



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

GEF ID:	9134		
Country/Region:	Senegal		
Project Title:	Food-IAP: Agricultural Value Chains Support Project		
GEF Agency:	IFAD and UNIDO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$7,219,450
Co-financing:	\$28,544,133	Total Project Cost:	\$35,883,583
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Naoufel Telahigue

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		<p>Gender issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There were specific questions in the template: did you remove them? - There is a specific study (in French), but we are not seeing how this study has impacted the reasoning, the result framework and the indicators. The Section A.4. only provide very general statistics. Please, could you elaborate further on key gender gaps (e.g. pinpointing some barriers and issues related to the project success including sex disaggregated information on roles, incomes, access to resources and services as well as to decision making opportunities as related to project outcomes); - Para 125 is unclear - specifically how the project will deal with challenges related to land ownership which was identified as a barrier; - Paras 128, 129, and 130 are unfinished. Please, complete the sentences (teh indicators, where to find further information, activities...). - The proposed indicators are interesting, but it would be good to see a list of

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			specific targeted measures/activities to address gender issues or women empowerment.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<p>Project Design and Financing</p>	<p>1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table A: please provide one line per program: divide the first line that combine LD Program 1 and LD Program 2. - Table E: The project has not been developed under a BD strategic objective and the project does not respond to the Corporate Result (CR) 1 on biodiversity. There is no demonstration of a benefit for a biodiversity of global importance. We should read zero and not 2,100 ha of lands. - CR2: We invite the Agency to revise the number of ha under SLM - Same comment for the CR3: we acknowledge there will be results for freshwater basins, but not on an IW perspective: we should read zero and not Five freshwater basins - CR4: The total GHG emission reduction target should be shown; eventually with the distinction between direct and indirect mitigation (but not a number of tons per ha per year). Please, include an annex with the details of the carbon accounting. - A letter of endorsement is available in French: the practice is to provide an informal (non-official) translation in English. Please provide such non-official translation. 	

		October 20, 2016 Addressed.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The table B is too summarized and is not informative about the value for money of the 8 million of US\$ provided by the GEF. The formulation of outputs does not follow GEF practices (cf. OECD guidelines). They are not specific, quantifiable, measurable, and do not reflect enough the results of activities. However, there is useful information in the request for CEO endorsement to clarify these outputs. We recommend at least to include the main concrete results into brackets to complete the formulation of outputs (p24, 28, and 31).</p> <p>Ex: Output 1.1: capacity building of actors at the national, regional, and local levels (=22 awareness workshops targeting 2,500 people; 14 training sessions for 800 beneficiaries).</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>October 20, 2016 Addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Based on the table E: 1,800 ha of agricultural lands under SLM seem very low for such project and not cost effective. Please, confirm the targets (and make the numbers coherent in the different documents, tracking tools included). - In Paragraphs 7.2 and 7.3, the targeted numbers of water-harvesting bunds and/or water spreading weirs should be put. - In Para 81, installing 20 solar 	

		<p>pumping systems in market garden sites look very small for such a project. This number should be enlarged enough to make sure project beneficiaries can easily access the information on the solar pumping technologies.</p> <p>October 20, 2016 We acknowledge the fact that the strategic choice has been made to invest more on scaling up mechanisms, including training and awareness, rather than direct field investments.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>Cofinancing is confirmed and evidence is provided.</p> <p>However, the level of cofinancing from UNIDO is surprisingly low. Please, clarify what the cofinancing is doing under the component 2. The GEF budget seems to finance a whole chain of activities, as a stand alone project (from studies, to civil work, monitoring, control, and training). The notion of additionality of GEF resources seems lost. Please, clarify. - See how UNIDO can increase their cofinancing.</p>	

		October 20, 2016 Addressed.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>- Please make the numbers of ha under SLM coherent between the project document, the request for CEO endorsement (notably the table E with Corporate Results), and the tracking tools.</p> <p>- Information is lacking on GHG accounting (see para 83, p28, CEO ER, tracking tools, for instance). IFAD and UNIDO need to provide detailed methodologies, assumptions and data for GHG emission reduction calculation. An annex, explaining the carbon reasoning and calculations, will be welcome.</p>	
		October 20, 2016 Addressed.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>- Please clarify how the resilience will be measured.</p> <p>October 20, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Addressed.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

	PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC • STAP 	<p>No. Please, include a table of responses of STAP comments, notably for comments applicable for this project (for instance 3, 5a, 8...).</p> <p>October 20, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>There was no specific comment for this child project in Senegal. However, the US, German, and Canada Council Members made comments at PFD level that are applicable to this project (land tenure issues, platforms, innovation, rain-fed agriculture, etc). Please, include a table of responses addressing these comments.</p> <p>October 20, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>Not yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>October 20, 2016 All comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement after a Council information 4 week period.</p> <p>Minor issues are still present in the tracking tools. Please, correct the TT before the end of the 4-week</p>	

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

		<p>information period.</p> <p>November 30, 2016 We received informal comments from one Council Member on November 9, 2016. IFAD took note of the comments and submitted a revised package on November 23, 2016, reducing the GEF project management costs from 5.2% to less than 5%. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	July 07, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 20, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		