



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

GEF ID:	5406		
Country/Region:	Gambia		
Project Title:	Community-Based Sustainable Dryland Forest Management		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,066,347
Co-financing:	\$12,718,100	Total Project Cost:	\$15,784,447
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Madankumar Janakiraman

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. UNCCD: Date of Signature: October 14 1994; Date of Ratification: June 11 1996; Effective Date: December 26 1996	Addressed.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A revised letter is available. After a first submission for a Multi-Trust Fund project in April 2013, the project is now a stand-alone LD project.	Addressed.
Resource Availability	3. 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? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - \$1,040,000 have already been used from the LD allocation for the SGP. - The total GEF resources requested for this project reach \$3,500,000 (project 	Table A: please revise. This table aims to reflect the GEF resources per outcomes. The management costs should not appear.

*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)
		grant + PPG + fees). - The total of programmed LD resources is \$4.540 million, under the cap of the initial LD allocation (\$4.57 million).	April 29, 2016 Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NOT AT THIS TIME. As at April 2013, the Gambia has accessed \$20.03 million for two full-sized projects and one medium-sized project approved under the LDCF. Given a current equitable access ceiling of \$20 million, the proposed project will be considered for approval only once additional contributions permit the ceiling to be sufficiently increased. August 21, 2013 Addressed. The project is now a GEFTF project. The request for LDCF resources has been withdrawn.	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	NA	NA
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>	The project is aligned with the LD result framework and the LD2 objective.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.	Addressed.
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?	Yes, the baseline projects are described. There is a reasoning explaining the problems the project will seek to address. Cleared.	Addressed.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	The result framework is coherent with 3 components, 4 outcomes, and 13 outputs. The outputs are well formulated. They are quantified. There are simple and clear indicators (# persons trained, forum created, # of ha of forests under community forestry management, # of ha of rehabilitated forests, # of community grazing agreements, # of households).	Addressed.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Yes. The GEB are based on the protection and sustainable management of 14,700 ha of drylands by the communities, including the rehabilitation of 735 ha of forest cover. At CEO endorsement, please describe and measure the GEB. Please, confirm or revise the carbon calculation.	Addressed.
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		The local communities are the main beneficiaries. In the PPG, please include an analysis of local communities, including traditional authorities, as well as gender issues. Addressed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Local NGOs, CSOs, and the private sector (NACO) are considered in the PIF. Please develop their engagement in the CEO endorsement.	Addressed.
	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)	Addressed. Please, provide a full risk analysis at CEO endorsement.	Addressed.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Please, confirm the elements at CEO endorsement. Detail coordination arrangements with other related initiatives in the country and the region, if appropriate.	Addressed.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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. 	More than innovation, this is the potential for scaling up that is worth mentioning. Given the government's commitment to expand community forestry and the need for SFM, the experience can be easily replicated throughout the country. The project will produce lessons that can also benefit to similar dryland ecosystems throughout Africa.	Addressed.

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?		Addressed.
	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?		Addressed.
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?	<p>- 80% of the GEF resources are tied with the component that will deliver on the ground.</p> <p>- The cofinancing is brought up by national and local partners, the Agency, and the CILSS.</p> <p>Confirm at CEO endorsement.</p>	The cofinancing from FAO has increased. Addressed.
	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?	<p>Addressed.</p> <p>FAO is bringing \$800,000 in cofinancing.</p> <p>Confirm the cofinancing at CEO endorsement.</p>	The cofinancing from FAO has increased. Letters of cofinancing are available. Addressed.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	less than 5 percent. addressed.	
	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	A PPG of \$130,000 is requested. The amount is acceptable for a \$3.06 million project grant, but in the upper limit of what is possible.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes.
	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?		Addressed.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The project cannot be considered at this time. Please refer to Section 3 above. August 21, 2013 The PIF is recommended for clearance. However, please check the review and the cell 25 for consideration at CEO endorsement.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- Please confirm the role of CSO, NGO, and the private sector; - Include an analysis of local communities, including traditional authorities; - Include gender issues in the project benefits.	

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"> - Include a Monitoring and Evaluation Program. - Confirm the nature of GEB, and notably the carbon print. - Detail the implementation arrangements and the coordination with other related initiatives (FIDA, WB, AfDB, etc). 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>Not yet, please, see the item 3. Upon a revised document, the project will be recommended for CEO approval.</p> <p>April 29, 2016 The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
	First review*	April 23, 2013	March 14, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 21, 2013	April 29, 2016
	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.**