



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

GEF ID:	9772		
Country/Region:	Gambia		
Project Title:	Landscape Planning and Restoration to Improve Ecosystem Services, and Livelihoods, Expand and Effectively Manage Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; BD-1 Program 2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,324	Project Grant:	\$5,644,685
Co-financing:	\$19,797,260	Total Project Cost:	\$25,441,945
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamour Bouhari

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	<p>- The project is potentially aligned with LD2 Programme 2, LD3 Programme 4, and BD1 Programme 2.</p> <p>However, the GEF has financed several projects in Gambia to support the PA network: Any new project on PA should clearly be built on the lessons from past projects (3961 and 1061 with the World Bank).</p>	

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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Non duplication and complementarity with on-going projects should be demonstrated (5529, UNDP, Gambia Protected Areas Network and Community Livelihood project). - Other adaptation or LME projects may also be analyzed. - Include the Aichi targets AND the indicators which will be used to track them. <p>Avril 3, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The mention of marmoset is wrong. There is probably a confusion with the Callithrix Monkey (<i>Cercopithecus sabeus</i>), present in Gambia. Please, correct. <p>Avril 3, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>The drivers are identified.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please explain how these activities will be financed once the project will have closed? Is there any thinking about sustainable financing mechanisms (new or existing)? - Please clarify the status of the National Conservation Trust Fund For Natural Resources). 	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Avril 3, 2017 Addressed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are seeing two distinct projects (one in the Kuntaur Local Government Area, one on coastal and marine protected areas), without enough explanation about the need and the added value of integration. Please, justify. - The baseline situation and cofinancing opportunities are identified for the SLM part. However, the reasoning to propose a fourth component related to the creation of the new marine and coastal protected areas is less robust. Please, complete. - Please, explain the level of dialogue with the 29 (!) sources of cofinancing" have all the different projects been contacted? - A significant part of the cofinancing from the local Councils is in grant. It is pretty unusual. Please explain the level of confidence to have all this cofinancing confirmed and in cash at CEO endorsement. <p>Avril 3, 2017 Addressed. Confirm cofinancing at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The formulation of the main project objective is weak "To support....". We recommend to rephrase it. - Cofinancing is estimated at nearly 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>\$20 million. It is then surprising to see so many outputs that sound as baseline activities: 1.1, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The formulation of some outputs has to be revised to well reflect the results of activities. They should be quantified as far as possible: 1.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.7. - The GEF does not finance business-as-usual activities that should be financed by cofinancing, mainly from institutions: 1.2. revised policies; 2.1 strategic environmental assessment. <p>Avril 3, 2017 Addressed. However, confirm the result framework at CEO endorsement. Use the PPG to reassess some components and/or outputs. We are seeing potential rooms for simplification.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Could you reassure the GEFSEC that the project will not be too top-down designed and implemented? - During PPG, please develop how CSO (NGOs, farmer organizations, universities, traditional authorities) will be associated in project design and implementation. <p>Avril 3, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
<p>Availability of Resources</p>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources</p>		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	<p>Yes. The total GEF grant requested (project + PPG + fees) = \$6,280,930;</p> <p>With \$3,276,398 from LD and \$2,995,856 from BD, after marginal adjustment from LD to BD of \$1 million.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>Avril 3, 2017 The Comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 15, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 03, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.