



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/EFC.10/5  
6 December 2012

---

Ethics and Finance Committee  
Tenth Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 11-12 December 2012

## **REPORT OF THE LEARNING MISSION TO SENEGAL**

## I. Background

1. The Adaptation Fund Board (AFB) has, at its 16<sup>th</sup> meeting, approved the Knowledge Management (KM) Strategy and Work Programme for the Fund. Adaptation projects and programmes are still relatively new and there is a strong need to build a body of knowledge on climate changes impacts and potential related vulnerabilities that can help scientists and policy makers to identify and prioritize management efforts, to minimize risks or reduce possible impacts on people and ecosystems. Furthermore, the Fund is utilizing a new source of revenue and piloting a new modality to finance projects (i.e. direct access to its resources by eligible countries and source of funding from proceedings of CERs under the CDM).

2. Therefore, it is expected that through its KM Strategy, the AFB will systematically use the knowledge gained from projects/programs and from its unique decision making structure and operations to (i) enhance countries' capacity and knowledge to improve the design and increase the effectiveness of future adaptation projects/programmes, and to (ii) inform its decision making, enhance transparency and improve the Fund's overall effectiveness.<sup>1</sup>

3. Under Action 3 "Collect, organize and analyze project/programme data, information and knowledge" and Action 5 "Systematize and share with all stakeholders the Fund's innovative experiences in funding and operating modalities" of the KM Strategy, it is expected that in order to organize information from projects and analyze the lessons learned at a portfolio level, learning themes should be defined and thematic lessons learned developed. Also, since the Fund is pioneering new funding modalities and operational processes the application of which and results will be of great interest for the international community working on development and environmental issues, the systematization of these experiences and the dissemination of the results are expected to provide valuable lessons learned to be shared with partners and beneficiaries.

4. The secretariat introduced the idea of conducting learning missions to support the implementation of the KM Strategy, which would fall under Actions 3 and 5. The AF programme in Senegal, titled "Adaptation to coastal erosion in vulnerable areas", was considered as a good candidate for the first AFB secretariat learning mission, for three reasons: (1) this is the first project that was funded by the AF following a technical review using the Board approved review criteria (2) the first project to have submitted implementation progress and reported results to the Board, and (3) this is the first direct access project, submitted by the first accredited National Implementing Entity, the Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE).

5. Therefore, at the 17th AFB meeting, the Board decided to approve a recommendation from the Ethics and Finance Committee (EFC) of "a learning mission to Senegal that would collect and disseminate the lessons learned by the implementation of the programme":

*The Chair also said that the programme had secured community consensus, had implemented key milestones in a satisfactory manner, with only minor delays, and had conducted the procurement process in an open and transparent manner. Consequently the Committee was recommending that the Board approve a third tranche of funding for the programme as well as a*

---

<sup>1</sup> See document AFB.EFC.6.3 "Knowledge Management Strategy"

*learning mission to Senegal that would collect and disseminate the lessons learned by the implementation of the programme.*

*Having considered the recommendation of the EFC the Board decided to:*

- (a) Approve the third tranche of funds requested by CSE for the implementation of the programme “Adaptation to coastal erosion in vulnerable areas” (Senegal), in the amount of US \$1,780,000;*
- (b) Request the trustee to transfer to CSE US \$1,780,000 as agreed to in the disbursement schedule included in the programme agreement;*
- (c) Approve a learning mission to the programme implemented by CSE; and*
- (d) Request the secretariat to include a budgetary provision for the learning mission in the Board and secretariat budget proposal for Fiscal Year 2013 (FY13).*

**(Decision B.17/16)**

## **II. Objectives of the Mission**

6. As a preamble, it should be noted that learning missions are different from supervision or evaluation missions and therefore are not meant to assess the impact of the programme, its effectiveness or its progress against RBM indicators. Rather, they will help in learning and drawing lessons from the implementation on the ground (at project/programme level) of the tools, sets of review criteria and RBM indicators, results framework, policies and unique modalities that have been established by the Adaptation Fund Board at the portfolio level.

7. For the first learning mission of the secretariat, the main objectives of the mission were:

Objective 1: to collect lessons learned from the direct access experience pioneered in Senegal, at different levels:

- At the institutional level, on the role of direct access in catalyzing transformational change, i.e. in terms of internal procedures, institutional structure, visibility etc.
- At the stakeholder level (partner CSOs, communities, private sector) , on the contribution of direct access in enhancing the level of involvement, awareness, and ownership of climate change adaptation and risk reduction processes;
- At the government level, on the effect direct access has had on the level of country ownership and opportunities for developing scaling up strategies, and possibly leveraging other sources of funding to continue or replicate the successes of the project/programme.

Objective 2: to collect lessons learned on the first AF funded programme, through understanding how key project review criteria, that were assessed as adequately fulfilled prior to approval, have been applied during project implementation, including assessment of both the relevance of the criteria and the degree to which they have been met during implementation. As far as possible, some or all of the following criteria will be assessed:

- Does the project / programme support concrete adaptation actions to assist the country in addressing adaptive capacity to the adverse effects of climate change and build in climate resilience?
- Does the project / programme provide economic, social and environmental benefits, particularly to vulnerable communities, including gender considerations?
- Is the project / programme cost effective?
- Is the project / programme consistent with national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or subnational development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments?
- Does the project / programme meet the relevant national technical standards, where applicable?
- Is there duplication of project / programme with other funding sources?
- Does the project / programme have a learning and knowledge management component to capture and feedback lessons?
- Has a consultative process taken place, and has it involved all key stakeholders, and vulnerable groups, including gender considerations?
- Has the sustainability of the project/programme outcomes been taken into account when designing the project?
- Is there adequate arrangement for project / programme management?
- Are there measures for financial and project/programme risk management?
- Are arrangements for monitoring and evaluation clearly defined, including budgeted M&E plans and sex disaggregated data, targets and indicators?

Objective 3: to gain methodological experience for future learning missions. As this is the first mission of its kind, it provides an opportunity to test sets of questions and methods of collecting information. The draft set of questions can be complemented during the mission, if gaps are identified.



**Figure 1: The mission team consisting of Mr Daouda Ndiaye (1<sup>st</sup> left) and Mr Mikko Ollikainen (3<sup>rd</sup> left) with the Director General of CSE Mr Assize Toure (2<sup>nd</sup> left) and the programme supervision team Ms Aissata Sall (2<sup>nd</sup> right) and Mr Dethie Soumare Ndiaye (1<sup>st</sup> right)**

### **III. The programme “Adaptation to Coastal Erosion in Vulnerable Areas”**

8. The concept for the programme “Adaptation to Coastal Erosion in Vulnerable Areas” was endorsed by the Adaptation Fund Board in its 10th meeting in June 2010, among the first four endorsed concepts. The fully-developed programme document was approved by the Board in the 11th meeting in September 2010. The programme was scheduled to have a two-year duration and a budget of USD 8,619,000 and it was launched in February 2011.

9. The programme, according to the approved programmed document, has five components: three location specific components in Rufisque, Saly and Joal, respectively, a cross-cutting component related to regulations, and another cross-cutting component on information, sensitization, training and communication. The three local components take up majority of the project resources, and within those components, activities related to protective infrastructure works have the majority of the budget. In Rufisque and Saly, the main infrastructure work targets coastal protection, in Joal the main activity is an anti-salt dike which aims to halt salinization of fields and paddies near the coast.

10. The specific objectives of the programme are:

- a. Implement the actions to protect the coastal areas of Rufisque, Saly, and Joal against erosion, with the aim to protect houses and the economic infrastructures threatened by the erosion including fish processing areas, fishing docks, tourism or cultural infrastructures, and restore lost or threatened activities;
- b. Implement the actions to fight the salinization of agricultural lands used to grow rice in Joal, with the construction of anti-salt dikes;
- c. Assist local communities of the coastal area of Joal, especially women, in handling fish processing areas of the districts located along the littoral and to conduct awareness programme and training related to adaptation and its adverse effects;
- d. Communicate on the adaptation, sensitize and train local people on climate change adaptation techniques in coastal areas and on good practices, to avoid an aggravation of the various situations encountered; and
- e. Develop and implement the appropriate regulations for the management of coastal areas.

11. The programme is implemented by the Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE), as the National Implementing Entity for Senegal. It is executed in close collaboration between a public institution (the Environmental Directorate), the NGO Green Senegal and a local women's association (Dynamique-Femmes).

12. Based on the Board decision to accredit CSE, the programme is subject to semiannual reporting, as compared to usual annual reporting. At the time of the learning mission, the Board had received three such semiannual reports from the CSE, and subsequent tranches of funding had been transferred following the clearance of those reports.

#### **IV. Methodology and findings**

##### **1. Methodology**

13. The mission team was constituted of Mr Daouda Ndiaye and Mr Mikko Ollikainen, Adaptation Officers from the secretariat. It was carried out from November 4 to November 9, 2012, in Dakar, and the three programme sites Rufisque, Joal and Saly.

14. Three sets of draft questions were prepared for the three objectives of the mission.

Key guiding questions in the targeted learning plan	
Mission objectives	Key questions for the mission

<p><u>Objective 1</u>: to collect lessons learned from the direct access experience pioneered in Senegal, at different levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the institutional level, on the role of direct access in catalyzing transformational change,</li> <li>• At the stakeholder level (partner CSOs, communities, private sector) , on the contribution of direct access in enhancing the level of awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes,</li> <li>• At the government level, on the effect direct access has had on the level of ownership and opportunities for developing scaling up strategies.</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) What are the capacities that the NIE has built during its accreditation process? Which of the 3 main competencies required as fiduciary standards by the AF has been further strengthened:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. During the accreditation process?</li> <li>b. During the programme implementation?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) What are the post-accreditation specific capabilities that the NIE has been able to build during programme implementation?</li> <li>3) How did the accreditation and programme implementation experience change the way the NIE is now doing business? Did this help in improving the NIE's fundraising capacity? Did the NIE improve its revenues as a result? Did this improve the NIE's visibility at the national level?</li> <li>4) What is the bilateral donors' perception of the direct access experience of the NIE in Senegal? Are they aware of it? Are they following it?</li> <li>5) What capacities (institutional, technical, financial...) have been built within the country as a consequence of the direct access experience of Senegal? Would these capacities be built equally if the programme was implemented by a multilateral entity?</li> <li>6) Which stakeholders have benefitted the most from this capacity building?             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Direct executing partners?</li> <li>b. Beneficiaries (communities, private sector, local governments)?</li> <li>c. Indirect stakeholders (other ministries, agencies, municipalities, private sector...)?</li> </ol> </li> <li>7) As a consequence of the NIE accreditation, what is the level of awareness of climate change issues and more specifically the link between climate change and the observed coastal erosion in the country? Would this level of awareness be reached if the programme was implemented through an MIE?</li> <li>8) What is the perception, at the government level, of the NIE accreditation to the AF? Was it seen as an opportunity? Are there plans for replicating the NIE experience with other entities, targeting other donors? Have there been interactions with governments of other countries regarding the experience of the NIE?</li> <li>9) What are the new initiatives developed/funded as a direct consequence of this programme? Would they have been identified if the programme was implemented by an MIE?</li> <li>10) What is the level of ownership, at the Ministry of environment and at cross-ministerial level towards the NIE implemented programme? Was this ownership enhanced by the direct access modality of implementation? Is there any replication or scaling up strategy under development or implementation? If yes, how did the direct access provide added value in developing this strategy?</li> </ol>
---	---

	<p>11) Did the programme effectively take the relevant national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or subnational development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments into consideration during its implementation? How has this feedback been upheld in the case where the government issued a new policy or document?</p> <p>12) How have the national technical standards been applied during the programme implementation? What were the constraints of applying such standards? What was the coordination system with the government to verify this? Was there a need to improve the national standards or apply international standards in a specific case during programme implementation?</p> <p>13) Did the programme develop a plan for coordinating or developing synergies with relevant existing initiatives? If yes, what were the constraints in implementing such a plan?</p> <p>14) Did the programme develop its learning objective (s)? Did the programme develop a knowledge management strategy? If yes, what are the lessons learnt from its implementation?</p> <p>15) Did the NIE have a project risk management system prior to the AF funding? Did the NIE develop a risk management system for the programme?</p> <p>16) Were the institutional arrangements for the management of the programme, as outlined in the approved proposal, adequate during implementation? Were there any constraints? What are the lessons learnt?</p> <p>17) As the programme reaches closure, what are some of the mechanisms for continuing or maintaining the processes the project has/will put in place? Does, in any way, direct access enhance the confidence the country has in the project, to the extent of financially supporting these measures in the future, for example?</p> <p>18) Did the programme develop a formal M&amp;E plan and share it with the executing entities? How did the implementation arrangement affect the implementation of the M&amp;E plan?</p> <p>19) Did the programme change or evolve from the initial programme document in relation to: distribution of resources amongst components, number of beneficiaries, technologies used, etc?</p> <p>20) Was there any aspect of programme implementation that was not taken into account by the proposal template?</p>
--	---



<p><u>Objective 2:</u> to collect lessons learned on the first AF funded programme, through understanding how key project review criteria that have been assessed as adequate have been effectively applied during project implementation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Did the AF project funding criteria and the related full proposal template help in structuring the programme's workplan and provide guidance for an effective implementation of the programme? If yes, which section(s)? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The logical framework?</li> <li>b. The detailed budget?</li> <li>c. The M&amp;E plan?</li> <li>d. The section on "duplication with other initiatives"?</li> <li>e. Other?</li> </ol> </li> <li>2) Did the programme establish specific criteria for identifying and targeting vulnerable groups?</li> <li>3) How did the programme ensure comprehensive involvement of stakeholders? Does this process continue throughout the lifetime of the project? Is it institutionalized?</li> <li>4) How did the programme ensure gender inclusion? Was there any constraint in its implementation?</li> <li>5) During implementation, did the programme assess the potential economic and social impacts of the programme's infrastructures? How have these impacts been documented and measured? Were there as planned in the programme document?</li> <li>6) How were the concrete adaptation actions in the programme selected? During implementation, has concreteness turned out according to how was planned?</li> <li>7) How was the cost effectiveness of the programme options assessed? During implementation, did these assessments turn out to be accurate?</li> <li>8)</li> </ol>
<p><u>Objective 3:</u> to gain methodological experience for future learning missions.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Was the set of questions appropriate? Were there redundant questions? Were there some aspects of direct access or programme implementation that were not included and should be considered for future missions?</li> <li>2) Was the selection of stakeholders interviewed comprehensive? Were there any that had not been included in the plan and that should be for future missions?</li> <li>3) Were the arrangements for the mission appropriate: is there anything that should be taken into account for future missions?</li> <li>4) Would it be more beneficial to assess the programme's progress in achieving its objective and against its RBM indicators, or to collect more quantitative data from the field?</li> </ol>
<p><b>N.B:</b> The following questions are cross cutting:  What is the level of awareness of the impact of climate change in the observed coastal erosion in the selected sites and at the national level?  What are the new initiatives developed/funded as a direct consequence of this programme?  Is there any replication or scaling up strategy under development or implementation?  Does, in any way, direct access enhance the confidence the country has in the project, to the extent of financially supporting these measures in the future, for example?</p>	

15. The sets of questions were used during the mission at the following occasions:
- a) The mission participated in a workshop organized by CSE, on the direct access experience of Senegal, with the presence of representatives of the Ministry of the Environment, other Ministries, bilateral and multilateral partners, NGOs, private sector representatives, and others – the workshop also functioned as a kick-off meeting of the mission;
  - b) During the visit of the project sites (Rufisque, Joal, Saly), the mission was accompanied by representatives of the programme implementing entity and executing entities, and the team met with different stakeholders, including local government representatives, communities, representatives of the consulting firms and public and private companies which were contracted for the programme, and hotel managers;
  - c) During the site visits, the mission discussed with the managers and staff members of the programme executing entities, i.e. *Green Senegal*, *Dynamique Femmes* and DEEC;
  - d) In Dakar, the mission had a meeting at CSE, with CSE staff that were involved in the process of accreditation and programme implementation;
  - e) In Dakar, the mission met with bilateral and multilateral development partners.



**Figure 1: The Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development Mr Haïdar El Ali (center), opening the workshop on the direct access experience of Senegal with Member of the Adaptation Fund Board Mr Cheikh Ndiaye Sylla (1<sup>st</sup> left), Director General of CSE Mr Assize Toure (2<sup>nd</sup> left) and the mission team.**

## **2. Findings**

### **2.1. On the direct access experience:**

- a) At the institutional level, on the role of direct access in catalyzing transformational change, i.e. in terms of internal procedures, institutional structure or visibility.

16. The mission met with the staff of CSE to take stock of the experience of CSE as an NIE for the AF. These discussions were complemented by exchanges with other stakeholders during the mission. The findings from the discussions are as follows.

*What are the capacities that the NIE has built during its accreditation process? Which of the 3 main competencies required as fiduciary standards by the AF has been further strengthened:*

- a. During the accreditation process?*
- b. During the programme implementation?*

17. It appears from the exchanges with the team, that the accreditation process and correspondence with the Accreditation Panel experts have allowed CSE managers to learn how to further strengthen some of their procedures, including in the procurement, transparency and project monitoring areas. The main difficulty for CSE during that process was to demonstrate its capacities in the areas that were assessed by the AP experts, despite its history of projects that were successfully executed. This resulted in a conditional accreditation, with a requirement of more periodic reporting, i.e. semi-annual reporting instead of annual as officially requested by the AFB.

18. Following accreditation, CSE has been able to strengthen some of the areas where gaps had been identified:

- i. Its manual of procedures was updated, to take into account particular procurement requirements;
- ii. A transparency policy<sup>2</sup> was developed for the first time, including an anti-fraud policy;
- iii. The technical and financial services of CSE have started working on a more integrated way, during the preparation of the AF proposal, for the development of a coherent budget and the identification of financial risks; and
- iv. A formal business plan has been prepared for the time.

*What are the post-accreditation specific capabilities that the NIE has been able to build during programme implementation?*

19. Unanimously, CSE's financial and technical experts agreed that during the implementation of the programme, they have been able to work in a more integrated manner. Specifically, the financial experts have learned a lot from the supervision missions in the project sites, having been for the first time involved in project monitoring. Furthermore, a procurement expert was hired for a period of one year to provide support to the update of the manual of procedures and to train the financial experts on these procedures. In addition, as a good practice, CSE is now systematically requesting a certificate of good execution from its partners

---

<sup>2</sup> CSE's [Transparency and Good Governance Policy](#) (French)

after the execution of a project by CSE. The reporting system has been also substantially improved, being done in a more periodic and systemic way.

*How did the accreditation and programme implementation experience change the way the NIE is now doing business? Did this help in improving the NIE's fundraising capacity? Did the NIE improve its revenues as a result? Did this improve the NIE's visibility at the national level?*

20. The improvements in CSE's organization of work mentioned above have given the entity more confidence in engaging with external partners. For example, following the Global Environmental Facility's (GEF) call for applications for the accreditation of new implementing agencies, CSE had started the process of applying but decided to wait until the next call for accreditation applications from the GEF. CSE representatives also mentioned that in the future, accreditation for direct access under the Green Climate Fund (GCF) is something they may decide to apply for. The accreditation of CSE has also been seen as a success by its long-time supporting partners such as the International Research and Development Centre (IDRC), which, as a consequence of the accreditation, has decided to further support building CSE's capacities. The experience of CSE in coastal erosion through the AF-funded programme and the involvement of the West African Economic Monetary Union in the programme resulted in the decision of WAEMU to designate CSE as the coordinator of the West African Coastal Erosion Observatory which will be established following the funding of 0.8 million USD by WAEMU. At the national level, the programme implemented by CSE has caught a lot of attention, through different media (national TV, newspapers, radios) and because of the publicity around the project sites and infrastructures. At the international level, CSE has acquired a lot of visibility as the first accredited NIE, and has been invited at several occasions to present its accreditation experience, by UNFCCC, USAID and neighboring countries with potential NIE candidates. Finally, the Momentum for Change Initiative of the UNFCCC has chosen the AF programme as one of the nine Lighthouse Activities for 2012.

21. However, CSE staff members told the mission that some national and international partners have felt that since it was implementing the AF-funded programme, with a budget of 8 million USD, CSE was no longer looking for projects of the size of the ones it used to execute in the past, i.e. in the range of hundreds of thousands of USD. This misperception, which also reflects a communication challenge associated with assuming the Implementing Entity role, could cause CSE some financial stretch, these small size projects being at the core of CSE's business and generating most of its resources.

- b) At the stakeholder level (partner CSOs, communities, private sector) , on the contribution of direct access in enhancing the level of involvement, awareness, and ownership of climate change adaptation and risk reduction processes

*What is the bilateral donors' perception of the direct access experience of the NIE in Senegal? Are they aware of it? Are they following it?*

22. Although most of the multilateral and bilateral partners met by the mission were aware of the accreditation of CSE as NIE and the implementation of the AF-funded programme, one multilateral partner, which was aware of the programme, requested more information on the accreditation of CSE and its implications, including the disbursement process, systems of verification of use of funds by CSE, and reporting. At the root of these questions from the partner, were some issues that it encountered while interacting with CSE on the implementation of the AF-funded programme. It appears that there was a misunderstanding between the

partner and the government of Senegal, through the Directorate of Environment which is also executing entity of the AF-funded programme. The partner felt it was receiving contradicting figures as to the amount of funding requested by the government of Senegal to address specific coastal erosion issues in Senegal, including in the sites selected by the AF programme.

23. Overall, most of the partners met by the mission felt that there was a need for more coordination with them and information sharing, on the specific issue of coastal management, in which they are all involved. There was an inquiry as to whether it would have been better to have a partnership on the critical issue of coastal management, with, from the government side, a higher supra-ministerial level to address this issue to ensure swift decision making and more effective coordination at the government level.

*What capacities (institutional, technical, financial...) have been built within the country as a consequence of the direct access experience of Senegal? Would these capacities be built equally if the programme was implemented by a multilateral entity? Which stakeholders have benefitted the most from this capacity building?*

- a. *Direct executing partners?*
- b. *Beneficiaries (communities, private sector, local governments)?*
- c. *Indirect stakeholders (other ministries, agencies, municipalities, private sector...)?*

24. Through any project or programme implemented within a country and including a capacity building component, regardless of direct access, it is expected that there will be positive effects on the targeted capacities to be built. In the case of projects/programmes implemented by multilateral entities, indirect capacity building may happen through the adaptation of the executing entities to the procedures set by the multilateral entities, which are usually specific to those entities. In the specific case of Senegal, the same level of direct capacity building as expected through the programme results framework, could be expected. The particularity of the direct access modality, in the case of indirect capacity building, is that the executing partners of the programme, in particular those that are local NGOs, have upgraded their procedures following national standards, which is more efficient and relevant to their day-to-day activities. In addition, one particular NGO, Dynamique Femmes, has substantially benefitted from the programme, as an executing entity. It is very unlikely that NGOs with the size and limited experience of Dynamique Femmes would have been given their chance in the case of a programme implemented by a multilateral entity. The NGO had to go through an extensive process of capacity building, in terms of procedures and project management, and CSE was possibly able to facilitate this better than multilateral entities because of its established presence in the country, its more direct understanding of the opportunities and risks of working with such NGOs, and its confidence in its own effective corrective measures as an implementing entity if needed. However, the NIE has ensured the procurement services in the case of expenses above a certain limit.

25. The consulting firms and contractors which had been selected to execute some of the programme's activities have praised the swiftness of CSE's payment procedures. According to them, this was clearly an improvement compared with the delays of payment that they used to experience in the case of projects implemented by multilateral entities.

26. At the local government level, the authorities met by the mission were unanimously praising the programme implementation and execution teams for having involved them in the



process since the beginning, which, according to them, was not usually the case for projects implemented in the past, in their jurisdiction. According to them, their involvement at the earliest possible could help avoid many social conflicts, especially on issues related to land tenure. Furthermore, the prefect of Mbour, one of the targeted districts, told the mission that he was receiving execution reports from the programme team.



**Figure 2: Visit of the mission to the headquarters of the executing entity *Dynamique Femmes*, in Joal.**

*As a consequence of the NIE accreditation, what is the level of awareness of climate change issues and more specifically the link between climate change and the observed coastal erosion in the country? Would this level of awareness be reached if the programme was implemented through an MIE?*

27. Based on the observations from the mission, the NIE accreditation has little to do with the awareness raised on coastal erosion, which would be more related to the communication campaign of the AF-funded programme.

- c) At the government level, on the effect direct access has had on the level of country ownership and opportunities for developing scaling up strategies, and possibly leveraging other sources of funding to continue or replicate the successes of the project/programme.

*What is the perception, at the government level, of the NIE accreditation to the AF? Was it seen as an opportunity? Are there plans for replicating the NIE experience with other entities, targeting other donors? Have there been interactions with governments of other countries regarding the experience of the NIE?*

28. Although the Directorate of the Environment is the main executing partner of the programme, its involvement in the support to the accreditation of CSE and its role as an executing entity do not seem to have been adequately understood and recognized by the Ministry of Environment. Similarly, the other relevant ministries covering sectors related to adaptation have a vague understanding of the role CSE is playing as an NIE and are usually considering that AF resources are only available to the Ministry of Environment, because of CSE's affiliation to that Ministry. In this regard, the ownership of the direct access experience by the government of Senegal has yet to be developed.

*What are the new initiatives developed/funded as a direct consequence of this programme? Would they have been identified if the programme was implemented by an MIE?*

29. The executing entities, and more specifically the NGO Dynamique Femmes, have benefitted a lot from the programme. The involvement of Dynamique Femmes in the building of the anti-salt dyke in Joal has caught the attention of the United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM), which is now providing support to its activities with a funding of 48 million CFA francs<sup>3</sup>. Other national programmes have also shown interest in the NGO activities and have promised to support rice-growing activities in the areas desalinized by the establishment of the dyke.

30. As explained above, these new opportunities could not have happened had the NGO not been selected as an executing entity, which was sovereignly decided upon at the national level.

*What is the level of ownership, at the Ministry of Environment and at cross-ministerial level towards the NIE implemented programme? Was this ownership enhanced by the direct access modality of implementation? Is there any replication or scaling up strategy under development or implementation? If yes, how did the direct access provide added value in developing this strategy?*

31. The Directorate of Environment is the promoter and main executing entity for this programme. Under the former government, the cabinet of the Minister of Environment was aware of this programme and had backed the application of CSE as an NIE. However, following the presidential and parliamentary elections in Senegal that took effect in early 2012, the new cabinet had to be updated on the accreditation of CSE, its role as an NIE and the programme it was implementing. More specifically, the lack of familiarity of the cabinet with AF procedures has delayed the implementation of the programme during the first months of its term of office. Therefore, the national implementation modality has been challenged by the turnover at the Ministry level. However, it is not clear if a similar delay would not have been encountered if the programme was implemented by a multilateral entity.

32. On the other hand, the AF funding has strengthened the government's ability to decide on the orientation it wants to take on tackling coastal erosion. The issue of coastal erosion is

---

<sup>3</sup> Around 96,000 USD

taken very seriously by the government and the Directorate of Environment has taken the lead in the coordination of actions to address this issue. To that end, the bilateral and multilateral partners have been called upon to support the government in tackling the devastating effects of this phenomenon that were being witnessed by the communities living along the coastline. Before the AF-funded programme was approved, some donors had already expressed their interest in supporting the government on this matter. However, no concrete action was taken because of uncertainties on the right adaptation options to tackle coastal erosion. Therefore, the design of the programme had included initiatives which had been originally submitted to some donors, but for which funding was pending because of the above-mentioned concerns. By receiving the necessary funding through the AF to initiate a series of pilot adaptation actions, the government has had the opportunity to demonstrate the relevance and effectiveness of the actions it was requesting its partners to support. In addition, the AF funding has facilitated the mobilization of additional funding to support the building of the seawall in Rufisque.

33. The replication of the programme actions is currently being discussed with the partners, which themselves have been working on a more comprehensive approach of coastal management in Senegal. Therefore, the results to be achieved by this programme could provide valuable inputs to this effort.

34. Finally, during discussions with stakeholders, there were inquiries about the way the Designated Authority is appointed in the Adaptation Fund. The stakeholders perceived a risk that the selection process might not adequately weigh capacities but rather, other criteria. It was said that the role of a DA is very important within the country, in terms of facilitating cross-sectoral consultation during project development and implementation. It was also suggested that communications from the Fund could be channeled to a committee instead of only the DA. However, the decision on the DA appointment lies with the government.

## **2.2. On the first AF funded programme**

*Did the AF project funding criteria and the related full proposal template help in structuring the programme's workplan and provide guidance for an effective implementation of the programme?*

35. The programme was one of the first four to be endorsed by the Adaptation Fund Board as a concept in June 2010, and one of the first two to be approved as a fully-developed programme document in September 2010. While the overall set of project review criteria was in place since the first call for project and programme proposals was issued, some additional criteria have been added and the requirements for others have been specified. Notable sections of the project review criteria that were not explicitly spelled out when the proposal was approved in September 2010 but have been since added or amended include:

1. Consultation process.
2. Project sustainability.
3. Gender considerations, and gender disaggregation of results.
4. Definition of concrete adaptation projects.
5. Detailed budget with budget notes.
6. Caps on administrative costs, and per country.
7. Alignment with AF results framework.
8. Disbursement schedule with time-bound milestones



36. Despite the above changes, the mission found that the review criteria used at the time of programme approval had mostly captured the essential, and helped structure and implement the programme. In some areas, such as gender considerations, concreteness, levels of administrative costs, and disbursement schedule, the programme would have clearly been compliant had those criteria been in place already. In other areas, such as alignment with fund results framework, the information has been provided subsequently. The two areas, if they had been considered at the time of approval in a similar way as in recent proposal reviews, which may have helped programme design most, were consultation process and project sustainability. Both criteria were considered at the time of approval, the former as it had been included as a section of the proposal document and the latter as a part of consideration of project benefits but the detailed requirements were not as specific as those laid out in the document “Instructions for Project Proponents” published in late 2011.

37. The mission found that the programme had generally progressed in line with its original results framework, budget, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan, and measures to avoid duplication with other initiatives. On M&E, the AF evaluation framework that was approved in 2011 specified that a mid-term evaluation would not be necessary for projects and programmes whose duration is less than three years. While this programme has a scheduled duration of only two years, it would not have been required to undertake a mid-term evaluation but one was conducted in mid-2012, as it had been budgeted and was considered by CSE to potentially offer useful lessons for the second half of project implementation.

*Did the programme establish specific criteria for identifying and targeting vulnerable groups?*

38. The programme identified the target areas through consultation between government agencies, and taking into account the fact that some of the areas were nationally well known as suffering from coastal development and adaptation challenges. Also responsiveness of the local stakeholders and security situation (compared to South Senegal especially) were mentioned as reasons during the mission. As mentioned above, the project review criterion on consultation was not as specific during the approval of this programme as it has become more recently. At the target areas the project did not have funds available to support all the adjacent communities or their parts, and choices had to be made. Through community consultation it was decided, for example, that in Rufisque the coastal protection would prioritize protecting a cemetery, a site of high religious importance. There was no indication that any lack of consultation had led to prioritization of less vulnerable parts of communities, and while consultation had taken place to ameliorate concerns of those parts of communities that could not be covered by AF funding the adjacent communities or their parts felt dissatisfied that they had not benefitted from the programme. Understandably, those who did benefit said they felt uncomfortable with this inequity, too, and expressed support towards the excluded ones. Some beneficiaries suggested that if additional AF funding would be available (as could be the case considering the country cap) it could be used to spread the project scope to cover some of the currently excluded areas.

39. Within the targeted communities, the Executing Entities, particularly Green Senegal, had collected as a baseline in the beginning of programme implementation an extensive dataset on the socio-economic status of the beneficiaries at the household level.

*How did the programme ensure comprehensive involvement of stakeholders? Does this process continue throughout the lifetime of the project? Is it institutionalized?*

40. As reflected above, the availability of funds constrained project coverage, which posed a challenge to managing expectations among potential stakeholders and, partly due to community decisions to prioritize certain areas, caused dissatisfaction among some who did not benefit directly. However, the communities that were heard during the learning mission spoke highly about the involvement from the beginning of implementation onwards. The involvement of two very committed local executing entities (Green Senegal and Dynamique-Femmes) had evidently helped to build support towards the programme and to ensure beneficiaries' participation.

41. In the three programme sites, participation has been coordinated using local frameworks, which consist of district-level committees. There are three such committees in Rufisque, and two in Saly. In Joal, coordination of waste management activities is carried out using local sanitation committees.

42. The programme is planned to contribute to the setting up of coastal development committees, within the framework of the new Coastal Development Law. While the law will provide a useful policy framework for institutionalization, the fact that it has not been passed yet, which is naturally outside the control of the programme, has proved a bottleneck. It has to be noted that even if the law is passed, it is unclear how rapidly and efficiently it can be enforced. Indeed, it appears the programme may have placed too much confidence on the formal institutionalization process taking over, and may have lost opportunities in actively ensuring "soft" institutionalization using community-level mechanisms in management of the new infrastructure. At the same, the programme has been able to foster participative decision-making and make advances using smart interventions, such as solving in Rufisque a waste management challenge that was pre-existent but was exacerbated in the short term by the coastal construction work.

43. A particular group of stakeholders are the tourism operators, including hotels and related businesses along the coast. Hotel managers have suffered from coastal erosion, which has led to decreased revenue, as particularly European travel agencies have delisted such hotels from their catalogues. The hotel operators expressed their anguish during the mission, and said they were hopeful that the AF programme would be successful in decreasing erosion. It turned out that they actively use the programme in their own client communications. However, the hotel operators' own participation has been limited to piecemeal independent and likely unsustainable measures. When asked about willingness to pay, the interviewed hotel managers stated that they felt having been left on their own by the government for some time, and therefore they did not consider it appropriate to be requested to pay more, as they are already paying lease for land to the government (National Society for Petit Cote), and in their view it would be principally the lessor's responsibility to maintain the quality of the leased asset.

*How did the programme ensure gender inclusion? Was there any constraint in its implementation?*

44. As mentioned above, gender considerations were not yet explicitly spelled out as a review criterion at the time of the approval of this programme. Despite this the programme, which takes place in a region of Senegal with traditionally matrilineal families and where women are active members of the society with well-defined livelihoods roles, proactively incorporated addressing gender considerations into its design, including a women's organization as one of the executing entities. Women are important beneficiaries and participants in the programme activities that concentrate on livelihoods. Gender considerations were included in the socio-economic surveys carried out among the communities by the executing entity Green Senegal. In

addition, two of the three executing entities are headed by women. No constraints to implementing a gender-inclusive approach were reported. When meeting the communities in each of the three programme sites, the mission heard first-hand comments from “representatives of women” appointed by the communities, in addition to the organized women’s organization (Dynamique-Femmes).

*During implementation, did the programme assess the potential economic and social impacts of the programme’s infrastructures? How have these impacts been documented and measured? Were there as planned in the programme document?*

45. It was not possible to comprehensively assess this criterion during the mission, as the major infrastructure works have not been completed yet. For the smaller scale works, such as the anti-salt dike in Joal, the positive economic, social and environmental impacts have started to show sooner than expected. According to all stakeholders in Joal, where the area protected by the dike has already produced rice on previously salinated land, the early success has immediately energized the community and stirred plans to expand the activity with other funds. Similarly in Saly and Joal, the improved fish-processing facilities have shown an immediate benefit. As the outputs are very new, however, measured impacts are not present yet.

46. However, the mission learned that a very comprehensive study on the economics of adaptation in the coastal areas of Senegal had been commissioned by the World Bank, and that study will likely also support the maintenance, replication and potential scaling up of the outputs of this programme.

*How were the concrete adaptation actions in the programme selected? During implementation, has concreteness turned out according to how was planned?*

47. The programme actions were selected based on perceived needs expressed by various stakeholders in the target regions, available solutions that had been piloted with other funds, and the ability of the project organizations to execute those activities. The main bulk of the programme funding is budgeted to relatively massive protective measures, which are supported by livelihoods development, community outreach and awareness raising activities, and a component of legal development, which is expected to bridge the local level outputs to the national level. As mentioned above, when the programme was approved, the Adaptation Fund Board had not yet specified the definition of concrete adaptation activities to the current level. This may have led to a “safe” choice of focusing strongly on activities that were undoubtedly concrete, such as coastal protection, while less funding was allocated to “soft” measures. According to various stakeholder comments, concrete outputs are also politically appealing, as they produce quick results. The mission observed that there may be risks related to the relative minor allocation related to “soft measures”, particularly as pertains to sustainability and replicability of the project activities (see below).

48. The approved programme document had referred to “infrastructures of protection” to designate the infrastructures to be built in Rufisque and Saly. The selection of the most adequate adaptation solutions had been widely discussed before and during the programme implementation, at the national level, with the involvement of the most prominent scientists, some local and international consulting firms, and multilateral and bilateral partners. Following the consultations and feasibility studies, the government and the NIE have decided on the solutions they felt were more cost effective, with the consent of the majority of the stakeholders consulted.



**Figure 4: A beneficiary carrying rice bundle following first harvest as a consequence of the building of the anti-salt dyke**

*How was the cost effectiveness of the programme options assessed? During implementation, did these assessments turn out to be accurate?*

49. Cost effectiveness of the programme activities was based on a comprehensive programmatic approach including a diverse suit of coastal protection measures, accompanied by livelihoods support activities, which would together produce a powerful demonstration effect. As the programme is still under implementation, it is too early to say, how the benefits from this approach materialize. It is clear from various stakeholders' comments during the learning mission, though, that by implementing the diverse suit of activities the programme has contributed to increased capacity and, by extension, to resilience.

*Did the programme effectively take the relevant national or sub-national sustainable development strategies, national or subnational development plans, poverty reduction strategies, national communications and adaptation programs of action and other relevant instruments into consideration during its implementation? How has this feedback been upheld in the case where the government issued a new policy or document*

50. The programme is built on the priorities of the National Adaptation Programme of Action, in which coastal adaptation is one of the focal areas. It is also linked closely to the development of sector legislation, especially the Coastal Development Law. As mentioned above, the fact that the Law has not been passed yet has proved a bottleneck, and the programme has very few means to influence that.

*How have the national technical standards been applied during the programme implementation? What were the constraints of applying such standards? What was the coordination system with the government to verify this? Was there a need to improve the national standards or apply international standards in a specific case during programme implementation?*

51. The programme has commissioned Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies for the coastal infrastructure activities. The EIA studies have been done for the anti-salt dyke in Joal and the seawall in Rufisque and in the case of the submerged berms in Saly, were being finalized during the mission and were not yet available. A strong aspect of the programme in terms of technical compliance is that one of the executing entities is the directorate for the environment, which is the authority in Senegal in charge of regulating EIA studies and therefore has one of the strongest capacities in that matter.

*Did the programme develop a plan for coordinating or developing synergies with relevant existing initiatives? If yes, what were the constraints in implementing such a plan?*

52. The programme deals with coastal management, which is an area where numerous government agencies, donors and other stakeholders are involved in. There have been attempts by both government and donors to coordinate activities in the coastal development sector but a regularly and frequently meeting coordination platform seems to be missing. In some other sectors coordination does work. The programme has links with other actors working with coastal adaptation and working relations appear to be good, and other organizations gave thanks to CSE for its very proactive approach but it seems that coordination and communication could be improved by a more systematic coordination mechanism.

*Did the programme develop its learning objective (s)? Did the programme develop a knowledge management strategy? If yes, what are the lessons learnt from its implementation?*

53. The programme developed a comprehensive communications strategy. The activities included setting up a website, producing informative films, airing radio broadcasts (104 broadcast by the time of the mission, and exchanging visits between women's groups. The focus of knowledge management in the programme has been at the local level, and there is dynamic uptake of those messages by the local communities and organizations, especially in areas where there is a link to improving livelihoods. On the other hand, the project website has not been updated in a systematic way and populated with documents related to the programme, including the technical studies on the adaptation solutions, the environmental impact assessments, the draft Coastal Development Law and the socio-economic baseline data. The website could be used to make project results and lessons learned available to a broader audience nationally and internationally. Further, considering that there are other initiatives working on coastal adaptation, it might be useful to integrate knowledge products to an integrated website, ideally under a permanent government-run or government-commissioned arrangement.

*Did the NIE have a project risk management system prior to the AF funding? Did the NIE develop a risk management system for the programme?*

54. Originally, the programme document had identified a number of risks and measures to attenuate those risks. However, during the review of the first semi-annual programme performance report, the secretariat had identified additional risks that the NIE agreed to incorporate. Also, the NIE recognized that project risks were not systematically monitored before this programme, which implementation has helped CSE develop of more systematic way of monitoring and reporting on risks.

*Were the institutional arrangements for the management of the programme, as outlined in the approved proposal, adequate during implementation? Were there any constraints? What are the lessons learnt?*

55. The programme was designed at a time when distinction between implementation and execution roles was not yet fully defined by the Adaptation Fund Board. Perhaps partly because of that, the implementing entity has taken on certain execution duties in the programme, especially related to programme coordination. The benefit of this approach is that it fosters coordination and communication between implementation and execution levels. The possible downside is that the implementing entity might lose some of its independence in relation to the executing entities. This creates a potential risk for conflict of interest, though signs of that, e.g. impaired control ability, were not observed during the mission.

56. The situation in which the Designated Authority is from the government agency that functions also as an executing entity is not ideal, as it introduces ambiguity to the roles of project entities. This was raised by participants of the stakeholder consultation meeting organized at the beginning of the learning mission.

57. The executing entities are committed and active. The two NGOs have turned out to be crucial in facilitating communication between the programme and local stakeholders, and in mobilizing communities to participate in programme activities.

*As the programme reaches closure, what are some of the mechanisms for continuing or maintaining the processes the project has/will put in place? Does, in any way, direct access enhance the confidence the country has in the project, to the extent of financially supporting these measures in the future, for example?*

58. This area is one where the programme may have some of the biggest challenges. While local coordination mechanisms have been put in place, the question of how coastal infrastructure will be maintained is open. The Directorate of Environment, which is the principal executing entity for this programme and the coordinator of efforts to tackle coastal erosion at the government level, claims that the maintenance and scaling up of the programme's infrastructures, notably in Saly and Rufisque, will be ensured by a new Agency that is proposed under the Coastal Development Law: the High Authority of the Littoral. However, it was not clear as to how this Agency will mobilize resources for its operationalization. At the community level, it is clear that communities' fiscal resources are not adequate for repairing the infrastructure if and when needed. In Saly, the type of coastal protection, submerged berms, is likely a low-maintenance solution. The coastal wall in Rufisque may be more prone to coastal abrasive forces. In Rufisque invigorating economic activity along the coastal wall promenade is likely but

it is unclear whether it could provide significant fiscal revenue for helping maintain the sea wall. During the mission, continuing the supportive processes of communication and participation was discussed: the coastal committees envisaged under the new law could be vehicles for this.

59. There is no sign that the programme being implemented using direct access will lead to more availability of domestic resources for future measures. At the same time, the specific experience of CSE from implementing this programme has increased its capacity to scale up activities outside the scope of the programme: CSE has recently secured funding for coordinating a regional coastal observatory network, to be funded by WAEMU.

*Did the programme develop a formal M&E plan and share it with the executing entities? How did the implementation arrangement affect the implementation of the M&E plan?*

60. Because of this programme, CSE has developed a more formal system of reporting. Hence, a system of periodic reporting was established with the executing entities of the programme, reports which were thereafter consolidated and submitted on semi-annual basis following the AF procedures. In this case as well, the specific implementation arrangement, with CSE's dual role of executing and implementing, has biased the reporting system and CSE has taken the lead in the development of the report. In a typical situation, reports are developed by the executing entities, and the IE only reviews the report and provides its ratings of the programme.

61. In terms of monitoring, as explained in the section on the implementation arrangements above, the NIE has been remarkably supervising the execution of the programme's work plan and several supervision missions have taken place during its implementation.

### **2.3. On the methodology used for this learning mission**

*Was the set of questions appropriate? Were there redundant questions? Were there some aspects of direct access or programme implementation that were not included and should be considered for future missions?*

62. The set of questions seemed to be appropriate, as used as a non-restrictive guideline. There were no redundant questions but one could assume that different questions are important for different NIEs and projects. The questions that were not listed in advance but were covered during the mission were related to country-specific circumstances.

*Was the selection of stakeholders interviewed comprehensive? Were there any that had not been included in the plan and that should be for future missions?*

63. It turned out that coverage was very comprehensive at the local level and the mission was confident that it got a full picture of how local level stakeholders perceive the programme. However, with a fundamentally cross-cutting theme such as coastal adaptation, coordination between sectors is crucial, and the mission did not have a chance to interview central government line ministries. It is often a challenge to reach such government stakeholders that

do not directly work with the programme but with future missions particular attention should be paid to allowing opportunities for such interviews.

*Were the arrangements for the mission appropriate: is there anything that should be taken into account for future missions?*

64. The arrangements for the mission were very good. The implementing entity had constructed a full and functioning programme, and all practical arrangements worked perfectly. Five days was a suitable time for such a mission.

*Would it be more beneficial to assess the programme's progress in achieving its objective and against its RBM indicators, or to collect more quantitative data from the field?*

65. This might be useful for a learning mission conducted to a longer-duration programme, towards the end of its implementation. In the case of this mission, many of the programme outputs will only be reached towards the end, and the mission would not have been able to capture meaningful quantitative data in many areas. Further, with climate change adaptation timelines are challenging even for regular ex post evaluations, as impacts take time to materialize, so a learning mission during project implementation should be realistic about what data can be collected.

## **V. Lessons learned**

### **1. Direct access**

#### **1.1. At the government level**

- Direct access can enhance country's ownership and "independence". NIEs, therefore the countries, are provided with the liberty to decide on which sector they want to receive funding, and to implement programmes that reflect the national priorities, which are designed at the national level. They also decide on which activities to allocate the available resources.
- The institutional linkage of the entity with a sectoral Ministry can hinder its ability to fulfill its NIE responsibilities in a neutral way. CSE, under the Ministry of Environment (MoE), has been viewed as the "MoE's NIE".
- The choice of the Designated Authority (DA) at the country level is critical for information sharing and coordination, and transparency in the selection process is important. This would help ensure that the incumbent would be in the best position to coordinate at the national level the selection of NIE and to participate in the process of project identification, through information sharing and provision of guidance to relevant stakeholders. To that end, it may be relevant for the Board to consider developing terms of reference or a guidance document for the selection of a DA within a country.

#### **1.2. At the institutional level**



- Direct access can strengthen institutional capacities by enhancing the procedures and profile of the NIEs through the accreditation process and by channeling capacity building based on own national standards to smaller executing entities, during projects/programmes implementation.
- Having the implementation responsibility with a national institution may lend itself to more flexibility in partnering with smaller-size executing entities, as the NIE may afford to manage inherent capacity-related risks of such organizations by more active communication and supervision. Using such executing entities may in turn open new and more efficient ways to operate at the community level.
- Having to learn or adapt skills required in the implementation role puts the NIE management on a steep learning curve. As with any organizational development, committed and skilled management and leadership skills are needed at different levels of the organization to navigate through those challenges. Also, ability to form and coordinate functioning consortia is key. A lot in the success can be attributed to having competent individuals who are able to champion direct access.
- The NIE taking its new role within a country is an interactive process which involves also learning of the national, international and local partner organizations: actively informing these organizations about the opportunities and limitations of direct access is important to avoid misunderstandings.

## **2. Adequacy of AF review criteria**

- The Adaptation Fund project proposal template and associated review criteria seem to provide a functioning framework for planning implementation successfully. The fact that the review criteria have been specified and consolidated over the lifetime of the Adaptation Fund has likely improved this framework. Areas that were identified in early meetings of the Project and Programme Review Committee as potential gaps in the review criteria, such as focus on gender, consultation and sustainability, indeed appear to be crucial for the long-term success of a project.
- The balance of “concrete adaptation actions” with soft measures supporting them, is something that the Fund should possibly look deeper into, when it conducts learning missions and more formalized evaluation missions.
- Consultation is important not only to ensure that the project or programme targets those benefitting most of the activity but also to ensure acceptance on the division of benefits among those who directly benefit from the project and those who don’t, and to manage expectations between the two groups.
- Sustainability of the project outcomes is a complex issue, and financial and institutional sustainability is as important as economic, social and environmental sustainability.

- Coordination among donors and national initiatives is a theme that cannot be solved by a single project alone but by focusing this in project review helps create awareness and links even before project starts.

### **3. Learning missions**

- As the Adaptation Fund experience on direct access and project implementation is still relatively young, any early lessons are valuable, and learning missions can provide an avenue to learn such lessons.
- Learning missions help maintain communication channels between the secretariat and the Implementing Entities, and offer an opportunity to communicate with executing entities, beneficiaries and stakeholders, with whom the secretariat otherwise does not have any direct interface.

## ANNEX 1: Planning of the mission

DATE	HEURE/OBJECTIF	NAME OF THE INSTITUTION/STAKEHOLDER
<b>5 Octobre 2012</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>9H00-9H30</b> : Prise de contact avec le DG du CSE</li> </ul>	CSE/Dr Assize Toure
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>9H45-12H00</b> : Atelier sur "L'expérience du Sénégal dans l'accès direct , cas du CSE comme entité de mise en œuvre du Fonds pour l'adaptation".</li> <li>• Echanges sur la perception, au niveau gouvernemental, de l'accréditation du CSE ; nouvelles capacités acquises à travers le pays et par les bénéficiaires ; niveau de prise de conscience des problèmes liés au changement climatique ; nouvelles initiatives (s'il y en a) développées/financées grâce à la mise en œuvre de ce projet ; le niveau d'appropriation au niveau du Ministère de l'Ecologie et au niveau interministériel ; la perception des bailleurs sur cette expérience de l'accès direct</li> </ul> <p><b>12H00-13H00</b> : Projection de film sur le projet et discussions</p>	MEPN/DEEC Min. Décentralisation, Collectivités locales et aménagement du territoire COMNAC CSE WAEMU UE JICA The Netherlands' Embassy The Embassy of the Kingdom of Sweden The Embassy of the Kingdom of Spain The embassy of the Swiss Confederation IDRC World Bank UNDP GREEN Dynamique Femmes NGOs (CONGAD, ENDA, etc.)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>13H00-14H15</b> : Pause</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>14H15-16H00</b> : Visite au Ministre de l'Ecologie</li> </ul>	COMNAC DEEC CSE GREEN Dynamique Femme NGOs (CONGAD, ENDA, etc.)

DATE	HEURE/OBJECTIF	NAME OF THE INSTITUTION/STAKEHOLDER
6 Octobre 2012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>08H00:</b> Départ pour les visites de sites (Rufisque &amp; Saly)</li> <li>• <b>09H00-10H00:</b> Rencontre avec les autorités de <b>Rufisque</b>: discussion sur la contribution de l'accès direct à l'amélioration du niveau de sensibilisation et d'appropriation des questions d'adaptation et des processus de réduction des risques liés au climat.</li> </ul>	Mayor Prefect of Rufisque Local extensions GREEN Senegal DEEC CSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>10H00-12H00:</b> Visite de site (<b>Rufisque-Est</b>) et rencontre avec EIFFAGE &amp; AGETIP: discussion sur l'ouvrage de protection côtière</li> </ul>	Mayor GREEN Senegal DEEC CSE EIFFAGE AGETIP Royal Haskoning
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>12H00-13H00:</b> Rencontre avec les représentants des autorités coutumières, des jeunes et des femmes : discussion sur la contribution de l'accès direct à l'amélioration du niveau de sensibilisation et d'appropriation des questions d'adaptation et des processus de réduction des risques liés au climat.</li> </ul>	Mayor GREEN Senegal DEEC CSE Representatives of traditional leaders Representatives of youth Representatives of women organization
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>13H-14h30: DEJEUNER</b></li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>14H30-16H00:</b> voyage sur <b>Saly</b></li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>16H00-17H00:</b> Rencontre avec les autorités de <b>Saly</b>: discussion sur la contribution de l'accès direct à l'amélioration du niveau de sensibilisation et d'appropriation des questions d'adaptation et des processus de réduction des risques liés au climat.</li> </ul>	Mayor Prefect of Mbour Local extensions GREEN Senegal DEEC CSE

DATE	HEURE/OBJECTIF	NAME OF THE INSTITUTION/STAKEHOLDER
<b>7 Octobre 2012</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>09H00-10H00:</b> Rencontre avec les représentants des autorités coutumières, des jeunes et des femmes (<b>Saly</b>): discussion sur la contribution de l'accès direct à l'amélioration du niveau de sensibilisation et d'appropriation des questions d'adaptation et des processus de réduction des risques liés au climat.</li> </ul>	CSE DEEC GREEN Dynamique Femme ENDA CONGAD Representatives of traditional leaders Representatives of youth Representatives of women organization Representatives of youth Representatives of women organization
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>10H00-11H30:</b> Visite de site (<b>Saly Koulang</b>)</li> </ul>	CSE DEEC GREEN Dynamique Femme ENDA CONGAD Representatives of fishermen Representatives of women transformers
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>11H30-13H00:</b> Rencontre avec le secteur privé et la société civile (<b>Saly</b>): discussion sur la contribution de l'accès direct à l'amélioration du niveau de sensibilisation et d'appropriation des questions d'adaptation et des processus de réduction des risques liés au climat.</li> </ul>	Hoteliers CSE DEEC GREEN Dynamique Femme ENDA CONGAD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>13H00-14h30: DEJEUNER</b></li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>14H30-15h30:</b> Travel to Joal</li> </ul>	

DATE	HEURE/OBJECTIF	NAME OF THE INSTITUTION/STAKEHOLDER
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>15H30-16H30:</b> Rencontre avec les autorités de <b>Joal</b> : discussion sur la contribution de l'accès direct à l'amélioration du niveau de sensibilisation et d'appropriation des questions d'adaptation et des processus de réduction des risques liés au climat.</li> </ul>	Mayor Local extensions GREEN Senegal DEEC CSE
<b>8 Octobre 2012</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>09H00-10H00:</b> Rencontre avec les représentants des autorités coutumières, des jeunes et des femmes : discussion sur la contribution de l'accès direct à l'amélioration du niveau de sensibilisation et d'appropriation des questions d'adaptation et des processus de réduction des risques liés au climat.</li> </ul>	CSE DEEC GREEN Dynamique Femme ENDA CONGAD Representatives of traditional leaders Representatives of youth Representatives of women organization
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>10H00-13h00:</b> Visite de sites (Khelcom, quai de pêche, digue anti-sel, plage)</li> </ul>	CSE DEEC GREEN Dynamique Femme ENDA CONGAD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>13H00-14h30: DEJEUNER</b></li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>14H30-15H30:</b> Retour à Dakar</li> </ul>	
<b>9 Octobre 2012</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>09H30-12H30:</b> Réunion avec le CSE et l'équipe du projet:</li> <li>• discussion sur les capacités acquises par le CSE pendant le processus d'accréditation et après (à travers la mise en œuvre du projet)</li> <li>• leçons apprises sur le déroulement de la mission</li> </ul>	CSE DEEC GREEN Dynamique Femme ENDA CONGAD

**ANNEX 2: Agenda of the workshop on direct access – Day1, Hôtel Terrou Bi, Dakar, November 5, 2012**

<b>09h00-09h10</b>	Mot de bienvenue de M. <b>Assize TOURE</b> , Directeur Général du Centre de Suivi Ecologique (CSE)
<b>09h10-9h20</b>	Mot du Représentant du <b>Secrétariat du Fonds pour l'Adaptation au Changement Climatique</b>
<b>09h20-09h30</b>	Ouverture de l'atelier par <b>Monsieur le Représentant du Ministre de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable</b>
<b>09h30-10h00</b>	<b>Pause-café</b>
	Projection de film / Expérience du CSE comme ENM du Sénégal et les enjeux de l'accès direct par M. <b>Déthié S. NDIAYE</b> , Coordonnateur du bureau de l'Entité Nationale de Mise en Œuvre
<b>10h00-10h20</b>	Le Fonds pour l'adaptation dans le cadre du protocole de Kyoto et des finances climat, par <b>Daouda NDIAYE</b>
<b>10h20-10h40</b>	Direct access at the global level (L'accès direct et ses enjeux au niveau mondial), par <b>Mikko OLLIKAINEN</b>
<b>10h40-11h20</b>	<b>DISCUSSIONS</b>
<b>11h20-11h40</b>	L'expérience du Sénégal dans l'accès direct aux ressources du Fonds pour l'adaptation: de l'accréditation du CSE à la mise en œuvre du projet "Adaptation à l'érosion côtière dans les zones vulnérables », par <b>Déthié S. NDIAYE</b>
<b>11h40-12h10</b>	<b>DISCUSSIONS</b>
<b>12h10-12h20</b>	Clôture de l'atelier
<b>12h30-14h00</b>	<b>DEJEUNER</b>

## ANNEX 3: List of participants to the workshop on direct access

Nom	Prénom (s)	Structure	Fonction	E-mail	Tel/Fax
IMOUA-GEIS	Maria	UNCDF	Change of SRE Bureau Regional Project & IUCM	maria.imaia@un.org	33 86 9 2814
SALUD	Astoid	EI/FAO	Coordination HSE	astoid.salud@un.org	77 940 15 78
Kane	Wendy	DEPA	Geography	Kendykan16@yahoo.fr	77 66 9 355

Nom	Prénom (s)	Structure	Fonction	E-mail	Tel/Fax
DIHILLO	Marc	CSE	Change of Project	marc.dihillo@un.org	77 66 9 2814
DIHILLO	David	BISC	Regional Director of the Bureau	diuhillo@un.org	77 66 9 2814
OLIKUWA	Miko	AFRSEC	ADDITION OFFICER	mlikuwa@un.org	44-208-458-9912
NDIYE	DAUDA	AFRSEC	Regional Officer	ndiye@un.org	77 66 9 2814
NDIYE	S.	CSE	Coordination	ndiye@un.org	77 66 9 2814

Nom	Prénom (s)	Structure	Fonction	E-mail	Tel/Fax
FALL	Tanor	Consulat	Ex-Post	tanor.fall@un.org	77 66 9 2814
WINE	Papa	UNESCO	Coordination	wine@un.org	77 66 9 2814
BYOU	Awa	UNESCO	Coordination	byou@un.org	77 66 9 2814
LY	Omara	UNESCO	Specialiste de l'Environnement	ly@un.org	77 66 9 2814

Nom	Prénom (s)	Structure	Fonction	E-mail	Tel/Fax
DIHILLO	Marc	CSE	Change of Project	marc.dihillo@un.org	77 66 9 2814
DIHILLO	David	BISC	Regional Director of the Bureau	diuhillo@un.org	77 66 9 2814
OLIKUWA	Miko	AFRSEC	ADDITION OFFICER	mlikuwa@un.org	44-208-458-9912
NDIYE	DAUDA	AFRSEC	Regional Officer	ndiye@un.org	77 66 9 2814
NDIYE	S.	CSE	Coordination	ndiye@un.org	77 66 9 2814



## ANNEX 4: List of stakeholders consulted during the mission

Stakeholders consulted	Location			
	Dakar	Rufisque	Saly	Joal
Implementing /executing entity	Management and technical staff CSE	- Head and programme officer - Green Senegal;  - Deputy director of the environment - DEEC	Head and programme officer- Green Senegal;  - Deputy director of the environment - DEEC	Head of Dynamique Femmes;  - Deputy director of the environment - DEEC
Central government	Director of cabinet of the Minister of Environment	-	-	-
Local government	-	- Prefect of Rufisque;  - Mayor of Rufisque-East	- Prefect of Mbour;  - Deputy Mayor of Saly	- Prefect of Mbour;  - Deputy Mayor of Joal;  - Extension workers from Ministries of water economics and environment
Communities	-	Representatives of Thiawlene neighborhood: women, youth and elders groups	Representatives of Saly village: women, fishermen and youth groups	Representatives of Joal: fish transformers, rice growers and women groups, representative of the matriarchal lineages
Private sector	-	- Groupe Eiffage – contractor of the seawall;  - Royal Asconing – consulting firm for the building of the seawall	- Managers Palm Beach and Teranga Hotels ;  - Consultant involved in the study on artificial berms	- Fish transformers,  - Entreprise Layousse et Freres – contractor of the anti-salt dyke
NGOs/CSOs	ENDA- Energie	Green Senegal	Green Senegal	Dynamique Femmes
Bilateral/multi lateral partners	EU, World Bank, UNDP, Embassy of the Netherlands			