



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

GEF ID:	5867		
Country/Region:	Senegal		
Project Title:	Promoting innovative finance and community based adaptation in communes surrounding community natural reserves (Ferlo, Niokolo Koba, Senegal river Bas Delta & Saloum Delta), Senegal		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5401 (UNDP)
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-3; Project Mana;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,460,000
Co-financing:	\$16,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$22,510,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	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, being Party to UNFCCC and an LDC.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes, the operational focal point has endorsed the project. However, the total amount stated is lower than the LDCF grant funding requested through the proposal. Recommended Action: Please ensure that the agency fee in the Focal Point endorsement letter reflects the PPG agency fee as well, and revise the totals in the letter accordingly.	

*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)
		Update 7/22/2014: A revised letter has been submitted, which reflects all amounts as required.	
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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
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>	Yes. The project is aligned with GEF strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2, and CCA-3. Recommended action: It is not clear what types of interventions will contribute to CCA-3. By CEO Endorsement, it is expected that this will be articulated.	
	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?	Yes.	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to	Yes, the baseline projects include the on-going initiatives include the National Program for Local Development and	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	UNDP's Program to improve the Dynamics of the Economic and Social Development, which targets women and youth.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	Yes, the components, outcomes, and outputs are sufficiently clear, detailed, and appear, for the PIF stage, sound.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes, for the PIF stage.	
	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?	Yes, the role of public participation, including CSOs (including women's and youth groups, farmers' and pastoralists' associations, etc.) will be project target groups contributing to the identification of key project activities, institutional arrangements, and stakeholders involvement. The Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development will facilitate PPG process, including consultations.	
	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	Not clear. The risks listed are well described, including risk mitigation measures, but this does not appear to be a complete list. For instance, setting up revolving funds, microfinance, and funds for capturing taxes or levies are complex	Recommended action: Please prepare an elaborated risks framework by CEO Endorsement.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)	<p>operations that carry a fiduciary risk. Although this risk is implied under "unavailability of requisite human resources and data", it is recommended to discuss it more fully, with justifications for why there is an expectation of success for this project despite this risk. If the fiduciary risk is deemed low, please also explain why.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please revisit and consider revising the Risks' section.</p> <p>Update 7/22/2014: Cleared. The risks are presented within broad categories, and it is understood that by CEO Endorsement an elaborated risks framework will be prepared.</p>	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	<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 	<p>The project is very innovative in attempting to sustainably establish financing flows for communities at risk from climate change, to engage in adaptive practices, via both public and private streams. These adaptive practices will include agro-sylvo-pastoral activities, early warning systems, management of supply chains, channelled through local budget, following the setup of requisite financial mechanisms at the sub-national level. In addition, nine community based credit and saving mutuals will be targetted to improve sustainability and performance, and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	intervention.	<p>accessibility for financing adaptation. Because this is an innovative approach to adaptation, it is difficult to assess the project's likelihood of success. However, if successful, the potential for scaling up would be high.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide additional information concerning the Agency's or country's prior experience in setting up financial mechanisms (other than for adaptation), and any lessons regarding the success of such efforts in contexts similar to this one.</p> <p>Update 7/22/2014: This is cleared.</p>	
	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?	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	Yes.	

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?	Yes, at 5%.	
	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?	Yes, the PPG request is for a standard amount.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
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			
	24. Is PIF clearance/approval	Not yet. Please address comments for	

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?	sections 2, 11, and 13. Update 7/22/2014: Yes, the proposal is technically cleared. However, the GEF has temporarily suspended the approval of LDCF funds until additional contributions are received. The project will be processed for Council review and approval as soon as adequate resources become available.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		11
	First review*	June 17, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 22, 2014	
	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.