Integrated project to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable communities and ecosystems in a changing climate

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12082
Countries
Senegal
Project Name
Integrated project to strengthen the resilience of vulnerable communities and ecosystems in a changing climate
Agencies
UNDP
Date received by PM
9/18/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Jason Spensley
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

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

October 1. 2025

Yes:

Agency's Comments

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

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 2025:

1) We note that paragraph 8 indicates that "flooding has been identified as the priority issue to be addressed in the project area". Please explain who has identified the priority issue in the specific project area, how this prioritization has been made, and reference the specific documents and plans.

2) We appreciated the climate information on temperature and precipitation change. However, little information is provided on current and anticipated trends of flooding, and corresponding impacts. Please strengthen.

3) Output 2.2.1: How specifically will "Support alternative economic models (e.g., integrated fish farming, agro ecotourism)" be achieved? Similarly, how will the general statement of "Promote climate-resilient agricultural practices" be achieved. Greater specificity is required as to the strategies to be deployed to achieve these general ambitions, and how these objectives will address increased frequency and severity of flooding.

4) Output 3.1.1.: We note the general statement that "The project will support innovative financing mechanisms to attract private investment in adaptation actions." But the it is not clear what innovative financing mechanisms are being referred to, how they will operate and be incentivized etc. Please strengthen with specificity on the innovative financing mechanism(s) that will be deployed, the design features, who will manage it, how its sustainability will be ensured after the project ends. In doing so, please ensure sufficient funds to prepare, launch, and catalyze private sector investment in these mechanism(s), even if this require s reducing budget from other project elements.

5) Please expand on how the project will strengthen focus and availability of inclusive microfinance at just terms for small holder farmers and entrepreneurs to gain the capital they need to transition to more flood resilient practices. In doing so, please ensure sufficient budget for this work, and partners engaged including microfinance institutions.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

1) Thank you for your comment. Paragraph 8 has been redrafted to provide more information related to the selection of flood at the institutional level and the rationale for prioritization.

2) In order to address your comment additional sub-sections have been added specifically on floods to present trends related to flooding (para. 13), flood projections (para. 17 and 18) and the impact of floods in Senegal (paragraph 20-23). All these sections provide specific information on occurrence of floods in Senegal and its impacts based on existing data.

3) Under output 2.2.1, the following activities have been detailed as follows:
- On support to alternative economic models, introduction of an effective and efficient fish culture techniques, construction of earthen ponds and training on fish culture techniques and fishing skills. The proposed interventions under this component provide innovations to small scale fishers, including women and young groups, to build resilience livelihood systems through modern aquaculture techniques. Ecotourism intends to contribute to the conservation of the natural environment and will include birdwatching and wildlife safaris, hiking and trekking, walking trails etc. The project will provide training for local eco-guides.
- On the promotion of climate-resilient agricultural practices, climate resilient practices have been added to include conservation agriculture, crop rotation, and integrated pest management to enhance soil health and reduce environmental impact. The development and distribution of climate-resilient crop varieties?those that are tolerant to drought, heat, salinity, and flooding?will ensure stable yields under unpredictable weather patterns. Agroforestry and contour farming, also play a critical role in slowing water runoff and reducing soil erosion during floods.

Promoting climate-resilient agricultural practices directly addresses the increased frequency and severity of flooding by introducing a range of adaptive strategies aimed at reducing vulnerability and enhancing recovery. These efforts are supported through capacity-building initiatives, farmer training, and policies that promote sustainable land use, infrastructure investment, and financial tools like crop insurance, all of which contribute to minimizing flood-related agricultural losses.

4) Additional details have been added under Outcome 3.1 and Output 3.1.1 to further detail innovative financing mechanisms, stakeholders, incentives and levers. At PIF stage, preliminary discussions took place with La Banque Agricole (LBA), however more will be needed during the PPG to further detail their modalities. The design will also lean on the lessons learned from ongoing projects, such as the SCALA project. A paragraph was added

under Output 3.1.1 to explain that more information will be provided during the PPG phase as follows:
The project will engage with a range of microfinance institutions? commercial banks, rural banks, microfinance institutions, and other relevant financial actors to co-design tailored financial products that suit the needs and realities of smallholder farmers. These packages may include: seasonal credit with grace periods aligned with cropping cycles, group-based lending schemes with reduced collateral requirements, insurance-linked credit for climate-related risks, low-interest loans, flexible repayment schedules, low-interest financing for inputs, irrigation systems, and small-scale infrastructure etc... The co-development process will involve participatory stakeholder consultations to ensure products are farmer-friendly and gender-responsive.
Matching grants are also an option considered to derisk investment in NBS solutions with commercial rationale. The project will also consider capacity building for applicants to existing green products as some are currently being rolled out, for instance by LBA, and noting that this trend is expected to continue in the upcoming years and is aligned with current government policy on developping a green taxonomy for agroecology investment.
All details will be discussed during the PPG phase. During the PIF stage, La Banque Agricole BA has demonstrated interest in participating to the project. However more discussion will be undertaken during the PPG phase to come up with specific products.

5) As explained under point 4, the project will strengthen the availability of microfinance through partnership with microfinance institutions based on lessons learned from ongoing projects (SCALA), this has been reflected in the revised text. Additional budget has been allocated under Outcome 3 to account for these activities.

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

Secretariat's Comments

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 2025:

1) No, not sufficiently. There is limited information and explicit integration of gender considerations in the design of the project. Please strengthen gender dimensions throughout the project components.

2) Please ensure that in the development of the project (and after gender analysis is undertaken), gender perspectives and actions to promote women?s empowerment are included in project outcomes and outputs. On knowledge products, awareness-raising, south-south exchanges, please ensure also to capture good practices in advancing women?s empowerment and gender equality, and that these are widely disseminated. Under M&E, beyond gender-disaggregated outcomes, please also monitor and report on lessons learned and best practices in implementing the gender-related activities/interventions of the project, and that these are included in PIRs, MTR and TE.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

1) Correction have been made to include Gender dimension throughout all components of the project. Para. 63 was added to note that ?The project will systematically strengthen the gender dimensions by ensuring that all components are designed and implemented in a gender-responsive and inclusive manner, recognizing the differentiated needs, roles, and capacities of women, men, and gender-diverse individuals in the context of climate resilience and livelihoods?. Under Output 1.1.2, the project will ensure women ?s participation within the project governance committees and as beneficiaries of technical support and training. Under output 2.2.1, support to agricultural communities will ensure that women and most vulnerable are equal beneficiaries. Under output 3.1.1, the project will ensure that women and youth entrepreneurs will particularly be targeted.

Moreover, a gender action plan will be prepared during the PPG to (i) facilitate equality in accessing project benefits by both men and women and (ii) ensure that women are actively consulted and engaged in project design, decision-making, implementation and monitoring processes; and (iii) collect gender disaggregated data/information to inform M&E and adaptive management responses.

2) This is noted and considerations will be considered in the preparation of the Gender Action Plan.

Component 4 has been restructured to include project communication and knowledge sharing while assessment has been introduced in the Monitoring and assessment component (Component 5). Under this component, it is specified that: ?the project will capture good practices in advancing women?s empowerment and gender equality?.

Under Component 5 and Outcome 5.1, it is specified that ?the project will implement a robust-informed gender responsive Monitoring and Evaluation plan that collects both gender and sex-disaggregated data with gender sensitive collection methods and will include gender specific indicators to record progress in gender mainstreaming efforts and women?s empowerment?. These will be reported on in the project reporting, to be evaluated during MTR and TE.

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

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

October 1. 2025:

Please note the comments above on project description.

Agency's Comments

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

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 2025:

Please note the comments above on project description.

We note the frequent reference to GEBs and limited reference to climate adaptation benefits. Please revise throughout to focus more directly on climate adaptation impacts.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

The project description has been corrected accordingly. Adaptation benefits have been further expanded on in paragraph 97-99. Other co-benefits, including GEBs, are presented separately in para. 102.

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

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 2025:

Inadequate attention seems to be placed on ensuring access to capital and accessible terms for smallholder farmers and entrepreneurs to transition. Please strengthen.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

Thank you for your comment. This constraint has been highlighted during the stakeholders consultations during the PIF process. In addition to revisions made under Output 3.1 above, an additional barrier has been included in relation to the limited access to capital and accessible terms for smallholder farmers and entrepreneurs to transition (See Barrier 3 and 4 and the revised Theory of Change).

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

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 202

The ambition for the number of people and hectares are low. Please increase. The number of private sector enterprises engaged is also very low, especially given the projects generalized statement of focus on entrepreneurs in component 3. Please strengthen.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

Indicators have been revised and increased as follows:

Direct beneficiaries: the project will directly benefit 362,882 people distributed as follows: 10% of the population of Saint Louis, (106,354); 3% of the population of Louga, (29,307); 10% of the population of Thi?s (32,394); 5% of the population of Dakar (194,827)

The total surface restored/under improved management for climate resilience has been increased to 25,000 ha, divided as follows: 10,000 ha of protected ecosystems within the Niayes, 5,000 ha in the urban and peri-urban zone around Dakar, 10,000 ha of degraded agricultural land restored within the Niayes.

The project will support 50 SMEs in each target region, for a total of 200 SMEs within the project zones.

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

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

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 2025:

Financial durability/sustainability aspects are week. Please strengthen with specificity.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

The exit strategy has been further strengthened, focusing on the sustainability of the physical project investments and the financial sustainability of the project (See para. 58 to 60:

58. The exit strategy for the proposed project requires that after project completion: i) the understanding and uptake of NbS for flood control in urban and peri-urban continues to be advanced through knowledge management (component 4); ii) the coordination mechanisms strengthened, strategies and plans developed, information and knowledge base built, and enhanced capacity continue to support flood control through NbS interventions; and iii) NbS interventions ? i.e. the restored wetland and retention basins? and permeable paving implemented under Component 2 are regularly monitored and maintained.

59. Sustainability of physical project interventions: First and foremost, strengthen the capacities of local authorities and decentralized institutions in project sites (e.g. through Output 2.1), as they are key stakeholders for the project?s success. The ecosystems rehabilitated by the project will be maintained through arrangements and practices established in existing planning frameworks. The sustainability of the restored wetland will be ensured through the local existing framework (urban development plans and land use plans (POS, SDAU) with the support of the coordination committees (Comit? local Coordination du projet - CLCP) (Output 1.1.2). Similarly, the rehabilitated retention basins will be maintained the associations for local and collective management AGCI (association de gestion Communautaire et institutionnelle) established by the project (Output 1.1.1). The permeable pavement demonstration areas will be maintained beyond the project period by the Minist?re de l?urbanisme, Minist?re de l?hydraulique et de l?assainissement (DGPRE), DGPI?) along with the institutions providing the demonstration sites. During the project preparation, it will be emphasized that stakeholder engagement process throughout the project life cycle will build on existing initiatives of the communities that will be found at project site to resolving flood problems in their localities.

60. Financial sustainability: As part of the capacity-building interventions, the project will provide training to city authorities and community organisations on identification of potential

integrated flood management interventions. In addition, the valuation of the benefits provided by urban ecosystems (Output .2.1) will encourage decision-makers to continue maintaining the ecosystems restored under the project and to invest further in such adaptation interventions. the project benefits will be maintained after implementation because of the: i) visible benefits of NbS interventions and permeable paving; ii) increased technical capacity of national and local government; iii) built-in monitoring and evaluation of project interventions; iv) presence of a sustainable knowledge management system; and v) availability of financing for maintaining or scaling up of initiatives. In addition, project outcomes have been designed to be scalable and replicable at national and local level.

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

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 2025:

Given biodiversity is indicated as 1, please 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).

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

The text has been revised to identify the targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Frame that the project contributes to (See para. 118):

?The project contributes to the Kumming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework through Target 2 (restore 30% of degraded ecosystems (terrestrial, inland water, coastal, marine)) with the restoration of 10,000 hectares of degraded wetland ecosystem in the Niayes. This directly supports the goal to restore at least 30% of degraded ecosystems globally. It also contributes to Target 11 (Restore and enhance nature?s contributions to people), enhancing ecosystem services such as water filtration and flood regulation. In addition, the project contributes to target 10 (Sustainable use of biodiversity in agriculture, forestry, and fisheries), target 20 (Strengthen capacity-building, technology transfer, and innovation) and target 23 (Gender equality and the role of women and youth in biodiversity) through the rehabilitation of the ecosystems and gender-responsive approaches.?

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

November 13, 2025:

Cleared.

November 3, 2025:

The comment below is still not yet addressed. The M&E component still lacks outcomes, outputs and there is no co-financing budget allocated for M&E. Please request the Agency to correct and revise the component table and resubmit the project.

1 October, 2025:

M&E component lacks outcomes, outputs, and financial information ? instead, the monitoring part is included in Component 4. Please delink the monitoring part from component 4 to include it in M&E component.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 3 November 2025: The component table has been revised to include the M&E outcome and output introduced in the previous revision and an allocation of 60,000 USD has been added as co-financing for the M&E activities.

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

Thank you for your comment. The document has been revised accordingly. A Monitoring and evaluation assessment component has been included with outcome 5.1 and Output 5.1.1 and Output 5.1.2, under the M&E component. A comprehensive M&E plan will also be prepared during the PPG.

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

Secretariat's Comments

October 1. 2025:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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 CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

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 CommentsYes

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

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

October 1. 2025:

Please strive to increase the number of co-finance sources and scale.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025:

Two additional co-financing for a total of USD 10 million have been identified and included in the indicative co-financing table, bringing the total co-financing to USD 49.6 million.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsYes

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 CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

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 CommentsN/A

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 CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

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 CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's CommentsPlease note comment above on biodiversity Rio maker

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025: Noted and addressed above.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

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 CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

November 13, 2025:

Cleared, pending final review and clearance by OP.

October 28, 2025:

Pending further OP review.

Agency's Comments**UNDP, 27 October 2025:** The comments have been addressed.

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

Secretariat's Comments

October 28, 2025:

Cleared

In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please consider and demonstrate how the GAP?s implementation will be ensured (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.)

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 27 October 2025: The comment is noted with thanks and will be considered in the preparation of the GAP during the PPG.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	**10/1/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/28/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/3/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/13/2025**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		