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

GEF ID:	**6991**		
Country/Region:	**Senegal**		
Project Title:	**Senegal National Adaptation Plan**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5428 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$2,913,750**
Co-financing:	**$9,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$12,013,750**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Rawleston Moore**	Agency Contact Person:	**Mame Diop**

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 eligible for LDCF funding.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes. The letter dated Oct. 17, 2014 is on file.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	N/A.	
	• the focal area allocation?	N/A	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	Not clear. Table A needs to reflect all the key outcomes to which the project intends to contribute. Recommended Action: Please expand on the project's alignment with the LDCF's strategic framework. Update 12/16/2014: This has been done.	
	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?	The project references the National Strategy for Socioeconomic Development for 2013-2017, and consistent with the Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection's Multiyear Framework of Sector-based expenses. However please see section 6.	
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?	No. It is unclear which processes this project will support. In this case, the baseline process, if there is one, should be described more fully. The cofinancing for this project is listed as $9 million, but it is not entirely clear what activities those funds will support. In addition, the premise of the project, including assumptions, and a desired end-state, including broad-based outcomes, are not sufficiently defined. The project should present a more concrete vision for the desired outcomes of this project, and consider more specifically what is realistically possible to fund with the amounts proposed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update 12/16/2014: Additional information has been supplied, providing a clearer picture of the objectives and approach of the project. This is sufficient for the PIF stage.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	For the most part, the components, outcomes, and outputs are clear. However, the details provided are not sufficiently informative, while requesting a substantial budget of $1.2 million. Recommended action: Please consider providing a more concrete, specific description of outcomes, on an indicative basis. In addition, please consider the comment under section 6 above. Update 12/16/2014: This has been done.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	No. Please see the end of this review (section 24.) Update 12/16/2014: Yes, the adaptation benefits are clear.	
	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. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified	Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and explicit means for their engagement explained?		
	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)	Yes, it does. However, the mitigation measures require further elaboration. For instance, it is unclear how the project will effectively implement the broad consultative process described as a mitigation measure under the weak coordination mechanisms risk. Please note that section 6 needs to be addressed prior to providing a definitive review of risks. Update 12/16/2014: This is cleared.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • 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.	Not clear. Please see section 6. Update 12/16/2014: This project intends to support the actions and policies that would lead to the creation of an institutional and policy environment for ensuring adaptation is included across the board in the economy of Senegal. In this sense, it is innovative, potentially self-sustaining, and would result in scaled-up adaptation action.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	Not clear. This question can be considered upon further revision of the proposal. Update 12/16/2014: This is cleared.	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	Not clear. Update 12/16/2014: This is cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	Not clear. Update 12/16/2014: At under 5% of project grant funding, the project management cost appears appropriate.	
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval,	Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** 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	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	Not at this time. This proposal aims to address an important issue, which needs to be presented in greater detail. The overarching objectives of the project need to be specified, and accordingly outcomes need to be spelled out in greater detail. The need for this project at this time should be justified, and the associated underlying assumptions should be briefly provided. Furthermore, kindly use the correct template for this project, as there are sections missing from the submission. If those sections cannot be filled, kindly provide brief explanation.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Update 12/16/2014: The resubmission provides some detail and elaboration on the approach of the project. The provision of customized information to decision makers, the facilitation of the revision of budgetary processes, such that climate change considerations are adequately reflected, and the establishment of an in-country system for monitoring, reviewing, and learning from the adaptation measures, are all necessary for multi-sectorally integrated and sustained, continuous adaptation. The PIF is recommended for Council 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?**		
	First review*	November 07, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**