



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	9532		
Country/Region:	Central African Republic		
Project Title:	LCB-NREE CAR child project: Enhancing agro-ecological systems in northern prefectures of the Central African Republic (CAR)		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$2,557,942
Co-financing:	\$3,394,500	Total Project Cost:	\$5,952,442
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Bamba DIOP

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?		June 21, 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?		June 21, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		June 21, 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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

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?		June 21, 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?		June 21, 2016 n/a AC
	• the focal area allocation?		June 21, 2016 Funds were approved under GEF 5 and are still available. Cleared. AC
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		June 21, 2016 n/a AC
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		June 21, 2016 n/a AC
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		June 21, 2016 n/a AC
	• focal area set-aside?		June 21, 2016 n/a AC
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		June 21, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		June 21, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant		June 21, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	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?		June 22, 2016 A clear and consistent language has to be maintained that PRESIBALT is the new baseline project, and this should reflect throughout the project. On p16, why should national projects carry on PRODEBALT activities as well, as if it were also a baseline project "National projects will carry on the momentum of PRODEBALT and PRESIBALT, sustaining activities at local level where action is most needed?" Similar observation on p27, last paragraph "The project will specifically try to address problems that arose out of the implementation of GEFID 767 and PRODEBALT as expressed in their terminal evaluations." Please, consider revising. AC 11 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?		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		June 22, 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?		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		June 22, 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)		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		June 22, 2016 Security of great concern in the region. Clarity is sought on what, in practical terms, you mean by the "project will retain flexibility to deal with insecurity and change." (second from last in the table of risks p 29). Second, the security of teams executing the project is also a concern and has

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			implications on the costs of the project. Please, highlight this as a risk and provide appropriate mitigation measures. AC 11 October 2016 Addressed
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		June 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		June 24, 2016 n/a AC
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		15 July 2016 According to the guidelines for GEF5, the amount requested should not exceed 5%. As the PMC is 10%, please provide the justification for exceeding the authorized limit and the detailed budget. 11 October 2016 Addressed
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		June 24, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		June 24, 2016 No letter to confirm cofinancing is attached to this project submission. Please, provide the cofinancing letters. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation			11 October 2016 The PRESIBALT document approved by the AfDB Board is presented as commitment from AfDB in terms of co-financing. Addressed
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		June 24, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		15 July 2016 LD TT: information in boxes highlighted yellow needs to be provided where relevant (II Outcomes and learning). BD TT: cleared CC and SFM: there are missing information and inconsistencies between SFM TT, Ex-Act tools and the project document. Notably regarding the deforestation: it is not clear how the deforestation avoided is calculated in the Ex-Act tool (505ha?), the area where SLFM applies in the project document is not clear either (cf table B and text of component 2). Please be very clear in both the tables and the text about what is being done on which surface and ensure that all the same figures can be found in the different documents. AC 13 October 2016 Thank you for the explanation and alignment between the different documents. Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>June 27, 2016</p> <p>The proposal includes an M&E description. Additional comprehensible budget and costing information is required.</p> <p>Second, as has been done for GHG emissions on p27, provide additional information on how you will measure the proposed GEB indicators on p41. For example, how does the project intend to measure improved livelihoods in rural areas (farmer income) as an indicator under GEF additional funding? Please, consider revising.</p> <p>AC</p> <p>13 October 2016</p> <p>Thank you for budgeting the M&E Plan and for the requested complements. Addressed.</p>
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>15 July 2016</p> <p>We acknowledge the responses to the STAP comments dated on 8/10/2011, 2/11/2011 and 15/03/2012.</p> <p>Nevertheless, despite the response to the comments dated 15/03/2012 states that "each response has been adapted to the child project", we note that the responses in the table are the identical among the different child projects. Please explain how and precisely where the response has been adapted for this child project. In addition, please provide a clear mention stating that this update</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			take into account the consultation occurred in May 2016 between the STAP and the agency. 11 October 2016 Adressed
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• 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?		June 27, 2016 Yes, annex C. Cleared AC
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		June 28, 2016 Not yet. Please, consider responding to comments above in cells 11, 19, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 29. AC and PM 11 October 2016 Yes. The comments have been addressed and the proposal can now be recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*		June 28, 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.