



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

GEF ID:	5133		
Country/Region:	Regional (Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Senegal)		
Project Title:	Senegal River Basin Climate Change Adaptation Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	131353 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; CCA-1; Project Mana; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$16,000,000
Co-financing:	\$68,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$84,500,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	01/31/2013 â€“ YES. Guinea, Mali, Mauritania and Senegal are all LDCs and they have completed their NAPAs.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>NO.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide Letters of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Points of the four participating countries.</p> <p>01/31/2013 â€“ YES. Letters of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Points of Guinea, Mali, Mauritania and Senegal, have been provided with the submission.</p> <p>IW/AH -- Please note that GEF IW funds are regional in nature; hence an artificial even split in LoEs is against</p>	

		modus of operation. Therefore, prior to CEO endorsement, please provide new LoEs without splitting IW funds by country.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	01/31/2013 " YES. The World Bank has a comparative advantage and considerable experience of large-scale initiatives in trans-boundary water resources management and climate change adaptation.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>01/31/2013 " NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would benefit from past and present World Bank programming in the Senegal River Basin, and well-staffed country offices in Senegal and Mali. However, some of the Country Assistance Strategies cited in Section C.2 appear to be outdated.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please demonstrate that the proposed project is consistent with the most recent CAS or equivalent programming documents in the participating countries.</p> <p>2/8/2013 -- YES: The re-submission clarifies that Country Partnership Strategies (CPS) are currently under preparation for all four countries and will be presented for World Bank Board approval in early 2013. The project will be appraised in light of the new CPS goals.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, based on the revised CPS, please clarify how the proposed project fits into the World</p>	

		countries.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	01/31/2013 â€“ IW/AH: YES.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	01/31/2013 â€“ CCA: YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	01/31/2013 â€“YES. The proposed project is aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework and the GEF 5 IW focal area strategy.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	01/31/2013 â€“ CCA: NOT CLEAR. According to the Focal Area Strategy Framework, the proposed project would contribute towards CCA-1 and, specifically, outcome 1.2 on reduced vulnerability to climate change in development sectors. In addition, however, the project appears to be consistent with CCA-2, particularly outcomes 2.1 and 2.2. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the Focal Area Strategy Framework captures all relevant LDCF and GEF-IW objectives, outcomes and	

		<p>IW/AH: YES. The GEF-5 IW focal area strategy objectives have been identified and listed in Table A.</p> <p>02/08/2013 â€“ CCA: YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	01/31/2013 â€“ CCA: YES. The proposed project is consistent with the PRSPs of the participating countries, as well as other relevant strategies, plans and policies in the area of sustainable development and natural resources management. The project also contributes towards the implementation of NAPA priorities in all four countries, particularly as these relate to climate-resilient water resources management, hydrological monitoring and institutional capacity building.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>01/31/2013 â€“ YES. The proposed project would strengthen the capacities of regional and national institutions to manage the Senegal River Basin in a sustainable and resilient manner. The project also supports enhanced community-based governance of water resources.</p> <p>The executing agency is OMVS, which is one of the RBOs in Africa with the longest history and a solid capacity to implement the proposed project.</p>	
	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?	01/31/2013 â€“ YES. The proposed LDCF and GEF-IW grants would be integrated into the second phase of the IDA-financed Senegal River Basin Multi-Purpose Water Resources Development Project (MWRD 2) which	

Project Design		<p>The project supports (i) regional institutional development; (ii) multi-purpose water resources development at the local level; and (iii) regional multi-purpose and multi-sectoral planning. The baseline project also includes co-financing from the Dutch Trust Fund, with a focus on (i) measures to combat invasive water weeds; and (ii) enhancing river navigability.</p>	
	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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>01/31/2013 “CCA: NOT CLEAR. The proposed LDCF grant would enable the integration of climate change adaptation into transboundary water resources management, while addressing urgent adaptation needs at the national level.</p> <p>With respect to Component 2, the PIF could further clarify the linkages between the vulnerability assessment carried out with LDCF funding, and the proposed TDA update requesting resources from GEF-IW.</p> <p>As for Component 3, the project would support the establishment of water-user associations and farmers' professional cooperatives. It is not entirely clear how, in this respect, the LDCF grant would support adaptation in line with additional reasoning given that very similar investments would be made through Component 2a of the baseline</p>	

		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify the linkages between the vulnerability assessment proposed under Component 2b and the TDA update proposed under 2a; and (ii) justify the request for LDCF resources for the establishment of water-user associations and farmers' professional cooperatives.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please (i) identify in greater detail the beneficiaries of the capacity building program proposed under Component 1b; (ii) clarify the scope and targeted areas for the investments in hydrological monitoring under Component 2b; and (iii) identify the demonstration areas for the investments proposed under Component 3a.</p> <p>IW/AH: YES. The incremental reasoning of project activities is clearly articulated and in line with the GEF 5 IW FA strategy.</p> <p>As this is a multi-TF project, the use of terms of 'baseline' may somewhat be confusing. Many ongoing related actions on national level - e.g. some of the projects listed e.g. in B 6 - contribute to 'baseline' actions. The increment (in terms of IW) are the GEF interventions, part of MWRD2 (USD 53 mill of that), and the second Dutch TF program (USD 15 million) - these 'parts of' MWRD2 and the Dutch TF are therefore co-financing (to the GEF increment). Please replace wording on page 8 bottom: instead of "direct baseline co-</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>financing...".</p> <p>02/08/2013 â€“ CCA: YES. The re-submission clarifies that the proposed vulnerability assessment will inform and be integrated into the TDA update, and the LDCF grant would focus on enhancing the adaptive capacity of existing water-user associations, whereas the baseline project would facilitate the establishment of new ones.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>01/31/2013 â€“ NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above. Component 2b, as presented in the project framework (Table B), suggests that an updated vulnerability assessment will be carried out only if necessary. This appears to be inconsistent with the description on p. 13. Moreover, it is not clear why Component 2b has been treated as INV, rather than TA.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13 above, please (i) revise the project framework accordingly, as necessary; (ii) ensure that the proposed components, outcomes and outputs are consistently described in the project framework and section B.2 of the PIF; and (iii) justify treating Component 2b as INV as opposed to TA.</p> <p>IW/AH: YES. The project framework is sufficiently clear and well formulated at PIF stage.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please consider the following issues:</p>	

		<p>and communication - please consider renaming component 2 (2 A and B). This component does much more than knowledge generation & management and enhances capacity for adaptive management to react to climate variability and change at regional and national levels.</p> <p>(ii) Component 2: There is conceptual & practical linkage between the vulnerability assessment of SRB (2b) and update of TDA/SAP (2 b). Hence we see freedom for flexibility during project design to budget either GEF IW or LDCF funds in this effort.</p> <p>(iii) Component 1: Enhancing capacities of OMVS and related national agencies with regard to addressing climate variability and change is equally flexible in this regard (between LDCF and GEF/IW). As described this is expected to be funded solely from LDCF.</p> <p>02/08/2013 “ YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>01/31/2013 “ NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please revise the description of the expected adaptation benefits accordingly, as necessary.</p> <p>02/08/2013 “ CCA: YES. The expected adaptation benefits have been adequately described for this stage of</p>	

		methodology and assumptions.	
	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?	<p>01/31/2013 – YES. The expected socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please clarify how gender dimensions will be addressed and what socio-economic benefits the proposed project is expected to deliver.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>01/31/2013 -- NOT CLEAR. The project identifies the principle stakeholders, but it does not indicate how local communities and civil society will be engaged in project design and implementation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide further indication as to how local communities and civil society will be engaged in project design and implementation.</p> <p>IW/AH: Please clarify (on pp. 13-14) that TDA formulation is a highly participatory process that requires/involves several workshops and diverse inputs at national and regional levels, e.g including from national NGOs and national academics. As written now, this aspect is not clear – in fact it appears as if the TDA is prepared (through some process) and only then "disseminated" to stakeholders.</p>	

		<p>02/08/2013 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies adequately how local communities and civil society will be engaged in project design and implementation, and describes in greater detail the participatory process for the TDA update.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please revisit and provide further details on public participation.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>01/31/2013 “ NOT CLEAR. The PIF identifies relevant risks and mitigation measures, but it could further elaborate on the risks associated with the present, fragile situation in Mali.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide further indication as to how the proposed project will address the risks associated with the present, fragile situation in Mali.</p> <p>2/8/2013 “ YES. The re-submission includes a specific section on Mali in the risk matrix, which adopts a long-term view and provides a frank assessment of the present situation. It is also noted that the areas of intervention lay outside of the zone of high concern.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>01/31/2013 “ NOT CLEAR. The PIF identifies several relevant projects at the regional level, as well as in the four participating countries. Yet, given the scope of the proposed project, a more comprehensive list of other relevant initiatives could be provided at this stage, particularly those financed through the LDCF in the four participating countries. The PIF could</p>	

		<p>institutional and substantive linkages with these other relevant initiatives, including opportunities for coordination.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the PIF identifies all relevant projects and programs in the river basin as well as in the participating countries, and provides an indication of potential areas for coordination.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information as to how the proposed project will be coordinated with other relevant initiatives.</p> <p>02/08/2013 “ YES. Coordination with other relevant initiatives has been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>01/31/2013 “ YES.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information about the proposed implementation and execution arrangements, particularly at the national level.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>01/31/2013 “ NOT CLEAR. At \$800,000 or 5.3 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF and GEF-IW funding level for project management is somewhat high.</p>	

		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the proposed LDCF and GEF-IW funding level for project management does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components.</p> <p>02/08/2013 â€“ YES. At 740,000 or 4.85 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF and GEF-IW funding level is appropriate.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>01/31/2013 â€“ NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component, as necessary.</p> <p>02/08/2013 â€“ YES.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	01/31/2013 â€“ The indicative co-financing level is adequate at \$68.6 million.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	01/31/2013 â€“ YES. In line with its role, the World Bank is bringing \$53.6 million in indicative co-financing towards the proposed project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	

	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Please refer to Section 2. In absence of Letters of Endorsement from the Operational Focal Points, the proposed project cannot be reviewed at this stage.</p> <p>01/31/2013 “ NOT YET. Please refer to sections 5, 8, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 23 and 24.</p> <p>02/08/2013 “ YES.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>01/31/2013 “ Please refer to sections 2, 13, 14, 16, 19 and 20.</p> <p>02/08/2013 “ In addition to the above, please refer also to sections 5 and 17.</p>	
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 13, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 31, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 08, 2013	
	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	

	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.