



---

## Improving Water Availability in The Gambia's Rural and Peri-Urban Communities for Domestic and Agricultural Use

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10199

**Countries**

Gambia

**Project Title**

Improving Water Availability in The Gambia's Rural and Peri-Urban Communities for Domestic and Agricultural Use

**GEF Agency(ies)**

AfDB

**Agency ID****GEF Focal Area(s)**

Climate Change

**Program Manager**

Dustin Schinn

**PIF**

## Part I – Project Informatic

### Focal area elements

#### 1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes. Project aligns with the GEF Programming Strategy on Adaptation to Climate Change for the LDCF and the SCCF (2018-2022). However, please adjust the distribution of funding requested between individual climate change adaptation objectives to reflect the focus of the project. Currently, CCA-3 is listed as \$1.8 million, however, the project activities do not include the development of a National Adaptation Plan and are more focused on implementation/tech transfer (CCA-1) and mainstreaming of climate change (CCA-2). Please consider using CCA-2 instead of CCA-3.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** Thank you. This has been revised accordingly.

### Indicative project/program description summary

#### 2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. The project is overall designed in clear and sound way, focusing on water resilience for domestic and agricultural use. However, several questions remain concerning the individual activities:

(i) Please describe how sustainability of additional boreholes (Output 1.1.1) will be ensured, including in areas close to the ocean and/or the river, where saline intrusion in groundwater resources could occur.

(ii) Please provide estimated numbers of new water tanks, pipe networks, reservoirs and animal watering points that would be installed/established under Output 1.1.2, to enable a better assessment of the cost-effectiveness of the proposed project. Please also provide estimated quantity for other outputs such as 2.2.2 (Training of district water monitoring assistants) etc.

(iii) Please explain how Output 1.2.1 is different to Output 1.1.1 and Output 1.1.2. Is one of them focusing on establishing new, and the other one focusing on climate-proofing of existing stock of infrastructure? Please clarify and provide more details.

(iv) Please clarify what specific "climate-smart agriculture practices" are envisaged under Output 3.1.2.

(v) Please clarify how livestock and sustainable rangeland management under Output 3.1.3 will aim to result in livelihood diversification benefits; what are people's livelihoods before the planned intervention and how will the intervention give them additional livelihood options that are less vulnerable or exposed to climate change?

DS, April 28, 2019:

Comments cleared at PIF stage. More information will be required at CEO endorsement stage on the specific activities.

### Agency Response

(i) As noted in the PIF, risk and vulnerability assessments will be used to inform investment decisions. Flood, drought and salinity prone areas will be identified to ensure that climate-resilient infrastructure is designed and installed as appropriate given expected conditions (for example, boreholes of appropriate depth to consider fluctuating groundwater resources). Additionally, the preparation of a groundwater map planned under baseline project combined with the institutional strengthening of relevant departments in hydro-meteorological and groundwater surveillance (2.2.1) and the planned assessment and development of concurrent groundwater recharge systems to enhance storage capacity (now 1.2.4) will inform the design of this type of investments and sustainability. Finally, in-country know-how exists in the installation of boreholes since several projects have financed this type of installations in the past (e.g. EC-financed - Rural Water Supply Sector Support Programme and Regional Solar Programme phase II).

(ii) Quantities for the installation of water supply infrastructure for the project have been estimated taking into account co-financing contributions (baseline project) as such (a) 40 solar powered borehole water supply systems equipped with storage tank, street taps/house connections, livestock watering facilities; (b) 270km of water supply pipelines laid; (c) 60 hand pumped boreholes constructed; (d) 40 rain water harvesting systems installed in schools. Considering that some of these activities will be co-financed with ADF funds, GEF-specific targets will be refined during PPG phase, in consultation with relevant stakeholders. Similarly, for the other outputs, estimated quantities will be further refined during the PPG phase to maximize cost-effectiveness.

(iii) We removed output 1.2.1, since it refers to an outcome and which is already reflected in outcome 1.2. rather than an activity. Moreover, outcome 1.1.1/1.1.2 were adjusted to clarify these investments will be climate proofed.

(iv) CSA practices with high climate-smartness scores will be selected and will vary depending on the target production system. At the PIF stage envisaged CSA practices relevant in the context of The Gambia include:

conservation agriculture (crop rotation, minimum/no tillage, cover crops), composting, use of improved varieties, integrated pest management, intercropping, contour bunds and drip irrigation. Further detail will be provided in the CEO document based on the stakeholder consultations and field visits to be conducted during the PPG phase.

(v) The overall objective of output 3.1.3 is to enhance livestock-based livelihoods to counter the threat from climate change and implement rangeland management activities that have the potential to increase resilience of the livestock sector. Beef and dairy cattle as well as small-ruminant production in The Gambia is predominantly based on the free-range pastoral system. Accordingly, a substantial reduction in the productivity of natural pastures due to climate factors calls for the adoption of new approaches to livestock production.

With this in mind, pilots will support diversification and improved rangeland management activities to enhance the resilience of livestock dependent livelihoods. Envisaged activities may include: rangeland regeneration pilots, introduction of resilient breeds, increasing livestock productivity and alternative income generating activities. These will be further refined during the PPG phase based on stakeholder consultations and expressed needs.

## Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was**

**identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please change the co-financing provided by the Government of Gambia from "investment mobilized" to "recurrent expenditures" given that the government provides in-kind co-financing that seems to fall within the recurrent expenditure category.

Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures" for the other sources of co-financing. For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines ([http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf)).

DS, April 28, 2019:

Comment cleared.

**Agency Response**

The co-financing has been adjusted accordingly. The description has been adjusted under the co-financing.

**GEF Resource Availability**

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

The project is within the \$10 million per-country ceiling of eligibility under the LDCF for the period of July 2018 to June 2022.

**Agency Response**

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Focal area set-aside?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Agency Response**

**Impact Program Incentive?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

## Agency Response

### Project Preparation Grant

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

## Agency Response

### Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please provide the Excel file with the 4 adaptation core indicators and the associated meta-data, which has been circulated to GEF Agency Adaptation Task Force by email early April. Please also explain how you have arrived at 500,000 estimated beneficiaries to be expected as a result of the LDCF funding.



DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** The Excel file is attached.

## Project/Program taxonomy

### 7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. Given that the project lists Rio Marker 1 for climate change mitigation, please explain how it qualifies as mitigation. Alternatively, you may wish to remove this Rio Marker for mitigation and list as zero.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** The Rio Marker for Climate Change Mitigation has been adjusted to zero, while the project envisages climate mitigation activities such as the installation of solar powered water points we concur this may not be sufficient to qualify the project as mitigation.

## art II – Project Justification

### 1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

### Agency Response

## 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. The baseline project is described in detail. However, it seems as if the baseline project already includes climate change adaptation measures, and it seems unclear how the requested LDCF funding will focus on effectively supporting the additional adaptation costs associated with the impacts of climate change. Please clarify.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** Yes, the reason being the baseline project already incorporates in its description the planned activities to be financed with the GEF financing to cover adaptation costs and mainstream climate change activities in the Bank operation. Accordingly, some of the envisioned adaptation activities to be financed with GEF financing particularly those related to the water sector were already listed as such in the baseline project.

## 3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

### Agency Response

#### 4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

### Agency Response

#### 5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please refer to comment above on baseline.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** See justification provided above.

## 6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please refer to comment above on indicators and number of beneficiaries, and clarify.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Please remove information entered for Indicators in GEF Portal entry mask, given that the indicators for CCA are submitted through the attached Excel file. In order to avoid double counting, please remove them from the GEF Portal field (Indicator 11 in particular).

DS, April; 29, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response** The excel table has been attached. Targets will be refined during the PPG phase.

## 7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response**

## Project/Program Map and Coordinates

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

**Agency Response****Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Please provide the name of the Executing Agency (government) in the appropriate field in GEF Portal.

DS, April 28, 2019:

The GEF Portal field for "executing partner type" is still left blank. Please insert information.

DS, April 29, 2019:

Cleared. Government is executing partner.

**Agency Response** This has been updated in the Portal.

## Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

### Agency Response

## Private Sector Engagement

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, April 17, 2019:

Partly unclear. Please provide information on how the water pipes will be maintained and in how far the public and private sector will cooperate in this regard.

DS, April 28, 2019:

Since the private sector will not be involved through a PPP, please remove the tick box for private sector engagement from the PIF and from the tracking tool.

DS, April 29, 2019:

Please remove tick mark for private sector engagement as per above.

### **Agency Response**

The selected key technologies, such as water pipes and the use of solar power for water pumping, have been adopted by previous projects in the Gambia, with minimal and affordable operation and maintenance costs, thereby ensuring sustainability. The project will also support decentralized planning and decision making at the local level, thereby maximizing the benefit at the lowest most appropriate levels.

Furthermore, as recommended in the baseline project ESMF, GEF financing will support capacity building to be provided to village development committees (VDCs) and village water committees (VWCs), including in operation and maintenance of new water and sanitation technologies and facilities. Finally, it is envisaged related project activities (GEF & baseline) provide opportunity to generate knowledge products for studies to develop business models to promote private Sector participation.

### **Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Knowledge Management**



**Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**art III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

DS, April 17, 2019:

Yes.

PPO, May 3, 2019:

The OFP endorsed \$200,000 for PPG. However, he missed to endorse the PPG Agency Fee of \$19,000. Nonetheless, the Agency requested the PPG Agency Fee for \$19,000 in Portal. The Agency has to either (i) request a new LoE which includes the missing \$19,000; or (ii) adjust the Agency Fee by reducing the \$19,000, then resubmit.

**DS, May 3, 2019:**

**Comment cleared. Agency fee was reduced to accommodate for PPG fee, and PPG fee + agency fee together now do not exceed the agency fee endorsed by the OFP.**

### Agency Response

### EFSEC DECISION

### RECOMMENDATION

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

DS, May 1, 2019:

All comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF for technical clearance and PPG. This project was part of the technically cleared pipeline of the LDCF at the end of the GEF-6 period. During the GEF Secretariat consultations with The Gambia OFP to discuss the new GEF Adaptation Programming Strategy and Operational Improvements, the OFP confirmed this AfDB project as a continued government priority.

The Gambia River presents fairly good water supplies while its floodplains, riverbanks and wetlands are important to local livelihoods. However, due to the country's flat topography, there is a significant marine influence while the river's high seasonality and salinity have consequences on land use, productivity and livelihoods. Surface water is thus rarely a source of drinking water. The water supply and sanitation sub-sector is particularly vulnerable to anticipated changes in climate conditions (especially temperature and rainfall) and the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events.

This project requests US\$ 10 million from the LDCF (incl. Agency Fee and PPG), to build resilience to climate change and variability by enhancing water supply for domestic and agricultural use, and ultimately improving livelihoods in rural and peri-urban areas of The Gambia. The project is structured around four principal components, including: (1) Provision of climate resilient water supply infrastructure; (2) Enhanced institutional capacity for adaptation and hydro-meteorological monitoring; (3) Community land and water-based adaptation; and (4) knowledge and monitoring.

Drawing on indicative co-financing of US\$ 10.4 million mostly from the GEF Agency, this project is expected to yield significant adaptation benefits, including: 500,000 direct beneficiaries (50% female); 200 hectares of land under climate-resilient management; and 500 people trained. The project is gender-responsive and fully embedded in the national policy agenda.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/17/2019	4/26/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/28/2019	4/29/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		