



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9594		
Country/Region:	Regional (Mauritania, Senegal)		
Project Title:	Strengthening Trans-boundary Cooperation for Improved Ecosystem Management and Restoration in the Senegal delta (Mauritania and Senegal)		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1 Program 1; IW-2 Program 3; IW-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$3,061,009
Co-financing:	\$7,850,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,061,009
PIF Approval:	October 30, 2017	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	(7/26/2016) Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF IW focal area strategy and supports both IW objectives 1 and 2 through addressing both transboundary governance for the tb biosphere and TDA/SAP priorities for the Senegal river.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies	(7/26/2016)	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>Yes, the project as described is consistent with the Senegal River TDA/SAP and relevant national strategies and plans.</p> <p>(8/24/2016)</p> <p>The PIF also outlines briefly the alignment with national strategies.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>Yes. The constraints and implied drivers of degradation are described sufficiently at PIF stage. The project document should make a better distinction between immediate pressures and underlying drivers.</p> <p>(8/24/2016)</p> <p>It would be helpful for the document to be more explicit in describing the significance and value of the resource (section 1 is very brief in that on page 8) and then link described constraints and related root causes to the selected project alternative - incl. which of the key constraints described the project is addressing as priority. Currently the baseline scenario is mainly comprised of a description of projects. A description of a baseline scenario</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>would aid in bridging the flow to the description of the alternative. See also comments below.</p> <p>It is not all that clear while some apparent clear constraints are not addressed by the project, e.g. addressing pressures of herders. Please be more clear on how the project interventions are linked to the drivers and/or immediate constraints.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please indicate how issues of sustainability regarding data collection are envisioned (please indicate/give an idea at PIF stage only and then expand during project design). - During project design (before endorsement) please include a plan for long term financial sustainability of the SDTBR. <p>(3/1/2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Comments are partially addressed: Monetary values of the resources are shown. - Constraints and root causes could be more clearly distinguished. - In order do clarify the Baseline Scenario, please move the part "IUCN/GEF project characteristics to address current constraints". This has 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>more to do with the solutions (ie the proposed alternative scenario).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On the sustainability of data collection and management, please make sure at CEO Endorsement to provide clear attribution for collection, management, analysis ... - Could you also please clarify the way constraints will be addressed? If it has to do with the part on "IUCN/GEF project characteristics to address current constraints", that could be made more obvious. - Linking the long term sustainability plan to the agreement of a fundraising plan seems risky. Are there other solutions? <p>(3/20/2017)</p> <p>- Cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The combined sections of describing GEBs (section 3) and incremental cost reasoning (section 4) overall address the intention of these sections when read together. - Yet, it would be useful to follow the PIF template more closely overall. Please address. - Specifically, section 1.4 heading 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>reads in the template reads "incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing". Yet, right now possible contributions/co-finance from other ongoing regional are listed as one section under the baseline.</p> <p>- Furthermore, the description of the project alternative is right now somewhat of a mix of sections that seem to provide context and those that summarize the project interventions. Restructuring the flow of the PIF sections would aid in presenting the context versus what is to be addressed by the project and why.</p> <p>(8/24/2016)</p> <p>- Thank you for working on the sections and including a heading for the section "3: Proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area strategies, with brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project". The section also needs to be more clear in describing the alignment with the focal area strategy and specifically linking the proposed intervention to the SAP implementation (objective 2) for the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Senegal river (mainly).</p> <p>The wording of the section on "features" is often unclear on what the project does and what is a "threat" (e.g. details on the Diama dam) or what "must be done" or "cannot be ignored" but then is not clearly addressed in the following project description (e.g. cooperation on a water allocation system - see pg. 16).</p> <p>(3/2/2017)</p> <p>- the linkages between threats/issues and key features/characteristics still don't show very clearly. Could you please highlight them in the document?</p> <p>- Specifically, section 1.4 heading reads in the template reads "incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing". Yet, right now possible contributions/co-finance from other ongoing regional are listed as one section under the baseline.</p> <p>(3/20/2017)</p> <p>- Cleared.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound	(7/26/2016)	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>- Suggest to consider to simplify the PDO: Support " improved governance, socio-economic development and ecosystems management in the Senegal Delta transboundary biosphere reserve"</p> <p>(8/24/2016) Comment addressed.</p> <p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>- Please provide a more closer match on how table B - which is very clear - matches to the component and subcomponent descriptions as part of the alternative in the text. If the text would follow the component and subcomponent structure in table B more clearly that would be very helpful.</p> <p>(8/24/2016) the revision of table B is noted as well as better alignment of text and table B.</p> <p>- In that regard please revise 1.2 and 1.2.1 in table B in alignment with text to indicate that there is a capacity building and training program being designed and implemented and not only a plan/program formulated. Please also indicate the target group to be trained in these training</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>institutions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - please be more explicit on outputs/activities of the project to address improved governance and/or conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. - please indicate where management structures, PPPs, or activities will cooperate with the city of St Louis - as indicated in the text and also with the aim stated to leverage co-finance. <p>(7/26/2016) Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - please aim at mirroring the structure of component 1.1. in the component text. Please consider to move very useful description in the first part of section 5 "coordination" into component 1.1. . Unless misunderstood by us, that section (page 26 lower half and page 27 upper third) pertains closer to the transboundary governance bodies than to " Coordination with other relevant GEF-finance and other initiatives". <p>(8/24/2016) It is noted that the text mentions that</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>"the SDTBR vision, mandate and management bodies will be revised". This seems fundamental and would well be worth to be mentioned as an output. Same for "revision of policies and legislation" (both under 1.1.1.) and possibly indicate (tentatively) the type of policies and legislation most likely to require revision</p> <p>(7/26/2016) Component 2:</p> <p>Again please use the table B structure of component 2 and its sub-components and main outputs as guide for the structure of the component text. A more easy match would aid to present what the project aims to achieve. Right now the text and table B are difficult to align.</p> <p>(8/24/2016)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please note that the text specifies at least 4 local plans for ecosystem restoration whereas table B only states between "2 to 4". Please indicate the scale of the actions plans in the text. - Throughout the revised write-up of the component please aim to indicate if there is plan to align 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>implementation of on the ground measures (comp.2.2.1. and 2.2.2.) to local governance structures and extension services or how else there will be a system that may allow scaling up or replicate activities.</p> <p>In that regard, please also note that the PIF states on page 24/potential for scaling-up that the aim is to provide models for replication/scale-up elsewhere in Africa. Please also note the need for scale-up in the rest of the local region/SDTBR.</p> <p>- Please explain the uniform target of "10" communities for every activity/output under comps 2.2.1. and 2.2.2..</p> <p>(7/26/2016) Component 3:</p> <p>- 3. 2 : Please clarify the para on "internal " assessment functions which surely are above and beyond the GEF tracking tool. It seems that there may have literally been possibly some language translation issues.</p> <p>(8/24/2016) - The para on internal assessment functions building on IUCN</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>guidelines remains unclear and as written seems to be a function of the implementing agency.</p> <p>(7/26/2016) Additional comments may arise once the restructured PIF is received; yet table B seems very clear and we assume that the overall resubmitted PIF would simply add to the detail of the logic presented there.</p> <p>(8/24/2016) Comments/additional comments have been inserted above.</p> <p>(3/2/2017)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could you please highlight the changes made in the text for 1.2 and 1.2.1 as well as the changes on outputs/activities to address governance and/or conjunctive management of surface and groundwater? - Regarding the cooperation with the city of Saint-Louis, there are suggestions from the December 2016 meeting, but could you please clarify which one will be transformed as measures in the project? <p>(3/20/2017)</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		- Cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>The role of communities and civil society and benefits to communities are highlighted throughout the document.</p> <p>Please clarify that gender aspects and distribution of benefits will be taken on board especially in component 2.</p> <p>(8/24/2016)</p> <p>Comment addressed in the section of gender.</p> <p>By endorsement please highlight the gender aspects and involvement of women and men more specifically. This pertains especially to the design and implementation of the suggested measures directly benefiting communities under component 2. The design and gender aspects will differ if these activities are directed to communities or groups of individuals.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>(04/10/2017)</p> <p>The FA allocation is subject to the projected shortfall of the GEF Trust</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Fund. Availability of the FA allocation will have to reviewed at the time of potential future work program inclusion.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	n/a	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>(7/26/2016)</p> <p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance yet. Please address comments provided above to tighten the structure of the document.</p> <p>Please also add the following in section A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Executing agency/partners (at least indicative/foreseen) - Project duration <p>Further, we recommend to verify that any co-finance can possibly be leveraged from already GEF co-financed World Bank projects. Yet, other regional and relevant national projects as described seem aligned based on the description provided and co-finance could be explored during project design. (please also note that the co-finance ratio is quite low in comparison to the overall portfolio target - which of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>course cannot be a goal point for each and every project)</p> <p>(8/24/2016). No the PIF is not recommended for endorsement yet.</p> <p>Besides the comments above, please :</p> <p>The project co-financing ratio remains low. Furthermore, it remains unclear how co-finance can be leveraged from already GEF financed projects. The co-finance for these projects is already accounted for in the respective endorsements for these projects. One exception may be WARFP in Senegal which is currently not yet being GEF co-financed (yet overall WARFP is). Please also add indicative co-finance from side of IUCN.</p> <p>(3/2/2017)</p> <p>No, the PIF is not recommended for endorsement yet. Please address the remaining comments. A document with tracked changes in addition to the official version would help us in the review.</p> <p>(3/20/2017)</p> <p>- Yes, but the FA allocation is subject</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		to the projected shortfall of the GEF Trust Fund. Availability of the FA allocation will have to reviewed at the time of potential future work program inclusion. Please make sure at CEO endorsement to provide complementary details on the public-private partnerships, to strengthen the financial sustainability scenario as possible and the gender analysis, and specify the level of financing dedicated to IW:Learn actions.	
Review Date	Review	July 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 30, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 08, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
		10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.