



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4702		
Country/Region:	Niger		
Project Title:	Integrating climate resilience into agricultural and pastoral production for food security in vulnerable rural areas through the Farmers Field School approach		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,800,000
Co-financing:	\$11,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,600,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Rikke Olivera

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Niger is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the GEF Operational Focal Point and dated October 3, 2011, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. FAO has a clear comparative advantage in capacity building, policy support and technical analysis for agricultural development. FAO also has a strong track record in applying and developing the farmer field school (FFS) approach.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with FAO's strategic objectives. FAO has been assigned a key role in Niger's UNDAF 2009-2013, with an emphasis on improving the food security of vulnerable populations. FAO has supported several initiatives to enhance food security and foster agricultural and rural development in Niger and the proposed LDCF project would build, among other, on two FAO-lead initiatives that apply FFS.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NOT CLEAR. The cover letter to the PIF suggests that the total LDCF grant request is incorrectly calculated. The correct LDCF grant request needs to be submitted in order to consider the proposal in this respect. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please revise Tables A, B and D based on the correct, total grant request. 05/25/2012 -- YES. The proposed grant (\$4.18 million, including Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area not aside?		

Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project would strengthen the adaptive capacity of smallholder farmers, promote the transfer of relevant technologies for climate-resilient crop and livestock production, and contribute towards mainstreaming adaptation in broader development frameworks.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is aligned with the Environmental Action Plan for Sustainable Development (PNEDD), the National Environmental Action Plan (PANE), the Poverty Reduction Strategy (SRP), the Rural Development Strategy (SDR), and relevant national and regional action plans.</p> <p>Still, while the PIF discusses the alignment of the proposed project with Niger's NAPA, it appears that the adaptation activities it cites (page 7) are not fully aligned with the NAPA priorities (see Appendix X of the Niger NAPA).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the PIF cites the NAPA priorities to which the proposed project would contribute. This helps demonstrate that projects financed under the LDCF, as well as from other sources, address NAPA priorities in a complementary manner.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- YES. The proposed project would address at least 8 out of</p>	

		introduction of fodder species in pastoral environments; (ii) diversification and intensification of irrigated crops; (iii) promotion of peri-urban legume growing and animal production; (iv) dissemination of agro-meteorological information; (v) contribution to the control of climate-sensitive diseases (affecting cropping systems); (vi) development of soil/water conservation and soil protection/restoration activities; (vii) promotion of climate-resilient species for animal and vegetal production; and (viii) strengthening the technical, material and organizational capacities of rural producers.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	YES. The proposed project is clearly geared towards enhancing the capacity of smallholder farmers to adopt and to scale up climate-resilient crop and livestock production technologies. The project would pilot tangible adaptation measures in the context of partner projects and programs. In parallel, FFS training would be provided to 20,000 farmers and agro-pastoralists to facilitate the adoption of the technologies and practices piloted.	
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	NOT CLEAR. The PIF cites a range of baseline initiatives on which the proposed LDCF project would build. FAO, WFP and other partners have implemented several measures to support the Government of Niger in coping with repeated food crises and there is growing interest in shifting focus from reactive relief efforts to proactive disaster risk management and climate change adaptation. FAO has	

Project Design	<p>development of FFS through a multi-focal GEF program, Reducing Dependence on POPs and other Agro-Chemicals in the Senegal and Niger River Basins, and IARBIC, which is focused on agricultural intensification. Finally, the Government of Niger is implementing a range of projects under the framework of the Rural Development Strategy (SDR), amounting to some \$100 million.</p> <p>In spite of this considerable baseline, Table C of the PIF only cites \$7.6 million in indicative co-financing, primarily from the Government and bilateral agencies. It is not entirely clear how the co-financing figures relate to the description of the baseline projects.</p> <p>The proposed LDCF project would focus on the vulnerable Sahelian band and the Soudano-Sahelian regions south of Niamey, which are crucial for national food security. It remains unclear to what extent the baseline projects cited in the PIF overlaps with the regional focus of the proposed LDCF project.</p> <p>The PIF notes that some of the baseline projects implemented under the SDR are currently under implementation. Indeed, many are scheduled to be completed in 2012-13. This presents a challenge as it may leave too little time for the achievements of the proposed LDCF project to be adequately adopted by and replicated through the baseline investments. (see Section 13 below)</p>	
----------------	--	--

	<p>Finally, while the PIF argues that the baseline projects do not systematically address climate change adaptation, it is not entirely clear to what extent they are vulnerable to the effects of climate change and unable to cope with such vulnerabilities.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify how the indicative co-financing provided in Table C relates to the baseline projects cited in Section B.1 of the PIF; (ii) describe to what extent the baseline projects invest in the target areas of the proposed LDCF project; and (iii) clarify to what extent the proposed baseline investments are vulnerable to the effects of climate change, including variability, and unable to adequately address such vulnerabilities.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Section B.1 has been reformulated and, according to the revised PIF, the proposed project would build on the following baseline initiatives: (i) the World Bank Niger Community Action Project for Climate Resilience (PAC-RC); (ii) the EU project Support to the launching of the program approach in the rural development sector in Niger; and (iii) three FAO projects on agricultural productivity and food security. The re-submission describes consistently the indicative co-financing associated with these baseline projects. The revised PIF also demonstrates a clear geographical overlap between the baseline initiatives and the proposed LDCF project.</p>	
--	--	--

		<p>While it is understood that the LDCF project would be closely coordinated with PAC-RC, the latter is not, as such, vulnerable to the effects of climate change and does not represent an appropriate baseline project. Instead, activities associated with PAC-RC should be described in Section B.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe PAC-RC and relevant coordination mechanisms in Section B.6 of the PIF and adjust the indicative co-financing figures accordingly.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Provided that the PIF does not adequately describe the vulnerabilities associated with the baseline projects, as well as their regional scope, it remains unclear whether the adaptation activities proposed are based on additional cost reasoning.</p> <p>Moreover, it is not entirely clear whether the proposed project would establish new FFS or whether it will integrate climate-resilient production techniques in the curricula of existing FFS. While the project framework suggests the latter, Section B.1 of the PIF mentions a need to "expand the scope of the FFS approach". The use of LDCF resources to establish new FFS</p>	

		<p>nor justified from the perspective of additional cost.</p> <p>Finally, Component 3 of the proposed project would spend \$700,000 in LDCF resources on mainstreaming climate change adaptation strategies into agricultural sector policies and programs. The component does not appear to be cost-effective nor does it build entirely on additional cost reasoning. The component would support the establishment of an inter-sectoral task force, as well as measures to enhance coordination and collaboration between institutions at the national level.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11 above, please revisit the additional cost reasoning described in Section B.2 of the PIF. In particular, (i) clarify how the proposed LDCF project can contribute towards the climate resilience of the baseline investments given that most of these have been under implementation for several years and are scheduled to be completed between 2012 and 2013; clarify whether the project would establish new FFS and justify this based on additional reasoning; (iii) significantly scale down and/or justify the activities proposed under Component 3.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>The re-submission clarifies that the</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>primarily on existing FFS projects, introducing climate-resilient technologies, and subsequently moving on to scale up FFS activities for climate change adaptation, notably in collaboration with PAC-RC.</p> <p>Component 3 has been scaled down as recommended.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11, please revisit the additional cost reasoning accordingly.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. While Table B of the PIF illustrates well the project structure and approach, the proposed outcomes and outputs should be more clearly formulated. The project framework could be significantly streamlined, with one outcome per component, representing the intended effect of a set of outputs. It should be noted that outcomes are not necessarily achieved during the lifetime of the project and that these cannot be fully attributed to the project. Outputs, in turn, should reflect the goods and services the project produces.</p> <p>It is recommended not to include outputs that cannot be fully attributed to the project. For instance, "enhanced institutional collaboration" and "improved coordination" may be facilitated by the project, but it should not be treated as an output against which project progress is measured.</p> <p>In addition, it is necessary to</p>	

		<p>output by grant type (TA or Investment) and grant amount.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) streamline the project framework, (ii) reconsider the outcomes and outputs, and (iii) consider removing outputs that cannot be fully attributed to the proposed project, especially under Component 3.</p> <p>Please disaggregate each outcome and each output by grant type (TA or Investment) and grant amount.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- YES. The project framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. While the proposed project is based on a sound understanding of the vulnerability of Niger's rural populations and their livelihoods to the effects of climate change, as well as proven approaches to reduce such vulnerabilities, the adaptation benefits cannot be fully assessed at this stage, as the additional cost reasoning requires significant clarification (see Section 13 above).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under section 13 above.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- YES. The adaptation benefits have been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	

	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?</p>	<p>YES. The socio-economic benefits associated with the proposed project are adequately described for this stage of project preparation. The project would specifically target women, notably through measures to enhance the climate-resilience of vegetable production.</p> <p>The socio-economic benefits and the targeting principles of the proposed project should further be more clearly described by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>YES. By adopting the FFS approach the project would work directly with vulnerable rural communities, farmers organizations and women groups.</p> <p>A more detailed stakeholder analysis and stakeholder consultations should further be undertaken by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF identifies relevant risks and outlines appropriate risk mitigation measures associated with the ongoing political transition period, as well as with climate change shocks and/or pest and disease outbreaks.</p> <p>In addition, the PIF should discuss risks associated with the sustainability of the project. As the proposed project does not directly facilitate access to markets, credit and long-term extension services for smallholder farmers, it relies entirely on other projects and programs to sustain and to scale up the adaptation measures it introduces. This represents an important risk that should be adequately addressed at PIF stage.</p>	

		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please discuss risks and relevant mitigation measures associated with the sustainability of the adaptation measures introduced through the proposed project.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- YES. The re-submission presents credible measures to mitigate the risks associated with sustaining the adaptation activities introduced through the proposed project.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>NOT CLEAR. While the PIF provides a comprehensive overview of other related initiatives, including the LDCF financed project Implementing NAPA Priority interventions to Build Resilience and Adaptive Capacity of the Agricultural Sector, coordination arrangements and synergies with the World Bank Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) should also be described.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please demonstrate that the proposed project is consistent and properly coordinated with adaptation measures supported under PPCR.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- YES. The re-submission demonstrates that the proposed project would be closely coordinated with SPCR and, in particular, PAC-CR.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	NA	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No. The project management cost should not be above 5% of the subtotal of the project components, not the total project cost.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please revise the project management cost accordingly.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- YES. At \$180,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 4, the proposed funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. As indicated in Section 6 above, the total grant request is yet to be determined. Moreover, the cost-effectiveness and the added value of the proposed activities under Component 3 are not adequately demonstrated.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under sections 6 and 13 above and, if necessary, adjust the grant amounts per outcome accordingly.</p> <p>05/25/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11 and 13 above, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per outcome accordingly.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated	The relationship between the indicative	

	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	remains unclear. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under Section 11 above, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures if necessary. 05/25/2012 -- 05/25/2012 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11 above, please adjust the indicative co-financing figures accordingly.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11 and 25 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under Section 11 above. 05/25/2012 -- YES. FAO would bring \$2.1 million to the proposed project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	

Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 9, 11, 13, 14, 15, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, and 26. 05/25/2012 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 24 and 25.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to sections 16 and 17.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 20, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 25, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

