



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

GEF ID:	5529		
Country/Region:	Gambia		
Project Title:	Gambia Protected Areas Network and Community Livelihood Project		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5000 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,324,310
Co-financing:	\$4,690,909	Total Project Cost:	\$6,015,219
PIF Approval:	March 13, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye

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 ?	Yes. UNCCD: Date of Signature: October 14 1994; Date of Ratification: June 11 1996; Effective Date: December 26 1996	03/27/2015: Cleared.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter is included with the project package, endorsing BD and LD resources. However, LD resources are not available anymore. Please, revise. 01/16/2014: New endorsement letter has been provided. Cleared.	03/27/2015: As at PIF stage. Cleared.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>Please, note that no LD allocations are available for the time being. Please, reconsider this project, focusing on the biodiversity aspects. The BD allocation is still available. A large part of the CC allocation seems also available.</p> <p>01/16/2014: Funding from the project is coming from BD allocation only; which is fine. The remaining allocation under BD is US\$1,482,969, as for January 16, 2014; please adjust accordingly.</p> <p>03/07/2014: The proposed grant is now US\$1,482,969. Cleared.</p>	<p>03/27/2015: Yes, cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>01/16/2014: Please see the comment Item3.</p> <p>03/07/2014: Cleared.</p>	<p>03/27/2015: Yes, cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>01/16/2014: N/A</p>	<p>03/27/2015: N/A</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>01/16/2014: N/A</p>	<p>03/27/2015: N/A</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	<p>01/16/2014: N/A</p>	<p>03/27/2015: N/A</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>01/16/2014: N/A</p>	<p>03/27/2015: N/A</p>
<p>Strategic Alignment</p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <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>01/16/2014: Yes, the project is well aligned with the BD strategic objectives. The project has explicitly articulated which Aichi targets the project will help to achieve. SMART indicators and tentative targets haven't been identified, beside the % of PA coverage, please complete accordingly (including METT, % species population increase, % SLM).</p> <p>03/07/2014: Addressed. It is noted that baseline will be provided at CEO</p>	<p>03/27/2015: Yes, the project is aligned the BD-1 and BD-2 strategy. SMART indicators have been developed, including TT on PA effectiveness management. The project will contribute to the CBD Aichi targets 5, 11, and 12 by increasing the coverage of the national PA system and targets 7 and 14 by working towards more sustainable land management. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		approval. Cleared.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	01/16/2014: Yes, the project is consistent with the Gambia Incorporated Vision 2020, the Gambia Biodiveristy Policy 2003, and NBSAP. Cleared.	03/27/2015: Yes, the project is consistent with the Gambia's national strategies including NBSAP, Gambia vision 2020, and the Gambia Environmental Action Plan. Cleared.
Project Design	6. 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?	01/16/2014: The baseline is well developed and provide a good overview of the biodiversity status and threats. Mention of regional initiatives supporting the PA management effectiveness in Gambia should be added (including PRCM, RAMP AO...). Because of the close link with the on-going GEF/WB project ID 3961, please provide information on its current status of implementation, the target achieved so far. 03/07/2014: Addressed.	03/27/2015: The baseline captures well the problems and describes well the on-going initiatives and investments. Cleared.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	01/16/2014: General comment: as mentionned in Item4, please develop SMART indicators for each component and provide tentative targets. Component 1: the outcomes and outputs sound appropriate; however they will be review based on the additional information provided in the baseline. Please confirm that GEF funding will not be used to support staff salary. Please also confirm that the project will support the development of an ecosystem assesement coverage (p6).	03/27/2015: As at PIF stage. The project components, outcomes, and outputs are clear. The project will strengthen the management effectiveness in the 3 PAs to address existing threats. A revised PA program of work and action plan will be developed based on an ecosystem coverage assessment of the current national PA network, determining relevant ecological representation gaps to identify sites that merit inclusion in the PAs system for biodiveristy conservation purposes. In parallel, the project will work with the communities surrounding the PAs to introduce

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component 2: Compare to the baseline funding for agricultural development (including NEMA), please explain further how the project can make the difference with US\$100,000 of funding. Component 2 is critical for the project so please detail further the activities envisioned, the stakeholder targeted. Please explain how the project will restore of vital resources into the production landscape (p6).</p> <p>03/07/2014: Addressed.</p>	<p>biodiversity-friendly sustainable land and natural management practices. It is noted that the part of the Component's baseline, targets will be defined at project start. This information will have to be presented in the first annual monitoring report. Cleared.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>01/16/2014: Yes, the global environmental benefits have been well identified. The project targets to increase the PA coverage by 23% to ensure the conservation of globally threatened species, including East Atlantic Flyways and wintering ground, habitat of Guinea Baboon. Cleared.</p>	<p>03/27/2015: As at PIF stage. Cleared.</p>
	<p>9. 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>		<p>03/27/2015: a significant part of the project will focus on the communities surrounding the PAs, primarily farmers, totaled an estimated 70,000 people. Through its SLM intervention, benefits will include food and water provision security. It is noted that the baseline and targets will be further defined at project start. Please share this information in the first annual monitoring report. The project will adopt UNDP's commitment to gender equality. Overall, the project will mainstream gender equality measures into the general conduct of the project. Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	01/16/2014: Yes, the role of public participation is well identified at PIF stage. Cleared.	03/27/2015: As at PIF stage. A comprehensive presentation of the stakeholders involved in the project, including role and engagement has been developed. Cleared.
	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 resilience)	01/16/2014: please consider the consequences of climate change. Build the mitigation measures based on the UNEP-WCMC project. 03/07/2014: Addressed.	03/27/2015: The risks, identified at PIF stage, have been confirmed together with their respective mitigation measures. Furthermore, the UNDP Atlas base for this project will set up a risk analysis and assessment system. Cleared.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	01/16/2014: Please confirm the list of stakeholder who will be involved in the steering committee of the project. As mentioned above, please provide further information on the GEF/WB project status and how the project will build on its achievements. 03/07/2014: Addressed.	03/27/2015: As at PIF stage, cleared.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	01/16/2014: By reinforcing the PA system and foster the integration of biodiversity consideration into their buffer zones, the project contributes at the consolidation of a sustainable development of the country. The approach developed in the three targeted PA will have the potential to be replicated in the other PAs. Cleared.	03/27/2015: The project will strengthen the management effectiveness of the national PAs system and will work with the communities surrounding the PAs to introduce biodiversity-friendly sustainable land and natural management practices. The project strategy will build on models that have proven success in other countries and will demonstrate the opportunity to scale them up at the national level. The project will work in close partnership with other initiatives, program strengthening the long term sustainability of its actions. Clear.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		03/27/2015: yes, the project structure and design is sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF stage. Cleared.
	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?		03/27/2015: Yes, the project will implement on-the-ground interventions in contained localities; this will reduce operational costs. The close integration of the project with other on-going projects will imply cost-savings and will implicitly provide opportunities to upscale project's successes. Cleared.
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?	01/16/2014: With regards to the importance of Component 2, please provide the rationale to allocate only US\$100,000 of GEF funding. How this funding will have an added-value compare to the US\$3.6M of cofinancing and US\$17M of baseline? 03/07/2014: addressed.	03/27/2015: Component 2 budget has been significantly increased. The funding and co-financing indicated in Table B is adequate. Cleared.
	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?	01/16: The co-financing ratio is about 3.6; which is fine. Table C, column "Type of Co-financing", please indicate it is either "in kind" or "in cash". UNDP's cofinancing is US\$ 120,000. 03/07/2014: Addressed.	03/27/2015: The co-financing ratio is the same as at PIF stage; about 3.5. UNDP's cofinancing of US\$ 120,000 has been confirmed. Cleared.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	01/16/2014: The Project Management Cost is about 10% of GEF funding, please decrease it in order to fit with GEF standard (5%). 03/07/2014: Cleared.	03/27/2015: As at PIF stage. Cleared.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency	01/16/2014: Cleared	03/27/2015: Yes, agency reported on the activities using the PPG fund. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>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?</p>		
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	01/16/2014: N/A	03/27/2015: N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		03/27/2015: Yes, the appropriate TT have been included. Cleared.
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		03/27/2015: Yes, the proposal includes a budgeted M&E plan. Cleared.
Agency Responses	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>The PIF has not been reviewed and cannot be recommended. Please reconsider the project focusing on the BD aspects, without LD resources, eventually with some CC resources (LULUCF), if appropriate. Please, check the last GEF5 PIF template on our website (http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1708).</p> <p>01/16/2014: The project cannot be technically cleared at this stage. Please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		address the issues raised in the above items. 03/07/2014: The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		03/27/2015: The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO endorsement. The Component 2 baseline, targets will be presented in the first annual monitoring report.
	First review*	August 21, 2013	March 27, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 16, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 07, 2014	

* **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.**