



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

GEF ID:	<b>5566</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Senegal</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening Land &amp; Ecosystem Management Under Conditions of Climate Change in the Niayes and Casamance Regions- Republic of Senegal</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4964 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCA-2; CCA-3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$4,100,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$43,700,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$47,950,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Bonizella Biagini</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mame Dagou Diop</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	YES. Senegal is an LDCF Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	<p>NOT CLEAR. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point of Senegal and dated October 8, 2012, is attached to the submission. However, the amount endorsed is \$4.305 million, inclusive of PPG and Agency fee, whereas the total amount requested in the submission is \$4.878 million.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the amount requested in the PIF; inclusive of project grant, PPG and Agency fee; is equal to or smaller than the amount endorsed by the Operational Focal Point.</p>	

		<p>2013/09/23 – YES. A revised Letter of Endorsement is attached to the submission, for a total LDCF amount of \$4.69 million, and the proposed project grant and Agency fee have been adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to Section 16 below.</p>	
<p>Resource Availability</p>	<p>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 2 above.</p> <p>Also note that in addition to the \$8.902 million that Senegal has already accessed from the LDCF in support of NAPA implementation, the Operational Focal Point has endorsed a request of \$6.985 million (PMIS ID 5503) towards a new proposal with FAO as the Implementing Agency.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Given the LDCF resources that Senegal has hitherto accessed, kindly coordinate with the Operational Focal Point and other Implementing Agencies in order to ensure that the additional financing sought is available in accordance with the principle of equitable access.</p> <p>2013/09/23 – YES.</p>	

	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><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></p>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA objectives 2 and 3.	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	YES. The proposed project would directly address Senegal's NAPA priorities on mangrove restoration, dune fixation, agro-forestry and water resources management in the coastal regions. The project is aligned with the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2013-2017) and the Framework of Short-Term Sector-based Expenses of the Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection, as well as other relevant policies, plans and legislation.	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	YES. The proposed project would build on and strengthen the following baseline initiatives: (i) CIDA's Program for Land Use and Economic Development of Niayes (PADEN) (CAN\$19.9 million); (ii) CIDA's Economic Development of Casamance Program (PADEC) (CAN\$19.8 million); and the (iii) EU/WWF/UNDP Program on coastal and marine resources governance in the West African ecoregion (\$2 million in indicative co-financing). The project	

		<p>carried out by the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development and the National Meteorological Agency (ANAMS).</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project framework (Table B) is broadly clear and sound. Please refer, however, to the recommendations made in sections 2 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 2 and 8, please adjust the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>2013/09/23 – YES.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. In general, the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>The PIF could, however, further describe the relationship between the proposed investments in hydro-meteorological monitoring and decision support services provided under Component 1, and the tangible, climate-resilient technologies piloted under Component 2. How would the two components and their associated activities be sequenced? To what extent would Component 1 be informed by Component 2? Similarly, to what extent is Component 1 expected to inform and enhance the investments planned as part of the baseline scenario, particularly the two CIDA projects?</p> <p>With respect to Component 3, it is not entirely clear what is meant by the “iterative and participatory evaluation of outcomes [”] through the use of</p>	

		<p>broad description of Output 3.3 does not appear to capture well the range of associated communication and knowledge management activities outlined on p. 12.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 12 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide further information regarding the relationship between components 1 and 2, their intended sequencing, and the extent to which the former could inform the latter, along with relevant baseline investments; (ii) clarify the description of Component 3.</p> <p>2013/09/23 –“ YES. The additional reasoning has been clarified as requested.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, has been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>YES. The PIF considers relevant risks and associated, appropriate mitigation measures adequately for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section A.4 makes no reference to the Adaptation Fund project</p>	

	<p>or in the region?</p>	<p>Vulnerable Areas, nor the World Bank Senegal River Basin Climate Change Resilient Development Project. In addition, the project could seek appropriate ways to draw on and coordinate with the planned LDCF investments in hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning systems in the region.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that Section A.4 outlines how coordination and complementarity will be ensured with all relevant adaptation projects and programs planned or underway in Senegal and the wider regions.</p> <p>2013/09/23 “ YES. The re-submission describes adequately how appropriate arrangements for coordination and collaboration with ongoing LDCF and Adaptation Fund projects will be established during project preparation.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project’s <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project’s strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project’s intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project shows potential for innovation and sustainability, but this question will be revisited once above recommendations have been addressed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under sections 8 and 12.</p> <p>2013/09/23 “ YES. The proposed project would strengthen “ in a comprehensive manner “ the abilities of Senegal’s national hydro-meteorological service, as well as extension services in the ministries of agriculture, livestock and water</p>	

		<p>and apply hydro-meteorological and climate information for resilient development planning and effective adaptation. Drawing on improved climate information services, the project would demonstrate cost-effective, ecosystem-based adaptation measures in two target areas.</p> <p>Thanks to the close alignment of the proposed project with significant baseline initiatives and financing, the project is well placed to achieve sustainable adaptation benefits, with a credible pathway to scaling up.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 2, 8 and 12 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 2, 8 and 12, please adjust the proposed LDCF and co-financing amounts as appropriate.</p> <p>2013/09/23 – NOT CLEAR. While the project framework has been revised in accordance with the revised Letter of Endorsement, Table D on Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested has yet to be adjusted. Moreover, the Agency fee</p>	

		<p>fee associated with the project grant, excluding the fee associated with the proposed PPG.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) adjust the Agency fee in the project identification box on p. 1 of the PIF and (ii) Table D in line with the revised Letter of Endorsement provided by the OFP, and to ensure consistency within the PIF.</p> <p>10/02/2013 â€œ YES.</p>	
	<p>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 bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>YES. At \$43.7 million, the indicative amount of co-financing is adequate. In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$2.5 million towards the proposed project.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>YES. At \$205,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIE</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?</p>	<p>YES. At \$150,000 the requested PPG is in accordance with the norm for projects seeking less than \$6 million.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant</p>		



	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 2, 3, 7, 8, 12, 13 and 16.  2013/09/23 “ NOT YET. Please refer to Section 16.  10/02/2013 “ YES. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 25, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 23, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 02, 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.**