

Promoting Sustainable Agricultural Production and Conservation of Key Biodiversity Species through Land Restoration and Efficient Use of Ecosystems in the Dallol Bosso and Surrounding Areas (PROSAP/COKEBIOS)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10420

Countries

Niger

Project Name

Promoting Sustainable Agricultural Production and Conservation of Key Biodiversity Species through Land Restoration and Efficient Use of

Ecosystems in the Dallol Bosso and Surrounding Areas
(PROSAP/COKEBIOS)

Agencies

IFAD, UNEP

Date received by PM

6/10/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 25, 2021

OK, except that the level of resources under the LD2.5 objective is uncommonly high.
See below.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request OK

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 25, 2021

- Original letters are included in the prodoc. Non-Official translations are included in the portal.

1) We invite the GEF Agency to combine each original letter with their translation: it is not very practical to be obliged to check two distinct documents for the same evidence.

2) Please, explain the cofinancing from IFAD and the evidence: there is a letter mentioning the PRECIS project with \$70 million. Please justify the mention of \$85 million in grant and \$33 million in-kind under IFAD.

3) Evidences are lacking for West Africa Development Bank (BOAD) and World Resource Institute (WRI)

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request OK, but please see the comments on the budget below.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
June 25, 2021

- The proportion between areas under SLM and restoration is uncommon. Please, confirm.
- Please explain the differences between PIF and the current proposal:
- Core Indicator 3.1: 34,987.5 ha of restored areas were identified at PIF level. Please, explain how you obtained 614,708 ha at CEO endorsement.
- Core indicator 4: 70,125 ha under 4.1 (land under improved management to BD) at PIF level versus 500 ha under 4.3 (SLM) at CEO endorsement. Please, explain, the 4.3 indicator is the main LD indicator: this change is surprising and was not expected. Please, justify and clarify.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 25, 2021

The general reasoning and the proposed scenario seem adequate in the main lines.

- In the details, please, explain how reducing post-harvest losses by 50% among smallholder producers will contribute to biodiversity conservation within the Dallol Bosso landscape and surrounding areas (Component 4).

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 25, 2021

The tables A mention BD2.7 and LD2.5.

- Please make the text coherent and provide a justification under these two objectives. Remove the mention of the BD1 objective.

- Please, note that such use of the LD2.5 objective on the LDN enabling environment is uncommon, as most of the projects assign few hundred of thousands dollars to this

capacity building objective and in general assign more resources to field investments under LD1 (SLM), LD2 (SFM), LD3 (restoration), or LD4 (integrated landscapes). We understand that the field investments will be largely financed by the cofinancing, so the current reasoning may be valid. Please, confirm.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 25, 2021

OK for the general reasoning.

See comments above on the indicators.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June , 2021

Partially. We take note of the innovations and the potential scaling up. However, the logics for sustainability should be reinforced. How will the proposed institutions and mechanisms, both for LDN and conservation, be sustainable once the project will have closed.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
OK

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Yes

Agency Response
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response
Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

OK

Agency Response
Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, but please see the comments on the budget below.

Agency Response
Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, but sustainability aspects should be clarified.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 25, 2021

- Please, include a budget using the GEF Excel template .
- On the budget you provided, we have difficulties to see the adequacy between the cofinancing and the use of GEF:
- \$1.428 million seems assigned to consultants: Have you tried to identify local entities or organizations to ensure a certain sustainability of the efforts?
- \$2.523 million of GEF resources seems assigned to "irrigation systems, marketing infrastructures"... This is typically the kind of expenses we would expect from cofinancing. We are not seeing the additionality of GEF resources for such expenses.
- \$1.166 million of salaries is budgeted. Please, confirm and justify.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes, there were comments on the risk analysis, the associated mitigation measures, and the implementation arrangements.

Addressed.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Comments from France and Germany have been addressed (Annex B).

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request The comments from the STAP have been addressed (Annex B).

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request No comment.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request OK

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request OK

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 25, 2021

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

5/25/2021

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations