



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

GEF ID:	<b>5802</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Senegal</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Promoting SLM Practices to Restore and Enhance Carbon Stocks through Adoption of Green Rural Habita Initiatives</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>LD-3; CCM-5;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,228</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,319,635</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$6,200,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$7,569,863</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Adamou Bouhari</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes, a letter of endorsement is available dated March 6, 2014, signed by the GEF OFP, with the project title, the engaged resources from STAR allocations, and the selection of the GEF agency (UNEP).	
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes, the project requests \$900,000 from LD and \$600,000 from CC (project +PPG + fees). This amount is within the resources available for Senegal (CC:	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		\$660,000; LD: \$920,000).	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>The project targets LD3 and CCM5 objectives.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The project is developed under the NAP and the NC (respectively strategic documents for UNCCC and UNFCCC).</p> <p>4/23/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>The PIF provides a brief summary of the Second National Communication and states that forest fires are the main reason for the decrease in the potential for carbon dioxide sequestration by the LULUCF sector. In the building sector it states energy efficiency and emissions from cement production to be the major contributors of GHG . However, it is not clear how the project addresses these</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>priorities stated in the National Communication (please see comments provided in sections below).</p> <p>Please also see if there is any consistency with the country's Technology Needs Assessment.</p> <p>6/12/2014 CCM JS Addressed</p> <p>It is not clear how forest fires will be directly tackled. Also unclear is baseline use of air-conditioners and building practices in the region.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>- The logical reasoning from the problem analysis to the project framework is difficult to capture. Two key environmental problems are mentioned with a) loss of agricultural productivity and 2) destruction of vegetation cover that leads to land degradation. The identified root causes are unsustainable agriculture practices and pastoral systems and wood exploitation for fuel wood and services, including rural house construction and charcoal. It is not very clear to figure out how mainstreaming SLM in local development plans is going to be instrumental to tackle these root causes. Please, clarify.</p> <p>- Some of the baseline projects that are mentioned are welcome (Typha project, Nubian Vault, PROGEDE). Please explain how the current project will build on the Electricity Demand Control Programme. We did not capture the role</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and the scope of this project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The JICA project should be a major baseline project to develop the reasoning on the SLM side and justify the use of GEF resources on the top of this project. Please, revise.</li> <li>- We suggest to take inspiration from terminal evaluations and KM material (best practices) of past projects, notably IEM and SIP projects (see UNDP and WB portfolio, also the transboundary IEM project between Senegal and Mauritania).</li> </ul> <p>4/23/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>For climate change mitigation aspects, baseline scenario is unclear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Please clarify the demand for building and construction material in the project target sites.</li> <li>b) Please also provide an estimate of GHG emissions that such development would cause.</li> <li>c) The baseline project, Association Voute Nubienne (AVN) dissemination program in West Africa, till date has mitigated 3,000 tonnes of CO2 with construction of 2000 vaults. Mitigation benefit therefore seems nominal.</li> </ul> <p>6/12/14 CCM JS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Addressed. It is stated that there is a demand for 168,750 housing units.</li> <li>b) A general estimate has been</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>provided.</p> <p>c) Mitigation benefit per unit is nominal (2.8 tCO2 avoided per Vault)</p> <p>By CEO Approval: Please clarify using site specific data baseline emission scenario if business as usual building practices were to be used.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>- Following the comment made in the cell. 6, please, justify the component 1 on mainstreaming SLM in municipal plans. Please be more specific on the strategy. Reformulate the outcome ("integrated municipal land use plans" is not an outcome). The outcome should reflect the consequences and the expected impacts of outputs and activities.</p> <p>- The second output is not formulated as an output (please provide quantified and concrete outputs that reflect the nature of activities that are financed).</p> <p>- Please, confirm that NGO and CBO are the right beneficiaries (why not farmer organizations and extension services).</p> <p>Component 2: Ok for the focus on demonstration activities related to the use of the Nubian Vault technique, but please elaborate the output 2.3 on Three SLM practices demonstrated to improve productivity.</p> <p>Component 3: OK for a KM component delivering a policy brief, forums, and guidelines to scale up the experience.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>4/23/2014 CCM JS No.</p> <p>a) Given the lack of clarity of baseline scenario related to building construction and potential GHG emissions, the project framework that mostly includes components that comprise of using improved building techniques seems insufficient to address mitigation issues in the area. Please establish the linkage between the potential future emissions and the benefits of the new building techniques.</p> <p>b) The description of project components is not sufficient to understand which land management issues the components are addressing and how. Climate change mitigation benefits from such practices need to be explicit.</p> <p>c) Baseline project description includes a number of shortcomings in Typha project and Association Voute nubienne (AVN) dissemination program. However, the project component description nor the framework provide details on how such shortcomings will be remedied through the proposed project.</p> <p>d) As presented, it is not clear how the project addresses the number of issues that are of concern in the project sites (pg 7). Please prioritize these issues with climate change mitigation in mind and revisit the project framework.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>e) Please clarify how the new building techniques will improve energy efficiency or decrease the rate of deforestation?</p> <p>f) Please provide CO2 benefits in tons of CO2 equivalent.</p> <p>6/12/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>a) Addressed for PIF stage. Please see comment for section 7.</p> <p>b) Some description on land management and GHG benefits has been added. However, land management practices described are diverse and do not respond to the major source of emission, forest burning.</p> <p>c) Addressed.</p> <p>d) Addressed.</p> <p>e) Addressed for PIF stage.</p> <p>f) Addressed for PIF stage. It is stated that 16,875 tCO2e emissions will be prevented through the project. However, it is noted that number housing units to be supported through the proposed project has increased from 500 to 168,750 units whereas grant amount and co-financing amount are the same.</p> <p>By CEO Approval: Please streamline activities related to land management to address the identified emission risks. Please establish direct linkage between sourcing for wood and deforestation (if applicable). Also please use site specific information to assess energy efficiency aspects of the new building technique.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Given the significant increase in the number housing units to be supported with same financial support, please clarify financial viability of the investment.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>GEB are listed p. 9.</p> <p>- OK to provide a number of hectares at CEO endorsement, but with the current result framework, it is difficult to be convinced that the project will be able to tackle X ha under SLM in three regions.</p> <p>Incremental reasoning: p8: once the text on the baseline problems and the baseline projects will have been improved (see cell. 6), please revise the text of the scenarios without the GEF and with the GEF, especially on the SLM justification ("The SLM practices to be promoted".... until the end of the section).</p> <p>4/23/2014 CCM JS No. The global environmental benefits related to CO2 emission reduction or increase in sequestration is unclear (please see comments for section 6 and 7).</p> <p>Please present emission estimates in tCO2e. Please note that when the volumetric value provided for CO2 emissions reduced are converted to tonnage, the CO2e benefits expected from the project is approximately 2.7 tonnes. The scale of this benefit is nominal from the national and global</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>perspective.</p> <p>6/12/2014 CCM JS Addressed for PIF stage.</p> <p>By CEO Approval Please show clear calculations on how estimate of CO2 emission reduction has been done. Please use site specific information on avoidance of cement related emissions, and gains from energy efficiency. Different section of the document show different CO2 benefits, please have consistent CO2 value throughout.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>- The role of CSO is clear for the construction part of the project with the support of the Ministry of Environment and the communes.</p> <p>- The stakeholder analysis is less clear for the SLM activities. Please, describe and explain the role of the partners, including the CSO.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate</p>	<p>- A short list of risks is proposed. During the PPG, please include a comprehensive risk analysis.</p> <p>- A risk related to degradation of wetlands biodiversity is mentioned.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)	Please, explain or revise.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>- The coordination with the Ecovillage project is a good idea. This GEF project may help the Ecovillage to include the idea of Nubian Vault for buildings. The network of ecovillages may help to scale up the approach.</p> <p>- Please, note that the Sustainable and Inclusive Agribusiness Development project is the Senegal project developed under the SAWAP/GGWI program (the two projects that are mentioned are actually the same).</p> <p>- The relationship with the Senegal river basin project is not obvious.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>The main technology that is promoted within this project is innovative, as well as the way to mainstream this technology in municipal plans.</p> <p>The project suggests a business model that should be developed at CEO endorsement. We understand that the idea is to promote a value chain approach, train and support local entrepreneurs. The concept seems sustainable linking service providers to the clients.</p> <p>There is a potential for scaling up in the countries and in the sub-region (Burkina Faso, Mali, Niger, etc).</p> <p>4/23/2014 CCM JS</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up are unclear from mitigation perspective.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	To confirm once the result framework will have been revised.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>- The cofinancing is composed of multiple partners (national government, local government, NGOs, projects). Please confirm at CEO approval.</p> <p>- Is UNEP able to bring cofinancing in line with its role?</p> <p>4/23/2014 CCM JS One of the sources of con-financing, the World Bank PROGEDE project is focused on improved charcoal and biogas system production.</p> <p>a)The linkage with and the type of support PROGEDE may provide to the proposed project is unclear.</p> <p>b)The official document on the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>PROGEDE states that the World Bank contribution is in the loan form, contrary to the co-financing type stated in the proposed project.</p> <p>6/12/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>c) Addressed.</p> <p>By CEO Approval</p> <p>The comments a) and b) have not been addressed.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	- The management costs are high (10 percent). Either reduce them around the norm of five percent, or at CEO approval, provide the budget breakdown and justify.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	The PPG is in the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	na	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		<p>The PIF is recommended for clearance. However, the PPG moment needs to be used to clarify the important following points. Please, also refer to the cell 25 summarizing the items to consider at CEO approval.</p> <p>CCM JS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- At CEO approval, please refer to the main emission sources identified in the national communications specific to the target areas. It will help to streamline and prioritize the project activities.</li> <li>- The financing sustainability of the whole approach to build 168,250 houses also needs to be described.</li> </ul> <p>instead of:</p>
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>4/29/2014 CCM JS The rationale for climate change mitigation is very weak and the expected mitigation benefits are limited. We cannot recommend the use of CCM resources for this project.</p> <p>6/12/2014 The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>However, the PPG moment needs to be used to clarify some important points. Please, see the following cell 25 summarizing the items to consider at CEO approval.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>6/12/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>The GEFSec allows the project to utilize the project preparation phase to adequately address the issues raised in the review.</p> <p>The project needs to modify its activities to directly address the main emission sources identified in the national communications (specific to the target areas). In doing so the project needs to streamline and prioritize its activities.</p> <p>The main focus of the project is building improved housing. The Greenhouse Gas (GHG) benefits of the undertaking needs to be based on site specific information and given that the project document has been revised to build 168,250 more units than planned in the first PIF submission, financial viability of the project is highly questionable. The issues will be revisited during CEO Approval.</p> <p>During the PPG:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Include a comprehensive risk analysis;</li> <li>- Confirm cofinancing (see if the Agency can provide some cofinancing).</li> <li>- Include a M&amp;E plan (confirm the number of ha under SLM and the carbon values).</li> <li>- Include the tracking tools.</li> <li>- Include a stakeholder analysis.</li> <li>- Refer to the main GHG emission sources identified in the national</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>communication in the target areas.            Prioritize actions and streamline project activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop implementation arrangements.</li> <li>- Confirm the GHG emission gains.</li> <li>- Include a strategy of scaling up in the project document.</li> <li>- Develop the financing sustainability.</li> </ul>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 18, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 13, 2014	
	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.**