



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

Country/Region: **Regional (Burkina Faso, Benin, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Sudan, Senegal, Chad, Togo)**
 Program Title: **Sahel and West Africa Sustainable Land and Water Management Program (supporting the Great Green Wall Initiative)**
 GEFSEC Program ID: **4511**
 GEF Agency Program ID: **P125210** GEF Agency: **World Bank**
 Type of Trust Fund: **GEF Trust Fund, Multi-Trust Fund**
 GEF Focal Area (s): **LD, BD, CC, SFM/REDD+, CCA** GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): **BD-1; BD-2; CCM-5; LD-3; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; CCA-1; CCA-2; Project Mana;**
 Anticipated Project Financing (\$ m): GEF/ LDCF/SCCF Project Grant: **\$105,444,444** Co-financing: **\$1,810,000,000** Total Project Cost: **\$1,915,444,444**
 PFD Approval Date: Expected Program Start Date:
 Program Manager: **Mohamed Bakarr** GEF Agency Contact Person: **Paola Agostini**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>This is a Programmatic Approach that includes 12 countries, all of which are eligible.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nine countries are strictly "Great Green Wall Initiative countries". - Three countries are joining the Programmatic approach as they would like to apply the concept on their territories. - The ratification of CBD, UNCCD, UNFCCC, as well as the submission of NAP and NAPAs are given in annex B for the PFD. <p>Cleared</p> <p>Among the countries included in this submissions, Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Sudan, and Togo are eligible for access to resources under the LDCF, while Ghana and Nigeria are eligible for resources under the SCCF (BB/RM)</p>
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Endorsement letters have not been received. However, the Bank informed us that the letters will be submitted on a rolling basis. At the the time of review, seven countries had submitted letters. Moreover, this PFD materializes a request made by the participating countries for a robust program to support the Great</p>

		<p>Green Wall Initiative. This PFD is the direct application of the Ministerial Declaration endorsed in Bonn by the eleven countries of the GGWI.</p> <p>April 7, 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Letters for Ghana, Chad, Mauritania, Togo, Nigeria were included in the submission. - Some discrepancies still exist in the use of the Sustainable Forest Management incentive: Ghana mentioned \$1 million from the SFM incentive, while \$2 million are mentioned in the PFD; for Mauritania: no mention of the SFM and the LDCF in the letter, with a total of \$3.9 million, while \$1 million from the SFM program, and \$3 million from the LDCF are requested for a total of \$7.9 million; Togo requested 1 million from the SFM incentive, but did not use the "multifocal" option in the table. - Due to the political support of the initiative expressed under the Bonn Declaration, and understanding the short time that the WB has had to prepare the program, the World Bank has informed us that it will deliver the letters of endorsement prior to the May Council.
Agency's Comparative Advantage	<p>3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes, the World Bank is well placed to lead the Program based on the level of existing and planned investments to be leveraged in each country. The Bank's comparative advantage is further reinforced by the new Strategy for Africa, which includes specific emphasis on vulnerability and resilience. This will be crucial for ensuring a consistent and longer-term engagement with the countries toward delivering on the vision for sustainable land management through the GGWI.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>4. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes, the co-financing is a mixture of soft loans and grants for baseline investments totaling \$1.8 billion. National counterpart funding is also considered. At CEO endorsement, additional cofinancing is expected from engagement by potential partners including bilateral agencies who are interested by the programmatic approach (see the Bonn Declaration)</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>5. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?</p>	<p>Not applicable for the LDCF and SCCF (BB/RM)</p>
	<p>6. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes, the World Bank is engaged in all of the countries involved, and will also build on a technical support framework of the Terrafrica Partnership Platform.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources</p>	

Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>- Not for all countries. Chad (\$6.8 million) and Niger (\$6.9 million) will exceed the total allocated. Please check and correct the amounts for these two countries.</p> <p>- The LDCF and SCCF do not apply the STAR. N/A (BB/RM)</p> <p>- Please also correct Table D to reflect actual breakdown of resources from the GEF/LDCF/SCCF, and to ensure that the column labeled "Type of Trust Fund" matches those in Table A for the Multi-Trust Fund.</p> <p>7 April 2011</p> <p>All the tables have been corrected to reflect appropriate amounts for the STAR, LDCF and SCCF.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	• the focal area allocation?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>- The focal area breakdown is not correct for Chad and Togo based on country allocations in the STAR. Please review these, and also ensure consistency with endorsement letters for all countries.</p> <p>- We understand that the WB is not exactly applying the ratio of 3:1 to leverage the SFM program incentive. When the GEF resources are between \$3 and \$5.99M, then \$1M of SFM resources have been requested; When GEF resources equals \$6M or more, \$2M of SFM resources have been requested.</p> <p>N/A for LDCF/SCCF (BB/RM)</p> <p>April 7 2011</p> <p>The breakdown has been corrected.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	The resources are available consistent with the principle of equitable access for LDC countries. (BB/RM)
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	The resources are available under the SCCF-Adaptation for this program (BB/RM)
• focal area set-aside?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>A total \$5 million (\$3 million from LD and \$2 million from CC) is requested for a regional project to support the programmatic approach. The aim is to develop a participative knowledge management and monitoring project in support of the</p>	

		<p>program. This request fits with the policy paper on the utilization of resources set aside outside the STAR (GEF/C.39/Inf.10)</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>N/A for LDCF and SCCF (BB/RM)</p>
<p>Program Consistency</p>	<p>8. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>The table A indicates direct contributions to the LD, BD, CC, SFM, and LDCF-SCCF result framework. However, the focal area outcomes are not adequately aligned with the program result framework. Given that the PFD is constructed around the a defined geographical region, an indication of spatial and quantitative targets will be essential for assessing consistency with outcomes of focal areas from which resources are being drawn.</p> <p>For the land degradation focal area, please provide some indicative targets (hectares) for SLWM in the Program Framework (Table B) based on the focal area results framework. These should take into account innovations and options highlighted in the PFD narrative as well in the concept note for countries.</p> <p>The program identifies two objectives in the GEF biodiversity strategy where the project will intervene: improved management effectiveness of PAs and increase in sustainably managed landscapes that integrate BD conservation. In order to clearly demonstrate use of the focal area resources toward these two objectives, please provide in the Program Framework (Table B) indicative outcomes or outcome targets from the focal area results framework, such as actual estimates of hectares of existing protected areas for improved or effective management. These should also be consistent with the narrative in the PFD and highlighted in the concept note for countries as appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TA activities such as capacity building are listed as INV grant type. - The M&E activities listed as GEF outcomes particularly in component 1 are not appropriate outcomes. They are M&E which needs to be conducted in all components. M&E costs are expected to be 5% or less. - LULUCF vs renewable energy objectives: Under B.1.1. is the sentence "In addition, by supporting low carbon technologies, the Program will support activities that will allow countries to follow a low-carbon development path." Either describe the low carbon technologies, and use the appropriate funding (such as CC-3) or delete this sentence. One would think that addressing drivers of deforestation/degradation would help contribute to green spaces though. This is also mentioned under Section C., but part D labeled mitigation and adaptation to climate change, bullet point on mitigation: "supporting alternatives to renewable household energy, resulting in reduced GHG emissions for charcoal production and use. These activities are CC-3 related. Please fix this throughout.

		<p>- For SFM/REDD+, please provide indicative target of forest area and ensure consistency with the PFD narrative and in concept notes for each of the countries.</p> <p>- For LDCF and SCCF the program is adequately aligned with reducing vulnerability and increasing adaptive capacity. (RM/BB)</p> <p>7 April 2011</p> <p>The revised PFD still lacks quantitative targets, which according to the Agency will only be carefully determined during the design of individual projects under the program. The Agency has indicated that a process for development of each discrete project will fully take into account the need to clearly define indicators and monitoring protocols in accordance with the results framework of each focal area or program from which resources are being utilized by countries. The results framework in the revised PFD now includes specific focal area objectives which will facilitate ensure consistency across the discrete projects as they are developed. It is also expected that focal area tracking tools will adequately reflect the quality of indicators and measures to be used for all GEBs identified in the projects. These will be assessed at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes. The focal area objectives are all mentioned in the table A for biodiversity (BD-1, BD-2), climate change (CC-5), land degradation (LD-3), SFM/REDD+ (1).</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>For LDCF/SCCF the objectives are identified; climate change adaptation (CCA-1, CCA-2). (RM/BB)</p>
	<p>10. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes. cf annex B in the PFD.</p> <p>This PFD is a response to request from countries that expressed interest for a robust program to help implement their collective vision for the Great Green Wall Initiative. This request was reiterated at several high level meetings (e.g. Ndjamenas Summits in June and November 2010), including a specific call for GEF financing which culminated in a Ministerial consultation Bonn where the countries expressed their support for a GEF programmatic approach. It is expected that a more detailed and accurate description of consistency with country strategies and plans will be provided at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>For the LDCs the projects included in the program must finance the actions needed to address the urgent and immediate adaptation needs as identified by</p>

		<p>each country's NAPA. Recommended Action: Please provide adequate information related to the linkage between the specific projects in the program and the country NAPAs.</p> <p>For the countries accessing SCCF resources the projects must be consistent with the vulnerability and adaptation assessments in the national communications. Recommended Action: Please effectively demonstrate this consistency with countries national communications. (RM/BB)</p> <p>7 April 2011 (RM/BM)</p> <p>The revised PFD now identifies NAPA priorities to be financed in the different countries utilizing LDCF/SCCF resources for implementing the program. However, please note comments on issues to be assessed for the country-specific projects at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>1. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?</p>	<p>March 31, 2011</p> <p>It is clearly mentioned that the program and its country-specific projects will not create new institutions. Each country will assign an institution or agency to implement the project. Committees at national and local levels will complete the project implementation arrangements to promote coordination and participative processes.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
<p>Program Design</p>	<p>2. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Most of the baseline projects are still in the early stages of being developed or conceptualized. As a result, the descriptions provided in the PFD are brief and sketchy, with poor or inadequate baseline data in most cases. It is expected that the GEF increment will strongly influence the design of baseline investments to ensure greater consistency and integration.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, provide clear baselines and quantified indicators. Develop the assumptions and the barriers that the program and its projects will seek to resolve. It is notably important that this barrier analysis address issues for each focal area. Lessons learned from past investments should underpin assumptions related to linking environment and development goals in such an ambitious program (e.g. alternative livelihood activities, knowledge and institutional barriers, etc.).</p> <p>- Technical experts have been advising us to stay above the 400mm rainfall threshold to have success green landscapes. At the bottom of page 9, it is mentioned areas with about 200mm). What is the plan here for targeted semi-arid and arid areas?</p>

		<p>With respect to the LDCF and SCCF the baseline projects are sufficiently described only for the following countries, Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Mali (LDCF) and Nigeria (SCCF). Additional information is still required to describe the vulnerability of the baseline projects to justify the grant requests for related adaptation measures (RM/BB)</p> <p>7 April 2011</p> <p>The Agency has indicated that baseline projects will be developed together with GEF alternatives in order to ensure the design of each discrete project is based on sound data and assumptions. These will be assessed at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>3. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>The program is designed to accommodate a number of existing and planned baseline initiatives in each of the participating countries, which together provide a constructive platform for GEF investment to generate GEBs. While the investments are all driven by country level priorities and opportunities, the potential for achieving transformative impact at regional scale is greatly enhanced through the programmatic approach. GEF investment is therefore crucial for ensuring alignment of country level activities, consistency in delivering outcomes in the focal areas, SFM/REDD+, and LDCF/SCCF objectives, and coherence in implementing the vision for the GGWI. The vision of the GGWI as outlined by countries stands to benefit greatly from a robust and holistic approach as proposed in this PFD. The programmatic approach will also help to address regional multi-sectoral challenges and offer multiple benefits compared to fragmented projects.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>4. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>The problems and barriers to be addressed - knowledge, technological, policy and institutional, economic and institutional - are very relevant to the context but only generally described in the PFD. The aim of the Program is to deliver better impacts on the ground using a holistic and integrated approach, with resources from multiple sources including focal areas. The description of barriers and problems should therefore be consistent with priorities of the focal areas in order to justify the use of GEF resources. Please provide a clear rationale for each of the barriers on this basis, including an indicative measure (sound data) of their significance to warrant investment under the program (i.e. how significant are these barriers relative to the vision of SLWM in the Sahel?).</p> <p>- GEF investments are 4% of the total. Based on past experiences under Terrafrica for instance, it is always a case to imagine how the GEF is going to be incremental. Please develop the reasoning at CEO endorsement.</p>

		<p>- The reasoning is notably difficult for BD resources when all the baseline is provided by agriculture or development projects. In the concept note for each country, please clarify the nature of investments under the BD focal areas (protected areas, PES, mainstreaming).</p> <p>- Carbon inventories/measurements: Need more specifics about the activities occurring for the incremental GEF funding from climate. Concisely state plans, if any, for measuring/estimating carbon benefits/stocks/changes as project proceeds.</p> <p>- Annex C country level increment: Incremental activities must be better described, especially for the CC funding as well as SFM funding. In the annex to the Togo project, with the SFM funds, expected carbon benefits should be listed.</p> <p>- SFM: Impacts of SFM activities are expected on the ground. At CEO endorsement, regardless of whether CC funding is directly involved as a focal area for a country, the SFM project must show carbon benefits.</p> <p>LDCF/SCCF-Please provide an explanation of how the adaptation resources will be effectively used with some level of specificity, as appropriate at this early stage. (RM/BB)</p> <p>With respect to the LDCF and SCCF, additional information is requested to describe the vulnerability of the baseline projects, and the problems the proposed projects seek to address (RM/BB)</p> <p>7 April 2011</p> <p>The revised PFD now includes a table summarizing the various barriers, their significance for the program, and links with GEF focal areas and the climate change adaptation program. The Agency has also indicated that each of the discrete projects will reflect detailed activities to be financed with the GEF increment. These will be assessed at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>LDC/SCCF (RM/BB)</p> <p>The revised PDF has addressed the concerns to some extent, but see note on expectations for discrete projects at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>5. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>The program framework needs to be made clearer in terms of consistency with focal area results framework (as noted above) and made more consistent with various GEF resources to be used for incremental costs. Conceptually, the following substantive issues need to be clarified:</p>

- a) alignment of baseline investments: please clarify exactly how multiple baseline projects in most of the countries will be integrated or linked to effectively leverage GEF resources for the alternative project.
- (b) regional integration and coherence: please clarify how exactly country-level investments and technical assistance will be aligned to maximize potential for transformative impact relative to the baseline.
- (c) PES a priority for investment: Based on STAP guidance, please provide a clear explanation of how this will be addressed in the context of implementing the GGWI. For the countries where PES is under consideration, please provide some baseline rationale to demonstrate the likelihood of achieving measurable impacts.

As noted above, the reasoning and the description of GEB need to be clarified, especially for biodiversity.

- Carbon indicators: The KPI 1: Indicator needs to have forest broken out by agroforestry system and forest. Wetlands are described as a part of this landscape. Areas of wetlands should be broken out due to their ability to emit relative large quantities of CO2 when drained, and emissions estimated.
- There appears to be an indicator for BD, LD, CC, and LDCF, and an indicator is needed for SFM. SFM must focus on forest lands, although in a wider landscape.
- The indicator of change in carbon accumulation rates in biomass and soil, [respectively] is probably for degradation type activities. Also separately report avoided emissions due to deforestation. For CC5, restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks, the aim is carbon stocks. For these activities, reporting the carbon stocks and the increase in them may be important. For BD activities carbon stocks may be important. Please revisit the exact carbon estimate needs (stocks, accumulation rates, reduced emissions, enhancements, etc.) of the activities.
- For purposes of double-checking always report area of land, with its corresponding carbon benefit.

The project framework is not sufficiently clear as it should more explicitly define how the resources from the LDCF and SCCF will be effectively integrated into baseline projects with the aim to reduce their climate change vulnerabilities. (RM/BB)

The adaptation benefits are not sufficiently described, and need to be explicitly clarified at country level (Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Mali and Nigeria) (RM/BB)

7 April 2011

The revised PDF has clarified most of these issues to some extent, included conceptual approaches to be used in development of the discrete projects. The Agency has indicated that the overall program framework will be further elaborated during development of the

		<p>discrete projects in order to ensure alignment between country-driven priorities and opportunities or needs for integration across national boundaries and regional level. However, the document still falls short of delivering concrete information on targets, indicators, etc, that is relevant for the different GEF Focal areas and programs. The Key Performance Indicators (KPs) are too coarse to reflect some of the GEF focal area specific needs. For example, KP#1 needs to include quantitative, biological and objective measures of "SLWM" for each ecosystem or land-use type: crops, rangeland, forest, wetland, protected areas. What kind of increase in forest area will the program seek? What crop varieties will be influenced and why? What role will crop wild relatives play in defining sustainability of agro-ecosystems? For both of these, what is the definition of sustainable practices and how is measured per land-use and ecosystem type? For protected areas as part of SLWM practices in the GGWI, how will the project measure sustainability? In this regard, clear expectations for each discrete project have been outlined in the comments under #29 below. These will serve as basis for assessing all projects at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>6. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes. The beneficiary and targeted partners in the field are described at the program level, including the civil society, indigenous peoples and women. At project level, it is expected that the beneficiaries and partners will be further detailed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>7. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes, and these need to be fleshed out in detail for the countries based on national and local realities.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>8. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>- Yes, but a more detailed analysis is expected at CEO endorsement. Some risks might be lethal, and some projects would need to be re-oriented based on feasibility of some planned interventions (PES? ecotourism?).</p> <p>- Ecotourism usually means increased GHG emissions from travel. Will these offset any increases in carbon sequestration or avoided land emissions? Please include as a risk and how it will be mitigated, or if not included as a risk why not. Perhaps safeguards are needed.</p>

Program Financing		Cleared
	19. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Yes, but there are still important initiatives missing, such as GEF funded programs in the Fouta Djallon (headwaters of the Niger river), the West Africa programmatic approach for biodiversity and energy, etc.. Please provide a more detailed assessment at CEO Endorsement to ensure that duplications will be avoided and synergies maximized.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>For the LDCF and SCCF financed components of the program, there needs to be coordination with other LDCF projects which are ongoing in country. Specifically close coordination with FAO and UNDP must be sought in Mali where two LDCF projects are already under implementation in the agriculture sector. (BB/RM)</p> <p>7 April 2011 (RM/BB)</p> <p>See comments on expectations for LDCF/SCCF at CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In every country, there will be a national execution arrangement on the ground. Partnerships with appropriate stakeholders will be developed on the ground. - Coordination will be ensured at program level with other key donors, as the AFDB and IFAD. - At regional level, existing and operational structures will be involved. We notably welcome the involvement of partners who mentioned their interests in the GGW Initiative in the Bonn meeting as OSS, IUCN, WWF, and ICRAF. <p>Cleared</p>
21. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GEF funding Project Management costs are 10% of GEF funding. This maximum is somehow acceptable due to the challenging environment of this Programmatic approach. We are expecting at CEO endorsement a rationale to use 10 percent of management costs. - However, the part of GEF funding for Project management costs is too high for such a significantly leveraged program. Please adjust the amounts for a ratio of at least 1:5. 	

		<p>7 April 2011</p> <p>This has been addressed, and the ratio for management costs is now 1:7</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	22. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>The budget seems adequate in the limits provided by the STAR and the LDCF-SCCF rules. At CEO endorsement, please provided quantified outputs and indicators, as well as quantified baselines.</p> <p>Please check consistency between Table A and B to ensure that the funding per objective is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs (check the outcomes/outputs linked to the creation of protected areas, the improvement of management effectiveness of existing protected areas, the definition of pilot PES approaches using BD allocations, mainstreaming, and ecotourism).</p> <p>7 April 2011</p> <p>These have been addressed in the revised PFD.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	23. Comment on the indicated co-financing..	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>- The co-financing currently stands at \$1.8 billion, but this will likely change since most of the baseline investments are still in the early stages of development.</p> <p>- At CEO endorsement, please include cofinancing from bilateral partners who mentioned their interests in the Great Green Wall Initiative (the US, Germany, and France).</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	24. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	<p>31 March 2011</p> <p>Same as #4 above.</p>
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	25. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	
	26. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
Agency Responses	27. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	7 April 2011

		The Agency has addressed many of the comments as appropriate for the PFD, and agreed to take others forward during development of discrete projects. These concerns have been included in list of items to be considered at CEO Endorsement. Some of the comments related to scientific research and methods will be accommodated in the discrete project on regional knowledge management. This project will also include a focus on addressing focal area learning objectives related to spatial analysis of land use, indicators and monitoring, and assessment of trade-offs. Cleared
	• Convention Secretariat?	7 April 2011 The UNCCD Secretariat provided comments that included a strong support for the program. All concerns expressed have been addressed in the revised PFD. Cleared
	• Council comments?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	The PFD reflects the engagement of many partners present in Bonn. We much appreciate the analysis of statements made in Bonn, and how the WB will include these recommendations (annex E)
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	28. Is PFD clearance being recommended?	March 31, 2011 Upon receipt on a revised document responding the comments above, the document will be recommended for clearance. 7 April 2011 The revised document has addressed most of the concerns raised in the first review and clarified how others will be accommodated during development of discrete projects. The PFD is now recommended for CEO clearance.
	29. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	31 March 2011 - Include Bonn recommendations at project level - Show that recommendations made by partners in the Bonn Declaration at project level are included in the project document, - Develop partnerships with bilateral and other GGWI partners (EU, IFAD, FAO, for instance) - Confirm co-financing - Provide a clear baseline with quantified information, - Provide a comprehensive risk analysis, - Develop a monitoring and evaluation plan with quantified indicators, - Provide a analysis of local stakeholders to justify the selection of beneficiary and targeted communities. - Check that management costs are strictly ≤ 10 percent of the total project grant.

7 April 2011

For GEFTF Investments (addressing LD, BD, CC, and SFM/REDD+ Agendas)

- clear evidence of "incremental" value of GEF investments relative to baselines in each project
- clear evidence of focal area specific outcomes and outputs based on national priorities and action plans, including for the relevant Conventions
- adequate description of spatial targets (i.e. geographical coverage with respect to habitats and agroecologies), including maps to illustrate planned spatial configuration of PAs, agriculture landscapes, and other land-uses in accordance with country priorities for implementing the GGWI vision
- adequate description of how spatially linked components will be mutually reinforcing to effectively manage tradeoffs, including a set of indicators to measure the global benefits to be generated through this integrated approach
- for projects specifically targeting protected areas, clarification of PA sustainability and how it is measured and how the PA investments are contributing to the national PA system sustainability
- for projects investing in PES, a clear evidence of economic feasibility of PES and ecotourism as options for generating resource flows
- adequate description of beneficiaries (including gender-specific consideration) and approach to enhancing grassroots participation to deliver both environment and development benefits
- very detailed information about renewable energy technologies adopted, including estimates of carbon benefits
- specifics about carbon inventories/measurements planned CO2 benefits, with expectations of improvements of those estimates as the project proceeds
- appropriate specific information about SFM projects are expected, including evidence to show that SFM investments are directed toward forest landscapes
- clarity of ecological conditions under which the field-based activities are planned to occur, including consideration of rainfall thresholds for successful establishment of vegetation cover
- exact and specific measure of carbon benefits from land use (such as carbon change vs carbon stock) relative to baseline, including US\$/tCO₂e estimates to assess cost-effectiveness and to contribute to knowledge development
- areas of wetlands involved should be broken out from other land covers/use with corresponding GHG emission benefits estimated
- an explicit M&E budget

For LDCF/SCCF (RM/BB)

- For the Chad project, please explain how the adaptation measures that need to be financed to meet the urgent and immediate adaptation needs as identified by the NAPA are integrated with the LDPSP2 project; and how the LDCF resources will be

used effectively in the LDPSP2 project to address the NAPA priorities. Alternatively, as the World Bank is preparing a new Agricultural Productivity Project for Chad, it may be more appropriate to use the new project as baseline and LDCF resources for climate resilience in this project. By CEO Endorsement, please provide a description of the adaptation benefit that is generated by this project and a justification of the LDCF grant request based on additional cost reasoning.

- For the Ethiopia project, LDCF resources must be used to implement urgent and immediate adaptation measures as prioritized by the NAPA. By CEO endorsement please provide: an explanation on how the adaptation measures will be integrated into the baseline project; a description of the adaptation benefits generated by this project; and the additional cost reasoning to justify the request for an LDCF grant. In addition, documentation about synergies and coordination (as well as a demonstration that there is no duplication) with the current UNDP LDCF project in Ethiopia must be provided.
- In Mali it is proposed that the LDCF funds will help the baseline projects to become resilient to climate change and complement activities developed through the disaster risk management project. Also, the resources will consider some of the top priorities included in the NAPA. As the major NAPA priorities in Mali revolve around food security, please explain how this project is linked to NAPA priorities. Clarification is needed as to what the complementary activities are, and how these activities relate to the NAPA priorities. LDCF resources are to be used for implementation of the NAPA priorities and the additional adaptation benefit needs to be demonstrated.
- In Mauritania it is proposed to use LDCF resources for reinforcing adaptive capacities to reduce sea level rise, flooding and sand dune encroachment threats. This does not entirely coincide with the NAPA priorities. Please demonstrate the linkages to the NAPA priorities and the additional adaptation benefits.
- The project in Togo is effectively aligned with the NAPA priorities of Togo, as it focuses on land management, however the PIF proposal must include a clarification on what elements/activities are being financed by the LDCF. The need to justify the grant through additional cost reasoning and generation of adaptation benefits is valid for all LDCF projects.
- The SCCF resources are to be used for the resilience of civil works susceptible or contributing to soil erosion in Nigeria. The activities identified are appropriate but further detail of how exactly the resources will be used should be provided by CEO endorsement. References to the Vulnerability and Adaptation section of the National Communications must be provided to demonstrate that the choice of these activities is consistent with the country's adaptation priorities. Additional cost reasoning and description of the generation of adaptation benefits must be provided.

11 April 2011

A revised information package has been submitted with revised numbers. The Program Framework Document is technically cleared. However, the title had slightly changed. Please maintain the title as it was agreed in the first submission: "Sahel and West Africa Program supporting the Great Green Wall Initiative". Upon receipt of a document with the revised title, the PFD will be recommended for

		clearance. 15 April, 2011 A revised information package has been submitted with a revised title. The project is recommended for clearance. Check that management costs are strictly ≤ 10 percent of the total project grant.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 01, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 07, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 15, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.**