



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

GEF ID:	5811		
Country/Region:	Regional		
Project Title:	Closing the Gaps in Great Green Wall Linking sectors and stakeholders for increased synergy and scaling-up		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$1,726,400
Co-financing:	\$12,035,943	Total Project Cost:	\$13,962,343
PIF Approval:	June 02, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

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 ?		Addressed at PIF level. No change.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		This project is developed under the LD4 objective (adaptive management, learning, scientific tools) and is at regional level. We agreed that letters of endorsement were not needed.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	Addressed at PIF level. No change.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Addressed at PIF level. No change.
	• the LDCF under the principle of	NA	NA

*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)
	equitable access		
	<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? 	Yes. The project requests \$1,726,400 from the LD set aside.	Addressed at PIF level. No change.
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>	<p>No.</p> <p>- We recommend the Agency, UNEP, and his partner, IUCN, to focus the project on the LD4 objective to increase capacity to apply adaptive management tools in SLM. This objective was notably conceived for such support, promoting synergies and best practices through regional networks of excellence.</p> <p>- We do not recommend to develop the project under the LD1 objective. It will be difficult to justify global environment benefits related to agricultural landscapes (even if it is the expected impact on the long term).</p> <p>Please, revise.</p> <p>May 28, 2014 Addressed.</p>	<p>The project is developed under the LD4 FA Objective and the Outcome 4.2.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>- We welcome a work to improve linkages and synergies between existing strategies and plans, especially those developed under Rio conventions (NAPs, NAPAs, NBSAPs). However, we do not support the creation of new strategic documents that will be out of existing and official mechanisms. Please, confirm.</p> <p>May 28, 2014 Addressed.</p>	<p>Yes. The project document has been updated under the light of new or revised documents, including the UNCCD NAPs aligned to the 10 year UNCCD strategy and the INDCs.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?	<p>We take note of the reasoning, the baseline problems, and the baseline projects.</p> <p>If you cannot provide all the information at PIF level, please consider the following elements at CEO approval:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Identify and detail the baseline projects (that can serve as cofinancing) on which the GEF can build on to finance additional/incremental activities. See notably the existing projects and initiatives led by CSO, NGOs, and networks of excellence. <p>May 28, 2014 Addressed.</p>	<p>Yes. There is a analysis of the main baseline investments under the GGWI (SAWAP, FLEUVE, Action Against Desertification, PRAPS). The taking stock exercise included other transboundary and national projects.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The table B shows a relatively complex result framework: 3 pages, 4 components, 7 outcomes, and 16 outputs. It is probably too much. We will call for more simplicity: shorter formulation for outcomes and outputs, less outputs, more concrete and tangible outputs. - Please, take note that we follow the definition of OECD in terms of project language (see OECD's Glossary of Key Terms in Evaluation and Results Based Management). The outcomes should express the short-term and medium-term effects/consequences of intervention's outputs. The outputs should express the products, capital goods and services which result from an intervention. They reflect the results of activities. Please, as far as possible, express them a very concrete manner, quantify them if possible, they have to help a non specialist to reflect the potential costs and 	<p>We thank the agency for the table highlighting the changes between PIF approval and CEO approval. These changes are light, mainly simplification and merging.</p> <p>However, we would like to be sure that there is no misunderstanding on some outcomes and outputs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1: All the participating countries having a functional multi-sectoral engagement in implementing the SLM/GGW is obtained: We support the idea of a national dialogue between key ministries and NGOs. However, we would like to see a comprehensive analysis of the different existing initiatives/platforms at country level to permit the executing partners to reinforce the most cost-efficient platforms (SLM, food security,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>figure out the value for money.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The section A.1. "Project description" has to be revised. The text should be more specific and explain the logical reasoning, the components, the outcomes, and detail the outputs (what are the activities planned to obtain the results?). <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, revise the formulation of outcomes and outputs: we do not understand the outcome 1.a; explain and reformulate the outcome 1.b; 1.c ("reporting") is not an acceptable outcome. - For all the outputs, please try to express numbers/quantities (Nb of training, Nb of publications). For instance for the 1.a.i, 1.b.i., and 1.b.ii. - It is difficult to understand what are the activities behind the outputs 1.a.ii, 1.a.iii, 1.a.iv, 1.c.i, and 1.c.ii. Please revise the formulation and explain in the text. - The output 1.b.iii is welcome. <p>Component 2: the principle of this component is welcome. The formulation of the component is close to an outcome.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is difficult to figure out how you want to achieve or reach with the outcome 2.a. Please simplify. - The outcome 2.b is welcome, but we should be able to read associated outputs. it is not the case. The output 2.b.ii sounds as an outcome. provide a more tangible formulation to reflect the activities. 	<p>environment, CPP, etc.). We do not want to support a project that will promote a dispersal of efforts or the multiplication of structures/platforms at national level. The GEF supported in a recent past the Country Strategic Investment Frameworks (CSIFs), also recommended by the UNCCD with the Integrated Financing Strategies and the Integrated Investment Frameworks (IFS and IIFs). We recommend to build on these past efforts.</p> <p>See UNCCD website: IFS processes are anchored in national governance processes and take into consideration existing SLM-relevant programmes and finances. IFS processes are designed to contribute to enhance the implementation of the NAPs and contribute to their alignment with the Strategy. The starting point for IFS processes is an in-depth analysis of current investment climate, resource allocation, SLM governance and capacity (diagnosis). Gaps and constraints that may have hampered financial flows into SLM are identified (gap analysis) and actions recommended for improving this environment (road map).</p> <p>Component 2: main NGO networks who are active on LD, drylands, oases are included. And we understand and approve the focus to identify representatives of vulnerable groups in each country. However, we would like</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- What are the activities behind the output 2.a.i? Please explain.</p> <p>The Component 3 is welcome. OK for the two outcomes 3.a and 3.b.</p> <p>- The formulation of the output 3.a.i. has to change. Please reflect a number of local planning processes you want to support. Explain in the text.</p> <p>- Output 3.a.ii: revise the formulation, express a number of training (if it is what you are planning to do). Explain in the text.</p> <p>- Output 3.b.i: we understand it is one (1) publication.</p> <p>- Outputs 3.b.ii and 3.b.iii: please revise the formulation to express tangible results. These sound more as outcomes.</p> <p>May 28, 2014 We take note of the efforts. The result framework is still very dense with 6 outcomes and 14 outputs. During the PPG, explore the possibility to simplify it, notably after discussing with other initiatives and projects.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	<p>to ensure that there is a transparent and fair process to identify the CSO and the partners. We would also like to see the possibility to adjust and adapt the list of partners during project implementation. For instance, we did not see the presence of Producer Organizations or their regional networks. At the first Conference on the GGWI, we met SOS Sahel who has been present for 40 years on these issues. Please, provide a list of criteria that will be use to maintain or adjust the list of partners (representativity, experience, results on the ground, staff, etc.).</p> <p>June 3, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The text A.1.1 is welcome. Actually, we do not directly expect GEB for the LD4 objective. We agree with the rationale about the complexity of land degradation and the need to link different stakeholders and find ways to target marginalized groups like women and indigenous people.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	<p>The added value is definitely demonstrated.</p> <p>Addressed.</p> <p>- Please, include a mention of the Branding Policy to well highlight the role of the GEF in key events and products.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			June 3, 2016 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 benefits?		Addressed.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes, this is the core of the project. Cleared.	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)	A short list of risks and mitigation measures is given. At CEO approval, please provide a comprehensive risk analysis to develop during the PPG. We consider it is a key piece of the project building blocks that may affect/change the whole result framework, the indicators, and the partnerships (to tackle risks that go beyond this project). May 28, 2014 Cleared.	The identification of CSO and partners to work with administrations and ministries can be delicate in some contexts. Please, include some objective and verifiable criteria to justify the selection of these partners. June 3, 2016 Addressed.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is linked to the Great Green Wall Initiative. - Please, confirm that the project will promote synergy and add simplicity to the current context, but will not build new institutions, new focal point mechanisms, or whatever. We recommend UNEP and IUCN to refer to the annexes of the SAWAP, the Bonn	Yes, the project is coordinated with other GGWI related initiatives. Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Declaration (February 2011), and especially the annexe 3 of the Declaration where partners, donors, centers of excellence, and NGOs provided clear guidance and principles (UNEP and IUCN were present and made statements included in this annex 3). The key principles that are expressed are still valid.</p> <p>- There are other key partners and stakeholders who support the GGW initiative (EU, FAO, GM). We would like to see the potential connections when activities are similar. See notably the project FLEUVE and the support of the civil society. See also scientific partners who recently published about the GGW concept (CFSD, IRD). See also the support of family or small scale agriculture by bilateral cooperation agencies, various international NGOs and farmer organizations.</p> <p>May 28, 2014 We take note of the response and will check at CEO approval. Please, note there are still confusions in the text between different platforms and projects. However, the PPG is there to clarify these different initiatives and explore partnership opportunities. Please, clarify at CEO approval.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is 	<p>We take note of the text A.1.6. For us, the project innovation is actually "to close the gap": meaning to increase the role of the civil society in such initiative as the GGWI, improving the access to</p>	<p>Innovation: At PIF level, we ask to improve the level of science in the project. Don't you think it would be possible to include 3 reviews/analysis for publication in peer review scientific</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	<p>knowledge about SLM, UNCCD, and the GGWI, and involve vulnerable groups as indigenous people and women.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	<p>journals? We are available to discuss further this option.</p> <p>June 3, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>Addressed.</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>- The role of the cofinancing is not clear. Please understand that the cofinancing should reflect the baseline activities on which the GEF will finance additional activities. Please clarify.</p> <p>- During the PPG, please identify other sources of cofinancing or baseline projects. Actually, it is one of the challenges for this project to improve the visibility of SLM and UNCCD (it is mentioned p.8): there are many initiatives and projects that aim to improve land management in a context of sustainable development, but these investments are disconnected with the UNCCD agenda</p>	<p>No comment.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(NAP, UNCCD focal points). This project should help to connect these initiatives and make the UNCCD/SLM agenda more visible.</p> <p>May 28, 0014 Cleared.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>- The cash cofinancing from UNEP and IUCN is welcome. - What are the activities/projects that are considered in the cofinancing in kind from IUCN (\$6,500,000)? - Please confirm that the cofinancing that is considered here is not already mobilized for other GEF projects with a risk of double counting.</p> <p>May 28, 0014 Cleared. Please, confirm at CEO approval.</p>	<p>- It may be a mistake from our part, but we only have the first page from Mauritania about the cofinancing, without the numbers, the parts in kind and in cash. Please provide the full letter. - The letter from Africa Union is missing. - Only some countries are mentioned in the cofinancing. Does it mean that not all the countries are interested? How do you define the baseline for these countries?</p> <p>June 3, 2016 We take note of the complementary information from Mauritania and the fact that the cofinancing from AU is withdrawn.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>The management costs reach 6.4 percent. It is acceptable.</p>	<p>The management costs are slightly under 6.4%.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>- Please, check the PIF template on http://www.thegef.org/gef/templates/gef-5-pif. A section related to the PPG is missing in the current document.</p>	<p>Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<u>At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</u>	May 28, 0014 Cleared.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		No. Please, check the quality of LD TT. - For instance, the project cannot start on January 1, 2016. Please, correct. June 3, 2016 Addressed.
	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?		NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		NA
	• Other GEF Agencies?		- A letter of support from FAO is available in the project submission.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	May 1st, 2014 The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Upon receipt of a revised document addressing the points above, the PIF will be considered for recommendation. May 28, 0014 The PIF is recommended for approval. Please, check the items to consider at CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO	At CEO approval, please include the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	endorsement/approval.	<p>following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provide a comprehensive risk analysis. - Confirm the cofinancing. - A Monitoring and Evaluation plan is expected. - See how to improve the science in the GGWI, investing in national and local skills. - Detail the implementation arrangements. Confirm the partnerships. - Explore the possibility to simplify the result framework. - Include a post-project strategy (sustainability). 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>May 10, 2016 The project cannot be recommended yet for approval. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>June 3, 2016 The project is recommended for CEO approval.</p>
	First review*	May 01, 2014	May 10, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 28, 2014	June 03, 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.**