



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

GEF ID:	5221		
Country/Region:	Ghana		
Project Title:	PSG-Additional financing - Sustainable Land and Water Management Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; LD-3; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,750,000
Co-financing:	\$59,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$68,250,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 26, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	

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?	CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012: Yes, Ghana ratified the UNFCCC on September 6, 1995. Addressed at PFD level.	CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: Yes Addressed at PFD level.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: Yes Addressed at PFD level. The endorsement is confirmed with a letter dated on April 15, 2013.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Addressed at PFD level.	Addressed at PFD level.

*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)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: The project is a grant NA	CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: The project is a grant NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		Addressed.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Addressed at PFD level.	Addressed at PFD level, confirmed with a new letter of endorsement dated on April 15, 2013.
	• the focal area allocation?	CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: Yes. Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: Financing issue: the budget per focal area was approved by the GEF Council when they approved the SAWAP in May 2011. It is not possible to use more resources than what was approved in the PFD. Please, revise the project budget per focal area (LD \$2,777,777,778; BD \$1,851,8521; CC \$2,268,518, SFM \$1,851,851, for a total of \$8,750,000). With the agency fees, the budget is then: LD \$3 million; BS \$2 million: CC \$2,450,000, and SFM \$2 million, for a total of \$9,450,000).	CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: Yes. Addressed.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA

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"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	SFM \$\$1,851,851 (SFM \$2 million).	Addressed.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012: There is no mention of climate change mitigation (CCM) in (i) the project development objectives, (ii) its key performance indicators. It is expected that the PAD will clarify how the project addresses climate change mitigation objective(s) and outcomes, and include relevant indicators.</p> <p>Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: The project is financed with GEF Ghana allocations from Biodiversity, Land Degradation, and Climate Change focal areas and the Sustainable Forest Management/REDD+ incentive program. In the introduction A, we will invite the Agency to refer to the outcomes and outputs of the GEF5 strategies in each relevant focal area to produce a fully GEF5 eligible project.</p>	<p>NR comments, email dated on March 19, 2014: 1. PDO - Please note that even though this is a multi-focal area project, we very much welcome the integrated approach to generating GEBs. So the PDO should demonstrate links between GEBs and livelihoods, such as (for example), "expand the area under sustainable management of land, water, forests and biodiversity for improved livelihoods in selected watersheds". For information, please note that other projects under the SAWAP defined their PDO largely inspired from the objective of the programmatic approach ("to expand Sustainable Land and Water Management in targeted landscapes and in climate vulnerable areas in West African and Sahelian countries").</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: a) Please clarify why the table page 8 of the PAD does not list Climate Change mitigation among the main themes of the proposed project. b) The PDO and GEO do not mention climate change mitigation objectives although CCM represents 26% of the total GEF funding requested. Please revise the formulation of the PDO and GEO to ensure consistency with the funding requested.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</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,</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012: Please clarify which outcomes and outputs of the GEF-5 CCM strategy the project is targeting.</p> <p>The project proposes an integrated nature resource management approach. However, we have to track in the best possible ways the allocations for each focal area, as each focal area is accountable to an International Convention for the Environment that Ghana ratified. We do not have any problem to figure out the integrated use of LD, SFM, and BD resources. It is less easy with the CC resources. In the proposed PCN, the sub-component 2.7 clearly targets CCM but with only \$1.5 million when the CCM GEF funding requested is \$2.27 million. Sub-component 2.8 also includes CCM outcomes but it is understood that this component (with \$1.6 million budgeted) will use the GEF SFM funding requested (\$1.85 million). It is expected that the Project Paper will clarify this and that additional budgeted activities will clearly target CCM objectives.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012: Please address the project's consistency with Ghana's (i) National Communication to the UNFCCC, (ii) National Portfolio Formulation</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: Cleared.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: The activities of the proposed project devoted to carbon monitoring seem to be limited to assessing the carbon impact of the project. This is fine and should be part of a project requesting CCM-5 funding, but this does not qualify for the output "Carbon Stock Monitoring system established" under the CCM-5 objective. The latter output concerns the implementation of sustainable monitoring systems that outlive the projects and contribute to help set up a national carbon monitoring system. Please clarify whether this is the case of this project and if not revise the reference to the CCM-5 monitoring output.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014: Comment cleared.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: Please address the consistency of the project with Ghana's 2nd National Communication to the UNFCCC and Ghana's Technology Needs Assessment</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>Document for the GEF, and (iii) Technology Needs Assessment for the UNFCCC.</p> <p>Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: Eligibility and Requirements: In the Project Paper and in the associated PID, we invite the TTL to refer to the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise made by the country, as well as the National Strategies and Action Plans taken under the relevant conventions that Ghana ratified (i.e. National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plan under the Convention on Biological Diversity, National Action Program under the Convention to Combat Desertification, National Communication to the UNFCCC, Technology Needs Assessment for the UNFCCC). During the project preparation, we invite the TTL to work with the national counterparts to confirm the project fits well these national documents.</p>	<p>and Technology Action Plan of 2013.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014: Ghana's TAP and TNA focus solely on climate change adaptation. This makes it difficult for the CCM activities of the project to be consistent with those two key documents. This inconsistency should be clarified anyway. We suggest to mention the time lapse between the program approval and the TAP finalization.</p>
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: Sustainability: It is expected that the Project Paper will clarify how the activities launched in the project will be sustained (financially, economically), notably the sub-components 2.7 and 2.8.</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	<p>CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012: It is expected that the PAD will clarify what would happen to (i) carbon stock assessment and monitoring, (ii) Management of organic content of the</p>	<p>NR comments, March 19, 2014 4. Baseline: Please consider highlighting how achievements from the original project fit into the baseline or business-as-usual scenario; i.e. what would</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?	soils, (iii) soil fertility management practices, (iv) local environmental committees, and (v) enrichment planting with the baseline activities without GEF funding.	<p>happen with the original design and associated outcomes if the additional financing does not materialize?</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014:</p> <p>a) In terms of climate change mitigation, the project appears to target two domains of potential carbon sequestration/avoidance of carbon depletion: sustainable land management and sustainable forest management. It is understood that the CCM funding requested will target the former. Please confirm this is the case since the rest of the review will focus on the associated activities under sub-component 2.2.</p> <p>b) Annex 7 provides an estimation of the deforestation and forest degradation rates but does not provide a similar description of the trends for the other land carbon content. Please do so.</p> <p>c) Please also provide an analysis of the other GHG emissions associated with agricultural activities and their trends such as methane emission from cattle and nitrous oxide emissions from nitrogen fertilization (if relevant).</p> <p>d) Annex 7 provides an extensive list of drivers of deforestation/forest degradation but does not appear to provide the same for the drivers of carbon depletion targeted by sustainable land management activities. Please identify and prioritize those drivers as this identification will be key to understand whether the project is likely to modify the carbon depletion trends or</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>not.</p> <p>e) Also, in the case where sustainable land management activities would also target reduction of deforestation or forest degradation, please prioritize the list of drivers of deforestation. Most of the drivers listed appear to be related to activities that are beyond the project's geographical and sectoral scope. This raises question as to the real possibility of the project to have an impact on GHG emissions. Failing to address the key deforestation/forest degradation drivers would mean that the project impact on forest carbon pools would be limited or would lead to shifting carbon depletion to other zones without any global impact.</p> <p>f) The proposed project lists and shortly describes several other projects and initiatives that have activities in Ghana on similar topics. What is missing is (i) a description of what the proposed project will enable to do that the other listed projects cannot do, and (ii) why the proposed activities will enable to have GHG benefits that would not have been possible with the other initiatives.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014: a) and f) Cleared. b) and d) Thank you for the clarifications. It is understood that a key driver of land carbon depletion is the extension of range and agricultural land with low productivity and sometimes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>harmful practices. Increasing range and agricultural practices will enable to increase agricultural land productivity and hence contribute to reduce the trend of agricultural land expansion. This in turn will help increase the carbon content of land. Ensuring the expansion of the proposed practices at a large scale will be key to ensure a real climate change mitigation benefit from these activities. Otherwise the risk is to see zones where farmers do not benefit from improved practices continue the agricultural land expansion trends and reducing or eliminating the project mitigation impact. We therefore strongly suggest that the exit strategy mentioned in paragraph 11 of Annex 10 includes support to designing a transition process to safely get from heavily supported activities (with the project) to a mainstreaming of similar activities that the Ghana government and institutions can manage on their own.</p> <p>c) We would like the PAD to clarify that the performance monitoring under component 2 will include the monitoring of the project impact on all greenhouse gas emissions, including methane from cattle. Please also consider having an indicator for these emissions.</p>
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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>CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012: Addressing Q11 above will help addressing incremental climate change mitigation benefits in the PAD.</p> <p>Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: Incremental reasoning: In the Project Paper, we hope to find the reasoning explaining the baseline scenario without GEF activities and what would happen to (i) capacities of local communities and extension services, (ii) SLWM activities in micro-watersheds, (iii) management of biological corridors, (iv) development of PES, (v) rangeland management, (vi) soil carbon management, and (vii) sustainable land and forest management (cf. comment 4b, definitely, it seems they are too many sub-components with a risk of dispersal). This reasoning is the way to demonstrate how the GEF resources will be additional to produce Global Environment Benefits. Please refer the GEF5 strategies to describe and monitor the Global Environment Benefits.</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: The question will be revised once Q11 has been addressed.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014: We suggest clarifying that activities targeting CCM activities have not been and are not currently undertaken by other initiatives in Ghana and will therefore be incremental.</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012: a) It is expected that the PAD will clarify whether "carbon stock monitoring system" under sub-component 2.7 refers only to estimating</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: As indicated in Q11 a), the review below will focus on the activities of sub-component 2.2. Depending on the response to Q11 a) additional comments</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the GHG impact of project activities or if the objective is to take part in setting up a national monitoring system of GHG emissions in the forest and agricultural sectors.</p> <p>b) It is expected that the PAD will clarify how the activities launched in sub-components 2.7 and 2.8 will be sustained (financially, economically) beyond the duration of the project.</p> <p>c) It is expected that the budget allocated to activities with a climate change mitigation objective would be commensurate with the climate change mitigation (CCM) allocation of the project. In the proposed PCN, sub-component 2.7 clearly targets CCM but with only \$1.5 million when the CCM GEF funding requested is \$2.27 million. Sub-component 2.8 also includes CCM outcomes but it is understood that this component (with \$1.6 million budgeted) will use the GEF SFM funding requested (\$1.85 million). It is expected that the PAD will clarify this and that additional budgeted activities will clearly target CCM objectives.</p> <p>Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: Project design: our main concern is to ensure that this PCN will lead to a realistic and feasible project in the spirit of the other projects developed under the SAWAP. That's why we hope that a significant part of the resources “around 50 percent- will be devoted</p>	<p>may be provided.</p> <p>a) The project description identifies a large menu of technical options for sustainable land management among which the stakeholders may choose what they want to implement. Since some of them are identified as having potential carbon sequestration benefits and others don't, please describe how the project will ensure that there will be climate change mitigation benefits from sustainable land management support activities.</p> <p>b) For the different activities identified as having potential carbon sequestration benefits, please clarify (i) what was the baseline practice that this activity will replace, (ii) why more carbon sequestration can be expected, (iii) how this carbon sequestration acquired can be sustained in the medium and long-term, (iv) how the amount of carbon sequestered was estimated and (v) how the impact on carbon sequestration will be monitored.</p> <p>c) Please also describe the impact of the project activities (on cattle, ranging, fertilization) on methane and nitrous oxide emissions, explain how the project will monitor such impact, and detail and this impact is taken into account in the assessment of the project climate change mitigation impact.</p> <p>d) The project intends to use a PES system and to set in place outputs based payments. Please describe how the PES system and the outputs based payments</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>to concrete activities on the ground (that's why some indicators in hectares are needed).</p> <p>a. Can you confirm that the project is field result oriented and a significant share of the resources will be used for concrete activities on the ground with the beneficiaries?</p> <p>b. While new activities on rangeland management are welcome, don't you think that eight sub-components are too much for such a project? Isn't there a risk to disperse and dilute the existing efforts?</p> <p>c. It is expected that the Project Paper will clarify whether "carbon stock monitoring system" under sub-component 2.7 refers only to estimating the GHG impact of project activities or if the objective is to take part in setting up a national monitoring system of GHG emissions in the forest and agricultural sectors.</p>	<p>would work in practice, and how these payments will incentivize activities targeting climate change mitigation benefits.</p> <p>e) Please also clarify the financial and human means the project will put in place to ensure that this instrument can be sustained beyond the project completion and may be replicated and scaled up.</p> <p>f) The description of the project's activities includes several mentions of "Positive contribution to the Clean Development Mechanism". Please clarify since the GEF CCM funding cannot support activities that would result in GHG emissions being offset under a UNFCCC mechanism.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014:</p> <p>a) We strongly suggest that the PAD clarifies that particular attention will be given to ensure that rangeland management options selected by local communities include options that provide clear CCM benefits.</p> <p>b), c), d) Further clarifications are expected on this once the negotiation process is finished.</p> <p>e) Please see Q11 b).</p> <p>f) Cleared.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>CCM/FJ - Dec 12, 2012:</p> <p>Please provide an estimation of the expected carbon stock enhancement benefits along with a rough rationale for this estimation.</p>	<p>NR comment, email March 19, 2014:</p> <p>2. GEBS in the form of carbon (as tons of CO₂eq) and improvements in forest / vegetative cover should be monitored and quantified based on focal area outcomes targeted.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: The Key Performance Indicators are close to those included in the SAWAP. We will invite the Agency to check the consistency of the final KPIs that will finally be retained. For instance, the number of management plans and the number of hectares of forests that benefit from a participatory management plan are welcome. For the second indicator, mapping the land and forest cover is not enough. Following the SAWAP's KPI, we recommend to monitor "the changes in vegetation cover in targeted areas compared to a baseline". CO2 eq sequestered or emissions avoided should also be estimated.</p>	<p>Addressed.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: The question will be revised once the other comments have been addressed.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014: Once the negotiation process is finished, we would appreciate a description of the assumptions used to assess the CCM impact of the rangeland activities.</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>Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: Socio-economic benefits: In the Project Paper, we hope to find a description of socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions and indigenous issues, including the role of traditional authorities (remind the #2183 project on community based integrated natural resources in Okyeman).</p>	<p>NR comments, email March 19, 2014: 6. Gender issues should be better considered, notably reaching an ambitious target in terms of beneficiaries and specific activities for women.</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>		<p>NR comments, email March 19, 2014: 7. Traditional authorities are never mentioned in the document, while some of them (traditional hunters) still have a strong role of watching and monitoring forests and natural corridors. Their implication would certainly be an element of sustainability.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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>NR comment, email March 19, 2014: 3. We find in the text that the initial projects encountered some implementation difficulties. Could you explain how you will remove these barriers to achieve the targets you have established (e.g. number of ha under SLM)?</p> <p>Addressed.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: Please clarify what are the expected climate change impacts for the targeted region, how these impacts may affect the projects outcomes in terms of climate change mitigation potential and how the project will mitigate the associated risks of reduced climate change mitigation impact.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014: The PAD indicates that the project activities will increase resilience. This should be briefly demonstrated based on an identification of expected climate change impact.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Comment included in the email dated Dec. 17, 2012: In the Project Paper, please include the GEF Documentation: 1) Please check the GEF templates that were approved by the GEF Coordination unit and GEF OBS and 2) include the final letter of endorsement, the proofs of cofinancing (letter of cofinancing or minutes of negotiation), the tracking tools, including the carbon benefits in t CO2 eq derived to justify the use of CCM5 funds in addition to the SFM incentive (please contact Marianne Burke, mburke@thegef.org, if you need help to calculate them; methodological guidance is also provided in the last GEF publication on LULUCF, http://www.thegef.org/gef/pubs/land-use-land-use-change-and-forestry-lulucf-activities).	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Addressed at PFD level.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant		NR comment, email March 19, 2014: 8. Please, include the tracking tools for CCM, LD, and SFM in the final

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		<p>submission.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 8, 2014: For the CCM tracking tool: a) Please review row 19 to include CCM funding only. b) Please fill in row 24 with an estimation of the co-financing going to CCM relevant activities. c) Since this project is only associated with CCM-5 objective, rows 29 to 141 should be left blank.</p> <p>CCM/FJ - Apr 16, 2014: Please review the CCM tracking tool as indicated.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>NR comments, email dated on March 19, 2014: 5. Key indicators: We are not sure about all the changes and justification for key indicators used in the initial project and those proposed for the additional financing (4 or 5 finally?). Please, consider the following elements: a. Inclusion of the four key indicators from the PFD is much welcome (can you confirm that all four indicators will be used as key indicators?), as well as the announced collaboration with the BRICK regional project. b. The number of pre-feasibility studies conducted for new large-scale multipurpose water storage investments can be an acceptable indicator, but not as a key indicator in the SAWAP context. c. Please, note that the baseline for the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>monitoring is expected before the project starts and not during the first year of implementation. The experience within the GEF folio shows that it does not work and the first year of projects are always overpromising.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>- There was no PIF approval, as the project concept was part of a programmatic approach (GEF and WB Sahel and West Africa Program to Support the Great Green Wall Initiative).</p> <p>- This project was also a pioneer and included in the streamlined pilot phase with the World Bank. Many issues were dealt through email exchanges, and subsequently included in the PMIS. Not all issues were then reflected in the review sheet. For instance, GEFSEC comments were sent out on December 17, 2012 in view of the virtual PCN meeting planned on December 19, 2012.</p> <p>- We also found out that the information was logged under two different GEFID numbers (5221 and 5</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		<p>- Since the PCN review meeting (December 19, 2012), there were no formal communication between the World Bank and the GEF until the Decision Meeting on March 19, 2014.</p> <p>- It is regrettable that we were not associated or receive some information at the moment of the Virtual Concept Decision Note (March 14, 2013) or the pre-appraisal mission (January 20-31, 2014), while we asked for information about the project (email sent on October 14, 2013). A response just mentioned the change of staff (project coordinator and TTL).</p> <p>- The information package was received late to make timely comments for the DM. However, the opportunity was given to send comments after the DM (March 19, 2014) that were appropriately addressed. Only comments from the NR team were addressed, as the CCM did not receive the package. We found out that there were two project IDs for this child project under the SAWAP; one of them did not include any CCM co-reviewer.</p> <p>- A revised package was then sent by the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>World Bank on April 4, 2014. Additional comments were proposed by the Climate Change Team on April 14, 2014 (email logged). The rationale for GEF CCM funding request needed to be strengthened. The CCM team asked to be contacted regarding CCM comments prior to resubmission.</p> <p>- By email (April 14, 2014), we agreed that the Bank will update the PAD, including three points related to CCM eligibility and will reaffirm some principles related to the climate change mitigation impacts of SLM/SFM/agriculture activities as well as the sustainability of interventions. Other comments, mainly clarifications will be addressed by the Board date.</p> <p>- After a response by email from the Bank on April 16, 2014, some clarifications were still needed from the CCM side. After a phone a conference on April 17, 2014, the Bank responded by email the same day.</p> <p>- April 18, 2014: All comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 12, 2012	April 08, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)		April 16, 2014
	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?	
	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.