

Building Niger's national capacities to implement the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11972
Countries
Niger
Project Name
Building Niger's national capacities to implement the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement
Agencies
UNEP
Date received by PM
7/22/2025
Review completed by PM
7/22/2025
Program Manager
Saba Kalam
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

1.a: Yes, it is eligible for funding.

1.b: Provide GEF Agency ID

Please change- Project Sector: Mixed and others

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

1.b. The GEF Portal field for Agency ID is not editable. We have therefore included the UNEP ID in the PDF version of the PIF. The UNEP agency ID is 242840. Could you kindly request the GEF Portal IT team to add it into the Portal? Thank you.

The Project Sector has been changed to ?Mixed and Other?.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

1. Cleared
2. We recommend to increase the percentage of women participation in the CEO endorsement document, if possible.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

2. Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

3.1 a) Yes, the objective is concise and clear. Cleared

3.1 b) Cleared. The project identifies institutional coordination as one of the barriers in the Transparency reporting but there are no outputs to enhance or strengthen ?institutional coordination?. Since this is the first CBIT project in Niger, it is recommended to have one output (in the CEO endorsement document) on enhancing the coordination among the relevant departments and stakeholders.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

3.1.b) Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, cleared. It is recommended to increase the percentage of women participation in the CEO endorsement document.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

3.3 (a) Yes

3.3 (b) Yes

3.3 (c) Yes, PMC is 10% considering this is an MSP

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

4.1 a) Yes, sufficiently elaborated.

4.1 b) Yes, barriers and enablers have been described well.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

4.2 a) Yes, there are other ongoing initiatives like ICAT, NDC partnership but these are for specific areas not overall transparency. Cleared

4.2 b) Yes, each barrier has details on drivers and these are resilient to future changes. Cleared

4.2 c) Yes, the table provides the detail on relevant ongoing/completed initiative. Cleared

4.2 d) Yes, cleared

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

5.1 a) Yes, cleared

5.2 b) Yes, cleared. It will be helpful to define (in the CEO endorsement document) what the project means by the term 'module'. Stakeholders may get confused with the reporting templates, whereas modules are bundle of activities.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

5.1.b) Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

5.2 Cleared. In the CEO endorsement document, it will add value to highlight what the Government has done in the past to strengthen the capacity of individuals and institutions for reporting under National Communication or ETF and what additional support is required. From the proposal it seems, there is huge reliance on the CBIT support to strengthen the ETF reporting, it will be important to highlight Government efforts and how the gap can be plugged by the CBIT support.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

5.2. Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

5.3 a) Yes, Cleared

5.3 b) Yes, Cleared

5.3 c) Yes, Cleared

5.4 d) Yes, Cleared

Agency's Comments

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared. Core Indicator 11 used for the project with 200 people to be benefitted.

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments

5.6 (a) All relevant risks identified.

5.6 (b) (c) in the CEO endorsement document, rating of risks need to be checked and so the mitigation measures. Political, technological risks can impact the project significantly because the project is dependent on adequate coordination among the Ministries/Government. Change in political priority may impact on the project. Also, the project depends on creating technological solutions for data/information gathering, what if the institutions do not have infrastructure or mandate to contribute. Please look into mitigation measures in each risk and provide concrete and measurable actions.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

5.6. b) c) Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared. In the CEO endorsement document, please also focus on how the project will adapt to changes in the ETF MPGs. What institutional arrangement will be built to comply with the future changes in the MPGs or IPCC guidelines.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

Cleared. Yes, the project is aligned with the objective 2.1 (Support capacity-building needs for transparency under the Paris Agreement through the CBIT) of GEF-8 Climate Change Focal Area Strategy and Associated Programming.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments Yes, Cleared

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cleared

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cleared

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cleared

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cleared

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cleared

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cleared

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. Cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

The LoE is dated September 1st, 2022, and signed by Yakoubou Mahaman Sani ? the current OFP as of December 27, 2024 is Dr. Mamane Bello. Therefore, a new LoE is requested from the current OFP. Please ensure to have the footnote that allows the GEF Agency to assess the capacities of the executing partner. GEF will review the financial information whenever the new LoE is submitted.

09/04/2025

The new LoE is attached. Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

A new LoE, signed by Dr. Mamame Bello on August 8, 2025, was uploaded as requested.

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, cleared

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

The LOE is missing the footnote subject to the designated executing entity to the capacity assessment by UNEP.

09/04/2025

The new LoE is attached. Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

The new LoE uploaded now includes the mentioned footnote.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, Cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, Cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes, cleared

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes the PIF is technically cleared. Agency is requested to address the comments outlined in the relevant sections during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

09/04/2025

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

Thank you. The comment is well noted and will be considered during the preparation of the CEO endorsement document.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments Once the gender analysis has been conducted and the Gender Action Plan developed, the Agency is requested to incorporate the findings and identified actions/interventions in the GAP in the project components, outputs and activities. Please ensure to include relevant gender-specific indicators in the RF and Under M&E, please reflect the reports submitted (PIR, MTR and TE) include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments

UNEP responses (03/09/2025):

Thank you for the guidance. Once the gender analysis and Gender Action Plan are finalized, we will ensure that the identified actions and interventions are fully integrated into the project components, outputs, and deliverables. Relevant gender-specific indicators will be incorporated in the Results Framework, and under M&E we will reflect gender-specific results and progress in PIR, MTR, and TE reporting, as per the requirements.

Review Dates

PIF Review

**Agency Response
9/3/2025**

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)