

Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) for resilient natural resources and agro-pastoral communities in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10691

Countries

Senegal

Project Name

Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) for resilient natural resources and agro-pastoral communities in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies

Agencies

UNDP, IUCN

Date received by PM

12/9/2021

Review completed by PM

7/25/2022

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 24 August 2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1 August 2022:

Please correct the expected implementation start date to a future date (it is currently indicated as July 1, 2022, which has already passed).

1Dec2021:

Please correct the expected implementation start date to a future date.

Agency Response

UNDP 16 August 2022:

This was corrected to December 1, 2022. Other dates were also consequently adjusted (end date, terminal evaluation date and mid-term review), as well as the date for CEO Endorsement as per the approved extension.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 27April2022:

Technically cleared.

GEFSEC 7April2022:

On the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$10,033,187 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$501,660 instead of \$470,000 (which is 4.6%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes. We note with appreciation the sharpened articulation of some of the outputs.

Agency Response

UNDP ? 18April2022

The co-financing contribution to PMC was increased to US\$503,187, representing 5,03%.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 27April2022:

Technically cleared.

GEFSEC 7April2022:

In addition to the comments below on concerns about the reduced level of co-financing, please make the following revisions:

Ministry of Husbandry and Livestock Production: change to ?Public Investment? and ?Investment Mobilized

DGPRES:

- o Spell out the full ministry name
- o Change to ?Public Investment? and ?Investment Mobilized?

UNDP -TRACK:

- o Will this be cash contribution? If not, change to ?In-kind? and ?Recurrent expenditure?

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

We note with significant concern the large decrease in the number and total amount of co-finance sources (from \$26,450,000 down to \$10,400,000 at CER). Please ensure all efforts are made to maintain the level of co-finance initially indicated and approved at the PIF stage. Please provided an text explanation of the reasons and actions taken for each change in co-finance sources and amounts from the PIF to the CER stage.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - OK

3/9/2022 - Upon further reflection, it seems that a number of these co-financing initiatives are not on compatible timelines with the proposed initiative. Please only indicate those sources of co-financing as those projects which will be ongoing

throughout the implementation period of the proposed project. Otherwise, it does not seem possible that the project will be providing co-financing.

5April2022: Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Feb22:

Certain assumptions on co-financing did not hold valid during the PPG stage. The project Promovilles (with an estimated US\$10,000,000 of co-financing at PIF stage) does not target the same areas as this LDCF project, and effective co-financing can therefore not be leveraged. Similarly, a co-financing letter for the PADAER/IFAD project (with an estimated US\$10,000,000 of co-financing at PIF stage) could not be obtained yet. Nevertheless, both are mentioned as key baseline projects, and the proposed LDCF project will ensure close coordination and complementarity with these initiatives, including through the sharing of lessons learned.

With an expected value at PIF stage of US\$20,000,000 of co-financing not materializing, the amount of co-financing at CEO ER stage is largely impacted. However, during the PPG process, the project mobilized additional, more relevant sources of co-financing. Despite lower amounts, these initiatives provide conducive basis for LDCF's additional interventions.

UNDP - 28Mar2022

Each co-financing was secured considering the project start date, around July 2022. Co-financings therefore only include activities conducted after July 2022 under the different projects and that are technically relevant to the project. More specifically:

- The ASERGMV will be in place beyond the project lifetime and the co-financing (US\$500,000) relates to recurrent expenditures of the agency that will be made available to support the project during its implementation period;

- The PDEPS will end in 2023, however the letter acknowledges the co-financing (US\$ 3,200,000) only covers the period starting in 2022;

- The PUDC also ends in 2023 and recognizes that the co-financing (US\$ 100,000) only covers the period starting in the second half of 2022;

- The project supported by the DGPRE will start in 2022 for 5 years and, as such, covers the same period as the EbA project (co-financing of US\$5,800,000);

- IUCN, as a GEF agency for this project, is well aware of the project duration and has only included co-financing for the overlapping period in the co-financings provided by PAPBio and Biopama (US\$ 300,000);

- UNDP's cash co-financing (US\$500,000) is specifically allocated for the project and will therefore be covering the entire project duration.

The GEF can review the translated letters for confirmation.

Additionally, following the comment on the CEO Endorsement, the type of the above-mentioned co-financings was changed to recurrent expenditure (except for the UNDP cash co-financing).

UNDP ? 11 April 2022:

The co-financing from the Ministry of Husbandry and Livestock production was changed to ?Public Investment? ?Investment Mobilized?.

The DGPPE was spelled out, the name of the Ministry under which it operates was added

UNDP confirms that UNDP TRAC are core UNDP resources provided in cash contributions (details on the use of these resources are available in the Project Document budget)

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

We note with concern the significant decrease in expected impact ambition in terms of number of beneficiaries, as well as number of hectares, as were initially indicated and approved at the PIF stage (155,000 decreased to 178,000 beneficiaries; 250,000 decreased to 16,900 hectares). Please endeavor to maintain the level of expected impact ambition previously approved at the PIF stage. If any decrease of expected impact ambition is required, please explain in detail why this is the case, and all efforts that have been taken to maintain the impact levels that was initially indicated and approved.

GEFSEC, 3/8/2022 - OK

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Fev22:

At PIF stage the total number of beneficiaries was 310,000 people, while it is 90,000 at CEO ER stage. The decrease can be explained considering that, at PIF stage, indirect beneficiaries were also accounted for in the figure due to the challenge in distinguishing direct from indirect beneficiaries in projects supporting land restoration and management. During PPG stage, it was agreed that only the populations in the targeted communities (90,000 people), directly engaged in the project implementation, will be considered as directly benefitting from the project activities, while populations in surrounding areas (more than 310,000 people) will indirectly benefit from the positive impacts of the project. Indirect beneficiaries will include communities in and around the FBR who will benefit from improved governance and management of the FBR, as well as economic development through the introduction of sustainable value chains; the same applies to the PCT, where downstream communities will benefit from restoration works, including in the city of Thies, leading to a reduced vulnerability to flooding.

We understand the comment refers to 16,800ha presented in the section E of the CEO ER, as compared to the data provided in the Core indicators sheet at PIF stage. Both numbers refer to different objectives. The 16,800 ha correspond to the area where ?Technologies and innovative solutions piloted or deployed to reduce climate-related risks and/or enhance resilience?, while the 250,000ha (at PIF stage) referred to ?Hectares of land under climate-resilient management?. Instead the comparison should be made between both PIF and CEO ER core indicator sheets, with an important increase in the area covered, with 2,059,014ha of land managed for climate resilience expected at CEO ER. This number accounts for the area covered by the FBR, as interventions under outcomes 1, 2 and 3 will impact the entire reserve.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

A) Regarding scenarios, we note with appreciation the indication of 4.5 and 8.5 RCP scenarios for precipitation. Please also provide this for temperature and any other climate hazards relevant for which information is available.

B) Please expand on the analysis of current and anticipated impacts of these climate hazards on key priorities for human well being and livelihoods of the target population, as well as national economic development more broadly.

C) With regards specifically to Output 1.3, please ensure and explain how the support to climate risk and vulnerability assessment and mapping will be approached as an ongoing living process, with continued capacity to conduct, update. and use these analysis on an ongoing bases throughout the life of this project and beyond it. Please adjust the outputs and any budget as necessary to ensure this.

GEFSEC, 2/15/2022 -

A) OK

B) OK

C) Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Fev22:

A/ Information on temperature was added in the CEO ER (see section 1.a) and the Prodoc (see section II. Development challenge)

B/ Information on the water sector and flooding risk was added in the CEO ER (see section 1.a) and the Prodoc (see section II. Development challenge)

C/ Output 1.3 is expected to establish the vulnerability situation, inform the updating of land-use management plans and ensure their implementation in the long-term. More details on the outputs are available in the project document (see section IV. Results and Partnerships). Reference to the Prodoc is made in the CEO ER prior to the component description. More specifically, the description of output 1.3 indicates *“The PPG phase revealed that the vast majority of management plans in pastoral units are not actually implemented. As a consequence, the project will support the updating of those plans and their subsequent implementation in light of the EbA approach through organizational and technical support to the management committees, including capacity strengthening and dissemination of rules and laws.”* This capacity building is expected to ensure the capacity to conduct, update and use these analysis beyond the project lifetime. Activity 1.3.3 in particular aims to support the implementation and monitoring of the updated management plans of PUs. Monitoring will be important to ensure the process is living and continuously improved, using a participatory approach.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Please indicate more explicit linkages of how the project interventions are effective (including cost effective and sustainable) solutions to the specified impacts of climate hazards and the underlying causes exacerbated by climate change that are described in this section

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - OK

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Fev22:

Text was added to the CEO ER to explicit the link more strongly and demonstrate the effectiveness of the interventions (see introductory text under section 3. Proposed alternative scenario: *The specified impacts of climate hazards and the underlying causes exacerbated by climate change described above require specific responses for long-term sustainability. In the case of the PCT and the FBR, a direct link is established between ecosystem degradation and vulnerability to climate change. As such, restoring ecosystem services in a sustainable manner appears as the most cost-effective and sustainable solution to face the impacts of climate change. By involving local communities and offering alternative livelihoods to the current environmentally-harmful practices, the project is expected to get the buy-in from beneficiaries in the long term and to be replicated in surrounding areas with and without external funding. It will also provide important lessons learned and best practices for larger-scale initiatives such as the Great Green Wall, the NDC implementation and other national initiatives under discussion.*

An alternative adaptation option is the introduction of large-scale irrigation schemes. This option might lead to overextraction of water resources, posing significant environmental and social safeguards risks with the possible depletion of water resources. This option would also be too costly to cover large areas with the limited available private (mainly smallholder farmers) and public budget.. Another option

would be to put in place more stringent policies and enforcement mechanisms to prevent further degradation of ecosystems. However this option has three limitations: (i) the currently degraded ecosystems are not able to withstand the current and projected impacts of climate change and need to be restored; (ii) a sufficiently strong enforcement mechanism will require extensive government staff, with high costs that can't currently be borne by government budget, and (iii) local communities will be adversely impacted by the loss of revenues from the unsustainable exploitation of natural resources and won't receive support to adopt alternative livelihoods?). The same changes were made to Prodoc section III. Strategy.

In addition, the details available in section V. Results and Partnerships of the Project Document, also provide clarification on the relevance of the project intervention to face the specified impacts of climate hazards and underlying causes.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Please provide detail on how all relevant equipped procured will be maintained and updated over time.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Fev22:

Details were provided in the CEO ER in the section 7. Innovativeness, Sustainability and Potential for Scaling Up, and in the Prodoc, section IV. Results and Partnerships / Innovativeness, Sustainability and Potential for Scaling Up : *The project design fully takes into account the maintenance and updating of equipment procured through the project, owned collectively (outcomes 1 and 2), as well as the equipment procured for private sector actors (outcomes 3 and 4). Details are available in the description of outputs in the project document. For instance, under output 2.1 To guarantee the sustainability of the protected zones, the project will ensure that not only good quality fencing is operational and maintained through a contractual system of guarding, but also that strong buy-in of local communities occurs through the concerted use and management of the preserved resources (fodder, NTFP) to the benefit of all, especially women?. Under activity 2.2.6, the project will Launch consultations and procure expertise to establish a funding mechanism for long-term sustainability of the monitoring, surveillance and control of access to resources system of the FBR?. Under activity 2.3.5 the project will Develop a sustainable financing system for surveillance and maintenance of the protected zone?. As part of the support to the development of the Private Sector, MSEs will receive training under activity 4.2.6 on the use and maintenance of their equipment. In particular, MSEs will be encouraged to establish contractual agreements with specialised maintenance companies which will maintain and repair equipment on a regular basis, as is already applied in other projects such as the FAI initiative under APEFAMI funded by the AFD. The output 4.3 is also dedicated to supporting MSEs to update their capacities and equipment by accessing financing opportunities. These financing opportunities will enable MSEs to have a longer-term vision and adopt and maintain resilient practices MSEs based on the sustainable use of natural resources are provided with training to access financing opportunities to promote the adoption of resilient practices that protect and conserve targeted ecosystems?.*

Trainings and sensitizations will be given a central role along the entire project duration to ensure government and private beneficiaries understand the need to put aside resources for the maintenance and updating of the equipment. The project will continuously support beneficiaries to adjust their maintenance and updating strategy and ensure the long-term impact of the project.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Please include detail what and how stakeholders were engaged during the project design/project preparation phase.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - More information requested: theres no actual plan included. Only a list of stakeholders and which output they are participating in. Can you provide more information regarding how exactly these stakeholders will be engaged?

GEFSEC, 3/8/2022 - Thank you. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Fev22:

Details were added to Section 2. *Stakeholders* of the CEO ER, including a table listing all the stakeholders involved. These details are based on the reports of the technical consultants provided as annexes to the Project Document (see reports under Annex 12 - Technical reports from national experts).

UNDP - 7Mar22

More details on the roles and engagement of stakeholders during project implementation are available in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) provided in Annex 8. This SEP covers key stakeholders, with an active role in project implementation. This engagement is summarized in the section 2. Stakeholders of the CEO ER, in the text below Table 2.

Table 2 provides a more exhaustive list of stakeholders, including all the stakeholders involved during the project design/preparation phase, as per the request in the review sheet of the 15th of December, 2021, it does not aim to provide information on how stakeholders will be engaged during implementation.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 24August2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1 August 2022:

Please more explicitly indicate if/how the project includes gender-sensitive indicators and expected results.

Agency Response

UNDP 16 August 2022:

The indicators mention the proportion of men and women benefiting from the project. This is reflected in the Annex A of the CEO ER 'Project Result Framework', where the *Indicator 1 # direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender (individual people)* is disaggregated by gender (90,000 of which 60% women; 54,000 women and 36,000 men). This is further detailed under the section 10 on benefits *'The project is expected to deliver direct adaptation and socio-economic benefits at regional and local level. The project will support 88,000 people (52,800 men and 35,200 women) in PUs and communities in transforming their direct environment into more productive and functional ecosystems, delivering long-term adaptation and socio-economic benefits to community members. Through its private sector and value chain development component (component 3), the project will also directly support 2,000 people (800 men and 1,200 women) from community groups (through MSEs, GIE and women's groups) in developing their businesses and, in turn, earning economic benefits from these businesses.'*

In addition, the project has conducted a gender analysis and action plan (GAAP), available in annex 11 of the Project Document. The GAAP has informed the design of the baseline, assumptions (see assumption 5), risks (see risk 6) and the outcomes, outputs and activities. The result of this analysis and action plan are summarized in the section 3 'Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment' and specify how the project expected results are gender-sensitive: '(?) the gender approach will be integrated transversally among outputs and activities of the components 1, 2, 3 and 4. Under component 1, specific activities will be implemented to reinforce the capacities of communities, local, administrative authorities and technical staff on women leadership, gender approach, women's rights and the link to climate change. Women leaders will be identified to integrate the organizational arrangements of the local committees. Under Component 2, women's groups will be integrated into the consultative processes around the newly created no-take zones network and exclosures, in the RBF, as well as the development of anti-erosion schemes in the PCT. Their economic autonomy could be enhanced by their hiring into the monitoring activities in both intervention zones. Finally, the burden of domestic chores will be lightened by the distribution of energy-efficient stoves. Under component 3 and 4, women will be fully involved in the management of the PSP and forum organization. Moreover, promising women led enterprises will be identified to benefit from the project capacity building in entrepreneurship, technical aspects of the operation of promising resilient sectors (NTFP, animal by-products), but also general skills in business management, accounting, training on the operation and maintenance of equipment acquired. Finally, they will also be trained to micro-financing mechanism and insurance schemes to improve their financial capacities and resilience to climate change.'

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Please provide more thorough information on private sector engagement and climate adaptation/resilience building in this section of the CER document. In doing so, please note small holder farmers are considered as important elements of the private sector.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Fev22:

More detailed information on private sector engagement and capacity-building for climate adaptation was provided under Section 4. Private Sector Engagement of the CEO ER: 'Private sector is a direct beneficiary of the project interventions. Indeed, component 3 of the LDCF project is dedicated to private sector development and resilience building, through the engagement of local entrepreneurs (mainly women groups, smallholder farmers groups or cooperatives, community members groups) into sustainable value-chains, organisational support and capacity building. These private

sector stakeholders are the main target of components 3 and 4, which will build their capacities to sustainably use and add value to natural resources through storage, processing and marketing of products, enhancing their resilience to climate change. Private sector will also be involved into governance development under component 1, in particular in the PCT where large companies operate. Those companies strongly impact ecosystem degradation, and the project will engage with them to raise awareness and promote the adoption of sustainable interventions. This will be supported by the adoption of management plans in the project intervention areas, which is expected to impact the operations of these companies, and incentivize sustainable practices. Close collaboration with the DGP/AFD Pout project, which engages directly with those large private sector actors to adopt a concerted governance framework, will enable more leverage and ensure a broader impact for both projects with regards to the private sector engagement in the targeted areas.?

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Please provide the relevant information on risks and measures that address these risks directly in the GEF CER document.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP - 9Fev22:

The Risk register table provided in the Annex 6 of the Project Document has been added to the Section 5. Risk of the CEO ER. It provides details on the expected risks to the project implementation and mitigation measures.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

A) Please provide a brief explanation of the contribution of the project to climate resilient recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

B) Please seek to expand the socio-economic benefits, including as possible indication of qualitative and quantitative targets.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - Cleared.

Agency Response
UNDP - 9Fev22:

A/ An explanation was provided in the section 10. Benefits, regarding the contribution of the project to the green and climate resilient recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic.

?Benefits relating to the climate resilient recovery from the COVID-19 pandemic

COVID-19 severely impacted most vulnerable people and communities, that are already under stress as a result of the climate crisis and global biodiversity losses. In addition to the direct impact of COVID-19 on Senegal's economy in terms of illness and deaths and

government-imposed restrictions, Senegal is also dependent on remittances from abroad and is therefore exposed to worldwide job losses and global recession.

A COVID-19 crisis survey conducted in April 2021 in Senegal found that 86.8% of households reported that their income over the past seven days was lower than normal. This percentage does not vary significantly between Dakar (83.8%) and the rest of Senegal (87.8%). On the other hand, rural areas seem to be more affected, with 91.5% of village residents reporting a loss of income, compared to 88.9% in medium-sized cities and 82.7% in regional capitals. According to the same source, people living below the poverty line suffered a greater loss of income (93.7%). The consequences of the health crisis and the response measures will also have dire consequences on income-generating activities.

The project strategy contributes to the COVID-19 green and climate-resilient recovery of Senegal, building on UNDP's support to the Government, and on the Government's commitment to socio-economic development. This strategy is aligned with the guidance document "GEF's Response to COVID-19", and has a dual action framework:

1. Actions to support COVID-19 response in the short-term: The proposed project has been designed to maximize opportunities for job creation and training, local economic development, and productivity improvements, as follows:

Job creation through small business development: In Component 3 of the project, climate-resilient agribusinesses, technologies and services are developed. This includes work to: (i) provide opportunities for local community members, in particular women and the youth, to receive entrepreneurship training; (ii) organise training to access financing opportunities to promote the adoption of resilient practices that protect and conserve targeted ecosystems.

Productivity improvements: Components 1 and 2 of the project will strongly contribute to ecosystem regeneration and sustainable management of natural resources, hence improving the long-term productivity of the targeted ecosystems in terms of production (fruits, wood, grass, among others) and ecosystem services delivered. Component 3 aims to improve productivity in the use of ecosystem products, by improving harvesting, storing and processing capacities, all contributing directly to the work productivity and efficiency of involved community members.

2. Actions to support COVID-19 response in the long-term: The proposed project has been designed to maximize opportunities for strengthening supply chains, consistent with long-term decarbonization targets, and increasing natural and economic resilience and adaptive capacity, as follows:

Strengthening supply chains: In Component 3 of the project, value chains for climate-resilient use of ecosystem products will be catalyzed. This includes work to: (i) empower entrepreneurs with climate-smart business and leadership training; (ii) support / establish women producer associations and cooperatives of youth and women., conducting value chain analysis and market studies; and (iii) equip the created/supported MSEs with specific agroprocessing, transport, conservation and storage equipment for the production of marketable products deriving from restored, productive ecosystems.

Supporting long-term decarbonization targets: All the equipment procured under output 4.2 will respond to low-carbon and long-term criteria such as: low-tech design; energy efficiency and renewable energy (in particular solar energy); reparability and access to spare parts.

Increasing natural and economic resilience and adaptive capacity: As mentioned above, components 1 and 2 jointly aim to restore ecosystem services and sustainability in a climate change context, through ecosystem-based adaptation interventions. This includes work to regenerate ecosystems, work to sustainably manage ecosystems (through land-use planning, governance and specific capacity development interventions), and training and awareness of ecosystem users, including small-holder farmers, agropastoralists, transhumant breeders, private sector companies, and local authorities (including city services in Thies).?

B/ The text on socio-economic benefits was expanded, with quantitative and qualitative targets.

The project is expected to deliver direct socio-economic benefits at regional and local level. The project will support 88,000 people (52,800 men and 35,200 women) in PUs and communities in transforming their direct environment into more productive and sustainable ecosystems, delivering long-term socio-economic benefits to community members. Through its private sector and value chain development component (component 3), the project will also directly support 2,000 people (800 men and 1,200 women) from community groups (though MSEs, GIE and women's groups) in developing their businesses and, in turn, get economic benefits from them. Therefore the project beneficiaries will (i) receive support for transforming the landscapes for increased productivity and restoration of ecosystem services which will deliver long-term socio-economic benefits including increased food security; (ii) receive support in the development of climate resilient value chains, improving community livelihoods and socio-economic safety, with direct impacts on community resilience to climate change; and (iii) gain access to new employment opportunities which will also increase household incomes, and the project approach will focus specifically on the needs and ambitions of women and youth.

Social benefits such as women empowerment, job creation and improved (and organized) concertation between different ecosystems users will also result from the project interventions. The project includes an important gender perspective in its activities and targets. Women will represent 60% of direct beneficiaries of the project, in particular under component 2 and 3. This will undoubtedly directly also deliver socio-economic benefits at the regional level, spreading good practices and lessons learned to other neighboring communities. The socioeconomic benefits will in turn reduce pressures on natural resources, help ecosystems deliver valuable adaptation services, and increase community resilience to shocks, including those associated with climate.?

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 24August2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 7April 2022:

With regards to the budget, please charge all M&E activities to the M&E budget.

GEFSEC 7April 2022:

On budget: please remove the purple color as it makes difficult the reading

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

With regards to Annex E (project budget table):

A) Please provide a detailed breakdown of the "acquisition of equipment for 100 MSEs (50 per region, @\$20,000).".

B) Please provide a detailed breakdown of the "aquisition and installation of fencing material for 12 exclosure zones @100,000 each", as well as "Acquisition and installation of fencing material to reinforce the Katane exclosure @\$150000; Acquisition and installation of fencing material for 2 new large exclosures @\$250,000". Please also clarify if this is intended to reach as "exclosure" or "enclosure".

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - The budget totals are impossible to read -- they are completely bled into each other - both the column and the row on the bottom. Please revise. Currently, the amounts for travel, office supplies, and international consultants seem a bit high but it is unclear from the table the way it is presented currently.

3/8/2022 - The audit template submitted with this endorsement request has been reviewed and cleared from a technical and programmatic perspective. The financial, operational, and policy due diligence may reveal issues that may still need to be addressed by UNDP.

Agency Response

UNDP ? August 16, 2022

The budget notes of the workplan were revised to reflect the KM and communication roles of the experts recruited under the component on KM and communication. The adjustments were made in the budgets of the Project Document (Section IX and Annex 16) as well as in Annex E: project budget table in the GEF CEO Endorsement (GEF portal).

UNDP - 9Fev22:

A/ MSEs will be identified during the project implementation, based on their interest in participating to the project, their level of vulnerability and their potential for success. A detailed breakdown will therefore only be available based on the selection of MSEs and

their specific needs for support. At this stage of formulation, a global envelop for procuring this equipment has been included. According to the CEO ER, under output 3.1, the project will conduct a market analysis and development study to identify adaptation technology needs of the selected businesses. We can nevertheless expect that this will include equipment such as carts for the collection of NTFPs (to reduce the hardship from the long distances travelled by women), crusher, huller, press, fridge and/or solar freezer for the conservation of juices, storage warehouses, agricultural equipment in inputs (e.g. improved seeds, fencing, small agricultural equipment).

B/ This is the cost of fencing material over large perimeters (including poles and wire mesh).

In Senegal, enclosures and exclosures are two distinct activities. ?Exclosures? are defined as large fenced areas where no grazing from farm animals can occur (only wild animals) to support ecosystem regeneration, and in particular enhance wildlife regeneration for biodiversity conservation, in other words nature reserves.

?Enclosures? are defined as smaller fenced areas protected from animal grazing to support ecosystem regeneration and enhance ecosystem services, for the socio-economic benefit of local populations, in other words set-asides.

UNDP - 7Mar22

The Table was readjusted to ensure it is readable. Costs for travel, office supplies and international consultants are detailed under the budget notes in the Project Document (see section IX).

UNDP- 11 April 2022: Done

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 24August2022:

Cleared

GEFSEC 1 August 2022:

Please address the 3 final comments from the GEF Secretariat (project start date, M&E budget, gender indicators).

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Please address the set of comments in a resubmitted CER. In doing so, please provide a tracked changes or highlighted version in the document upload section.

GEFSEC, 2/24/2022 - In process

GEFSEC, 3/8/2022 - Yes.

Agency Response

UNDP 16 August 2022:

The project start and other dates were adjusted in the Project Document. The budgets (in the Section IX and Annex 16 of the Project Document and in Annex E: project budget table in the GEF CEO Endorsement (GEF portal)) were revised. The gender-sensitivity of the indicators and results was clarified in this response sheet.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Cleared

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 7April 2022:

Cleared.

GEFSEC 7April2022:

PPG report is not detailed enough and it's not clear if IUCN and UNDP execute PPG activities ? please provide details of what the activities below entail (please differentiate the items within each activity and provide the costs) as requested in this section (please remove the purple color as it makes difficult the reading)

Agency Response

UNDP 11 April 2022:

The table was updated, separating UNDP and IUCN budget. Both agencies received PPG funds (US\$110,000 for UNDP and US\$90,000 for IUCN) and conducted the studies and formulation in collaboration. The highlighting was removed.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 15Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

UNDP responses: 5 July 2022

Please find below responses to USA Council Member comments:

| USA Council member comments | UNDP Responses |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
|-----------------------------|----------------|

We recommend strengthening support for proactive drought policy options, including incentives for destocking early in drought. The only way to limit soil erosion from the more intense rainstorms is to maintain vegetation cover. The minimum cover value matters in these cases, not the average cover. If the proposal does not include support for drought destocking, overgrazing during drought will occur, followed by accelerated erosion.

Maintaining vegetation cover is indeed a key element of ecosystem services delivery, including reducing drought risk, biodiversity conservation, soil fertility, carbon stocks and production of forest products. The project area (Ferlo Biosphere Reserve - owned by local communities does not create pressure on the land conditions. Pressure is instead caused by transhumant herders traveling through the FBR (including largely from Mali and Mauritania).

Current legislation in Senegal regarding animal rearing and pastoralism, in line with the country's NDC, aims to sustainably manage and conserve pastoral resources, transhumance corridors, integration of forage crops, cross-border cooperation, development and strengthening of pastoral units. The main objective is good governance of pastoral activities.

The FBR is significantly used by nomadic pastoralists, which involves moving from an area to another, including to the south of Senegal, near the border with the Government of Mauritania, allowing for Mauritanian access to pastures. Destocking of weaker animals is practiced to reduce the size of the herds when leaving from their villages to southern regions to reduce the size of the herds and ease the travel, and earn cash for travel. In other countries of the region like Niger, destocking is a response to the risk of livestock loss from drought rather than a strategy to reduce degradation from grazing. Indeed, only large scale destocking is enough to reduce land degradation.

During important drought events, the government of Senegal provides the distribution of animal feed. Indeed, the nomadic and cultural relationship with neighbouring countries (Mauritania and Mali) is important. Senegal is a net importer of livestock, milk and meat are not produced locally and economic environment for the adoption of impactful and sustainable practices. On the contrary, these conditions have incentivized the government to increase the number of animal numbers and improve and modernize rearing practices. Senegal and reduced reliance on neighbouring countries for food security.

For the project to be successful, it is important to take into account the needs of herders and local communities, in particular ensuring food security and resilient practices. This is why the project proposes an integrated approach to develop and maintain vegetation cover:

The review and update of management plans of the Pastoral Area in the FBR to integrate the EbA approach. The objective is to provide the legal and operational framework for sustainable management of the territory, pastoral resources and community infrastructure. The project will support practices, such as grazing management practices (regeneration of pastures), cooperation with transhumant herders traveling through the FBR. The PRAPS project demonstrated that local communities could support herders to settle in another area when the availability of pastures and ecosystems at risk. The WB project, covering Niger and Senegal, developed a destocking strategy for the Ministry of Livestock and Animal Husbandry in case of crisis (drought, famine, etc.) to avoid losses for herders. The project will integrate the strategy into the management plans of the FBR. The destocking of animals in poor health condition, encouraging the sale of healthy animals. To this end, the project will first conduct local-level

●Barrier 1 identifies part of the problem (governance), but its solution does not adequately address this risk. Without a change in incentives (including the way that drought aid is allocated), enforcement will be difficult if not impossible.

Barrier 1 is: ?Weak governance mechanisms, limited institutional support EbA

The government of Senegal has shown, over the last twenty years, a strong commitment to climate action, notably through its Nationally Determined Contribution process of drafting the National Adaptation Plan (NAP). The consultations with stakeholders revealed that climate change is currently being integrated into the budgeting of national technical departments and regional authorities. However, EbA has not yet been mainstreamed. Moreover, the consultations with multisectoral bodies responsible for the participatory management of the FBR and the PCT. The major challenge therefore lies in the coordination of the work that will be then responsible for the coordination of sectoral policies and the implementation of training courses illustrating the opportunities. These educational contents, based on concrete examples, will be developed by the technical services of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, other relevant ministries but also in the decentralized administrative authorities, and the groups of municipalities at both strategic levels.

Considering the importance of livestock for food security and livelihoods, the availability, the aid provided by the Government during droughts is crucial for animal feed. Even with a stronger governance, it is unlikely to be prioritized. As explained in the response to the first comment, the solution to land degradation but it will adversely impact the availability of animal feed. This will lead to increased imports of livestock and meat from Mali and Niger, which will only be displaced to neighbouring countries. In addition, the consultations with Senegal allow for cross-border travels for herders, and Mali to destock, might make use of the freed grazing areas to augment their livestock and livestock products will need to travel longer distances, further causing pressure on ecosystem if transported by walk, truck or train.

Barrier 1 and the solutions under outcome 1 highlight the need to strengthen local level capacities regarding Ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change, risk management, and the enforcement and upscaling of the solutions under outcomes 2 and 3. In particular, under outcome 2, the introduction of grazing enclosures will ensure the protection of critical lands from degradation. The improved governance under outcome 1 will, in turn, ensure the effective management of these spaces. Please refer to the response to comment 1 for more details on the management practices that will be supported by the project.

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>●The proposal defines the land degradation problem relatively well, but the proposed solutions will likely not work unless combined with a change in the incentive structure, which encourages pastoralists to hold onto their livestock through the drought.</p> | <p>In the Senegalese context, pastoralists are encouraged to hold onto their livestock through the drought, and creating incentives to destock is unlikely to be a viable solution:</p> <p>The government is not willing to reduce the number of animals, as it would undermine the more organized, productive and modernized rearing industry and lead to increased imports;</p> <p>Herders want to sell their livestock at specific periods of the year, such as the Kebir, when demand is very high and insufficient, with high prices;</p> <p>When fodder and water are scarce, herders travel, as they are nomadic. Reducing the number of animals would be perceived as forcing sedentarism on those who are nomadic;</p> <p>Decreasing the number of animals for Senegalese herders would lead to increased imports to occupy the area, in accordance with the agreement signed with the EU.</p> |
| <p>We recommend updating this project with these enhanced incentives, and the theory of change should be modified accordingly.</p> | |

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 24 August 2022 - Cleared.

GEFSEC, 15April2022- Cleared, pending any further comment on policy adherence.

7April 2022 - A limited number of policy related comments remain to be addressed.

5April2022 - This project is recommended for technical clearance as all remaining technical comments have been addressed, pending any further policy-oriented comments.

GEFSEC, 3/8/2022 - Not yet. Please review the co-financing entries and justify those which are labelled as investment mobilized? There is currently no justification provided. Additionally, all but two of the co-financing letters are provided in French -- these must be translated, according to GEF policy. Please also refer to the item on co-financing regarding the seemingly incompatible timelines of the co-financing initiatives with the proposed project.

Review Dates**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement****Response to
Secretariat
comments**

| | |
|---|-------------------|
| First Review | 12/15/2021 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 2/24/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 3/8/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/5/2022 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 4/7/2022 |

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**