender assessment and action plan during the PPG. We further suggest elaborating the inclusion of gender dimensions across other project components including how the project will leverage financing opportunities for women.

Additional PPO Comments on Gender : (i) Under Output 3.2, on reference to ?incentives that promote investments in women-led climate-resilient infrastructure and businesses?, the Agency may wish to review and consider WOCAN?s W+ Standard (see: <https://www.wplus.org/> ; <https://www.wplus.org/ssp/> and <https://www.wplus.org/era-brazil/> ). W+ Standard quantifies and monetizes women's empowerment in projects across six areas (time, income and assets, education and knowledge, leadership, food security and health). (ii) Please ensure that in outputs 4.1. and 4.2, the KM products developed integrate gender dimensions. Under M&E, ensure the gender dimensions are reported and monitored on and the GAP is budgeted.

On knowledge management, component 4 is dedicated to increased awareness and dissemination of project knowledge products. We note the plan to generate and use diverse communication tools to support knowledge management activities, please consider developing a comprehensive communication plan. Also consider the inclusion of

urban ecosystem based adaption including locally led innovation mechanisms as thematic options in the learning, partnership and exchange program for this project.

While there is a allocation for M&E, please provide some details on planned action for effective monitoring and evaluation process including monitoring the effectiveness of the proposed adaptation solutions to maximize impact.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank for additional inputs integrating gender, knowledge management and M&E.  
Comment cleared.

### Agency's Comments

#### Response28/04/2024

This feedback is well noted. Gender considerations have been mainstreamed throughout the project summary and the entire project by acknowledging socioeconomic vulnerabilities ? please refer to track changes for gender revisions/additions. In addition, we will explore in more detail during the PPG phase WOCANs the W+ Standard and how to integrate this into project interventions. Lastly, gender dimensions have been included in the knowledge management products under Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 (formerly 4.1 & 4.2).

Thank you for the suggestions regarding knowledge management under Component 3 (former Component 4). These inputs have been integrated into the project description under Outcome 3. Please refer to edits in paragraphs 101-103

A reference to monitoring and evaluation has been added under section B paragraph 104.

Please refer to track changes in section B for edits

**3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?**

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

**c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

a) Yes.

b) Yes. Further information is, however required on the co-financing (40%) from the World Bank. We note the reference to stakeholder consultations/meetings as mechanism to identifying the investment mobilized through the World Bank WACA program,

however the meeting report does not provide evidence of such consultations. Please provide more details on the planned coordination with the World Bank. Also, provide detailed description on how the investment will be mobilized. The co-investment with the WACA program suggested in the prodoc is not clear.

c) Yes. Additional PPO Comments : While the GEF resources and co-financing re-sources allocated to PMC fall within the cap of 5.0% for FSPs, it is worth to highlight that normally projects of this magnitude (above US\$ 10 million) require an important amount of resources for managing the project. Agency recommended to discuss with the country and eventually to increase the portion (from GEF and co-financing) allocated to PMC.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you addressing the comments. Cleared.

### Agency's Comments Response28/04/2024

a) N/A

b) The proposed project will scale up, rather than co-invest in the WACA initiative. Additional details of consultations with the ministry in charge of executing the WACA initiative (MECCNAR) have been added to section D ? stakeholder engagement ? paragraph 125. Consultations were held with the WACA in country project coordination team under MECCNAR. The proposed project will be up-scaling WACA project interventions in the Kotu Stream area locations to other hotspot areas outside of the Kotu Stream area identified by the WACA flood risk assessment. This is detailed in the project narrative.

c) Comments are well noted. We will review the portion of co-financing going to PMC during the PPG phase

Please refer to track changes in the revised PIF

#### **4 Project Outline**

##### **A. Project Rationale**

##### **4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS**

**a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?**

**b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?**

### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

a) To a large extent, yes. Further information is requested. It would be useful to elaborate more clearly the current climate hazards situation and how socio-economic and other conditions influence the vulnerability of people and ecosystems in the target area (GBA). In the context of the proposed alternative livelihoods, consider highlighting current local economy in the GBA and how the introduction of ecotourism, agroforestry, agriculture, aquaculture, etc will bring value to the community.

b) Some barriers are identified. It may be useful to reference barriers related to the innovative financing mechanisms (including the associated regulatory frameworks), alternative livelihoods (ecotourism) being proposed under the project. A brief articulation of the enablers will also be helpful.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for further elaboration and inputs. Comments cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

##### Response 28/04/2024

a) An analysis on the climate hazards situation can be found in paragraphs 40 ? 46 and in Table 5. Additionally, the socio-economic overview section under section A (paragraphs 10 to 16) has been strengthened and now includes references to the local economy in the GBA and how livelihood practices enhanced under the proposed project will bring value to the community.

b) A reference to barriers related to innovative finance mechanisms has been included under the description for Barrier 2 (paragraph 60). Additionally, a section detailing project enablers has been added to this section as well. Please refer to edited paragraphs 62 to 63.

Please refer to track changes text for edits

#### 4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

**a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?**

**c) 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?**

**d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024



a) Not fully. The project doesn't provide sufficient justification for the selected approaches. Please strengthen and consider the justification of the intervention solutions through the lens of financial and institutional sustainability and cost effectiveness. On livelihood diversification, the project design is premised on the provision of technical support and inputs to local communities to adopt sustainable livelihood activities (including training in agroforestry, horticulture, indigenous bivalve and crustacean aquaculture, kelp farming, apiculture, ecotourism) as mechanisms to reduce pressure on limited natural resources, and subsequent measures to raise financing. The project should endeavor to validate these assumptions by providing a clearer understanding and targeted engagement with the beneficiary populations categorized (urban, and gender) based on identities that are pertinent to the types of their livelihood activities and how these contribute to vulnerability drivers the project is aiming to address. It is important to ensure that project interventions are indeed relevant, and impactful to the target community.

b) It proposes a mix of nature based solutions and alternative livelihoods as long term adaptation solutions to climate vulnerability in the GBA.

c) Yes. Further information is needed on the co-investment approach suggested for the WACA program.

d) No. Provide list of relevant stakeholders, their roles and means of engagement. The project requires a comprehensive mapping and engagement strategies with different stakeholders including the different categories of the beneficiary population (local entrepreneurs, SMEs). Please be specific on the roles of the government, CSOs, private sector, women groups, and academia. A Stakeholder Engagement Plan should be developed during PPG.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for further elaboration and inputs. Comments cleared.

### Agency's Comments

#### **Response 28/04/2024**

a) Thank you for the comment. Further justification for the selected approaches has been provided under a new sub-heading in Section A - Preferred Solution (paragraphs 54-57). Additionally baseline information has been added to the economic overview section (paragraphs 9-12), to demonstrate how the existing local economy ? as well as the beneficiary population and target ecosystems ? will benefit from livelihood diversification. Although initial stakeholder consultations were held to confirm these assumptions, further engagement during PPG phase will be used to validate the proposed project design.

b) N/A

c) Thank you for this comment. As detailed above, the proposed project will not co-invest in, but rather scale up the efforts of the WACA initiative. Additional details of engagement with the WACA project team have been added to the stakeholder section. Additionally, references to the proposed project working in hotspot areas outside of Kotu Stream (the WACA target region) have been added.

d) Thank you for this comment. A column has been added to Table 6 to demonstrate the envisaged role of each stakeholder in the proposed project. Additionally, the SRIF now details that a Stakeholder Engagement Plan should be developed during PPG phase.

Please refer to track changes text for edits.

## **5 B. Project Description**

### **5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE**

**a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?**

**b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

a) We note the reference to the ToC in the prodoc, please insert it into the PIF. The theory of change will benefit from an articulation of the climate (adaptation) problem (as the starting block) that the project will target. Please refer to the climate adaptation decision tree paper by [STAP](#).

b) In addition to comments in Section 2 above;

Output 2.2 Provide more background on current urban livelihoods, how this ties with the climate problem and justify the livelihood diversification approach as suggested in the project document . We recommend that activities/solutions are directly linked to a clear climate problem (and the associated socioeconomic challenges).

Output 2.3 It would be useful to define the scale of these public green spaces, are these in the form of large parks or small-scale green spaces? Urban agriculture prevents huge multidimensional benefits including food security but these needs to be explored in the culture, and livelihood practices in the proposed intervention area. Suggest providing some background literature on green spaces (ecotourism and urban agriculture opportunities) in the city and how the proposed interventions will bring about transformation.

Output 2.4/2.5: Without a strong adaptation rationale, the waste management and promotion of biofuels may not be justified for funding as described. Please consider deleting.

Output 4.1 We note the reference to hosting workshops and seminars on training stakeholders on the use of EbA interventions introduced through the GCF Landscape program in the rural communities of Gambia. As mentioned in previous comments, its crucial to ensure that this baseline information is relevant and applicable to the urban contexts where the interventions will be implemented. It may be worthwhile to explore opportunities that would engage the University of Gambia, students, local entrepreneurs, for instance, to develop and demonstrate a suite of urban EbA solutions in the local context. This could be in the form of innovation challenges.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for further elaboration and inputs. Comments cleared.

### Agency's Comments

#### **Response28/04/2024**

a) The Theory of Change diagram has been included in the portal submission. A summary description of the ToC has been added to section B- paragraphs 66-69

b) Thank you for this valuable feedback. The comments have been addressed as detailed below.

- Output 2.2: Additional baseline info regarding current economic activities in the GBA has been added to the project rationale, along with a description of how proposed livelihood interventions will benefit target populations.

- Output 2.3: The description of this output has been expanded upon to clarify that urban green spaces will be established on unoccupied state-owned land. These plots will, therefore, vary in size (but will be small-scale), as described in the project description. Footnotes with references to UNEP studies/ publications on green spaces in cities have been added to the description of output 2.3. UNEP will consult with our internal experts on inputs to the design of this output during the PPG phase.

- Outputs 2.4 and 2.5: These outputs have been deleted and instead, references to specific adaptation-related ideas from these outputs have been integrated into other outputs (Output 2.2. and revised Output 2.4)

- Output 4.1 (currently 3.1): Under the baseline section - reference was made to the GCF EbA (landscapes) project activities that relate to setting up of a national information portal. While the project in question focuses in rural areas, the information portal will be at national level and hence the proposed LDCF project will build on and include assessments, knowledge gathered and lessons learned into the information platform. Reference to explore opportunities that would engage the University of Gambia, students, local entrepreneurs, to develop and demonstrate a suite of urban EbA solutions in the local context in the form of innovation challenges has also been included to the description text for this output. Paragraph 102 - 103.

Please refer to track changes text for edits



## 5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

No. The project provides an overview of baseline projects and complementarity to the proposed project but details about the incremental inputs of the project in general and of the GEF funding, in particular, is not presented. Please briefly describe the incremental cost reasoning and the role of the GEF/LDCF financing.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Response 28/04/2024**

Additionality of the proposed project is provided under Table 3 ? this table has been renamed ?Overview of baseline projects and additionality of proposed LDCF project?. The additionality reasoning of the project is also demonstrated under the description of components under section B ? which provides a baseline description and proposed project approach. It should be noted that LDCF projects apply the term additionality rather than incremental.

## 5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

**a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?**

**b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).**

**c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area**

**d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

a) Yes

c) See comments above regarding coordination with the World Bank WACA program.

d) The project proposes wide range of communication strategies to foster coordination and partnerships in the learning and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned. We recommend the development of a communication plan during PPG to fully capture and ensure synergy across the broad spectrum of interventions and engagement.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you addressing the comments. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

**Response28/04/2024**

a) N/A

c) The comments regarding the WACA program have been addressed.

d) Thank you for the suggestion. This text has been added under the description for Outcome 3 - output 3.1 (former Output 4.1).

Please refer to paragraph 103

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

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

a) Yes

b) yes

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**5.6 RISKS**

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?**

**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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

a) In general yes. Project may also consider risks associated with the adoption of proposed NbS/livelihood solutions, and the regulatory risks associated with the respective innovative financial mechanisms.

b) PPO comments: Under the Fiduciary risk category of the Key Risks section, please consider assessing the related risk category, outlining anticipated mitigation measures and providing a rating pertaining to the residual rating, as available.

c) Environmental and Social risks and impacts have been screened and rated. We note that the uploaded screening document categorized this risk as minor, while the project document rates the risk as substantial. Please reconcile and ensure that the screening acknowledges the proposed interventions would require the preparation of an ESIA.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you addressing the comments. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

**Response28/04/2024**

a) Comments are noted, however we view that the risks related to adoption of proposed NbS/ livelihood solutions would fall under the risk related to stakeholders - Insufficient community ownership. In addition, given the reduced scope of the financial level outputs of the project ? the regulatory risks will be taken into account during the development of the mechanism.

b) A description and risk rating of the Fiduciary risk category has been added in the risks table/section.

c) Thank you for the feedback. The risk rating has been reconciled across the SRIF and PIF document

#### **5.7 Qualitative assessment**

**a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**

**b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

**c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

The project has the potential to be transformative and innovative through the promotion of nBS and financing mechanisms to support local entrepreneurship in the urban space. Project design needs to be further strengthened to be complementary and relevant to the local context.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for further elaboration and inputs. Comments cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Response28/04/2024**

Thank you for the feedback. Comments on the project design have been addressed and the ToC has been revised to ensure complementarity and relevance in the local context.

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

**6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

The project is aligned with the LDCF's core priorities of scaling up finance, fostering partnerships for inclusion and whole of society approach, and innovation and private sector engagement.

Agency's CommentsN/A

**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's Comments

GEFSEC: 2 April 2024

We suggest elaborating the project's alignment with Gambia's NAPA and NDC. Also consider referencing the Gambia's Strategic Program for Climate Resilience developed under the Climate Investment Fund. We note the reference to the WACA program as a regional strategy the project aligns with, please clarify.

#### Agency's Comments

**Response28/04/2024**

This is well noted. Alignment descriptions with the NAPA, NDC and Strategic Program for Climate Resilience (SPCR) have been added to the Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities section.

Reference to the West African Coastal Areas Management (WACA) program is made ? as the proposed LDCF project through targeted interventions in the GBA, will contribute to the regional efforts to protect vulnerable coastal communities and ecosystems. Though the program cannot be considered a regional strategy it can be considered a regional priority and hence we have retained WACA under this section.

Please refer to edited (track changes) text for additions in Section C

**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's Comments

#### Agency's Comments

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

#### **7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Yes

#### Agency's Comments

**7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024



There is reference to a stakeholder meeting report on the PIF development process. However, evidence of engagement with the World Bank as indicated in Table 6 (digital summary of stakeholders consulted during PIF) needs to be clarified. The project design is hinged on upscaling the interventions implemented under the World Bank WACA program, however evidence of a consultation or coordination with the World Bank has not be established.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for further clarification on the stakeholder engagement process. Comments cleared.

**Agency's Comments**  
**Response28/04/2024**

Further clarification on consultations held with the WACA project coordinators and representatives in MECCNAR ? the executing entity for the World Bank-funded WACA initiative have been added under the stakeholder engagements section D.

Please refer to paragraph 125 for additions

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 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's Comments

Agency's Comments  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments  
**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

**8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

In general yes. Further information required as commented above

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Response28/04/2024**

Thank you for the feedback. Further information has been provided in response to the comments above, as requested.

Please note that the co-financing plan has been adjusted in the revised PIF to align with the revisions made to project outcomes and outputs.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Yes

Additional PPO comments : the template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions for the selection of the executing partner ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE pr request request a new LoE. Also, the table misses the Focal Area Source - please ask the OFP to also include such Focal Area in the email or new LoE.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Thank you for addressing the comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Response28/04/2023**

A revised letter of endorsement has been provided by the GEF operational focal point and is resubmitted.

**8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Annex C: Project Location**

**8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

No. Actual location of intervention area has not been established

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Response:28/04/2024**

Thank you for the comment. The exact locations for project interventions will be determined during the PPG phase and during project implementation, during the development of a comprehensive urban resilience master plan (URMP) for the Greater Banjul Area.

**Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating**

**8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

A UNEP screening document has been uploaded.

Agency's Comments N/A

**Annex E: Rio Markers**

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments N/A

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

**9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 2 April 2024

Not yet. Project needs to strengthen the rationale, relevance and justification for the proposed interventions, while ensuring linkage to the climate problem in the intervention area. Suggest project design is streamlined.

GEFSEC 28 April 2024

Yes. PIF has been revised to strengthen the climate rationale and justification of the proposed activities.

Agency's Comments

**Response28/04/2024**

A revised letter of endorsement has been provided by the GEF operational focal point and is resubmitted.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval**

Secretariat's Comments Submit co-financing letter at CEO stage

Agency's Comments

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/10/2024</b>	<b>4/26/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/28/2024</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		