



Strengthening the resilience of small farmers through Climate Smart Agriculture (PRP-AIC) techniques in Tahoua Region

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11004

Countries

Niger

Project Name

Strengthening the resilience of small farmers through Climate Smart Agriculture (PRP-AIC) techniques in Tahoua Region

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

9/23/2023

Review completed by PM

10/19/2023

Program Manager

Jason Spensley

Focal Area

Climate Change

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

18Oct2023:

Yes

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

18Oct2023:

Yes

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 N/A

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

26 February 2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

25 Oct 2023:

A) Please provide a summary of each investment mobilized co-financing reported in the Investment Mobilized description section.

B) Please replace 'recurrent expenditures' to 'investment mobilized' for UNDP.

C) Please provide English translation of co-financing letters of support for both the Ministry of environment and agriculture.

D) On the proportionality of the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$44,511,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$2,225,550 instead of \$1,790,000 (which is 4%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

A) A summary has now been provided in GEF portal and under the Table of section C in the CEO ER (which has also been uploaded).

B) Yes, this is now addressed, with a change to ?investment mobilized? for UNDP.

C) Translated English versions of the co-financing letter have now been provided and uploaded to the section.

D) The co-financing proportion allocated to PMC has now been increased to 5%, corresponding to \$2,204,810. Please see section B of project description table.

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

18Oct2023:

Yes

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

26February2024:

Given no budget was utilized for "miscellaneous" and "professional services", please remove them.

25Oct2023:

Please clarify what ?Professional Services? and ?Miscellaneous? entail.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

- Budget line "Miscellaneous" (74500) is intended to cover any expenditure not formally provided for, but which may be necessary in order to carry out PPG activities,

- Budget line "Professional Services" (74100) is intended to cover costs of any audit or actors capacity assessment.

It is important to note that those budget lines were not utilized.

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

26February2024:

Cleared

18Oct2023:

The climate change adaptation indicators are not uploaded in the CER. Please do so, at the same or a higher level than the PIF, noting the indicator levels at the time of PIF were quite modest.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

The climate change adaptation indicators in the PIF are now uploaded in the CER as requested. The current version of adaptation indicator related to ?Area of land managed for climate resilience? has now more than doubled from 3000 ha in the PIF to 8500 ha. See Annex H of the CER document.

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

26February2024:

Cleared

18Oct2023:

We note significant information, particularly as related to risks of climate hazards and anticipated impacts that was included in PIF has been removed, and other information has been included in the CER. Please explain why information in the PIF was not included in the CER. Is it no longer relevant? Or place it back in the CER.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

Thanks for the observation. The section has now been revised. Climate risks identified in the PIF, which were found relevant at this stage, are now reflected accordingly.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18Oct2023:

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

18Oct2023:

Yes

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

18Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18Oct2023:

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

26February2024:

Cleared

18Oct2023:

No. The section on global adaptation benefits in the PIF was actually more elaborated than in the CER. Please address this. Please explain why any material removed from the PIF is no longer relevant to the project or put it back in.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

More information on the adaptation benefits has now been added in the CER ? see page 29 (also page 35 of the ProDoc)

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

26February2024:

Cleared

18Oct2023:

No. This section in the PIF was actually more elaborated than it is in the CER. Please address this. Please explain why any material removed from the PIF is no longer relevant to the project or put it back in.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

The section has now been revised. Relevant information from the PIF has also been added to the current CER version and the ProDOC.

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

26February2024:

Cleared

18Oct2023:

Maps are provided, but georeferenced information is not. Please address this.

in Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field ?GEO LOCATION INFORMATION? ? it is left blank.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

The maps are now georeferenced. See in the section in GEF portal and Annex E of CER. Geo location of the project map is now provided. See Annex E of CER and Annex 3 of the ProDoc. The central coordinates are 14°53'36.47"N and 5°15'1.14"E

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

N/A

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

18Oct2023:

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

26February2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

18Oct2023:

Please clarify where in the CER the Gender analysis and action plan is included. Please ensure this is uploaded within the CER or as an annex to it.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

Gender action plan is now added to the annex section. See Annex J in the CER. For the Prodoc, it is attached separately as Annex 10 which had been uploaded to the Gender section of the GEF portal in the previous submission as well.

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

18Oct2023:

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

26February2024:

Cleared.

18Oct2023:

No. This section s in the PIF was actually more elaborated than it is in the CER. Please address this. Please explain why any material removed from the PIF is no longer relevant to the project or put it back in.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

We have updated Table 5 in the CER (and Annex 7 in the ProDoc). In addition, risks identified at PPG were further reviewed, with more detailed environmental and social risks included in the full SESP (as Annex 5 of the Prodoc, and included as Annex I in the CER).

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

18Oct2023:

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

26February2024:

Cleared.

18Oct2023:

Again, why is some information that was in this section removed for the CER? What has changed that merited this removal?

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

More information has now been added to the CER online (portal) and offline version. Please refer to page 41-43.

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

18Oct2023:

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

26February2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

18Oct2023:

No. Please provide an informed explanation in the CER.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

A full SESP was developed, and it provides documentation of measures required for the environmental and social risks. Please refer to Table 2 in Annex I included in the CEO ER. The full SESP is also attached separately as Annex 5.

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

26February2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

18Oct2023:

The M&E Budgeted Table in section 9. of Portal is missed ? please ask the Agency to include it.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

Yes. This is now added to the portal.

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

26February2024:

Cleared.

18Oct2023:

Please see the comment above on adaptation benefits.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

The section on adaptation benefits in the CER (online in portal and offline page 30) has been updated with more information.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

26February2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

18Oct2023:

With regards to the budget -

- A) Why is cost for organizing workshops indicated as an equipment expenditure category?
- B) Please provide a detailed breakdown of the \$1,513,386 cost for local labour for reclaiming and securing agricultural land.
- C) Please provide a detailed breakdown of the \$1,065,842 for local labour for restoration of degraded farmland and rangeland
- D) Thee above mentioned costs for local labour seem exceedingly high. Please consider alternative was to secure this local labour or local buy in to the project, or provide a justification of these significant expenses.
- E) Please explain the reasoning for \$40,000 to be provided for vaccination parks and how this is addressing the risk of a current or anticipated impact of a climate hazard.
- F) The rate of \$750/day for international consultants seems quite high. Please reconsider or explain.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

A) The cost for organizing workshops has now been crosschecked, with corresponding budget notes. Specifically, the following budget notes were validated 4, 15, 22, 28, 34, 39, 43, 52, 59. The budget note 23 had a mistake and was corrected to accurately reflect the Cost for organizing workshop.

B-C) The budget is now updated in the ProDoc with a breakdown as requested. The breakdown for the restauration costs is provided in the budget notes 7 and 26.

D) Detailed justification of the cost for local labor is now further clarified (see budget note 7).

Specifically, fees for local labour for restoration of degraded farmland and rangeland:

- Installation of water catchment erosion control structures to restore 1500 ha of degraded farmland (\$525,000) ? installation of erosion control structures is labour intensive. Human labour cost for the installation of the structures was estimated at \$350/ha^[1]. Hence the total cost estimate is $350 * 1500 = \$525,000$
- Reforestation of 250 ha of degraded forest land (\$33,220) ? estimated at \$133/ha based on consultations with local stakeholders
- Creation and restoration of 1000ha of grazing areas ((\$174,660) - estimated at \$174/ha based on consultations with local stakeholders
- Restoration of degraded pastoral land through the installation of water catchment erosion control structures on 500 hectares (\$175,000) ? estimated at \$350/ha.
- Demarcation and seeding of 1500 km of animal corridor (1000 ha) (\$122,650) ? estimated at \$122/ha based on consultations.

E) The breakdown for the cost representing contractual services for the creation of vaccination parks has been provided in budget note 20. A description of the relevance of vaccination parks

to addressing climate change impact has been provided in the CER and ProDoc. Please refer to Activity 2.1.13 in the ProDoc (page 23) and CER (page 22)

F: This is based on prevailing market rates for this kind of work, as per the assessment done during PPG. In recent times, international consultants charge a daily fee of USD 750 upwards. While some consultants could accept a daily fee inferior to USD 750, it could be challenging for the project team to get an experienced international consultant willing to accept a daily fee lower than USD 750 during the procurement process. This could culminate in either getting inferior services from inexperienced/incompetent consultants thereby affecting results, or a delay in the procurement process, translating in delayed implementation of the project.

[1] The estimate is based on consultations with local actors in the Tahoua coupled with with feedback and consultations with Niger's National Coordinator for the Great Green Wall Initiative.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18Oct2023:

Yes

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18Oct2023:

Please address the comments.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

26February2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

18 Oct 2023:

Comments from Germany were not addressed ? please address these comments.

Agency Response

UNDP responses, 23 Feb 2024:

Kindly note that comments from Germany have been addressed and were reported to Annex B of CEO Endorsement Request. Women specific / focused activities include:

Activity 1.3.2. Training women entrepreneurs to build improved clay stoves.

Activity 2.1.4. Support small ruminant fattening by women.

Activity 2.1.5. Support the establishment of mutual savings and equipment fund for women.

Activity 2.1.11. Training of women on food processing and agricultural marketing techniques.

Activity 2.2.9. Training women on fish farming.

Activity 3.1.1 Support communal and village nursery business run by women.

Activity 3.1.2 Provide small equipment for income generating activities managed by women.

Activity 3.1.3 Support robust, and traceable certification and labelling of products produced and processed by women.

Activity 3.1.4 Create or revitalize consultation frameworks at regional, departmental, and communal levels with focus on women.

Activity 3.1.5 Promote women-led cattle fattening and restock livestock.

Activity 3.2.4 Support women MSEs and entrepreneurs to access green line of credits and green subsidies.

In addition to these activities, there is a Gender action plan aimed at systematically integrating women across all activities and presenting disaggregated results on men and women.

The comment on invasive species is addressed under activity 1.1.6 and Risk 5 (alien invasive species) with a proposed mitigation measure as stated below and in the CER and Prodoc.

Risk 5: Nature-based solutions (Outcome 1.1) may lead to negative environmental effects such as the introduction of alien invasive species, a modification of existing ecosystems, the establishment of a monoculture that lacks biodiversity and true ecosystem function).

Mitigation measure proposed in the document:

- Partnerships with research centers should be envisioned.
- The risk will be assessed further as part of ESIA and Biodiversity Action Plan (inception) will be needed as part of the ESMP, per requirements outlined in ESMF.
- Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) practices will be emphasized.
- Project activities will complement afforestation measures with measures to diversify sources of food, fodder, forage, fuel, and timber through planting native species of trees and shrubs.

A dedicated activity on certification has been integrated into the project design. See:

Activity 3.1.3 Working with Niger's Agency for Standardization, Metrology and Certification (ANMC). The project will work with the Ministry of Commerce to support robust, and traceable certification and labelling of products produced and processed by women and youth from the project as a risk management and opportunity optimization option. This will permit processed products to compete in the international market and benefits the African Continental Free Trade Area (AfCFTA).

ANCM, established in 2019, is fully functional and has a system, capacity, and experience in working with different sectors to train and support them and carry out certification of different produce, products, and goods. ANCM has an 8-step certification procedure that can be met within the project lifetime if collaboration between the project and ANCM is initiated early on to avoid unnecessary delays especially regarding laboratory testing and evaluation by the ANCM certification committee.

Examples of recent certification activities by ANCM include: (i) TASTY TOM and FESTIN tomato concentrates by NUTRIFOODS GHANA LIMITED TOMATO FACTORY Niamey, with licence number 2020-07-001/Version 01. ANCM issued Certification for the granting of Niger conformity mark.

Addition, as part of the implementation of actions planned by the <<West Africa Competitiveness Program>> WACOMP project, the ANMC organized on October 07, 2021, a national training workshop for butcher trainers on the internal control of quality raw hides in relations to hide traceability techniques and methodologies to help improve the quality of raw hide production, enhance their exports and boost the incomes of players in the <Niger hides and skins> subsector.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

18Oct2023:

Cleared

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

26February2024:

Cleared.

18Oct2023:

See comment above on coordinates.

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

N/A

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 RequestN/A

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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

26February2024:

Cleared, pending any further comment from GEFSec colleagues on policy alignment.

18Oct2023:

Note yet. Comments need to be addressed.

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| First Review | 10/19/2023 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 2/26/2024 | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations