



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

GEF ID:	5788		
Country/Region:	Cote d'Ivoire		
Project Title:	Assessment of Land Degradation Dynamic in Coffee -Cocoa production and Northern Ivory Coast to promote SLM practices and Carbon Stock Conservation ALDD SLM CSC		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	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):	LD-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,324	Project Grant:	\$1,726,027
Co-financing:	\$9,750,000	Total Project Cost:	\$11,567,351
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Yes	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, the project is within the LD allocation available for the country, as well as the CC allocation (\$200,000 are transferred from CC to LD, applying the marginal adjustment).	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes.	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Yes the project is aligned with the LD1 objective.</p> <p>However, different outcomes and outputs are mentioned (1.1, 1.2, 1.4...); some of them without the right numbers (outcome 1.2 for instance), we will invite the agency to better focus the project to avoid possible dispersion of efforts. Please keep in mind that these different outcomes and outputs should be reflected in the M&amp;E program at the end.</p> <p>May 1st, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>The section B1 needs to be revised. A list of national documents is provided. However, 1) some documents are out of date and irrelevant and 2) information is missing on how this project fits with national programming and convention documents. Please, analyze the existing strategies to justify how this project fits with them.</p> <p>May 1, 2014 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to</p>	<p>The project is tackling key baseline problems that are well identified and were amplified by the socio-political</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>crisis between 2000 and 2011 (lack of police and surveillance enforcement, lack of resources, and poor agricultural practices).</p> <p>What remains unclear is the role of current policies and programs in the baseline scenario: How are these interventions of the 14 cofinancing partners interact together. Please, clarify.</p> <p>May 1st, 2014 Cleared</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Table B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The project objective is missing.</li> <li>- More information is needed to clarify what the cofinancing is implementing and how the GEF resources are incremental. There are 14 sources of financing and the complementarity of GEF resources is not limpid. Please, clarify.</li> <li>- The output 1.3 related to the reinforcement of SLM dissemination institutions seems very important. However, there is no mention of the strategy and the kind of support these institutions will receive. Please confirm that the consolidation of existing institutions will be preferred at the creation of new entities. At CEO endorsement, confirm and detail the budget for these activities.</li> <li>- Outcome 2: During the PPG, detail the financing and the sustainability of this component related to livelihood options. Long term and sustainable financing</li> </ul>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		mechanisms should be included.  May 1st, 2014 Addressed.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	As this project is developed under the LD1 objective, please describe GEB that are compatible and quantifiable with this objective. See the GEF5 strategy (p67): the number of ha of productive landscapes under SLM is acceptable, as well as the quantification of multiple benefits (increase of vegetation cover, improved livelihoods, value in SLM investments, flow of services in agro-ecosystems, etc.).  May 1st, 2014 Addressed.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	- Partially for the role of CSO. - Please, include the mention of traditional authorities and groups as some traditional stakeholders can be very important in the North for sustainability aspects.  May 1st, 2014 Addressed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>- The project is supposed to work in 17 regions of the country (but 9 local land use plans are mentioned). Is it reasonable and feasible? is there not a risk of dilution of efforts?</p> <p>- During the PPG, include a comprehensive risk assessment, including climate variability and change.</p> <p>May 1st, 2014 Noted.</p>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>A certain number of initiatives are mentioned in the PIF.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, confirm the mechanisms of coordination.</p> <p>May 1st, 2014 Noted.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes. The incorporation of land rehabilitation and SLM in agricultural policies is included in the National Investment Plan. This project can serve all the sub-region for scaling up the results.</p> <p>The role and empowerment of key stakeholders at local level will be strategic for sustainability (farmer organizations, chain value associations for cotton, coffee, cocoa, Hevea, Mango, Anacardium, Shea butter, etc.)</p> <p>Please confirm the strategy at CEO approval.</p> <p>May 1st, 2014</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>More explanation is needed to figure out what the cofinancing is doing in the baseline.</p> <p>With 14 sources of cofinancing, is there a mechanism for coordination equivalent to a Country Strategic Investment Framework?</p> <p>May 1st, 2014 Cleared.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>- Confirm the cofinancing at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- We take note of a cofinancing in cash from the agency (\$50,000). Try to improve it at CEO approval.</p> <p>May 1st, 2014 Noted.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	<p>Project management costs reach ten percent. It is more than usual (five percent).</p> <p>At CEO approval, provide a detailed budget and a justification to have PMC</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		over five percent.  May 1st, 2014 10% project management costs can be acceptable, but you will have to justify the need for ten percent. Please provide and justify the detailed budget at CEO approval.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	The PPG is in the norm.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>April 7, 2014 The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>May 1, 2014 The comments have been addressed or responded, and will be taken into account at CEO approval. The PIF approval is recommended.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop aspects related to local governance and the role of traditional authorities.</li> <li>- Include gender aspects.</li> <li>- Provide a comprehensive risk assessment.</li> <li>- Detail the monitoring program and the indicators.</li> <li>- Please detail the assessment that is planned on carbon stock conservation.</li> <li>- Develop sustainability aspects and the mechanisms to scale up SLM and carbon stock conservation in coffee/cocoa agroforestry parklands.</li> <li>- Develop coordination mechanisms with the key other projects on similar themes or the same regions.</li> <li>- Confirm partnerships on the ground with key stakeholders (farmer organizations, chain value associations for coffee, cocoa, etc).</li> <li>- Explore the possibility to develop or contribute to a CSIF.</li> <li>- Confirm the cofinancing and the linkage with these cofinancing projects.</li> <li>- Justify and detail project management costs.</li> </ul>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Approval	First review*	April 07, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 01, 2014	
	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.