



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:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$8,000,000
Co-financing:	\$21,510,000	Total Project Cost:	\$29,610,000
PIF Approval:	October 15, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	April 10, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mark Tadross

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. The Gambia is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	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	YES.

*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		climate change adaptation.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	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.	YES.
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.	YES.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
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.	YES. However, please refer to Section 8 below.
	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	NOT CLEAR. According to the request for CEO Endorsement, the proposed project would contribute only towards objective CCA-3 and Outcome 3.1. Given the scope of the project, however,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of relevant adaptation technology. More than 70 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant would support CCA-3.1.</p>	<p>the project -- and Component 2 in particular -- would seem to contribute considerably towards objective CCA-2, outcomes 2.1 and 2.2; as well as to a lesser extent towards Objective 1, Outcome 1.1.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 27 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) captures the relevant CCA objectives, outcomes and outputs towards which the project would contribute.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised to include objective CCA-2 and outcome 2.2.</p>
	<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?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards the implementation of the Gambia's first NAPA priority on 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>YES. The project remains fully aligned with the priorities articulated in the Gambia's NAPA, the first of which the rehabilitation of early-warning systems for climate change -related natural hazards.</p> <p>The project also supports the 2008 Gambian Environmental Action Plan, and it is in line with the findings of the Gambia's National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA).</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</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>address the recommendations under Section 13.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES.</p>
Project Design	<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 (GAFDP); (vi) the FAO support to 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</p>	<p>YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a clear description of the baseline situation as it relates to each of the four outcomes of the project.</p> <p>The project would build on the following baseline initiatives that seek to address some of the baseline problems identified: (i) Technical Support Programme to the Gambia on Climate and Development by the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa, African Climate Policy Center (ACPC); (ii) the AfDB National Water Sector Reform Project; (iii) the AfDB Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Initiative; (iv) the African Monitoring of the Environment and Sustainable Development (AMESD); (v) the Gambia National Agricultural Investment Programme (GNAIP); (vi) the IFAD Livestock and Horticulture Development Project (LHDP); (vii) the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) remove the AfDB Artisanal Fisheries Development Project and the GEF project among the baseline initiatives, and adjust the indicative co-financing 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</p>	<p>USAID Gambia-Senegal sustainable fisheries project; (viii) FAO support to strengthen capacities for policy-making, planning, programming, statistics and monitoring in the agriculture and natural resources management sectors; (ix) the UNEP Global Climate Change Early Warning System; (x) PROVIA; and (x) in-kind contributions by the Government of the Gambia.</p> <p>The baseline initiatives appear relevant for the proposed project. They could nevertheless be more consistently described. The co-financing figures summarized in the end of Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement are not consistently provided or clarified in the description of each baseline initiative; and they do not seem consistent with Table C, where 93 per cent of the confirmed co-financing would be provided by the national government. The duration of certain initiatives is also unclear. AMESD and the USAID initiative in particular appear to be drawing to a close. Finally, for those baseline initiatives that are relevant for Outcome 4, it would be useful to understand to what extent these operate in the 14 pilot sites identified.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide a consistent description of each relevant baseline initiative, including its duration, geographical coverage (where it is not country-wide, regional or</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Development Project and the UNEP Early Warning Assessment program among the baseline initiatives, and instead treats both as other related initiatives.</p>	<p>global), as well as associated co-financing. Also (ii) ensure that the sources and types of co-financing provided in Table C are consistent with the description provided in Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The re-submission, in Annex O, clarifies the intended duration and geographical coverage of each baseline initiative, as well as the co-financing these initiatives would bring. For clarity and transparency, Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement could provide a reference to Annex O.</p> <p>Table C of the Request for CEO Endorsement remains unchanged, however, and therefore inconsistent with Section A.4; Annex O; as well as the UNDP and UNEP Project Documents as it relates to the different sources and types of co-financing. For example, p. 1 of the UNEP Project Document provides a different breakdown of co-financing by source. Please refer also to Section 25 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) provide, in Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement, a reference to Annex O; and (ii) ensure that the sources and types of co-financing provided in Table C are consistent with the description provided in Section A.4 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			07/02/2014 -- YES. The re-submission of July 1, 2014 provides a consistent description of the sources and amounts of co-financing associated with relevant baseline initiatives.
	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>NOT CLEAR. According to the June 30, 2013 PIR of the first phase of the project, several targets will not be met due to insufficient funds, particularly as it relates to strengthening the meteorological and hydrological observation networks. It is not clear to what extent the proposed project has been able to draw lessons from the first phase with a view to ensuring cost-effectiveness while setting realistic targets.</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 15 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how the first phase of the proposed project has informed design and budgeting.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The cost-effectiveness of the proposed project has been adequately demonstrated.</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<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</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>Overall, the additional reasoning is well articulated. With regard to Outcome 1, however, it would be useful to understand the opportunities and constraints for a viable cost-recovery</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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 under Output 2.1.1 could be carried out 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>policy. In particular, what are the potential public and private clients that would be targeted?</p> <p>As for outcomes 2 and 3, it is not clear what the first phase of the project has achieved in addition to the training of technicians, how the second phase would build on and complement these achievements, and what lessons may have been drawn to inform the design of the second phase. See also Section 12 above.</p> <p>With respect to Outcome 4, finally, it is not entirely clear whether the proposed, community-level response plans would be carried out as stand-alone exercises, or whether these would be integrated into existing village planning processes. Also, further to the recommendation under Section 11 above, it is not clear whether and how the proposed project would build on any of the baseline initiatives at the local level, in the 14 pilot sites.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please (i) provide further information regarding the opportunities and constraints for a viable cost-recovery policy; (ii) clarify how outcomes 2 and 3 would build on, complement and draw lessons from the first phase of the project; (iii) clarify the nature of the response plans under</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Outcome 4, and the interface between the proposed LDCF project and relevant baseline initiatives in the 14 pilot sites.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The additional reasoning has been strengthened as recommended.</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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13 and 23.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11, 13 and 23, please adjust the project framework, if necessary.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above. Certain key targets in the results framework could be further clarified. In particular, with respect to Outcome 1, it is not clear what a "sufficient" budget allocation for the NHMS would entail. It would seem appropriate to determine sufficiency in relation to certain core functions that the NHMS would be expected to perform. Also, the total population in the 14 target sites should be provided in the results framework, otherwise it is unclear how the project would monitor progress towards the 75 per cent target for Outcome 4.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please clarify the expected</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>adaptation benefits. In particular, (i) clarify what core functions the NHMS would be expected to perform and, accordingly, what an adequate budget allocation would entail. Also, (ii) provide an estimate of the total population in the 14 target sites.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The expected adaptation benefits have been clarified and quantified, where applicable.</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 vulnerable communities and groups, and how gender dimensions will be considered in the information and decision support services and communication systems to be developed.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 15 above. While the expected socio-economic benefits are generally well described, it would be important to know the estimated total population in the 14 pilot sites, given the target to increase early warning and climate information coverage by 75 per cent.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under Section 15.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The expected socio-economic benefits have been clarified as recommended.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<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>	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer, however, to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please clarify how the proposed project would address the risk currently described as "limited capacity to effectively tackle all project components".</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. Relevant risks and associated mitigation measures have been clarified as recommended.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. While Section A.7 identifies several initiatives with which coordination and collaboration would be sought, it does not refer to the regional initiative on climate information and early-warning systems financed through the LDCF and implemented by UNDP.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe how the proposed project would collaborate and coordinate with similar activities carried out in the region under the UNDP-LDCF initiative on climate information and early-warning systems.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. Coordination arrangements have been further clarified as recommended.</p>
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<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</p>	<p>YES.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Ministry of Fisheries, Water Resources and National Assembly Matters.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, kindly clarify the division of roles and responsibilities between UNDP and UNEP.</p>	
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 8 and 23. It is unclear why the alignment of the project with the LDCF results framework has changed to such an extent, and why the LDCF funding level for project management has been increased.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under sections 8 and 23.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 8 and 23.</p>
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		<p>NA</p>
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>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.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed LDCF funding level for project management has increased from \$380,000 to \$394,850, or 5.2 per cent of the sub-total for project components, without any clear justification.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please adjust the LDCF funding level for project management or provide a clear justification for the change in Section A of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			05/15/2014 -- YES. The proposed LDCF funding level for project management has been adjusted to \$380,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components.
	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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 11, 13 and 23 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11, 13 and 23, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The LDCF and co-financing amounts per component seem appropriate and adequate relative to the proposed outcomes and outputs.</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> <p>10/09/2012 – At \$25.36 million, the indicative co-financing is appropriate and adequate.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>Contrary to Table C, the Government of the Gambia is clearly not the source of 93 per cent of confirmed co-financing. Moreover, while the government's confirmation of several sources and amounts of co-financing is appreciated; it would be equally important that the sources and amounts are confirmed by the agencies that provide the co-financing through their projects and programs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please (i) adjust the co-financing amounts, types and sources</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>accordingly; and (ii) seek, where applicable, additional confirmation from the relevant sources of co-financing.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. The sources and types of co-financing should be accurately and consistently reported.</p> <p>The re-submission provides additional clarification regarding the confirmation of co-financing by the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs. The confirmation is deemed adequate on the grounds that the baseline projects are implemented and executed by the national government. This does not appear to be the case, however, for the USAID project, which according to its mid-term review is "implemented in The Gambia and Senegal by the University of Rhode Island Coastal Resources Center (URI) and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF)." AMESD, in turn, is managed by the African Union Commission.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please (i) adjust the co-financing amounts, types and sources accordingly; and (ii) seek, where applicable, additional confirmation from the relevant sources of co-financing, particularly where the baseline initiatives are not executed by the national government.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			07/02/2014 -- YES. The re-submission excludes the USAID and AMESD initiatives from the final, confirmed sources and amounts of co-financing and provides a consistent description of co-financing across relevant documents.
	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 -- YES. In line with their roles, UNDP and UNEP are bringing \$1.8 million and \$500,000 towards the proposed project.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. It is not clear why the UNDP co-financing has been dropped.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify whether UNDP would provide any co-financing towards the proposed project and, if not, why its indicative contribution was dropped.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES. The Agencies' response clarifies that the UNDP baseline initiative has been closed.</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 8, please ensure that the Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) provides baselines and targets for relevant indicators corresponding to all relevant CCA objectives.</p> <p>05/15/2014 -- YES.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 13 and 19 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 13 and 19, please address more clearly the Council comments pertaining to sustainability and regional coordination. 05/15/2014 -- YES.
• Other GEF Agencies?	NA		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 14, 15, 24, 25 and 26. 10/09/2012 â€œ YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 10, 16, 17, 18 and 20. 10/09/2012 â€œ In addition to the above, please refer to Section 13.	
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?		YES.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29. 05/15/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11 and 25.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			07/02/2014 -- YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 22, 2012	April 02, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 09, 2012	May 15, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		July 02, 2014
	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	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	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.