



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

GEF ID:	5071		
Country/Region:	Gambia		
Project Title:	Strengthening climate services and early warning systems in the Gambia for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change – 2nd Phase of the GOTG/GEF/UNEP LDCF NAPA Early Warning Project		
GEF Agency:	UNEP and UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5156 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,000,000
Co-financing:	\$25,360,000	Total Project Cost:	\$33,360,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Ermira Fida

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?	YES. The Gambia is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated July 20, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP and UNEP both have a clear comparative advantage in the area of institutional capacity building, scientific and technical assessments and assistance, as well as policy support for 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?	YES. UNDP and UNEP both have relevant programming and adequate staff capacity in the country and in the region. Notably, the two Agencies are currently overseeing the Gambia's first two NAPA implementation projects.	
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?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$8.8 million, including Agency Fees) is available under 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?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, CCA-2.2 on strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks of climate change-induced economic losses; and CCA-3.1 on the successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of relevant adaptation technology. More than 70 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant would support CCA-3.1.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards the implementation	

	<p>assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>the rehabilitation of early-warning systems for climate change-induced natural hazards. The project would further contribute towards priorities on coastal-zone management and fisheries development. The proposed project is aligned with the Gambia's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) and the Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment (PAGE).</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>YES. The project combines physical investments in hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning infrastructure with capacity building for national hydro-meteorological services and other key stakeholders. The project includes a sub-component focusing on long-term public and private financing arrangements to ensure the sustainable management of the systems developed.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of the risks associated with the lack of sustainable financing, institutional support and political commitment, along with appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	
	<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?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on and contribute towards the following baseline initiatives: (i) the African Monitoring of the Environment for Sustainable Development (AMESD) Project; (ii) the IFAD Livestock and Horticulture Development Project; (iii) the ECOWAS supported Gambia National Agricultural Investment Programme (GNAIP); (iv) the USAID Gambia-Senegal Sustainable Fisheries Project; (v) the AfDB Gambia Artisanal Fisheries Development Project</p>	

monitoring and data collection on agriculture and natural resources management for policy-making and planning; (vii) the UNEP Early Warning Assessment Program; (viii) the UNDP and Spanish Fund Public service reform and institutional capacity development project; (ix) the Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaptation Programme (DRR-CCA) for the Gambia; (x) the AfDB Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Project; (xi) the AfDB National Water Sector Reform Project; (xii) the GEF Promoting renewable energy-based mini grids for productive uses in rural areas of the Gambia project; and (xiii) the Technical Support Programme to the Gambia on Climate and Development.

Of the baseline initiatives listed, the AfDB Artisanal Fisheries Development Project has been completed in 2011 and could therefore not benefit from the information services generated by the proposed project. Moreover, it is not clear how the UNEP Early Warning Assessment program, which appears to be global in scope, would be strengthened by the proposed LDCF project. Finally, GEF financing is generally not considered as co-financing towards LDCF projects, and the GEF project should hence not be regarded as a baseline initiative.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** Please (i) remove the AfDB Artisanal Fisheries Development Project and the GEF project among the baseline initiatives.

		<p>figures accordingly; and (ii) clarify why the UNEP Early Warning Assessment program is treated as a baseline project.</p> <p>10/09/2012 “ YES. The re-submission excludes the AfDB Artisanal Fisheries Development Project and the UNEP Early Warning Assessment program among the baseline initiatives, and instead treats both as other related initiatives.</p>	
	<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?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to the recommendations under Section 11 above.</p> <p>Overall, the activities proposed for LDCF financing appear to be based on additional reasoning. Still, under Component 1, Output 1.2.4 on wildlife monitoring does not appear to contribute towards the adaptation objectives of the proposed project. Under Component 2, the activities proposed under Output 2.1.1 appear to overlap with those routinely carried out during project preparation. Finally, Activity 2.1.4.2 appears to form part of project management.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) consider seeking more appropriate sources of financing for Output 1.2.4 on wildlife monitoring; (ii) clarify the extent to which the activities proposed</p>	

		<p>during project preparation; and (iii) consider treating Activity 2.1.4.2 as part of project management.</p> <p>10/09/2012 " YES. The re-submission provides a stronger rationale for Output 1.2.4; and clarifies Activity 2.1.4.2. As for Output 2.1.1, the relevance of the proposed baseline study should be reassessed upon project preparation.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>10/09/2012 " YES. The project framework has been adjusted as recommended.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please clarify the adaptation benefits, if necessary.</p> <p>10/09/2012 " YES. The expected adaptation benefits are clearly described, based on sound methodology and assumptions.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are well described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information as to how the proposed project would reach the most</p>	

		how gender dimensions will be considered in the information and decision support services and communication systems to be developed.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly provide further information regarding the local-level stakeholders involved in the project.</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>YES. The risk assessment is adequate for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of risks and relevant mitigation measures, considering in particular the sustainability of the systems established and the capacities developed (see also Section 10 above).</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>YES. The PIF identifies a range of national and regional initiatives, with which coordination and synergies will be sought. Specifically, the project would be closely coordinated with and complementary to the UNEP-LDCF project Strengthening of the Gambia's Climate Change Early Warning Systems. The project would also benefit from the UNDP-LDCF regional initiative on hydro-meteorological monitoring and early warning systems.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>YES. The project would be jointly implemented by UNEP and UNDP, and primarily executed by the Ministry of Forestry and the Environment and the Ministry of Fisheries, Water Resources</p>	

		By CEO Endorsement, kindly clarify the division of roles and responsibilities between UNDP and UNEP.	
	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?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. At \$380,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 and 2, the funding level for project management is appropriate.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13, please adjust the grant and co-financing figures per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>10/09/2012 “ YES. The indicative grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures accordingly, if necessary.</p>	

		indicative co-financing is appropriate and adequate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please adjust the Agency co-financing figures accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>10/09/2012 â€œ YES. In line with their roles, UNDP and UNEP are bringing \$1.8 million and \$500,000 towards the proposed project.</p>	
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	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 14, 15, 24, 25 and 26.</p> <p>10/09/2012 â€œ YES.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Please refer to sections 10, 16, 17, 18 and 20.</p> <p>10/09/2012 â€œ In addition to the above, please refer to Section 13.</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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 22, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 09, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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 preparation appropriate?	YES. The proposed PPG would support (i) forming the project management team, identifying partnerships and confirming co-financing arrangements; (ii) stakeholder analysis, consultations and capacity needs assessment; (iii) technical specifications for infrastructure and information needs; and (iv) feasibility analysis, budgets and institutional recommendations. The proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	YES. At \$100,000, with \$122,000 in co-financing, the proposed budget is appropriate and the PPG has been designed in a cost-effective manner.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	YES.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 09, 2012
	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.