



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

GEF ID:	5503		
Country/Region:	Senegal		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Ecosystem-based Approaches to Climate-resilient Rural Livelihoods in Vulnerable Rural Areas through the Farmer Field School Methodology		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,228,995
Co-financing:	\$24,607,385	Total Project Cost:	\$30,836,380
PIF Approval:	January 29, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	February 27, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	William Settle,

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 ?	Yes, Senegal is an LDC and Party to UNFCCC.	YES. No change from PIF.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter dated February 15, 2013 is on file.	YES. No change from PIF.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the funding amount requested is available to Senegal under the principle of equitable access.	YES. No change from PIF.

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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 project is aligned with the LDCF results framework and strategic objectives, including CCA-1, CCA-2, and CCA-3.	YES. No change from PIF.
	<p>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?</p>	Yes, adaptation in agriculture is a priority for Senegal according to its national strategies and plans, including its NAPA.	YES. No change from PIF. The proposed project would contribute towards the continued implementation of Senegal's NAPA, particularly the priorities pertaining to resilient agricultural production and rural livelihoods. Moreover, the project is in line with the 2001 Environmental Code, the 2005 Action Plan for the Environment, the 2010 National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change as well as the PRSP II (2010).
	<p>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>	Yes, the underlying problem and the various baseline initiatives undertaken, among others, national agencies such as Senegal River Valley National Development Agency, Societe de Development et des Fibres Textiles du Senegal, Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural, as well as bilateral,	YES. There is no significant change from PIF with regard to the baseline situation, the baseline scenario, and the investments and initiatives on which the proposed LDCF grant would build and that it would enhance. The proposed LDCF grant would

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		such as USAID and multilateral agencies, such as AfDB, are well described.	contribute towards the following baseline initiatives: (i) the Agricultural Value Chain Support Project; (ii) the Project to Support Food Security in the Regions of Louga, Matam and Kaffrine; (iii) the Program to Support Agricultural Development and Rural Entrepreneurship; (iv) the Project to Support Local, Small-Scale Irrigation in the Areas of Fatick, Kedougou, Kolda and Tambacounda; and (iv) the Great Green Wall Initiative.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Not clear. The components and associated information is clear, but under what is currently component 2, there are a number of outputs that could be categorized as mostly technical assistance.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please disaggregate component 2 so that it is clear how much LDCF financing will be dedicated to investment versus technical assistance.</p> <p>Update 9/13/2013: Thank you for the clarifications provided. However, it remains unclear what proportion of the financing of component 2 would be dedicated to TA versus investments. Please note that at this stage indicative figures are sufficient.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide an indicative breakdown of the financing and cofinancing of the project subcomponents 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3.</p>	YES. The components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework are clear and appropriately detailed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update 10/9/2013: The breakdown has been provided. This is satisfactory.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, the adaptation benefits are identified and additional reasoning is well-articulated.	YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement and the FAO Project Document provide a clear description of the expected adaptation benefits and the additional reasoning for the proposed LDCF grant.
	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?		YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	No, the role of CSO is unclear. In addition, there is no explanation on whether inclusion of indigenous people is foreseen. Recommended action: Please clarify how the CSO will be included in this project. In addition, please consider inclusion of indigenous people participation, or, alternatively, provide justifications. Update 9/13/2013: The clarifications provided in the revised submission are helpful, and it is understood that the relevant CSOs will be identified and specific roles will be defined during the implementation phase. However, please note that a plan for including the CSOs, also in the	YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, is adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and FAO Project Document.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>preparation/consultative stages of the project is needed.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please highlight the plan for the inclusion of the CSOs, indigenous people, gender groups and/or any other, as appropriate, in the preparation stage of the project.</p> <p>Update 10/9/2013: Cleared. As clarified in the revised submission and additional communication on 10/9/2013, the project will prepare a Stakeholder Participation Plan, and will hold a stakeholders' workshop during the project design phase.</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>Not entirely. Major risks appear to be addressed with adequate risk mitigation measures. However, in case of the risk of buy-in from communities and stakeholders, the mitigation measure is unclear, particularly considering that the involvement of the civil society is unclear in the proposal.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please see comment under no. 10, and reconsider the relevant mitigation measures, specifically enriching the measures through a more robust involvement of all stakeholders, including, importantly, in the upstream stages of the project.</p> <p>Update 9/13/2013: Please see comment under no. 10, concerning the involvement of CSOs and other groups, as relevant, during the</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks and associated mitigation measures are adequately described in the Request for CEO Endorsement and FAO project document.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>preparation stage of the project.</p> <p>Update 10/9/2013: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes, the project appears to be well coordinated with other related initiatives in the country.</p>	<p>YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives is adequately described in the FAO Project Document.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>The project uses an approach that is sustainable and has the potential for scaling up, including through substantive knowledge-sharing if appropriate networks and partnerships (whether formal or informal) exist.</p>	<p>YES. The FAO Project Document provides a detailed description of the proposed sustainability strategy and the potential for scaling up the expected outcomes.</p> <p>The proposed project adopts a participatory approach with a strong interface at the community level in the form of farmer field schools (FFS), community radios and producers' organizations. The extensive field-testing of more sustainable and more resilient agricultural and sylvo-pastoral production systems and technology will contribute towards the long-term viability of the selected approaches, while increasing the likelihood of broader adoption beyond the populations and areas immediately targeted by the project. Moreover, through a concerted effort to integrate climate change risks into policies at the national level, and establish a longer term funding channel for climate resilience, the project presents a clear pathway for 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>YES.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		YES. The cost-effectiveness of the proposed project is adequately demonstrated in the Request for CEO Endorsement.
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?	Yes.	YES. The proposed grant and co-financing per component seems adequate and appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes.
	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?	Yes.	YES. Adequate confirmation is provided for all sources and amounts of co-financing.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	YES. At \$296,618, or five per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.
	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?	The PPG requested does not deviate from the norm.	YES.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	n/a	NA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		YES. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool has been completed with baselines and targets for relevant indicators.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement responds adequately to the comments made by members of the LDCF/SCCF Council.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please see comments under 7, 9, 10, and 11. Update 9/13/2013: Note yet. Please see additional comments under 7, 10, and 11. Update 10/9/2013: The project is ready to be recommended for approval. 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	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		YES.
	First review*		September 14, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 13, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 09, 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.**