



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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,228,995
Co-financing:	\$20,895,000	Total Project Cost:	\$27,273,995
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
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	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes, Senegal is an LDC and Party to UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the letter dated February 15, 2013 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?		
	• 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.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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.	
	<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.	
Project Design	<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 Developpement et des Fibres Textiles du Senegal, Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural, as well as bilateral, such as USAID and multilateral agencies, such as AfDB, are well described.	
	<p>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>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> <p>Update 10/9/2013: The breakdown has been provided. This is satisfactory.</p>	
	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.	
	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 and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>No, the role of CSO is unclear. In addition, there is no explanation on whether inclusion of indigenous people is foreseen.</p> <p>Recommended action:</p>	

		<p>included in this project. In addition, please consider inclusion of indigenous people participation, or, alternatively, provide justifications.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

		<p>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 preparation stage of the project.</p> <p>Update 10/9/2013: Cleared.</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, the project appears to be well coordinated with other related initiatives in the country.	
	<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. 	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.	
	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		

	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?	Yes.	
	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.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes.	
	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.	
	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		

	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?	<p>Not yet. Please see comments under 7, 9, 10, and 11.</p> <p>Update 9/13/2013: Note yet. Please see additional comments under 7, 10, and 11.</p> <p>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.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
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.