

# Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) for resilient natural resources and agro-pastoral communities in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10691

**Countries**

Senegal

**Project Name**

Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) for resilient natural resources and agro-pastoral communities in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies  
**Agencies**

UNDP, IUCN

**Date received by PM**

9/27/2020

**Review completed by PM**

11/2/2020

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes it is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-2.

Agency Response

**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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Some of the outputs are written as outcomes and should be reformulated. Outputs 1.1.5; output 2.1.3; output 3.2.1 and output 3.2.2. Please keep in mind outputs should be easily measurable against output indicators and against the outcomes. Outcomes are the lasting impact or achievement of the project activities; and the outputs should be easily counted (programs, trainings, etc.).

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Cleared for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

The outputs were reformulated as follows:

Output 1.1.5 “The EWS under the ANACIM is equipped to strengthen the observation and dissemination of climate data in the project areas”

|

Output 2.1.3 “Green infrastructure, (i.e. bunds, embankments, weirs, earth dams) will be installed to improve access to water resources for local producers”

Output 3.2.1 “Local entrepreneurs, in particular women and youth, are trained to develop and commercialize products and services based on the sustainable use of natural resources, taking into account climate change”

The output 3.2.2 was split into two outputs to make them more measurable:

Output 3.2.2 “SMEs based on the sustainable use of natural resources are provided with equipment (i.e. for the establishment of nurseries, village multi-purpose gardens, fodder reserves and integrated model farms) and agriculture and forestry inputs”

Output 3.2.3 “SMEs based on the sustainable use of natural resources are provided with training to access financing opportunities to promote the adoption of resilient practices that protect and conserve targeted ecosystems”

1. There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as it is the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$25,950,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,297,500 instead of \$500,000. Please ask the Agency to amend.

CG, 30 Oct. 2020

The co-financing under PMC was increased to US\$1,350,000 instead of US\$500,000.

**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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More information requested. Please provide more information in the baseline section on those projects which are listed in Table C as providing co-financing to this initiative. It is difficult to ascertain whether they are in fact investment mobilized at the moment, and it seems unclear which projects are merely part of the baseline scenario and which are contributing co-financing to this project. Please make that explicitly clear and ensure those described as providing co-financing in the baseline section match those listed in Table C, in addition to those projects which are part of the general baseline scenario.

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - More information requested.

1) Please convert these project financing amounts to USD

2) Please clarify -- which of these listed are the 5 included in the table (please label clearly) and how much? Apologies if I am missing something here, but the amounts of attributed co-financing and relevant details do not seem to be listed (the portal submission looks the same as it was from the first submission). Perhaps the portal submission was not updated - as the type of co-financing was also not updated from In-Kind to Grant in Table C - please advise - or whether there is a glitch?

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - Not cleared. The change has not been reflected (From in-kind to grant). Additionally, it does not intuitively make sense that in-kind concurrently be investment mobilized unless the agency can provide further clarification on how this is the case. ). In general, in-kind recurrent co-financing such as government staff salaries, office space, operating costs are considered recurrent expenditures, whereas capital investments and equipment purchase are considered investment mobilized. Agencies should include information on how the amounts are classified in accordance with their internal categorization practices, where possible. Please clarify.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - This is cleared.

Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

More details were provided for each project listed in the section 1.a.2. *The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects*, sub-section ‘*Externally funded baseline projects*’. Details include the activities under each project that will contribute to co-financing, as well as the amount of co-financing expected. This list of externally funded baseline projects includes the 5 projects listed as co-financing in Table C, but excludes the co-financing from COSEER, SONOTEL, UNDP and the municipalities (as these are not baseline projects). Details on these co-financers are provided in section 1.a.5. *Additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the LDCF, and co-financing* for each component and PMC, as presented in tables B and C. Section 1.a.5. indicates the exact amount to be tagged as co-financing for each co-financer under each component. Mention is also made that “*The co-financing is a combination of ongoing project activities that are already funded and serve as a baseline for adaptation activities covered in this project, as well as cash and in-kind contributions specifically made to support the implementation of this project. The co-financing from baseline projects will be secured in the PPG phase through written confirmation with project owners.*”

Note that the co-financing from the ASRGM has been changed to Grant, as the resources will directly be managed by the project team, operating under the ASRGM.

JP, 27 Oct 2020

the type of cofinancing has been changed to "other" for PDDPS, PADAER II, PUDC II, PROMOVILLES, COSEER and SONOTEL. More details on the type of cofinancing are available in the sections "Externally funded baseline projects" and "1.a.5. Additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the LDCF, and co-financing"

1. Co-financing : co-financing from donor Agencies is indicated as “unknown” type. These are the baseline projects so the type is known. Please revise. Also, please provide the definitions/approaches used to differentiate between “recurrent expenditure” and “investment mobilized”

CG, 30 Oct 2020

There is an issue with the GEF portal that changes co-financings tagged as “other” into “unknown”. All co-financing tagged as “unknown” have now been changed to “grant”. These projects are existing baseline project, that will be ongoing during the period of implementation, and will conduct activities relevant to the LDCF project. This means the resources will not flow directly through the project but that the activities will be conducted in coordination and partnership to reach the project objective.

Regarding the definition of “recurrent expenditures”, UNDP understands it as the payments made by government or organizations for costs such as salaries, office space, etc. that do not flow through the project but which will contribute to facilitate the implementation of the project. In the case of this project, it could include the salaries of local agents in the FBR and Thies, that will support the monitoring of the project or facilitate the implementation of some activities. “Investments

mobilized” are resources that are allocated for a specific intervention, project, programme, etc. that will support the LDCF project. “Investment mobilized” also includes resources that are secured for the implementation of the project such as UNDP core resources, that will be managed by the project management unit. Ongoing projects in the targeted areas that have similar objective and could support the scale-up or provide important lessons learn are included in that category.

#### **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 GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

1. IUCN Agency Fee was calculated at 9.5% instead of at 9.0% - please ask the Agency to amend so the GEF Financing Agency Fee will be \$327,653 (as opposed to \$345,856) – similarly the PPG Agency Fee will be \$8,100 (as opposed to 8,550). The total Agency Fee has also to be adjusted accordingly (now it is set at \$848,580)

**CG, 30 Oct 2020**

IUCN fee was corrected and reduced to 9% both for project implementation and PPG. The unused resources were reallocated under the project activities.

**JP, 3 Nov 2020**

**New LOE was uploaded to ROADMAP.**

#### **The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes. Senegal is eligible to access up to \$10 million from the LDCF under the current GEF-7 programming strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA



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 GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - 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 GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - NA

Agency Response  
**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 GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

**Part 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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More clarification requested. Is there some specific defining factor that pulls Thies and the FBR together that creates a rationale for approaching these two localities together (aside from "increased vulnerability")? Please integrate the future climate scenarios into this section, and the specific impacts of both the historical and projected climate information on Thies and the FBR communities. How much of an issue is potential conflict amongst pastoralists?

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Thank you for the additional information, however it does not seem to be reflected in the updated portal submission. The text in the box below is not in the portal PIF?

Additionally, how will the agency ensure that this project is implemented in a coherent way considering the disparate geographic reality? What efforts will be made to ensure the activities implemented at each site are not isolated separate pilots, and instead part of a larger initiative? This is particularly relevant in the current context (pandemic).

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

The FBR and Thies were selected as they cover rural and urban environment and are considered as priority landscapes for the introduction of EbA practices. The implementation of EbA practices in both areas will provide lessons learned and best practices to be replicated at a larger scale and introduced into NAP priorities.

More details were added in the PIF to:

- (i) Provide more details about the selection criteria for both targeted areas (see 1.a.1. *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed*: “The FBR was selected to represent the rural landscape zone in this project, as identified as a priority by the Government of Senegal, due to its economic importance for Senegal’s livestock industry, its high biodiversity and location within the Great Green Wall corridor, and the current and projected climate impacts in this zone. (...) The City of Thies was selected to represent the urban landscape zone in this project, providing a parallel perspective on EbA next to the rural zone of FBR. It was identified as a priority by the Government of

*Senegal due to its large urban population size, the severity of the impact associated with climate-change driven flooding, the link between exacerbation of the climate impacts and the pastoral activities outside the city, and the opportunity that EbA offers to address observed and forecasted climate impacts.)*

(ii) Provide a clearer rationale for the selection of these two sites (see 1.b. *Project Map and coordinates: “The two project areas, selected as priorities by the Government of Senegal for the introduction of EbA practices, are the FBR and Thies, covering rural and urban environment”*)

(iii) Better articulate the common challenges (see 1.a.1. *“the FBR population includes rural agropastoralists, whose livelihoods are particularly vulnerable to climate change, due to their dependence on reliable rainfalls for fodder supply and rainfed agriculture. In contrast, the urban population of the City of Thies is heavily impacted by flooding, which disrupts transportation and local commerce. Additionally, the population under the wider area of influence of the City of Thies includes agropastoralists and other natural resources users, which are vulnerable to the changes in rainfall patterns, and whose maladaptive practices may directly impact the flooding in the city.”*)

Sub-sections were added in the PIF to clearly emphasize the historic climate information as well as future climate scenario for both project areas (see 1.a.1. *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed*).

Conflicts between pastoralists were identified in the Sahel in general but no particular issue was raised for the specific project sites at this stage. During the PPG, the SESP will help identify any potential conflict risk and, if relevant, conflict risk analysis will be conducted.

CG, 22 October 2020

Apologies, the changes have now been inserted in the portal.

Concerning the additional concern from the GEF about the coherence of the implementation, the KM component (component 4) will put an emphasis on the coordination between the activities conducted in both project regions. The project coordination unit (PCU), in particular the M&E specialist and the coordinator, will ensure that the lessons learned are capitalized and shared across the project areas. In addition, stakeholders at the local level (either local project staff or local government staff supporting the project) will support the day-to-day activities and report to the PCU (based in Dakar) to identify barriers to be considered, lessons learned and best practices to replicate in other areas. A new risk was added in the PIF to reflect this potential challenge (see section 5. Risk)

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

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More information requested. What exactly is the nature of the relationship of this project to the GGW and what exactly is the GGW financing which is being classified as co-financing? Is UNDP in discussion with relevant stakeholders on any GGW initiatives under development? More information on each of those projects which are providing co-financing and listed in the co-financing table (Table C) is requested.

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Thank you for the additional information, but again, similar to the above comments, the changes do not seem to be reflected in the portal. Additionally - what does this phrase mean -- "as the IP for this project" (written below in the response box)?

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - This is cleared.

### Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

The project will be implemented through the ASRGM, which is the national agency that supports the GGW initiative in Senegal. This will ensure a strong coordination with the GGW projects and activities ongoing in Senegal and more specifically in the FBR. Indeed, the FBR is included in the defined route of the GGW, as now indicated in section 1.a.1 *"The FBR is located in the area of Senegal where the Great Green Wall (a pan-African initiative to plant a wall of trees from Dakar to Djibouti as a tool to combat desertification) is being implemented"*. More information was provided in section 1.a.2. *Externally funded baseline projects "The ASRGM is both the lead for the GGWI in Senegal as well as the implementing agency for this LDCF project. This will therefore ensure a strong coordination with other ongoing and planned programming under the national and regional GGWI and this project."*

In addition, in section 1.a.3. under component 2 description, details on the GGWI interventions in the Ferlo, in relation to the project interventions, are provided *"the "Great Green Wall" initiative, which is led by ASRGM and includes the FBR: it aims to strengthen the capacities of local communities to help boost investments in land restoration and created employment opportunities or 'green' jobs but does not specifically address ecosystem based adaptation approaches. (...) The restoration activities in the FBR will also directly contribute to the GGWI, as it is located in the same zone and both are led by ASRGM."*

As the IP for this project, the ASRGM will provide co-financing to directly support the implementation of the project, including project management costs or complementary field activities. In addition, the project will ensure the activities are implemented jointly with other ongoing GGW interventions. More details on these projects are available in section 1.a.2. *Externally funded baseline projects "In particular, projects under the ASRGM in the project areas include fruit tree (jujube, baobab, fig tree) and medical plants reforestation, biodiversity conservation, anti-erosion activities (for improved water infiltration) and capacity building*

*for local governments. As such, activities undertaken under the GGWI in the project areas will directly provide lessons learned to the LDCF project while restoration activities in the FBR will contribute the GGW coverage". Note that, because these projects won't be implemented in the project areas, they have not been included in the co-financing table (Table C)*

CG, 22 October 2020

Apologies, the changes have now been inserted in the portal.

Regarding the sentence "as the IP for this project", this is referring to the role of the ASRGM (ie. the national agency supporting the GGW work in Senegal) as the Implementing Partner for the project. This is the internal term within UNDP to refer to the project executing entity.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - General comments on project design:

- 1) Thies and the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve (FBR) seem to be geographically disparate areas. What is the connection between the two sites, and why does it make sense to tackle them both under one project?
- 2) What exactly is the green belt? More elaboration on this would be appreciated.
- 3) Please see comment in the Coordination item regarding the activities financed under the UNDP-LDCF project currently under implementation in Ferlo.

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Thank you for this information. One clarification requested - there does not seem to be any description of the green belt under outcome 2. The green belt is mentioned however. Is the green belt merely the tree planting along the road corridors? How was this tree species chosen?

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - Cleared for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

- 1) The justification was provided in the comment 1 above:

The FBR and Thies were selected as priority landscapes for the introduction of EbA practices by the Government of Senegal, due to the climate change vulnerability of both areas and the opportunities to address these vulnerabilities through ecosystem restoration and regeneration. In addition, the implementation of EbA practices in both landscapes (urban and rural) will provide lessons learned and best practices to be replicated at a larger scale and introduced into NAP priorities.

More details were added in the PIF to:

- (i) Better articulate the common challenges (see 1.a.1. *“In this context, the Government of Senegal, through the Agence Sénégalaise de la Reboisement et de la Grande Muraille Verte (ASRGM), identified two project sites (the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve (FBR) in the North and Thies in the East of the country) considered a priority in terms of climate vulnerability, environmental degradation and high socio-economic importance, as well as the opportunities to address these vulnerabilities through ecosystem restoration and regeneration. In addition, the implementation of EbA practices in both landscapes (urban and rural) will provide lessons learned and best practices to be replicated at a larger scale and introduced into NAP priorities. Indeed, the FBR is a rural, biodiverse zone, and Thies is in and around a large urban population center. This will enable the project to build a strong knowledge base for future scale-up of Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) across both urban and rural landscapes (maps are available in Section 1.b).(...) the FBR population includes rural agropastoralists, whose livelihoods are particularly vulnerable to climate change, due to their dependence on reliable rainfalls for fodder supply and rainfed agriculture. In contrast, the urban population of the City of Thies is heavily impacted by flooding, which disrupts transportation and local commerce. Additionally, the population under the wider area of influence of the City of Thies includes agropastoralists and other natural resources users, which are vulnerable to the changes in rainfall patterns, and whose maladaptive practices may directly impact the flooding in the city.”*)
- (ii) Provide a clearer rationale for the selection of these two sites (see 1.b. *Project Map and coordinates: “The two project areas, selected as priorities by the Government of Senegal for the introduction of EbA practices to address climate change impacts, are the FBR and Thies, covering rural and urban environment”*)
- (iii) Provide more details about the selection criteria for both targeted areas (see 1.a.1. *The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed: “The FBR was selected to represent the rural landscape zone in this project, as identified as a priority by the Government of Senegal, due to the climate change vulnerability of its communities, its economically important livestock industry and its high biodiversity and due to its location within the Great Green Wall corridor. (...) The City of Thies was selected to represent the urban landscape zone in this project, providing a parallel perspective on EbA next to the rural zone of FBR. It was identified as a priority by the Government of Senegal due to the climate change vulnerability of its large urban population, in particular to the severe impacts of flooding, the link between exacerbation of the climate impacts and the pastoral activities outside the city, and the opportunity that EbA offers to address observed and forecasted climate impacts.”*)

2) 2. The green belt refers to the reforestation of areas surrounding the city of Thies. Details are available under the description of outcome 2, and the wording has been slightly revised to more clearly make reference to the green belt (see 1.a.3. outcome 2 “*This component will support the restoration of a green belt by replanting khaya senegalensis and other endemic trees alongside roads and in public green spaces (output 2.1.5.) for drainage control and the reduction in hydrological disaster risks, thus reducing flooding from extreme weather events in parts of the City of Thies, and decreasing the population’s vulnerability to these climate change impacts*”)

3) 3. More information on coordination with other UNDP-LDCF projects was provided under the component description, as well as in the coordination section – see response to the comment in the coordination item for more details.

CG, 22 October 2020

Apologies, the changes have now been inserted in the portal.

We confirm green belt refers to tree planting along the road corridors around the city of Thies to protect the city from the increasing risk of floods. Regarding the choice of the tree species, Khaya Senegalensis is just one variety of tree species to be used, along with other endemic species. The studies and consultations conducted during the formulation phase will enable a more thorough identification and selection process of most appropriate species.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - 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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Not clear. This is difficult to ascertain without the specific activities being supported by the co-financing.

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - This is still not clear.

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

As indicated in the response to comment 3, Part I, more details about the co-financing are available under the baseline section as well as in section 1.a.5.

CG, 22 October 2020

Apologies, the changes have now been inserted in the portal. Please advise if that clarifies.

**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

ecGEFSEC, 19/6/2020 - No. The LDCF/SCCF uses its own spreadsheet to track core indicators and metadata for adaptation projects. This spreadsheet was shared with agencies following the Adaptation Task Force Meeting in April 2019. Please upload the worksheet onto the roadmap section of the portal.

Additionally, the information provided in Adaptation Benefits is not adequate. How do the activities of this project directly result in increased resilience of the target communities -- how do the proposed activities support these communities in more effectively coping to the negative impacts of climate change?

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - More information requested. In GEF-7, the LDCF is aiming to continue to serve the specific needs of LDCs, while also increasing ambition and impact. Taking this into consideration the above, 10,000 direct beneficiaries for a project requesting \$10 million does not seem to be cost effective or achieve the a level of impact intended for a project of this size. Currently, the cost per beneficiary is at about \$1,000 per head. The Secretariat appreciates the large land impacts this initiative aims to achieve, but the primary goal of the LDCF is to increase the resilience and decrease the vulnerability of people and communities to the negative impacts of climate change. Therefore, the Secretariat is expecting a higher number of people, households, and communities to be directly benefitting from this project. Some rural areas are very sparsely population so this goal is not attainable, but the City of Thies is described as Senegal's third largest city. Please provide some justification for the very low target for direct beneficiaries of this project -- such as, what is the population of the rural communities of FBR? What is the demographic profile of the area (density)? More information and revisiting the targets provided would be much appreciated.

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - This is cleared.

Agency Response



JP, 15 Oct 2020

The core indicators spreadsheet is now filled and shared with the GEF.

The section on adaptation benefits was revised to align with the results indicated in the core indicators spreadsheet (see 1.a.6 *Global adaptation benefits* “The ecosystem restoration measures for pasture rangelands and forests in the project areas include re-planting of native species and infrastructures using natural materials of water retention and storage, and will contribute towards (i) increased soil water retention, (ii) increase in biomass, (iii) storage of atmospheric carbon, (iv) decreased erosion and loss of arable lands, (v) decrease of flooding events, (vi) decreased sediment load in rivers and silting of river beds. These ecosystem services are the foundation of the adaptation benefits delivered by this project. Indeed, the project proposes to restore at least 5,000 Ha of land, including pasture rangelands, as well as forest and wooded areas in the transition zone of the FBR and in and around Thies. This will be a combination of replanting native species, assisted natural regeneration and building green infrastructure to facilitate water and soil retention. These restored lands, as well as existing ecosystems, will form the basis of the EbA nature-based business models supported through the project. The strengthening of local EbA governance and support for development of nature-based SMEs covers a wider area of influence, including the 242,564 ha wildlife reserve, 1,156,633 ha of buffer zone and 659,019 ha of transition zone, as well as the region of Thies, which covers 667,000 ha. It is estimated that 300,000 households will indirectly benefit from these activities.

In addition, adaptation benefits will also result from the strengthening of local capacity and governance for the restoration and maintenance of economically useful ecosystems. Specific adaptive benefits are estimated to directly benefit 10,000 households (50% women) in particular through (i) maintained or increased livestock productivity (through fodder and water availability), (ii) new income-generating EbA opportunities, including agroforestry and tree crops which will increase the resilience of local communities by providing a diversity of fruits, nuts, medicines, fuel, timber, nitrogen fixation services, fodder, and habitat, and (iii) opportunities for recreation and ecotourism development. The ecosystem services of water retention and flood impacts reduction will also be a key contributor to the resilience of these adaptive livelihoods.”)

CG, 22 October 2020

The “Global adaptation benefit” section provides more details on the adaptation benefits of the project. The 10,000 direct beneficiaries are the beneficiaries of trainings under components 1, 2 and 3. However, a much larger number of beneficiaries is expected through the results of restoration activities conducted under component 2 (300,000 households). As these households will not be engaged directly in the project through capacity building or the provision of inputs (contrary to the 10,000 tagged as direct beneficiaries), but instead through awareness raising and the indirect benefit from restored ecosystems, they have been considered as “indirect beneficiaries”. While this distinction needs to be made, we can consider that all 310,000 households can be tagged as direct beneficiaries. Adequate changes were made both in the PIF (under “global adaptation benefit” section) and in the core indicator spreadsheet.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes. The project is innovative for Senegal and the sustainability and replication potential are sufficiently articulated for this stage of project development.

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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - 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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More clarification requested. Stakeholder engagement undertaken until now has been summarized in the submission, however - how do the project proponents intend to ensure future engagement considering the current context with potentially limited travel conditions?

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Specific information related to stakeholder engagement in the COVID-19 context was added under section 2. *Stakeholders* "In the context of the current COVID-19 pandemic, Senegal initially closed its international and city borders, significantly limiting travels for national and international consultants, including during the

*formulation of the PIF. However, restrictions have now been lifted and in-country travels are authorized, and the airport reopened to international flights. The spread of the virus remains relatively low in Senegal and it is currently not expected that another closing of borders will be enforced. We can therefore expect that, during the PPG stage, the COVID-19 context will not impact travels and the conduct of stakeholder engagement activities. Consultations will however be conducted cautiously following the restrictions and safety measures imposed by the government and recommended by health institutions (ie. WHO) ”*

### **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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More information requested. The information provided on the gender elements are very general and not specific to this intervention. More specific information regarding the gender dynamics which will inevitably be confronted by this project and how the project will address these gender dynamics would be appreciated.

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - This is cleared for this stage of project development.

#### Agency Response

More details on the specific gender dynamics in Senegal and in the project areas, as relevant to the project activities, was provided in the PIF, under section 3, *Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment*. Please note that a gender analysis will be conducted during the PPG phase to collect more information specific to the project areas and develop a gender action plan.

#### Changes include:

- Clarifications about the governing bodies in the project areas that do not significantly include women in the decision-making processes “*Silvipastoral Reserves and Pastoral Units (UPs), forests, Wildlife Reserves and Community Natural Reserves (RNCs)*”

- JP, 15 Oct 2020

Information about the traditional economic roles of women in rural Senegal, as relevant to the project interventions “*In the rural productive areas of Senegal, women are mainly involved in activities for consumption and low profitability: in the cultivation and marketing of market garden produce, milk, rain-fed rice, the processing of agricultural products and the rearing of small ruminants. Men tend to be active in more profitable commercial activities such irrigated rice and cash crops, large and small ruminant livestock. Gender literature indicates that women can more easily be persuaded to learn and start innovative approaches that build on traditional knowledge, and they are therefore more willing participants in ecosystem-based approaches to climate adaption.*”

The gender equality approach the project will aim to adopt and that will be reflected and explained in more details in the gender action plan “*In line with national policies aimed at increasing women's economic empowerment and participation in decision-making, at least 50% of the direct and indirect beneficiaries of the project will be women*”

#### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes. The information provided is sufficient for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

#### **Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More information requested - two major risks that consistently show up but are sometimes missing in these risk matrices are: fiduciary and climate risk. Please integrate.

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Cleared.

## Agency Response

These risks are now reflected in the risk table and the risk table has been adjusted: “*Climate variability and extreme weather events undermine the implementation of interventions and lead to economic losses and/or material damage*”. In addition, a fiduciary risk was added: “*Fiduciary risk: funds are not used for the intended purposes; do not achieve value for money; and/or are not properly accounted for*” and a mitigation strategy was provided “*The project will apply UNDP’s well-tested fiduciary risk management strategy, which is a written standard based on widely recognized processes and an internal control framework to protect against fraudulent and corrupt practices and waste. The project will develop detailed operational and monitoring plans, deliver financial monitoring reports and financial statements that will provide for any warning flags that may indicate possible misuse or losses and require an urgent response. Further, the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards require that the implementation and executive functions are clearly separated, which, in the case of this project are divided between UNDP and IUCN as executive agencies and ASRGM as implementation agency*”

## 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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More information requested. There is no mention of the other UNDP projects currently under implementation in Senegal financed by the LDCF, in particular there is a UNDP project "Promoting innovative financed and community based adaptation in communes surrounding community natural reserves" and the NAP project. The former project is being implemented in Ferlo - please indicate how this project has coordinated with the aforementioned project to ensure maximum synergies and prevent any duplication. While this project is mentioned in the description of the alternative scenario, more information on exactly which "critical activities" being implemented the proposed initiative will build upon.

Additionally, there are two other projects financed by the LDCF through FAO (FFS) and UNDP (Casamance and Niayes). Lastly, there are numerous initiatives either recently approved, or under development, financed by the GCF in Senegal, including GGW and WACA. Please provide details on how this project will coordinate with those, particularly those with any potential or explicit technological or geographic overlap.

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Thank you for the additional information, however, the information provided is still somewhat confusing and has similarly been the case regarding other items flagged in this review -- the information provided below is not reflected in the portal submission. The NAP project is only mentioned once as

far as I can see -- under the description for Component 1. And the paragraph below regarding national level coordination is not present in the portal submission. Please advise?

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - This is cleared.

## Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

Both projects mentioned in the comment (Promoting innovative financed and community-based adaptation in communes surrounding community natural reserves (PFNAC)" and the NAP project) are mentioned in the presentation of UNDP in section 6. *Coordination "(i) the Project for the Promotion of Innovative Financing and Community Adaptation in Communal Areas around Community Nature Reserves (PFNAC); (...). (iii) Senegal National Adaptation Plan (NAP)"*

Under the same section, details on the coordination potential for 18 relevant projects (including LDCF projects – ongoing and closed, GCF projects – GGW and WACA) were presented. During the PPG phase, the formulation unit will review these projects and engage with the stakeholders as relevant to collect lessons learned and identify potential coordination.

In addition, a paragraph was added to provide more details about coordination at the national level between ongoing projects *"Overall, the Ministry of Environment & Sustainable development (MEDD) established the National Climate change Committee (COMNACC) as an exchange platform for stakeholders engaged in climate change interventions. During the PPG phase, in-depth consultations will be undertaken in this framework to establish partnerships and practical modalities for linking and collaborating with the listed on-going initiatives so that duplication is avoided and LDCF resources build on the progresses and achievements made to date through these initiatives. Key potential initiatives and partners are laid out in the section on additionality and baseline. During the preparatory phase a strategy and plan for collaboration with relevant on-going initiatives will be prepared, including defining the roles and responsibilities of critical stakeholders. As the three agencies involved in delivering this LDCF funded project are UNDP, IUCN and ASRGM (GGWI) there is significant opportunity for internal coordination with projects identified below"*

Finally, the coordination potential of the project with the NAP LDCF project was highlighted under the component 1 description. Coordination potential with the PFNAC project was also raised under the component 3 description *"The GEF-LDCF project led by UNDP PFNAC, intervening in the Ferlo, is in the process of setting up innovative and sustainable finance mechanisms, and is working to improve the capacity of local credit and saving mutuals to finance adaptation projects, both of which have strong potential to directly benefit the SMEs supported under this EbA project. These activities will depend on coordination with the UNDP project as well as the development of partnerships with the National Agricultural Insurance Company of Senegal (CNAAS) and other national, multilateral and international financiers."*

CG, 22 October 2020

Apologies, the changes have now been inserted in the portal. As per the details provided in the resubmission on 15 October 2020, the coordination with the NAP project is emphasized in the revised PIF. Please advise if that is sufficient.

### 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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - More information requested. Are there any current climate policy/ies that this project is aligned with? How will this project support the NAP process?

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - This comment was meant to inquire whether there were any specific national climate change policies (non UNFCCC-related) that are more current. In the absence of any information on this, this item is cleared for this stage of project development, as it demonstrates alignment with NAP priorities.

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - Cleared.

#### Agency Response

JP, 15 Oct 2020

Current climate policies and links with the NAP process are available under 7. *Consistency with National Priorities*. The first paragraph provides details on the alignment with the NAPA, the second paragraph focuses on alignment with the NAP (validated in 2017), the NDC and the Third national communication, while the third paragraph lists the national policies that are supporting or aligned with the project. No recently adopted policy is relevant for this project.

More information was provided about the alignment with NAP priorities: “*Senegal’s Third National Communication on Climate Change to UNFCCC provides updates on the eight priority areas identified in the NAP, and identifies three adaptation objectives: strengthening the resilience of ecosystems and production activities (the primary focus of this LDCF EbA project), the strengthening of observation networks and the collection of climate, ocean and coastal data (included in Component 1 of this project) and ensuring the health, well-being and protection of populations against risks and disasters related to extreme events and climate*

*change (explicitly addressed through the flood protection measures to be implemented in Component 2). In addition, the current LDCF-funded NAP project, focuses on two priority sectors: agriculture and management of risks and disasters, which were considered as a baseline for the development of this project.”*

CG, 22 October 2020

Apologies, the changes have now been inserted in the portal. Some additional details are now provided in the PIF as per the comment.

#### **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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes. Component 4 outlines a KM approach and the information is sufficiently detailed for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Yes.



Agency Response

**Part 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

GEFSEC, 10/7/2020 - Yes, an LoE signed by the current OFP has been submitted with the project on the portal.

Agency Response

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC 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

GEFSEC, 10/6/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit. Please also consider the following general comments:

1) The portal submission refers to a Theory of Change (ToC) in Annex D, but it does not seem to be uploaded onto the portal. GEF-STAP consistently requests an explicit ToC to accompany GEF project proposals. Please refer to the STAP primer on this - <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>

2) Considering the current context, the Secretariat would appreciate that all PIFs include a detailed analysis regarding the impact of COVID-19 and the pandemic integrated into the project design, taking into consideration (i) associated impacts and how it will be dealt with in the context of delivering adaptation and resilience benefits; (ii) How risks have been analyzed and mitigation strategies have been incorporated into project design and implementation; and (iii) How the project will contribute to Senegal's green recovery and building back better in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic.

GEFSEC, 10/19/2020 - Not yet. Please referred to flagged items and resubmit. Additionally, the Secretariat is requesting a summary of the expected COVID-19 impacts, risks, and opportunities for recovery, as requested in the last round of comments. This does not seem to be have been added into the PIF. Please refer to the document that was circulated to agencies last month, also here: <https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>. You can also view it on the [Policies and Guidelines](#) page.

GEFSEC, 10/26/2020 - Please refer to the comment on co-financing and resubmit at your earliest convenience for consideration.

GEFSEC, 10/27/2020 - All items on this review sheet have been address adequately for this stage of project development and this project is being recommended for technical clearance.

GEFSEC, 10/29/2020 - Please kindly address the below issues for final consideration:

1- IUCN Agency Fee was calculated at 9.5% instead of at 9.0% - please ask the Agency to amend so the GEF Financing Agency Fee will be \$327,653 (as opposed to \$345,856) – similarly the PPG Agency Fee will be \$8,100 (as opposed to 8,550). The total Agency Fee has also to be adjusted accordingly (now it is set at \$848,580)

2- There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as it is the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$25,950,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,297,500 instead of \$500,000. Please ask the Agency to amend.

3- Co-financing : co-financing from donor Agencies is indicated as “unknown” type. These are the baseline projects so the type is known. Please revise. Also, please provide the definitions/approaches used to differentiate between “recurrent expenditure” and “investment mobilized”.

GEFSEC, 11/2/2020 - Comments 2 and 3 were addressed. However, comment 1 was only partially addressed: the fee was adjusted for IUCN in both parts –the GEF Financing and the PPG . However, as opposed to what reviewed previously and what was allocated in the LoE which is \$3,640,594, in the resubmission increased the GEF financing up to \$3,657,707. Please amend.

GEFSEC< 11/3/2020 - Cleared, the agency has submitted a new LOE.

**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**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/7/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/19/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/26/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/27/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

### **Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

**Senegal.** *Ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) for resilient natural resources and agro-pastoral communities in the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve and Plateau of Thies* (GEF ID: 10691) Agency: UNDP and IUCN; GEF Project Financing: \$9,781,450 Co-financing: \$26,450,000. This project aims to promote ecosystem-based Adaptation (EbA) in two target sites: the Ferlo Biosphere Reserve (FBR) and the City of Thies, to strengthen the resilience of agro-pastoral communities, ecosystem services, and biodiversity to the negative impacts of climate change, particularly droughts and floods. The project will do this through three components: (i) Developing regional and local governance for climate resilience through EbA; (ii) Restoration and conservation management to increase resilience of natural assets and ecosystem services; (iii) Investment in climate-resilient value chains; and (iv) Knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation. An estimated 300,000 households will benefit from the restoration activities in the two project zones; while 10,000 households will benefit from the development of ecosystem-based services in economically useful ecosystems as well as trainings on EbA within the localized contexts of the two target sites. The project also aims to support the direct restoration and more climate resilient management of more than 5,000 hectares of forest and rangelands, as well as an additional 245,000 ha of land in the Wildlife Reserves of Ferlo Nord and Ferlo Sud among others. As the Senegalese Agency for Restoration of the Great Green Wall (ASRGM) is the lead for this project in Senegal, it will ensure strong coordination with planned programming under the national and regional GGWI, while activities in the FBR will contribute directly to GGW activities. EbA re-frames biodiversity and ecosystems in terms of their economic value for humans, bringing together often-siloed strategies of conservation and livelihoods. This approach has not yet been systematically adopted in Senegal and has significant potential to transform existing development projects into climate adaptation activities, within the project areas and beyond, offering significant potential for replication and scaling.