



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5371		
Country/Region:	Senegal		
Project Title:	Project for the Restoration and Strengthening the Resilience of the Lake de Guiers Wetland Ecosystems (PRRELAG)		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,315,525
Co-financing:	\$27,352,708	Total Project Cost:	\$28,668,233
PIF Approval:	September 09, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Souleye Kitane

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	04/23/13: Yes	10-15-15 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	04/23/2013: Yes, the OFP has endorsed the project in a letter dated February 12, 2013 for a total amount of US\$2,000,000. Cleared.	10-15-15 Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	04/23/2013: The BD resources remaining to be allocated are US\$ 1,550,000 as April 23, 2013. Therefore the proposed grant is within the resources available.	10-15-15 Cleared

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		06/24/2013: As mentioned, the remaining BD resources is about US\$ 1,550,000; therefore the project proposal (including fees and PPG) cannot exceed this amount. Please update accordingly. 07/26/2013: Addressed.	
	• the focal area allocation?	04/23/2013: See comment in Item 3. 07/26/2013: Addressed.	10-15-15 Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A	NA
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	04/23/13: The project aims to notably improve the sustainable management of biodiversity in PA, therefore the objective BD-1 could also be targeted. Please identify the project contribution to the Aichi targets together with SMART indicators in Table B to track the progress. 06/24/2013: Addressed. Objective BD 1 has been added to Table A and METT indicators included in Table B. Please, mention in the text the Aichi targets that the project will contribute. It is noted that indicators will be further developed for CEO endorsement. 07/26/2013: Addressed. It is noted that indicators and MEET will be further developed for CEO endorsement.	10-15-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	04/23/2013: The description of the project coherency with national strategies is comprehensive. It is noted that the project will supports the key elements of national strategy for the conservation of biodiversity, the NAPA, and the Document de Politique Economique et Social. Cleared.	10-15-15 Cleared
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>04/23/2013: Preliminary information on the baseline is provided. However, regarding the biodiversity status, please provide further detailed on the status of globally significant species, status of the PA management (specify its IUCN category). Furthermore, please mention the on-going action of other key actors of the region, such as OMVS, IUCN, Birdlife; and specify when the PREFEL has started.</p> <p>06/24/2013: Comprehensive information regarding on-going programs has been provided. The baseline on the status of globally significant species is still lacking. Please, list the major species living or nesting in this area and their population status. Annex1, only the name of the PA is mentioned; therefore, please fill the rest of the table with the requested information (Area in hectares, global designation, IUCN category).</p> <p>07/26/2013: Annex1 has been updated. The baseline on the status of globally significant species is still lacking, please, list the species of global importance living or nesting in this area and their population status.</p>	10-15-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		09/05/2013: Cleared.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>04/23/2013: No, please provide outcomes with indicators and clear expected outputs in Table B to track the progress. Please further explain which kind of restoration will be implemented. Same comment for the shared management framework, please clarify how this activity will benefit the avifauna status in the Ndial reserve. Regarding component 2, please demonstrate how the activities will secure sustainability. Please detail the kind of training which will be developed and which organization will be in charge of the Information/ observatory system.</p> <p>06/24/2013: Table B has been updated. It is well noted that indicators will be refined for CEO endorsement; however at PIF stage, please provide the following information: Component 1/ Output 1.2: give an insight of the number of local ecosystem based management which will be supported by the project and clarify the expected outcomes (i.e. support to establishment only or support to implementation phase). Component 2/ how do you expect to increase the PA METT with only capacity building activities? An increase of 70% of the METT score is optimistic. Does the current METT score is available for this PA?</p> <p>Three points have not been addressed in the response:</p>	10-15-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(i) Information regarding the kind of restoration that the GEF project will support: the GEF does not fund ecosystem restoration. Therefore, be more specific on the kind of activities that will be implemented to reverse the ecosystem degradation.</p> <p>(ii) shared management framework are missing. Please, be more explicit about the governance and purpose of these frameworks. Furthermore, explain how these frameworks will secure sustainability.</p> <p>(iii) the observatory: please further explain which kind of activity will be funded by the GEF. Please confirm that the observatory will not be a new entity but will be a monitoring system implemented by an existing organization.</p> <p>07/26/2013: Most of the information requested has not been provided.</p> <p>Component 1: As already mentioned, GEF doesn't fund restoration activities, therefore, be more specific on the kind of activities that will be implemented to reverse the ecosystem degradation. Please, clarify the purpose and expected outputs of the local ecosystem based management. Furthermore, explain how these frameworks will secure sustainability.</p> <p>Component 2: How do you expect to increase the PA METT with only capacity building activities? An increase of 70% of the METT score is optimistic. Does the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>current METT score is available for this PA?</p> <p>09/07/2013: It is noted that the restoration activities, consisting of rewatering the Ndiael's area, will be undertaken by PREFEL. The project will finance the ecosystem based management activities, water quality management. It is noted that METT will be delivered at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>04/23/2013: The GEB is the upgrade of a site of international importance as a migration route for Palearctique and Afro tropical birds and the reduced impacts of productive landscape through adoption of a shared management framework. Please be more specific on the nb of hectare concerned by the project (total ha of the reserve, ha concerned by the restoration activities, ha concerned by the shared management framework).</p> <p>07/26/2013: Addressed.</p>	10-15-15 Cleared
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		10-15-15 Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	04/23/2013: Public participation and communities involvement are mentioned under the activities. However, please provide further information on how the communities will be involved in the preparation and implementation of the	10-15-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		shared management framework. 06/24/2013: The comment has not been addressed, please provide further information on how the communities will be involved in the preparation and implementation of the shared management framework. 09/07/2013: Cleared.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	04/23/2013: Sufficient information is provided at PIF stage. At CEO approval, please provide a full consideration of the potential risk and mitigation measures with regards to coordinating within and between ministries and private sector.	10-15-15 Cleared
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	04/23/2013: Further detail needs to be provided regarding the coordination with NGOs and OMVS on-going work. 06/24/2013: The Office du Lac de Guiers, which is the national implementing agency, will sign an MoU with major NGOs and OMVS. Detail of institutional arrangements will be provided at CEO endorsement. Cleared.	10-15-15 Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency 	04/23/2013: Innovation: please further detail the approach of common governance and how it will be applied in the context of the project. Sustainability: the project will upgrade the PA status. But please clarify how the suggested outputs will be sustained, after the end of the project. Scaling-up: if successful, this project has the potential to be replicated in other	10-15-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>downgraded PA.</p> <p>06/24/2013: Please further describe the approach of the "local convention" and how it will ensure sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>07/26/2013: Please further describe the approach of the "local convention" and how it will ensure sustainability of project outcomes and sustainability.</p> <p>09/07/2013: Further information has been provided. At CEO endorsement, socio-economic outcomes and how this approach will be applied in the context of Ndial will have to be further developed. Cleared.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		10-15-15 Cleared
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		10-15-15 Cleared
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	04/23/2013: Yes. Financing and cofinancing amounts are appropriate for the activities.	10-15-15 Cleared
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency	04/23/2013: Cofinancing ratio is about 1:13; which is very good. The AfDB contribution is about 19,705,000 in soft loan.	10-15-15 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	04/23/2013: The PMC is under 5%. which is fine.	10-15-15 Cleared
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	04/23/2013: PPG is approved.	10-15-15 Cleared
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	04/23/2013: There is no non-grant instrument in the project.	10-15-15 Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		10-15-15 Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		10-15-15 Cleared
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
	24. Is PIF clearance/approval	04/23/2013: The project proposal cannot	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	being recommended?	<p>be recommended at this stage. Please address the issue raised above.</p> <p>06/24/2013: The project proposal cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the remaining issues.</p> <p>07/26/2013: The project proposal cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the remaining issues.</p> <p>09/07/2013: The project is recommended for approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Please consider the following items at CEO endorsement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provide METT - define target for each outcomes' indicators - clear description of activities addressing ecosystem degradation - presentation of the "local convention" governance applied to Ndiael's context - 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		5-15-10 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	April 23, 2013	October 15, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 24, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	July 26, 2013	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.