

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

5/26/2022

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
September 24, 2021

Addressed.

June 25, 2021

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

Agency Response

Agency Response

August 5, 2021

Many thanks for the concern raised. We have reviewed the proposed soft and hard activities and have considered to allocate LD resources from LD-2-5 (Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN) to LD-1-1 (Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through Sustainable Land Management) and LD-1-4 (Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape), representing \$2,876,712 and \$1,540,058, respectively. BD-2-7 have been maintained at \$880,038. This change is also reflected in Table D. This level of resource allocation also considers the cost of land rehabilitation in Niger, based on the estimations of 2007 but also the costs indicated in the table in section 5. The table details various SLM practices/technologies and how much it costs per ha to implement them in Niger. The information has been included in the third paragraph of section 5 on ?Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing? to strengthen the value addition of GEF support.

Reference: Table A CEO Endorsement Request and Para. 80 of the CEO ER

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

Agency Response

August 5th, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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
December 15th, 2021

Addressed.

October 22, 2021

Not addressed.

- About IFAD financing: we take note of the given explanations. However, as we do for other GEF agencies with loans, please provide the project document or the minutes of negotiation reflecting the breakdown between the grant and the in-kind cofinancing.

- There is a letter from the regional department of Environment, Dosso Region. However, this letter is provided to justify the first line of cofinancing from the Government of Niger. The same letter of cofinancing is still used for the last two lines of cofinancing from the Dosso Region (\$10 million in public investment and \$500,000 in-kind). We suggest logging the right letter in front of the last line of cofinancing (Regional Department of Environment) and remove the first of cofinancing from the government of Niger. Please, check the coherence of the total cofinancing amount in the different tables of the portal.

September 24, 2021

Thanks for the translation and revision. We suggest not including the cents in the table. Please address the two following questions:

- Please explain how you calculated the breakdown between in-kind and grant cofinancing from the PRECIS project, IFAD, as the letter is silent on it.

- The Regional Council of Dosso is included two times in the cofinancing table, with the same letter as evidence: The \$5 million cofinancing in public investment corresponds to the contribution of \$500,000 per commune (then \$5 million for 10 communes). We do not understand the mention of \$500,000 in-kind from the same Regional Council.

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

Agency Response

1. The GEF agency has combined each original letter with the translated letter.
2. The cofinancing from IFAD has been corrected in the table C, and tables A and B have been corrected accordingly. The cofinancing letter is corrected to reflect the exact amount.
3. The cofinancing letters from WRI and BOAD were not secured on time and dropped. The cofinancing structure has been updated accordingly

September 30, 2021

Request to explain the breakdown between in-kind and grant cofinancing from the PRECIS project, IFAD noted with thanks. In response:

The in-kind contribution that amounts to \$29,930,000 relates to tax exemption on goods and services from the government during the life of the project ? for all goods and services related to the project implementation. This has been approved and signed in the financing agreement with the government of Niger. The grant, amounting to \$23,870,000 related to IFAD's grant cofinancing from PRECIS project. The sum total of the in-kind contribution and the grant as explained above is \$53,800,000, the amount indicated on the cofinancing letter.

With regard to The Regional Council of Dosso, which included two times in the co-financing table, the two lines are different and the letter of co-financing different. The first one relates to Dosso Regional Council while the second one relates to Regional Department of Environment, Dosso that are two different things.

November 2021

i) Kindly note that the IFAD project document had been uploaded to the GEF portal 6th October 2021. Please find re-attached to the current submission, alongside the UNEP project document.

ii) With regard to The Regional Council of Dosso cofinancing letter, which is said to be included twice -in the co-financing table, it is important to note that the two lines are different, and the source- of co-financing are different too. The first one relates to Dosso Regional Council, which stands as the regional locally elected municipality (10.500.000 USD) while the second one (500.000 USD) relates to Regional Department of Environment of Dosso, which is the Regional Representation of the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development. Therefore, the two are different things. The

names of the two respective institutions responsible for the different sources of co-finance have now been revised in the CEO endorsement request, to enhance clarity.

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

Agency Response

July 5, 2021

Comment and recommendation noted with thanks. As alluded to under point 1 above, the initial allocation of resources to LD and BD activities has been reconsidered and adjusted accordingly. LD-related activities have been allocated resources as follows: LD-1-1 = \$2,876,712; LD-1-4 = \$1,540,058; and BD-2-7 = \$880,038. Once again, this level of re-allocation has been guided by proposed interventions/activities related to LD.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

May 26, 2022

The targets should be confirmed at the inception workshop. For instance, you only counted protected areas under the core indicator 1.1 (creation). It may be true for the Bosso Giraffe PA, it is disputable for the Kandaju Hippo Sanctuary as the decree for the

PA creation was already taken, but the protection has not yet been concretized on the ground. to be confirmed at the inception workshop.

December 15th, 2021

Addressed.

October 22, 2021

Not fully addressed.

- We take note of the revised target of 307,354 ha under the core indicator 3.1 (degraded agricultural land restored). Now, please, fill in the core indicator 3.2 for bushes and 3.3 for grasslands. The total core indicator 3 should be the sum of these sub-indicators.

- Participatory monitoring is potentially interesting during project implementation. However, we recommend confirming these numbers using GIS, especially because there are huge changes with the PIF and several adjustments.

September 24, 2021

- - We take note and appreciate of the confirmation of 70,125 ha under 4.3 (SLM) at CEO endorsement.
- - About the uncommon increase of targets under the Core Indicator 3, we do not understand the justification of the cofinancing increase up to \$143,588,966: the proposed cofinancing in the table C so far is \$70,388,966. Justification to be revised and/or targets should be reduced.
 - Can you please clarify if the different targets were confirmed through discussions with stakeholders or if you calculated them using GIS and mapping technologies. What methods will be in place to monitor these aspects?

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

Agency Response

July 5, 2021

Comment well noted and appreciated. In response:

At PIF stage, the project intended to focus only in restoring degraded sections of the landscape of the planned giraffe Protected Area. However, following thematic studies during PPG and additional consultations national stakeholders, it becomes clear that the restoration activities should be extended to equally important production landscapes whose use has implications for the PA and community livelihoods. During in-country additional consultations with stakeholders, it was agreed that the area of land restored be extended from 34,987.5 ha at PIF to 614,708 ha at CEO as follows: restoration of agricultural land (13,620 ha); restoration of pastoral grasslands (10,216 ha); restoration of degraded tiger bushes (132,522 ha); and restoration of agroforestry parks (458,350 ha). 614,708 ha is the sum total of the proposed ha to be restored in the afore-mentioned production landscapes as proposed during PPG. Please, also note that the 70,125 ha for Core indicator 4 has been retained in the current iteration as at PIF following additional consultations with the country.

Changes:

- At PIF, the proposed LD FA objective was LD-2-5 (Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN). Following the GEF review comments and additional consultations that informed proposed activities, LD resources will be allocated to LD-1-1 and LD-1-4;
- At PIF, the proposed area for the giraffe PA creation was 69,975 ha. After additional consultations during PPG, the size of land was adjusted to 55,300 ha. The size was validated by stakeholders meeting held in Dosso;
- At PIF, the proposed area of landscapes under improved practices was 70,175 ha. During PPG and validation workshop, the size was adjusted to 500 ha. However, please, note that with the recommendation and adjusted BD and LD allocations as mentioned above, the PIF stage ha have been retained in this current iteration.
- The level of cofinance has adjusted upwards from \$137,700,000 to \$143,588,966. Please, note that BOAD is not among the cofinanciers in the CEO endorsement document.
- The number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefits of GEF investments has been adjusted from 300,000 (150,000 women and 150,000 men) to 150,000 (75,000 women and 75,000 men). This adjustment has been informed following thematic studies during PPG and additional stakeholder consultations to ensure in one hand to consider potential risks which may occur as result of COVID 19 persistence and

the prevailing insecurity situation in the Sahel. It is also a result of a more focused and meaningful socioeconomic contribution to the target population in the project catchment area;

- Additional information has been provided to further substantiate the role of reducing post-harvest losses in biodiversity conservation in the catchment area;

- Targets and indicators have been included in Table B; and

- A table of different SLM practices has been included on page 36 with costs of each of the practices.

-

-

- **September 30, 2021**

We note with appreciation the GEF Secretariat's drawing of our attention to adjusting the figures to reflect the adjusted level of cofinancing, and secondly, to clarify if the targets were confirmed in discussions with stakeholders and methods to be used to monitor the aspects of interest. In response:

- The figures have been adjusted as follows:

? Restoration of degraded production landscapes from 614,708 ha to 307,354 ha, divided as follows:

- o Direct beneficiaries from 150,000 to 75,000;

- o Smallholders (50% women) with enhanced capacity to control PHL associated with pest and disease outbreaks from 600 to 400 smallholders;

- o Restoration of agricultural land from 13,620 ha to 6,810 ha;

- o Restoration of pastoral grasslands from 10,216 ha to 5,108 ha;

- o Restoration of degraded tiger bushes from 132,522 ha to 66,261 ha;

- o Restoration of agroforestry parks from 458,350 ha to 229,175 ha; and

- o Area of small irrigation systems from 500 ha to 350 ha.

-Second:

We confirm that the targets have been agreed upon through a consultative process with key stakeholders in the country. Additionally, adjustments in the level of cofinancing have been shared with stakeholders.

Regarding monitoring mechanisms on the aspects of interests, a combined approach will be used to ensure effective monitoring that will also involve communities. Monitoring will be ensured through standard supervision missions which are done every six months, and additional findings will be documents and reported on in standard periodic project reviews. Based and learning from IFAD's experience and ongoing collaboration with ICRAF, monitoring will be supplemented with the use of GIS and participatory monitoring that will involve communities and their lived experiences of project interventions and activities ? to report on the changes/impacts throughout the life of the project.

-

- **November, 2021**

We thank the Secretariat with the comments: i) filling the core indicators; and ii) use of GIS to monitor changes.

In response:

i) As footnoted under E, ?Project's Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators,? the 307,354 ha are a sum of agricultural restored (6,810 ha), tiger bushes (66,261 ha), and grasslands and agroforestry parks (234,283 ha). These figures have been entered for core indicators 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, respectively.

ii) We note that the request for clarification on the monitoring mechanism was addressed previously. In the current version, we clarify and include in the document the following:

[The monitoring mechanism will be informed by a combined approach that will involve community participatory approach and GIS. It should be mentioned that this combined approach will be complementary and therefore, ensure a more robust monitoring system. Community participatory monitoring will benefit from community member observations and their lived experiences of project interventions and activities. Additionally, community participatory monitoring will also serve as a mechanism for 'ground-truthing' the changes attributed to the project's activities of restoration. On the other hand, GIS will be used to 'systematize and package' changes in formats such as maps that will be easier for data capture, interpretation and dissemination. The use of GIS will draw on lessons from IFAD's experience and ongoing collaboration with ICRAF. Furthermore, monitoring will also be ensured through standard supervision missions, which are done every six months, and additional findings will be documented and reported on in standard periodic project reviews]. This is now added under paragraph 104, CEO Endorsement Document.

-

- **9 June 2022**

- Comment noted and will be confirmed at Inception Workshop

-

-

-

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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
September 24, 2021

Thanks for the response and the text inserted in the CEO endorsement.

Cleared.

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

Agency Response

July 5, 2021

Comment well noted and appreciated. In response:

The following additional details have been provided in Para 65, cited from *The Impact of Postharvest Research?* by Francesco Goletti and Christiane Wolff:

The reduction of postharvest food losses in itself contributes to sustainability. Reducing waste of already produced food is more sustainable than increasing production to compensate for postharvest losses. Increasing production leads to more intensive farming or to an expansion of the area under cultivation, both of which may have negative effects on the environment especially when poor rural households tend to farm in fragile ecosystems or marginal land.

The underpinning rationale that links post-harvest losses with biodiversity conservation is that reducing food waste is more sustainable than increasing production to compensate for the losses. In supporting communities to reduce post-harvest losses, the project proposes value addition opportunities that enhance the value of key commodities to broaden the income base that improves the welfare and provides farmers with the financial resources for investment in resource enhancing technologies, but also in other non-intensive agricultural land use activities.

R?f: Para 65 component 4 CEO ER

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
September 24, 2021

Addressed.

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

Agency Response

July 5, 2021

Comment well noted and appreciated. In response:

As mentioned in Sections 5 and 7 above, resources are no longer allocated to LD2-5 but have been allocated to field investments. LD-related activities have been allocated resources as follows: LD-1-1 = \$2,876,712; LD-1-4 = \$1,540,058; and BD resources objective BD-2-7 has been allocated \$880,038.

To this effect, LD2-5 has been deleted.

Under section 4 *?Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?*, the following additional information has been provided to strengthen the coherence of the BD and LD focal area objectives for the project:

The proposal seeks GEF support to establish and manage a giraffe Protected Area system in a ?social landscape? that also supports livelihoods. Related to this proposal is that the GEF resources will support adequate coverage of threatened species (giraffes threatened with extirpation in the West Africa sub-region and in the Niger, and hippos in Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary) at a sufficient scale to ensure long-term persistence of these species. Additionally, the GEF support will ensure sustained individual and institutional capacity to manage the created protected area and the Hippo Sanctuary such that they achieve their conservation objectives. Thus, the project is consistent with BD focal area.

The establishment and management of the giraffe Protected Area and the Kandadji Hippo Sanctuary are an important step in the right direction to ensure sound investment in biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. However, the Dallol Bosso is a ?social landscape? where human-wildlife conflicts are not uncommon. Due to overexploitation, climate change, among other factors, the landscape is degraded; threatening the persistence of the species the project seeks to conserve and the livelihoods of human communities. Therefore, the productivity of the land (which supports the animal habitat and livelihoods) is critical to both wildlife and humans for principally four reasons: maintain the habitat, home to the giraffes; provide food for the herbivores that this project seeks to conserve; improve land productivity to support pastoral and crop production systems for communities; and the abundance of resources (due to improved land productivity and reduced human (over)exploitation) will potentially reduce human-wildlife conflicts. Human-wildlife conflicts in a landscape such as the Dallol Bosso, is a conflict over scarce resources between humans and wildlife, and among humans. Thus, taking care of the socioeconomic aspects of biodiversity conservation efforts that focus

on improving and sustaining food production and livelihood systems, and reducing pressures on natural resources from competing land uses is, overall, complementary to the broader strategy to ensure the sustainability of interventions in biodiversity conservation. For this proposal, this is the logic that informs the allocation of resources to BD-2-7 complemented by those allocated to LD-1-1 and LD-1-4 which seek to sustain food production and livelihoods and reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses, respectively.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

July 05, 2021

Comment well noted and appreciated. Please, see response above under point 7 .

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

September 24, 2021

We take note that the project execution by the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock can contribute to sustainability, as well as the building of technical capacities, and the resources assigned to knowledge and learning. We would like to reiterate our interest to see an emphasis of activities under the first component on policy coherence, with the endorsement of LDN targets beyond the two concerned Ministries (Primature, Ministry of planning Ministry of finance) and the continuity of multi-stakeholder platforms within the integrated landscape management planning beyond the project duration.

To be checked in future PIR and MTR.

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

Agency Response

July 05, 2021

Comment well noted and appreciated. We are of the view that the project has provided information on the strategic paths for sustainability and scaling up through i) community engagement and participatory processes; ii) capacity development of key stakeholders, who even include community members as beneficiaries; iii) engagement of wide array of stakeholders within the Dallol Bosso landscape and beyond; iv) embedding the project in government institutions with a legal mandate to implement development plans related to the project. To complement the provided information, the following sentences have been included to reinforce further the aspect of sustainability and scaling up:

?It should be noted that the logic is that this is a government of Niger-driven project with total support and facilitation from the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock as Executing Agencies respectively for UNEP and IFAD led Components. Its implementation is therefore, embedded in government development priorities. Therefore, its sustainability will be ensured at this level.?

September 30, 2021

We note the GEF Secretariat's interest in activities under the first component on policy coherence, with the endorsement of LDN targets. This is to confirm that UNEP as the Implementing Agency lead of Component 1 will ensure that the activities strengthen the policy coherence and multi-stakeholder platforms in support of the LDN implementation agenda in Niger. This will reflect in MTR and PIR. This has been updated in the CEO endorsement document.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

The response is provided in budget related comments. In addition, for UNEP led components 1&2 the following M&E costs have been included:

- Budget Line (BL) 1104 related to the cost of recruiting a full dedicated M&E officer for the project
- BL 1105 Two (2) Project Field Officers
- BL2201 related to National and Regional Levels data and monitoring system hubs
- BL 3301 related to Steering Committee meetings cost
- BL 5201 and 5202 MTR and TE respectively

In addition and consistent with the above, and as detailed in the section *Monitoring and Evaluation. Describe the budgeted M & E plan,* the IFAD-led components 3 and 4 have had M&E included through an M&E Officer, as well as through terminal evaluation and the mid-term review/evaluation.

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

September 24, 2021

Addressed.

June 25, 2021

Yes, but sustainability aspects should be clarified.

Agency Response

Agency Response

July 08, 2021

Comment well noted and appreciated.

Please, see our response under point 7 above

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 25, 2022

- We now understand the request for the two vehicles in complement to the existing fleet covered by cofinancing: the activities developed by UNEP will take place in different landscapes and with different executing partners. In addition to the activities of monitoring, we are sensitive to the notion of security to bring to project teams. We approved the request.

- The terms of reference of the "Natural Resources Management Specialist" highlight several activities of "political coordination", "report consolidation", and various administrative tasks (workplans, budget). This position can then be covered by pmc. Cleared.

- Capacity building activities: Point taken. Cleared.

- Budget lines 29 to 67: Point taken. Cleared.

- Excel budget reconciled for UNEP and IFAD. Cleared.

December 15th, 2021

Not fully addressed. In the current format, new elements also become visible:

- The explanations given for the vehicles are not fully coherent with the text and the budget. You have developed a rationale for two vehicles. Now, three vehicles are included in the budget. If the IFAD PRECIS cofinancing project includes 45 vehicles, we are not seeing the need to buy one additional vehicle. Please, adjust.

- Field Officers: the explanations below are not coherent with the terms of reference included in the prodoc annex. In the Annex G, the terms of reference mainly describe project assistance and not really technical activities as mentioned below. If you maintain these budgets in the technical components, you need to update the terms of reference and include technical tasks as 1) technical guidance and support to local communities and partners, 2) ecological monitoring, and 3) research on key biodiversity species and tiger bush ecosystems.

- Several budget lines sound equivalent to GEF activities that will be financed under the upcoming Umbrella Projects for UNCCD enabling activities. We see a strong risk of duplication of expenses. Please, clarify.

- Budget lines 29 (1 national and 1 regional (Dosso)-level data and monitoring systems hubs set up and government-approved to showcase LDN implementation), 30 (1 national and 1 regional (Dosso)-level institutional and legal frameworks that strengthens land tenure for LDN implementation approved by the government) (32 (Gender-responsive tools developed to support national technical and policy implementation of LDN), 64 (training sessions for supporting national, technical, and

policy implementation of LDN), 65 (training of local stakeholders), 67 (communication toolkits and radio programs): all these activities are expressed as planned activities under the upcoming umbrella project. Please, confirm that these activities cannot be assigned both to this GEF project and GEF enabling activities. Please clarify how you will ensure a non- duplication of activities.

- The output 3.1.2 has indeed been removed. However, about the output 3.1.3, while you responded it was also removed, there is on the first page of the budget an activity named "Phytosanitary control serving as trading points, solar energy systems for irrigation, processing and packaging to improve the marketability of selected VCCs" budgeted for an amount of \$340,595. Without further explanation, we are not seeing the added value of GEF resources for this kind of activity. Please, remove or justify.

- The excel budget introduces the GEF grant of \$5,296,808 with \$2,871,712 under IFAD's responsibility and \$2,425,096 under UNEP's responsibility. Please, check these numbers in the IFAD and UNEP prodoc (UNEP: \$2,420,096; IFAD: \$2,876,712) and make the numbers coherent.

- Last, but not least, please confirm that the respective prodocs from IFAD and UNEP followed internal procedures for GEF programming. It is the first time we can see both prodocs together. It is surprising to find an IFAD prodoc dated on January 2021 and a UNEP Prodoc from November 2021.

- We are not fully seeing how the GEF grant is going to be managed vis-a-vis the PRECIS project. Please, clarify.

- Several adjustments and changes requested in this review process are not reflected in the IFAD prodoc (small scale irrigation, storage, renewable energy. Please, clarify.

October 22, 2021

Not addressed.

Three pages are available in the excel budget: 1) GEF budget in UNEP format, 2) indicative project budget, and 3) cofinancing budget. There are differences in these budgets that do not help. For instance, the M&E budget is available on the page 2 and not the page 1.

- This is the second submission for CEO endorsement and still not project document is included in the project package. The next submission will not be reviewed without a project document.

- We take note of the additional text, but we do not see in which measure this text provides a justification of GEF resources for irrigation and infrastructures to deliver global environment benefits: either you can provide a convincing justification or you will need to adjust the contents of the outputs 3.1.2 (small irrigation on 350 ha) and 3.1.3 (infrastructures established ? storage facilities, phytosanitary control, solar energy

systems?). Without these explanations, some aspects may be better covered by the cofinancing.

- About the vehicles, again, we can understand the need to purchase vehicles fully assigned to this project, but please provide accurate information on the number and state of existing vehicles in the cofinancing projects and partner institutions.

There are several unsolved issues in the budget:

- It seems to us that the project field officers should be financed under pmc. If you cover these budgets under technical components, please, provide an explanation.

- Same question for the drivers (independently on the question related to the purchase of vehicles). The budgets for these two drivers may be assigned elsewhere than in the pmc, if they are affected to specific activities (for instance in the Giraffe reserve and the Hippo sanctuary).

- Project M&E Officers should not be budgeted under the technical components, but under the M&E.

- Please explain the lines of budgets related to meetings, steering committee and KM assigned to the component 1. Without more information and clarification, the steering committee does not sound as a technical activity and should be covered by the M&E or eventually the pmc. Knowledge Management should be covered by the component 3 (as there are KM activities in this component) and not the component 1.

- Please, justify the line of \$6199 of travel under the component 1.

- Mid-Term Evaluation and Terminal Evaluation should be covered by the M&E budget and not the components 1 and 2. Please, revise

September 24, 2021

Thanks for the clarifications and modifications.

- We take note of the decrease of budget for irrigation and water management. However, you did not respond about the additionality of GEF resources for this kind of activities and the contribution to GEB. Please, clarify, justify, or remove this item.

- The assignment of Project Coordinator and financial officer's budgets in the pmc is correct.

- We regret there is not a full project document with annexes to check the terms of reference of the different positions.

- We do not understand the assignment of field officers in component 1 and 2;

- Same question about the M&E Officer under the components 1 and 2 (respectively outcomes 1.1 and 2.1).
- The budget for vehicles (39,637 and 37,018) and two drivers (20,000 each) has not been discussed. We are not formally opposed to the purchase of vehicles, but you need to 1) explain the state of the vehicle fleet involved in the project, starting by existing vehicles from executing partners and 2) describe the vehicles that will be purchased through cofinancing (preferred option), as well as the budget assignment of drivers. Based on these elements, we may discuss the need of GEF resources for this.
- MTE and TE are wrongly assigned to technical components 3 and 4: these items are M&E.

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

Agency Response

- The components 1 and 2 budgets in GEF format is already included. It is again included as Annex to Annex 1 to UNEP Project Document.
- For the components 1 and 2, most, if not all the activities, are subcontracted with national entities or departments with the Ministry in charge of Environment, with mandate on the thematic areas concerns. For example, the data platform and Monitoring of environment indicators are assigned to the National Centre of Ecological Monitoring (CSE); the issues related to land tenure are assigned to the Permanent Secretariat of Rural Code and the Integrated Landscape Management Plan (ILMP) is assigned to the Directorate of Water and Forest withing the Ministry in Charge of Environment as the Department has a dedicated Service in charge of Land Use and Land Management Plans. Ref: Component 1 and 2 Budget description.

- Regarding the comment on \$2,523, in the revised budget for components 3 and 4 led by IFAD, irrigation and water management systems and marketing infrastructure, the budget allocation has been adjusted downwards to a total of about \$833,000, and the remaining will be financed through cofinancing.
- Regarding the comment on \$1,166 million, please note that in the revised attached budget for IFAD-led components 3 and 4, the amount allocated to salaries is \$226,000. Adding envisaged consultancies, the total amounts to \$687,801.

September 30, 2021

We note with thanks the five comments on: i) justifying budget for irrigation and water management; ii) ToRs of different positions; iii) assignment of Field Officers; iv) M&E Officers; and v) budget for vehicles. In response:

i) Additional information below has been provided in the component 3 description to clarify the role of small-scale irrigation in contributing to biodiversity conservation and SLM.

[Small-scale irrigation systems in this project will be important in improving sustainable use of land. First of all, loss of habitat and reduced soil fertility and land productivity have been identified in this project as threats to biodiversity and land productivity. Given the climatic conditions and production system prevalent in the project target area, small irrigation systems will lead to improved productivity per unit area. It has been shown that irrigation leads to improved crop yield, crop income and household food security,[1]¹ as long as it does not lead to unsustainable water withdrawal.[2]² In the context of improving biodiversity conservation and SLM, improved yield per unit area will reduce expansion of agricultural lands that leads to land degradation and loss of habitat and biodiversity.]

ii): ToRs have been included as Annex L to the document

iii) & iv): The project implementation strategy has embraced a decentralised approach improve service delivery and technical support and monitoring of project activities on the ground. This approach has also been prompted by the security volatility in the country. Having staff in the field closer to the communities will reduce travelling long distances for activity supervision in communities, which would otherwise be risky due to sporadic security concerns and threats. Proven evidence suggests that having staff closer to communities more efficient in terms of technical support/backstopping and reduces security risks given the security concerns in Niger, but also in the region as a whole.

v) The existing vehicles have been involved in other projects, and were procured for those the activities of those projects. Some of these projects are far away from national offices and cover a wide area. This means that they move over very long distances in bad roads. The old IFAD funded projects vehicles are not in conditions that they can support the implementation of this project. To effectively monitor the implementation of the activities under the GEF project, and given the large area of coverage and states of the roads, additional two vehicles are needed.

[1] Ogunniyi, A., et al. (2018). Impact of irrigation technology use on crop yield, crop income and household food security in Nigeria: A treatment effect approach. *AIMS Agriculture and Food*, 3(2): 154-171

[2] Masashi, O., et al (2018). Varying Benefits of Irrigation Expansion for Crop Production Under a Changing Climate and Competitive Water Use Among Crops. *Earth's Future*

November 2021

Three pages are available in the excel budget: 1) GEF budget in UNEP format, 2) indicative project budget, and 3) cofinancing budget. There are different of presentations in these budgets that do not help. For instance, the M&E budget is available on the page 2 and not the page 1.

Thank you for your comment, please do find now one consolidated GEF budget excel file attached (in GEF template). This document i.a. includes the M&E and PMC total. In addition, you will find the IFAD Costab of the Precis project as well as co-financing budgets in the UNEP and IFAD project design reports, and in the CEO endorsement request document.

- This is the second submission for CEO endorsement and still not project document is included in the project package. The next submission will not be reviewed without a project document.

Kindly note that the IFAD prodoc had been uploaded to the GEF portal on 6th October 2021. It is re-attached to the current submission, alongside the UNEP prodoc. In addition, please find the Precis project document attached.

- We take note of the additional text, but we do not see in which measure this text provides a justification of GEF resources for irrigation and infrastructures to deliver global environment benefits: either you can provide a convincing justification or you will need to adjust the contents of the outputs 3.1.2 (small irrigation on 350 ha) and 3.1.3 (infrastructures established ? storage facilities, phytosanitary control, solar energy systems?). Without these explanations, some aspects may be better covered by the cofinancing

Anything related to irrigation has been removed, and output 3.1.2 has been changed to ?Soil and water management practices (mulching, water harvesting, trenches, conservation tillage, and inorganic fertiliser application) promoted on 350 ha for the benefit of small-scale producers in Dallol Bosso and surrounding areas.? The narrative in the document has also been changed to reflect this change. Output 3.1.3 on infrastructure has been deleted. The irrigation infrastructure is deleted from the GEF grant project and would be covered by the IFAD loan project.

About the vehicles, again, we can understand the need to purchase vehicles fully assigned to this project, but please provide accurate information on the number and state of existing vehicles in the cofinancing projects and partner institutions.

We thank the reviewer for the understanding of the rationale to purchase vehicles for this project. The main rationale of procuring additional 2 cars under this GEF is to ensure

effective coordination and supervision of activities under the GEF project particularly on monitoring hippos and giraffes within vast areas. 2 cars are needed as these animals are migratory and, in addition, the two locations subject to monitoring are located at different areas of Niger, which consists of a territory. The IFAD funded project (PRECIS) has 45 vehicles and those vehicles have been approved to support specific interventions under the IFAD investments.

PRECIS (IFAD funded proposal design) was approved in 2019 and has started implementation. It is therefore at this stage difficult to include new vehicles under the IFAD investments for this GEF projects. To note, all PRECIS cars are connected to very specific activities that do not overlap spatially with the GEF-funded activities. Hence, using these cars, which are overall in a good condition, for the GEF funded project, is not possible.

Thus, the 2 cars budgeted under the GEF project (for component 1 and 2) are anticipated to serve for giraffe and hippo monitoring as the 2 species are present in two different regions and due to the migratory nature of these species' population, 1 vehicle each for monitoring these species population can be considered as the minimum investment to support the ministry in charge of environment.

These means of transportation will help address security issue, COVID social distancing measures in transportation, reduce long distance between regions and accessibility, and cover properly the work which is on monitoring of hippo and giraffe.

It seems to us that the project field officers should be financed under pmc. If you cover these budgets under technical components, please, provide an explanation.

The project field officers in component 1 and 2 are technical experts. Their role is not managerial or coordination but technical guidance and support to local communities and partners like CSOs. They will be responsible for the ecological monitoring, research on the key biodiversity species and tiger bush ecosystems, etc. Based on the above they are technical experts and not managers. Therefore, we remain convinced that these position should remain to be charged on technical components.

- Same question for the drivers (independently on the question related to the purchase of vehicles). The budgets for these two drivers may be assigned elsewhere than in the pmc, if they are affected to specific activities (for instance in the Giraffe reserve and the Hippo sanctuary).

For the drivers under components 1 and 2, the related costs are now charged under outcomes 1.1 and outcomes 2.1 (see UNEP/ GEF excel budget).

- Project M&E Officers should not be budgeted under the technical components, but under the M&E.

There was no specific M&E component approved in this project at PIF stage. A new M&E component is now created and the monitoring and evaluation activities are charged on that component.

- Please explain the lines of budgets related to meetings, steering committee and KM assigned to the component 1. Without more information and clarification, the steering committee does not sound as a technical activity and should be covered by the M&E or eventually the pmc. Knowledge Management should be covered by the component 3 (as there are KM activities in this component) and not the component 1.

The steering committee meetings are now charged on the newly created M&E component. The Knowledge Management is now considered in component 3 as per the guidance.

- Please, justify the line of \$6199 of travel under the component 1.

The line and related amount are now removed. Since there is a budget line related to meetings/conferences, we now realised that that budget line is no more necessary. The \$6199 has been added to meetings/conferences budget lines.

- Mid-Term Evaluation and Terminal Evaluation should be covered by the M&E budget and not the components 1 and 2. Please, revise

Mid-Term Evaluation and Terminal Evaluation are now charged on the newly created M&E component.

IFAD Responses to comments of 15 December 2021

11 May 2022:

We take note of the GEF Secretariat of the comments and recommendation. We provide responses below each comment as below:

1- As suggested, the budget for the additional vehicle has been removed from the IFAD budget

2- Terms of References for the Field Officers have been included, highlighting their technical roles in the implementation of project activities. Refer to Annex L Terms of Reference for project key personnel of CEO Endorsement Document ToRs # 9.

3- We are of the view that while the potential risk of duplication cannot be completely downplayed, the design of the project and proposed activities under the four components began in 2019, and took due consideration of environmental challenges and the socioeconomic context of the Dallol Bosso. In this regard, in our judgement, the UNCCD activities will in fact amplify and scale up activities funded under PROSAP/COKEBIOS, rather than duplication of expenses. Additionally, some of the activities under PROSAP/COKEBIOS are specific to the Dallol Bosso, while the enabling activities are more national-level. The decentralised nature of UNCCD related activities in relation to LDN, land tenure and Land Use planning, which will be implemented will provide an opportunity for innovation by taking to the local level the implementation of these activities. The CEO endorsement document has been amended to provide the local level focus of the LDN related activities. Reference: p34 of CEO ER. Under the UNCCD activities, a regional support program will be established to ensure the coordination between all GEF funded projects, other partner's funder projects including the GCF.

4- As highlighted in the response above, activities proposed under PROSAP/COKEBIOS will be a decentralisation of LDN related activities and amplified and scaled up by those planned for in the upcoming umbrella project. The decentralised nature of related budget lines is now clearly stated ? in this regard, non-duplication of activities and expenses will be ensured in one main way: tracking the extent of support towards the cited activities in PROSAP/COKEBIOS and how the umbrella project can

advance the activities to another level, that is, through seeking synergies and complementarity. For example, since PROSAP/COKEBIOS will set up 1 national and 1 Dosso regional level monitoring systems, the umbrella project will focus on other regions to improve the quality of data and monitoring across the country. In this way, complementarity will be ensured without duplicating expenses. It should also be noted that in-country consultations will continue at national and subnational levels. The M&E process will continue informing the project, and lessons will form basis for adaptive management. During with these processes, risks of duplications will be identified, and necessary remedial measures that will support synergies and complementarity will be sought. In our view, the risk of duplication is negligible. This is highlighted in the CEO ER p.34.

5- Removed from the budget and resources re-allocated accordingly

6- Numbers have been reconciled accordingly. The CEO endorsement has \$2,871,712 under IFAD's responsibility and \$2,425,096 under UNEP's responsibility, and so do IFAD and UNEP ProDocs, and the budget.

7- The date January was one of the elements that were not updated, but now has been updated in the current version.

8- Consistent with standard project management practice, PROSAP/COKEBIOS is a separate project and will have its independent operational and fiduciary management structures and resources in terms of the project management unit and steering committee. Therefore, there will be no co-mingling of financial resources of PROSAP/COKEBIOS with those of PRECIS. It should be noted that even in terms of reporting obligations to the funders, PRECIS will not influence or affect the reporting schedules of PROSAP/COKEBIOS. PRECIS project having preceded PROSAP/COKEBIOS has lessons to offer and inspire the implementation of the latter, and both projects will be part of IFAD's programmatic programming in Niger, and will be institutionalised within the same IFAD's structures in Niamey. It is in this sense that they are related.

9- The attached IFAD ProDoc version reflects changes and adjustments requested in the review process.

8 June 2022

Comment acknowledged with thanks

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 15th, 2021

Addressed.

October 22, 2021

In the expected project document, please, clarify the project arrangements to reinforce synergy and exchanges with existing initiatives, projects, and partners, as suggested by France and Germany.

May 25, 2021

Comments from France and Germany have been addressed (Annex B).

Agency Response

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

November 2021

The project takes note of other initiatives and interventions by other development partners, under Annex B and section stakeholder engagement.

Also, the project arrangements to reinforce synergy and exchanges with existing initiatives, projects, and partners, as suggested by France and Germany, are presented in UNEP Project Document section 2.13.1 Baseline projects.

The project will have a Project Management Unit that will be headed by a National Project Manager. The Project Manager will be the official representative of the project,

and his/her tasks will include representing the project at "opportunity tables" to strengthen synergies but also draw lessons from experiences of other initiatives. This will include holding meetings or exchange visits with other initiatives to exchange experiences, draw lessons and synergise. The periodicity will be discussed between teams and at the project level. At the level of Implementing Agency, IFAD and UNEP will continue supporting the country where needed and as appropriate, to collaborate or synergise with initiatives of other additional partners. During missions of supervision, IFAD and UNEP will offer technical support and offer a dialogue platform to strengthen potential synergies with other development partners.?

Please, also note that Annex B of responses has been updated

STAP comments

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

Agency Response

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request OK

Agency Response

Agency Response

June 28, 2021

Clearance noted with thanks.

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 9, 2022

All points are addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

June 6, 2022

Please, find below the comments from the quality control. The review by PPO was an opportunity to see that some previous comments were not fully addressed (see the comment on the field officer).

1. On **co-financing** (comment provided by Seo-Jeong):

a. Department of Wildlife and Hunting \$560,000 cash contribution: change ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Investment mobilized?

b. Department of Sustainable Land Management \$2.1M cash contribution: change ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Investment mobilized?

Recipient Country Government	Department of Wildlife and Hunting	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	560,000.00
Recipient Country Government	Department of Wildlife and Hunting	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	432,000.00
Donor Agency	Coordination for the Support Project for Sensitive Agriculture (PASEC) Project	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	157,384.00
Recipient Country Government	Department of Sustainable Land Management	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	2,100,000.00

2. On **Project information**: correct the expected completion date to **08/31/2026** in order to comply with the expected duration.

Submission Date 5/11/2022	Expected Implementation Start 9/1/2022	Expected Completion Date 8/31/2022
Duration ⓘ 48 in Months		Agency Fee(\$) 503,196.00

3. On **Table B**: the total GEF financing per component, provided in Table B, do not seem to match the totals provided in the budget table in Annex E. Please see screenshot below and kindly request the agency to double check and verify that all budgets match.

Component 1 (UNEP): Enhanced National Capacity for LDN implementation	Technical Assistance	1.1. Government of Niger adopt and implement new integrated	1.1.1. Training, Tools and Technical assistance provided with due gender	GET	892,216.00	4,235,803.00
Component 2 (UNEP): Improved biodiversity conservation and land restoration actions in	Investment	2.1: Funding and technical assistance provided to demonstrate land	2.1.1 One Protected Area (for Giraffes) is created and two Integrated	GET	1,412,637.00	26,000,000.00
Component 3 (IFAD): Promote improved production practices of key selected agricultural value chains (VCs)	Technical Assistance	3.1 3,000 smallholder producers of selected VCs become market	3.1.1. 3,000 smallholders participate in awareness-raising on market literacy[1]	GET	2,339,726.00	29,724,688.00

Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Responsible Agency	Component (US\$eq.)								Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) ⁵⁰
			Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4		Sub-Total	M & E	P M C		
						Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1					
Grand Total			572 018.00	1 507 836.00	2 149 474.00	166 650.00	198 602.00	4 594 580.00	450 000.00	252 228.00	5 296 808.00	

4. On **M&E**: \$450,000 have been allocated for monitoring and evaluation activities (excluding project staff time for M&E). This represents 8.5% of the overall project budget. As per guidelines, observed M&E budgets for projects close to 5 million should represent between 3% and 5%. Please request the agency to revise the M&E budget.

Table of the budgeted M&E plan

Type of Monitoring & Evaluation activity	Responsible	Budget US\$ (Excluding project staff time)	Frequency
UNEP project component M&E: Associate activities, including annual progress technical reports, publications and dissemination	PMU and UNEP / IFAD	130,000	Monthly and according to the periodicity of production
IFAD project component M&E: Officer activities, including annual progress technical reports, publications and dissemination	PMU / IFAD / UNEP / GEF	100,000	Monthly and according to the periodicity of production
Steering Committee Meetings	ME/SDG + relevant Ministries (IFAD/UNEP/GEF, PMU, CNEO)	45,000	Every year, after completion of the annual progress report
Mid-term evaluation of the project	PMU / IFAD/UNEP/GEF External evaluator	70,000	Midway of the project implementation
Conferences and other meetings	PMU / IFAD/UNEP / GEF	45,000	As needed and according to opportunities
Terminal Evaluation	PMU / UNEP/IFAD External evaluator, ME/SDG	60,000	Once at the end of the Project
Total indicative Costs		550,000	

5. On the **budget**:

a. Although an excel spreadsheet has been provided as an attachment we would kindly request the agency to provide a table, in Annex E, a budget that is easy to read. Currently some item lines cannot be read.

Works												
	1 Giraffe Protection Area created and operational							130 803			130 803	PIU
Goods												
	Field gadgets (GPS, cameras, etc) 5 000							10 000			10 000	PIU
	Computers, printers, data show, maintenance etc							0		5 000	5 000	PIU

b. 4 project field officers have been charged across components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please, note that we alerted you on this point during the review process, but you did not address it.

Salary and benefits / Staff costs	UNEP	IFAD	GEF	PMU	Other	Total	UNEP	IFAD	GEF	PMU	Other	Total
Natural Resources Management Specialist	UNEP					0	60,342					60,342 (PIU)
Project M&E Specialist (month 1-48)	UNEP					0	100,000					100,000 (PIU)
4 Project Field Officers	UNEP/IFAD	20,000	20,000	25,000	25,000	90,000						90,000 (PIU)
Project Field Visiting Officer	UNEP	30,000	20,000			50,000						50,000 (PIU)
Project Finance Associate (month 1-48)	UNEP					0	40,000					40,000 (PIU)
Natural Resource Manager	IFAD					0	64,500					64,500 (PIU)
Project M&E Officer	IFAD					0	90,000					90,000 (PIU)
Project Financial Officer	IFAD					0	40,000					40,000 (PIU)

May 26, 2022

All technical points have been addressed. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement upon clearance from the quality control (the deadline for actual CEO endorsement is June 30, 2022).

December 15, 2021

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

October 22, 2021

Most of comments have not been addressed and a project document with annexes is still not available.

September 24, 2021

Not all comments have been addressed. Please, see the review above. Please include a full project document with annexes in the next submission.

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	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/24/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/26/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations