



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: **GEF Trust Fund**

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Community-based Sustainable Dryland Forest Management			
Country(ies):	The Gambia	GEF Project ID:	5406
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	620178
Other Executing Partner(s):	Department of Forestry (DoF)	Submission Date:	19 Feb 2016
		Resubmission Date:	17 March 2016 10 May 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation (LD)	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee (\$):	291,303
➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>			
➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)
LD-2	Outcome 2.2: Improved forest management in drylands	Output 2.3: Suitable SFM interventions to increase/maintain natural forest cover in dryland production landscapes	GEFTF	3,066,347	12,718,100
Total project costs				3,066,347	12,718,100

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: To improve community based management of dryland forests in Gambia to reduce forest degradation and improve local livelihoods

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
1. Strengthening policy and institutional capacity for sustainable dryland forest management	TA	<p>Outcome 1.1: Institutions at national and regional level have the capacity to integrate dryland forest management into policies, sectoral planning, and practices</p> <p><i>Under LD (LD 2) Tracking Tool: Forestry Policy score moved from 4 to 5</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1.1: Key sectors and institutional stakeholders trained on effective dryland forest management (90)</p> <p>Output 1.1.2: National dryland forest management and rehabilitation strategy developed as a supplement to the Forest Policy 2010-2019</p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Multi-stakeholder regional dryland forest management forums created</p>	GEFTF	220,331	875,300

2. Community-based sustainable dryland forest management and rehabilitation	TA	<p><u>Outcome 2.1:</u> Community forestry legally strengthened</p> <p><i>Institutional bottlenecks removed resulting in improved JFPM (18 agreements) and efficient and effective transfer of forest ownership to communities (at least 28 gazettes)</i></p> <p><u>Outcome 2.2:</u> About 15,000 ha of dryland forests are sustainably managed by local communities</p> <p><i>Successful application of 18 JFPM plans and 73 management plans</i></p>	<p><u>Output 2.1.1:</u> Regional community forestry task forces created and strengthened</p> <p><u>Output 2.1.2</u> 3251.4 ha of forests under start-up phase advanced to PCFMA stage and 4578.42 ha of forests at PCFMA stage are advanced to CFMA stage</p> <p><u>Output 2.1.3</u> 14 new management plans (1438.12 ha) developed for CFs under CFMA</p> <p><u>Output 2.1.4</u> 5,749.9 ha of forests brought under Joint Forest Park Management</p> <p><u>Output 2.2.1:</u> Community Forestry Committee and Joint Forest Park Management committee members trained in improved dryland forest management and CF procedures/processes (600 members) (<i>trainings linked to Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.3 & 2.1.4, and the committees under them</i>)</p> <p><u>Output 2.2.2:</u> SFM practices implemented</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest cover increased by 5% through small scale tree planting and assisted natural regeneration - Site suitable agroforestry techniques implemented across 500 ha - Improved bushfire management techniques <p><u>Output 2.2.3:</u> Controlled grazing implemented through 10 community grazing agreements in the community forests and efficiency of fuelwood use improved by introduced cooking stoves (2000 households)</p> <p><u>Output 2.2.4:</u> Community based forest enterprises strengthened (21 enterprises)</p>	GEFTF	2,590,000	10,927,600
---	----	---	---	-------	-----------	------------

3. Project monitoring and evaluation and information dissemination		<p>Outcome 3.1: Project implementation based on results based management and application of project findings and lessons learned in future operations facilitated.</p> <p><i>Project M&E system designed, established and applied throughout the project and across all components, provinces and project sites</i></p>	<p>Output 3.1.1: Project monitoring system providing systematic information on progress in meeting project outcomes and output targets</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: Project related 'best practices' and 'lessons learnt' published</p>	GEFTF	110,000	342,200
Subtotal					2,920,331	12,145,100
Project management Cost (PMC)				GEFTF	146,016	573,000
Total project costs					3,066,347	12,718,100

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
National Government	DoF (Participatory Forest Management Programme)	Grant	370,000
		In-kind	1,830,000
National Government	National Agricultural Land and Water Management Development Project	Grant	5,000,000
National Government	Food and Agricultural Sector Development Project	Grant	2,800,000
Private Sector	NACO (National Resources Consulting)	In-kind	100,000
CSO	ADWAC (Agency for the Development of Women and Children)	Grant	450,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	100,000
GEF Agency	FAO- Action Against Desertification	Grant	1,668,100
GEF Agency	FAO- Forest and Farm Facility	Grant	400,000
Total Co-financing			12,718,100

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	Total c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	Land Degradation	Gambia	3,066,347	291,303	3,357,650

Total Grant Resources	3,066,347	291,303	3,357,650
------------------------------	------------------	----------------	------------------

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Co-financing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	117,178		117,178
National/Local Consultants	168,630		168,630

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

No changes from PIF. Please refer to Section 1.5.1 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

No changes from PIF. Please refer to Section 1.5.2 of the FAO-GEF Project Document.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

No changes from PIF.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

The baseline project and barriers that the project seeks to address have been further analyzed and detailed during the full project preparation. Please see the FAO-GEF Project Document sections *1.2.1 Threats to Global Environmental Benefits*, *1.2.2 Baseline initiatives*; and *1.2.3 Remaining barriers*.

A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The project aims to reduce forest degradation in the northern part of the Gambia through the strengthening and expansion of community-forestry and implementation of Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices.

For Component 1 GEF incremental financing of USD 220,331 will be invested in: i) training programmes for building institutional capacity; ii) technical assistance for drafting of a dryland forest management strategy and revision of NFAP; iii) technical assistance for the creation of a multisectoral coordination mechanism.

Cofinancing for Component 1 comprises of national level capacity building related to multisectoral processes and management of initiatives on sustainable forest/land management and restoration, and policy advocacy and development work (specifically the renewal of the Agriculture and Natural Resources policy, ANR). The a. Participatory Forest Management Programme (PFMP) will contribute USD 200,000. The Natural Resource Consulting (NACO) will contribute in-kind USD 10,000. FAO executed the Action Against Desertification (AAD) and the Forest Farm Facility

(FFF) will contribute USD 555,300 and USD 100,000 respectively. FAO Representation will contribute USD 10,000 in-kind.

The GEF incremental financing for Component 2 will be USD 2,590,000. Through this component, the project will strengthen community forestry in the Northern region of the Gambia, through facilitation of transfer of forest tenure to local communities, provision of technical assistance and establishment of support mechanism at regional levels to identify and resolve bottlenecks in Community Forestry (CF) tenure transfer. Under this component, the project will also ensure that 15,017 ha of dryland forests are sustainably managed by the local communities, this will be achieved through community level capacity development, improved and new forest management plans, and implementation of SFM practices, and reduction of pressure on dryland forests targeted by the project.

Cofinancing for Component 2 comprises renovation and maintenance of forest stations and tree nurseries, capacity development of women producers including development of agroforestry manuals, improvement of market access and agroforestry related infrastructure (including agroforestry nurseries), development of Market Information System (MIS), on the ground implementation of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices in the project sites, community mobilization and promotion of energy savings cooking stoves and functional upgrading of primary producers in smallholder agro and forestry value chains. PFMP will contribute USD 1,500,000. The National Agricultural Land and Water Management Development Project (NEMA) will contribute USD 5,000,000. The Food and Agricultural Sector Development Project (FASDEP) will contribute USD 2,800,000. NACO will contribute in-kind USD 80,000. The Agency for the Development of Women and Children (ADWAC) will contribute USD 450,000. FAO executed AAD and FFF will contribute USD 777,600 and USD 280,000 respectively. FAO Representation in Gambia will contribute USD 40,000 in-kind.

GEF incremental resources of USD 110,000 will be utilized under Component 3 to ensure that; i) the project implementation is effective and efficient, and is based on result-based management principles; and ii) project findings and lessons learnt are captured and disseminated for future initiatives.

Cofinancing for Component 3 comprises activities related to gathering information for the evaluation of the results achieved by the project and dissemination of information and lessons learnt through the project. PFMP will contribute USD 100,000. NACO will contribute in-kind USD 10,000. FAO executed AAD will contribute USD 222,200. FAO Representation in Gambia will contribute USD 10,000 in-kind.

Expected global environmental and adaptation benefits

The project will help deliver the following global environmental benefits:

- i. Reduction of forest degradation processes in the areas of project intervention (15,000 ha). In particular, processes associated with loss of forest cover and restricting forest regeneration.
- ii. Increased area under SFM: target: 15,000 ha
- iii. Improvement in the provision of ecosystem goods and services. The introduction of SFM practices and improved management of dryland forest resources in an area of 15,000 hectares will increase productivity and sustain the livelihoods of local communities.

Please refer to Sections 1.3.2 *Project objectives, outcomes and outputs* of the FAO-GEF Project Document for a detailed description. The Project Results Framework in Annex 1 of the FAO-GEF Project Document includes GEB benefit indicators and targets at outcome level.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The risks identified in the PIF remain. The mitigation measures have been further assessed and described. Please refer to Appendix 4 “Risk Matrix” of the FAO GEF Project Document for the full risk assessment.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

FAO and the project partners will collaborate with the implementing agencies of other programs and projects in order to identify opportunities and mechanisms to facilitate synergies with other relevant GEF projects, as well as projects supported by other donors. This collaboration will include: (i) informal communications between GEF agencies and

other partners in implementing programs and projects; and (ii) exchange of information and outreach materials between projects.

In particular, the project will develop mechanisms for collaboration with the following initiatives:

1. GEF Project (UNDP) #5529, *Gambia Protected Areas Network and Community Livelihood Project*. The Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM) will primarily execute this project. The coordination will be primarily under Component 2, in order to ensure synergies in involving communities under the Joint Forest Park Management arrangement.

2. GEF Project #5782, *Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change in the Gambia*, FAO will implement this project through the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and other institutional partners. The coordination will be primarily in sensitizing and improving awareness/capacities at all levels on integrated natural resource management and the multiple benefits generated, specifically on improving livelihood resilience.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

B.1.1 Project implementation and management arrangements

The FAO will be the GEF agency responsible for monitoring and providing technical backstopping during project implementation. In addition to FAO as a GEF agency, the main government institution involved in the project is the Department of Forestry (DoF). DoF will play the overall lead role in the execution of the project as well as the day-to-day monitoring. DoF will be responsible for ensuring the overall coordination of the project's implementation, as well as coordination and collaboration with partner institutions, local community organizations and other entities participating in the project. At the regional level, DoF's regional offices will play the role in coordinating field level activities and training in conjunction with the National Project Coordinator (NPC).

The Project Management structure will ensure the participation of key stakeholders during project planning, implementation and M&E through its decision-making structure: a multi-stakeholder Project Steering Committee (PSC)

The PSC will be established to guide and oversee implementation of the project. The PSC will meet at least twice a year and its specific responsibilities will be:

- a) Provide guidance to the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) to ensure project implementation is in accordance with the project document;
- b) Review and approve any proposed revisions to the project results framework and implementation arrangements;
- c) Review, amend (if appropriate) and endorse all Annual Work Plans and Budgets;
- d) Review project progress and achievement of planned results as presented in six-monthly Project Progress Reports, Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) and Financial Reports;
- e) Ensure that co-financing support will be available on time;
- f) Advise on issues and problems arising during project implementation;
- g) Facilitate cooperation between all project partners and facilitate collaboration between the Project and other relevant programmes, projects and initiatives in the country; and
- h) Approve ToR for midterm and final evaluations

The PSC chair will be nominated by DoF in consultation with PSC members. The Committee's composition will include representation from the Office of President, DoF, National Environment Agency (NEA), FAO Gambia, Department of Agriculture (DoA), Natural Resources Consulting (NACO), NGOs/CBOs, the GEF focal points, etc. The PSC may co-opt ad hoc representatives from the other partners from related projects, other relevant government departments, private sector etc. as may be necessary. Draft ToR for this committee will be prepared in the first quarter of project implementation. The PSC will have the mandate and flexibility to establish site-specific management committees and appoint site coordinators.

For further details, please refer to Section 3.2 in the Project Document.

B.1.2 Stakeholder involvement plan

During project preparation, several consultations were held with diverse stakeholders at all levels (including local communities and CFCs). Based on the consultations, a detailed stakeholder analysis was conducted, this coupled with the feedback received in the inception and terminal workshops has helped to identify the stakeholders and the different roles they are expected to play in the project. The compilation is provided in the below table.

Table 1. Roles and responsibilities of stakeholders

Stakeholder Institution/Entity	Relevant roles/responsibilities related to the project implementation
Department of Forestry (DoF)	Main executing partner in the project. DoF is the custodian of forest instruments (policy, legislation, etc) and their implementation at national and local levels.
Department of Lands and Surveys(DLS)	Key government stakeholder in implementation. DLS is the custodian of the Decentralization Act 2002 (amended), endorses surveying of forests for community ownership and formal transfer.
Department of Agriculture (DoA)	Key government stakeholder in implementation. DoA is the custodian of the agricultural policy and related instruments and their implementation for agricultural production and development. Chair of the Agricultural and Natural Resources (ANR) platform at national level. At local level, will provide key inputs for activities related to agroforestry, fire management, etc.
National Environment Agency (NEA)	Key government partner in implementation. NEA is the custodian of the National Environment Management Act and its implementation. NEA serves as the secretariat of the ANR platform and will be a key liaison between the project and the ANR working group.
Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM)	Key government stakeholder in implementation. Responsible for the implementation of the Biodiversity Act (2002) and CBD targets through biodiversity conservation and protection from forest fires, deforestation, etc. DPWM is expected to play a key partnership role in on-the-ground activities related to Joint Forest Parks Management (JFPM).
Ministry of Energy (MoE)	Key government stakeholder in implementation. Especially in the context of introducing improved cooking stoves.
Ministry of Lands and Rural Administration (MoLRA)	Key government stakeholder in implementation. MoLRA is the custodian of traditional forest and lands at national and local level. Their support is essential for effective transfer of CFs to local communities.
ANR Working Group	ANR Working Group is the main multi-sectoral body at the national level to oversee the effective implementation of the ANR policy, and the working group has the mandate to provide guidance to all natural resource management activities in the country. This project's steering committee will work in close coordination with this group for smooth project operations at all levels.
Social Development Fund (SDF)	SDF was initially established under an African Development Bank funded project in 1998. SDF turned out to be very successful in supporting community-based micro-enterprises using a participatory demand-driven intervention

Stakeholder Institution/Entity	Relevant roles/responsibilities related to the project implementation
	strategy; this resulted in it turning into a Fiduciary Finance Institution and an apex national institution in the development of microfinance operations in the Gambia. Micro-enterprises targeted under this project will approach SDF for start-up microcredits.
Natural Resources Consulting (NACO)	NACO is will be co-financing the project as explained above and will also executing a part of the project in cooperation with DoF.
Agency for Development of Women and Children (ADWAC)	ADWAC will be co-financing the project as explained above.
Local communities, CFCs and JFPM committees	They are the main beneficiaries of the project and primary partners on the ground for the successful implementation of the project.
Local Government Authorities (LGAs)	LGAs (Regional Governors, District Heads, Village Heads, Village Development Committees, and Council of Elders) are key partners at local level for ensuring coordination and facilitation of project operations.
Local Technical Committees	Regional Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) are responsible for providing and sharing/disseminating technical and scientific information on natural resource management at regional level. Similarly, Multi-Disciplinary Facilitation Teams (MDFTs) are responsible for supporting farmers and other stakeholders (line departments) directly in taking innovations and technical knowledge to the ground level. The Regional Forestry Offices will engage with both these entities for technical extension part of the project.
Village Farmers Developed Programme Multipliers (VFDPM)	VFDPMs are peer groups at village level for continuing the transfer of knowledge/new technologies at community level (farmer to farmer), primarily in agriculture. This project envisages utilizing VFDPMs, where possible, for sustaining the local level knowledge transfer.
National Farmers Platform	The platform is a vehicle for advocacy, information sharing and lobbying for the benefit of farmers. They are a very active and strong civil society entity in the Gambia and will be a key partner at all levels of project implementation.
All Gambia Forestry Platform (AGFP)	AGFP was formed under the national forest programme implemented from 2009 to 2012. It is a multi-stakeholder platform created to mainly assist CFs in capacity strengthening. AGFP still remains integral to work with CFs at a level higher than individual or groups of CFs.
Livestock Owners Association	The association (will) play a key coordination role in the parts of the project supporting communities in establishing rangelands and cattle tracts and their regulations.
National Women Farmers Association	The association has the mandate to identify and resolve the constraints affecting women's participation and performance in agriculture and related sectors, and will play a vital role in ensuring women benefit significantly from the project's efforts.

Stakeholder Institution/Entity	Relevant roles/responsibilities related to the project implementation
National Bee Keepers Association (NBAG)	NBAG supports the Gambian bee-keeping industry through a market-oriented approach, and will play a key role in the enterprise development part of the part (further information under project components description).
Other Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and international organizations	The project will collaborate with organizations like Concern Universal, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) etc. working in the natural resource management sector both at national and local levels, to generate synergies where possible.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The socioeconomic benefits will be mainly delivered at local levels through Component 2. Households in the project sites depend heavily on forest resources for their livelihoods¹ (for example the socio-economic survey revealed that: 90% of the households depend on fuelwood from the forests as the main source of energy, 94% of households depend on forest plants for traditional healing and wild fruits and nuts as a source of food). The implementation of SFM in the project sites will contribute to food security and local livelihood development. Sustainable and controlled utilization of the forest resources will ensure continued availability of forest products (timber and non-timber) for personal consumption. The activities related to agroforestry development and improving forest-product value chains (through small and medium forest enterprises) will increase income generated by local communities and contribute to their livelihoods development and improved resilience to shocks and extreme events. These sustainable and tangible benefits generated will guarantee continuing sense of ownership by local communities in managing their forests sustainably, ensuring the achievement of global environment benefits.

In the project sites, at present, women are actively involved in the management and protection of forests (71% of the surveyed households). The project will build on this and ensure active participation of women in trainings, workshops and other consultations, especially through the local user groups headed by women. These user groups will also be capacity building under the activities related to agroforestry development and forest enterprise strengthening activities. Women are key change agents at the local level, their participation and sense of ownership in the project activities will contribute to uptake of best practices and ensure the achievement of global environment benefits. Activities related to the improved cooking stoves will rely heavily on women beneficiaries for successful uptake and in turn will benefit them the most, as women bear the brunt of health hazards from inhaling smoke from cooking stoves.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

The project design is cost-effective because it is based upon baseline initiatives, national and local skills and infrastructure, and national and local policies. During full project preparation, a number of strategies and methodologies have been identified that are complementary and synergic among them and are cost/effective ways of removing the barriers and addressing the threats to GEBs. Kindly refer to sections 4.5. *Appropriateness of Technologies Introduced and Cost/Effectiveness* and 4.6 *Innovativeness, Replication and Scale-Up* of the FAO GEF Project Document for a full description.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

The monitoring and evaluation of progress in achieving the results and objectives of the Project will be based on targets and indicators of the Project Results Framework (Appendix 1 of the FAO GEF Project Document). Project M&E activities are budgeted at USD 101,200 (see Table below) and will follow FAO and GEF policies and guidelines for monitoring and evaluation. The M&E system will also facilitate learning and replication of the project's results and lessons in relation

¹ A detailed socioeconomic survey was conducted during the project preparation phase.

to the integrated management of natural resources. A full description of the monitoring and evaluation activities under the project can be found in the Sections 3.5 and 3.6 of the FAO-GEF Project Document.

Table 2. Summary of main monitoring and evaluation activities

M&E Activity	Responsible parties	Time frame/ Periodicity	Budget
Inception workshop	NPC; FAO Gambia (with support from the LTO, and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit)	Within two months of project start up	USD 5000
Project Inception report	NPC, Expert M&E and FAO Gambia with clearance by the LTO, BH and FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after the workshop	-
Field-based impact monitoring	NPC; project partners, local organizations	Continuous	USD 10,800 (9% of the Project Coordinator's time, technical workshops to identify indicators, monitoring and evaluation workshops)
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	NPC; FAO (FAO Gambia, LTO). FAO-GEF Coordination Unit may participate in the visits if needed.	Annual, or as needed	FAO visits will be borne by GEF agency fees Project Coordination visits shall be borne by the project's travel budget
Project Progress Reports (PPRs)	BH with support from NPC, with stakeholder contributions and other participating institutions	Six-monthly	USD 4,200 (3.5% of the Project Coordinator's time)
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	BH (in collaboration with the PCU and the LTO) Approved and submitted to GEF by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Annual	FAO staff time financed through GEF agency fees. PCU time covered by the project budget.
Co-financing reports	BH with support from PCU and input from other co-financiers	Annual	USD 1,200 (1% the Project Coordinator's time)
Technical reports	NPC, FAO (LTO, FAO Gambia)	As needed	-
Mid-term evaluation (MTE)/review (MTR)	MTE: FAO Independent Evaluation Unit in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others MTR: FAO Gambia, External consultant, in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	Midway through the project implementation period	USD 30,000 by an external consultancy

M&E Activity	Responsible parties	Time frame/ Periodicity	Budget
Final evaluation	External consultant, FAO Independent Evaluation Unit in consultation with the project team, including the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit and others	At the end of the project	USD 45,000 by an external consultancy. FAO staff time and travel costs will be financed by GEF agency fees
Terminal Report	NPC; FAO (FAO Gambia, LTO, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit, TCS Reporting Unit)	Two months prior to the end of the project.	USD 5000
Total budget			USD 101, 200

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** :
(Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Ndey Sireng Bakurin	Operational Focal Point to the GEF	NATIONAL ENVIRONMENT AGENCY	AUGUST 12, 2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation and Programme Management. FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		17 March 2016	Madankumar Janakiraman Forestry Officer, Programme Coordination Unit, FAO Forestry Department. Fritjof Boerstler Technical Officer, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division.	+39 06570 54464	Madankumar.Janakiraman@fao.org Fritjof.Boerstler@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin				+3906 57055680	GEF-Coordination-Unit@fao.org

Senior Coordinator, FAO GEF Coordination Unit. Investment Centre Division.					
---	--	--	--	--	--

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please refer to Page no. 62 in the Project Document (Appendix 1)

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

No.	Comments from GEF Secretariat/STAP	Response
GEF Sec		
1	At CEO endorsement, please describe and measure the GEB. Please, confirm or revise the carbon calculation.	LD GEBs have been described and measured in the Project Document and the Tracking Tool. Since this is a LD project, we have not endeavored to measure the carbon benefits in detail.
2	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.	Detailed stakeholder analysis and a socioeconomic survey was conducted during project preparation. Table 2 under Section 1.3.3 in the Project Document includes description of roles/responsibilities of local communities and local community based organizations/entities; this includes traditional authorities (for example: refer specifically to Local Government Authorities, National Women Farmers Association, Village Farmers Developed Programme Multipliers). Refer to Sections 1.1.5 (under cluster profiles) and 4.1 for analysis on gender equality and gender mainstreaming. Also, refer to section B.2 above.
3	Local NGOs, CSOs, and the private sector (NACO) are considered in the PIF. Please develop their engagement in the CEO endorsement.	NACO is a co-financing (described under Section 1.2.2) and an executing partner. NACO will provide support for community mobilization, training development, manuals and management plans development as a co-financing partner and will be a key executing partner for achieving Project Outcome 2.1. Engagement with local NGOs and CSOs has been described in Table 2 under Section 1.3.3 in the Project Document/Table 1 under B.1.2 above.
4	Please, provide a full risk analysis at CEO endorsement.	A detailed risk analysis was carried out, please refer to Appendix 4.
5	Please, confirm the elements at CEO endorsement. Detail coordination arrangements with other related initiatives in the country and the region, if appropriate.	Co-financing partnerships have been established with majority of related initiatives in the country. As mentioned under Section A.7 above, coordination will be established with two related GEF projects.
6	FAO is bringing \$800,000 in co-financing. Confirm the co-financing at CEO endorsement.	FAO's co-financing is now \$2,168,100. Confirmed through co-financing letters.
7	Please confirm the role of CSO, NGO, and the private sector;	Addressed (refer to Response 3 above)

No.	Comments from GEF Secretariat/STAP	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Include an analysis of local communities, including traditional authorities; - Include gender issues in the project benefits. - 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). 	<p>Addressed (refer to Response 2 above)</p> <p>Addressed (refer to Response 2 above)</p> <p>Addressed.</p> <p>Refer to response 1 above.</p> <p>Implementation arrangements are described in detail under Section 3.2 of the Project Document. For coordination arrangements, please refer to Response 5 above.</p>
STAP		
8	<p>It would be useful to describe further the forest ecosystem (including tree species) in the target areas by providing data (If data is not available, it is important to add this aspect in the proposal.). Similarly, STAP recommends detailing further the socio-economic features of the targeted communities. STAP encourages FAO to provide disaggregated data by gender where available, so this information can better target the needs of women and men as forest users. Additionally, STAP suggests adding climate change data (trends or projections) on Gambia. Combined, this information can help contextualize the global environmental challenges described in the proposal, as well as strengthen the components so that climate change risks and its impacts on forest ecosystems and communities are imbedded throughout the design of the project.</p>	<p>Socioeconomic features of the communities are described under Cluster Profiles (Section 1.1.5). The description includes specific information related to gender. In addition, under Table 18 in Appendix 7, demographic data has been disaggregated by gender.</p> <p>Table 19 under Appendix 7 provides the list of tree species found in the project sites.</p> <p>No specific information was collected on climate change projections, but climate risks were analyzed, given the observations made on the ground by in-country stakeholders and NAPA. Considering this, mitigation actions have been planned. Please refer to the risk matrix under Appendix 4. Moreover as indicated in Section A 7, the project will collaborate closely with the GEF Project #5782, <i>Adapting Agriculture to Climate Change in the Gambia</i> and therefore benefit from improved weather and climate forecast information and its dissemination of it to vulnerable communities targeted.</p>
9	<p>In component 1, STAP notes the proposal will address "...challenges resulting from non-forestry sectors that influence dryland forests." It would be useful to define further these challenges in the full proposal by identifying comprehensively the drivers and causes of forest degradation, and how the project intends to address them).</p>	<p>The project will address direct drivers of forest degradation (unsustainable and uncontrolled resource extraction and forest fires). The underlying drivers of forest degradation are increasing population pressure and lack of adequate socioeconomic/livelihood opportunities. The former is beyond anything the project can address; Component 2 of the project will address the latter to an extent. Component 2 will improve local livelihoods through agroforestry development and forest enterprise development and strengthening.</p> <p>Challenges resulting from non-forestry sector that influence the health of dryland forests arise mainly through lack of sectoral coordination and poor capacities and awareness (on the role of dryland forests in provision of ecosystem services and linkages with agricultural productively, etc.) among</p>

No.	Comments from GEF Secretariat/STAP	Response
		other sectors. These issues are explained under Section 1.2.3 of the Project Document. Project activities/outputs related to capacity development (specifically non-forestry sectors) and improved sectoral coordination will address these issues.
10	<p>In component 2, STAP recommends for FAO to consider STAP's advisory document "The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental Benefits and Improving Local Welfare". The document summarizes the evidence base of the effectiveness of community forest management in generating global environmental benefits and improving livelihoods. In particular, STAP recommends for FAO to note the following key messages when developing the proposal.</p> <p>a. "There are five main threats that possibly undermine the effectiveness of community forest management (CFM). STAP recommends for the project components to describe design choices to minimize these threats, and identify indicators that allow monitoring the importance of these threats.</p>	<p><u>Limited devolution of authority and rights across and within communities, which fails to give community members incentives to manage forests sustainably;</u></p> <p><i>Devolution of authority to communities</i> In the context of Gambia, CF tenure transfer steps are clearly defined, without any ambiguity (refer to Appendix 8 of the Project Document). It is firmly backed by legislations and national policies. When communities obtain Community Forestry Management Agreement (CFMA), the communities have the rights for exclusive and sustainable use. The only condition being the CF management plans have to be approved by the regional forest officers.</p> <p><i>Devolution of rights within communities</i> Each CF is managed through Community Forestry Committees (CFCs), the members of the committees are chosen to represent every section of the community (incl. women), and the committee formation is transparent and is overseen by the regional forest offices. Moreover, local community members are allowed to attend CFC meetings and express their concerns at any point of time. The consultations and meetings to develop management plans (incl. resource utilization and allocation) involves, CFCs, local NGOs, regional forest office, local user groups (mainly women headed groups) and other interested members of the community. The Regional Task Forces (Output 2.1.1) would also be a mechanism for addressing any specific conflicts between or within CFs.</p>

No.	Comments from GEF Secretariat/STAP	Response
		<p><u>Limited technical and institutional capacity of communities, which prevents communities from responding to incentives (institutional capacity includes ability to allocate and enforce rights);</u> Output 2.2.1 will train 600 local community members, belonging to the CFCs and Joint Forest Park Management (JFPM) committees targeted by the project. The training will focus on technical aspects of SFM, CF tenure transfer procedures and management (this will include the committees' capacities to allocate and enforce resource utilization rights).</p> <p><u>Conflict between the production of private and public goods in which communities are most interested and public goods in which national and global stakeholders are most interested;</u> Forest degradation (especially from forest fires) are almost non-existent in CFs in Gambia (refer to the evaluation of performance of CFs under Appendix 8 in the Project Document), whereas forests that are not under community control face continued degradation. Considering this, the public goods (that national and global stakeholders are interested in) can only be secured with local communities taking ownership facilitated by incentives (private goods) from sustainable forest management. Specifically, in the Gambian context, it is difficult to conceptually separate the local and national/global interests.</p> <p><u>Displacement of forest exploitation from CFM forests to other forests leakage);</u> Upscaling CFM to the landscape mosaic level is one of the strategies to address this threat. Efforts have picked up at this front within Gambia, for example, this project and the co-financing FAO implemented Action Against Desertification project will coordinate and ensure synergies at the landscape level. The Regional Task Forces created would be working towards this objective as well.</p> <p><u>Adverse self-selection, whereby communities already engaged in, or intending to engage in, environmentally-friendly forest management practices disproportionately participate in CFM programs;</u> Specifically, the Regional CF task forces and in general, the sensitization and awareness creation activities under Outcome 2.1 will reach out beyond the sites targeted by the project and other non-project CFs. This is to influence the communities that have not already engaged or intending to engage in CFM. Moreover, in the Gambian context, CFM is a part of national discourse in the</p>

No.	Comments from GEF Secretariat/STAP	Response
	<p>b. Evidence demonstrates weak causal links between community forest management and the environmental or socio-economic impacts. STAP recommends describing in detail the pathways through which community forest management is believed to result in additional environmental, and perhaps socioeconomic, outcomes (i.e. the GEF evaluation office's "theory of change").</p> <p>c. The limited evidence base should encourage project design that contributes to the knowledge base – that is, designed in a way that demonstrate clearly the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of community forest management projects. STAP recommends applying a design whereby there is a selection of non-CFM community forests that have similar baseline (pre-CFM project) trends and characteristics to CFM community forests and to monitor a few outcome indicators at both CFM and non-CFM sites over the project period."</p> <p>These recommendations are detailed further in the STAP advisory document on community forest management, which can be downloaded from the STAP website – www.stapgef.org</p>	<p>mainstream, encouraging all forest depend communities to partake in CFM. Considering this, this threat is minimal.</p> <p>The project site comparison with non-project site (described below) throughout the project will be documented carefully to demonstrate the causal links between CFM and environmental and socio-economic impacts. The description of pathways through which CFM results in environmental and socioeconomic outcomes will be one of the key lessons captured through the project.</p> <p>A project site- Feleng Koto has been chosen for direct comparison with a non-project site- N'joba Kunda. Feleng Koto's forests are to be demarcated for CFM shortly. N'joba Kunda is a non-CF site. Both the sites have 18 households and similar socio-economic and ecological characteristics. The socioeconomic survey conducted included all the households in both the villages ensuring direct comparison at the end of the project.</p>
11	<p>Under global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning, STAP recommends defining the methodology that will be used to estimate and monitor carbon stock changes from forests. Currently, this information is not included in the proposal, and it is relevant for monitoring the project's global environmental outcomes. Several methodologies are available including FAO's EX-ACT, and the UNEP/GEF carbon benefits project methodology.</p> <p>Additionally, if the proposal aims to contribute to additional global environmental benefits besides carbon, STAP recommends identifying indicators for these benefits. If carbon is the only intended global environmental benefit arising from sustainable forest management/sustainable land management activities, STAP suggests clarifying this in the full proposal. Currently, this aspect is not clear in the proposal.</p>	<p>Since this is a LD project, during the project preparation, detailed carbon calculations were not carried out.</p> <p>LD GEBs are described in the Project Document and the LD Tracking Tool.</p>

No.	Comments from GEF Secretariat/STAP	Response
12	<p>STAP would like to bring to the attention of the project proponents an initiative in which indigenous landowners are earning carbon credits through early dry season burning of savannas, in Australia. The initiative is described here: http://www.nailsma.org.au/hub/programs/carbon-project</p> <p>There may be potential to market carbon credits in a similar manner, though this would require acceptance of the concept and the methodology by a scheme to which Gambia has access. The carbon accountings approach may be useful to this project:</p> <p>http://www.climatechange.gov.au/reducing-carbon/carbon-farming-initiative/methodologies/methodology-determinations/savanna-burning</p>	<p>This idea was brought up during consultations with the in-country stakeholders, including the project proponents. They are not considering this approach this, at this point due to other priorities.</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS²

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

NA

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 130,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To Date/Committed</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Professional salaries	7,359	7,301	58
Consultants	52,200	41,784	10,416
Travel	57,441	26,205	31,236
Workshops	13,000	7,730	5,270
Total	130,000	83,020	46,980

² If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA