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

GEF ID:	**9470**		
Country/Region:	**Cameroon**		
Project Title:	**LCB-NREE Cameroon child project: Improving agro-pastoral systems in the Far North region of Cameroon**		
GEF Agency:	**AfDB**	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-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$1,479,952**
Co-financing:	**$19,375,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$20,854,952**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Pascal Martinez**	Agency Contact Person:	**DIOP BAMBA**

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?		April 15, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		April 19, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		April 19, 2016 n/a AC

*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)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		April 19, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		April 19, 2016 n/a AC
	• the focal area allocation?		April 19, 2016 Yes. The agency fee is 7.99% of the grant amount. Cleared. AC
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		April 19, 2016 n/a AC
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		April 19, 2016 n/a AC
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		April 19, 2016 n/a AC
	• focal area set-aside?		April 19, 2016 n/a AC
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		April 19, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		April 19, 2016 While the project is aligned with the LD results framework, it is suggested here that component 2 be rephrased to capacity building/development in line with LD-1 project support points 1 and 2. Proposed outcomes and output under

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			component 2 are more in the direction of capacity development than securing the provision and availability of ecosystem services (ES) or indeed improving the function and process of ES. 4 October 2016 Addressed
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		April 19, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		April 19, 2016 No. Building on comments in cell 8 above, there is need for a better articulation that will link developed capacities (as suggested above in cell 8) to the achievement of the project aims, which are: to enhance land productivity and the functioning of agro-ecosystems (croplands, rangelands and wetlands) through landscape rehabilitation measures involving communities, in order to mitigate the pressures that threaten ecosystem stability. Activities will focus on the rehabilitation of degraded land, water use efficiency and improved pastoralism (p14 last paragraph) AC. 4 October 2016

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Addressed
Project Design	11. 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?		April 19, 2016 Partially. It will be helpful to maintain a language that is not open to misunderstanding regarding whether PRODEBALT and PRESIBALT are both baseline projects or simply PRESIBALT. Notably, the allusion to PRODEBALT on p12 (the table), p18 (paragraph 3), p23 (paragraph 2) suggest PRODEBALT is a baseline project for this project. Please adjust the language accordingly. AC, PM 4 October 2016 Addressed
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		April 19, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?		April 19, 2016 The project document is silent on the specifics of activities, measures, technologies/practices to allow for an assessment of incremental/additional reasoning. Generalisations have been made on pages 14, 15, 18, 19, 30, 32, 33 and 34 about activities, measures, technologies/practices, renewable energy technologies that the project will focus on without however, specifying exactly which these are. Please provide the necessary details on what is intended

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			to be done. In addition, if securing ES is an important component of the proposal, it will be useful to give specifics about what kind of ES the project envisages, preferably by drawing on the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) typology. AC, PM 4 October 2016 Addressed
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		April 19, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	16. 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?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		April 20, 2016 The baseline project has been changed from PRODEBLT to PRESIBALT. However, consider suggestions and comments in cells 8 and 11 above. AC 4 October 2016 Addressed
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		April 20, 2016 n/a AC
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		April 20, 2016. The funding is appropriate for components 1 and 3. Component 2 is more on trainings and developing plans and guidelines. It is not clear how these activities will cost 5,410,709 USD. Please provide more details and justification for the use of such funding in component 2. AC, PM 4 October 2016 Addressed
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated		April 20, 2016

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		No letter to confirm cofinancing is attached, only mention in the ADF Memorandum that indicates Cameroun's loan of AU 12.5 million on p1 and AU 13.38 million on p7 under the financing plan. Please provide the missing co-financing letters. AC, PM 6 October 2016 Addressed
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		April 20, 2016 The Tracking Tool (TT) has been submitted, however, there is insufficient information in some of the sections. P22 of the project document mentions GHG emission reduction and sequestration. It was expected that this be included in the "Measurable global environmental benefits in the project target area" section of the TT. The same is true for the "socio-economic context - characterization of affected communities and populations" section that is empty despite the fact that the number of beneficiaries have been mentioned on p29. In addition, clarify if 125,000 people (p29) or half million people (p32) is the number of beneficiaries. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			4 October 2016 Addressed
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		April 20, 2016 The proposal includes an M&E, however the proposed M&E activities need a clear and substantiated budget and costing. In addition, the proposed indicators appear too many, and therefore will need to be streamlined to capture the most relevant measurable elements of the proposed project. AC 4 October 2016 Addressed
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		May 16, 2016. As STAP requests major revisions, please contact the STAP and ensure to address all its comments before resubmission. PM 4 October 2016 Addressed
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		May 16, 2016. The reality described by Germany and France may have changed since 2011. Please take this into account and, if relevant, update the response accordingly to council comments. 4 October 2016 Addressed

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		April 20, 2016 Yes. Annex C AC
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		May 17, 2016 Not yet. Please, consider revisions as per suggestions above. To facilitate the review, please also indicate in your response to this review where the changes have been made and show it clearly in one version of the project document highlighting the modifications. AC, PM 6 October 2016 Yes. The comments have been correctly addressed and the project can now be recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*		April 21, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.