



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

GEF ID:	5232		
Country/Region:	Benin		
Project Title:	Flood Control and Climate Resilience of Agriculture Infrastructures in Oueme Valley- Benin		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	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-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,200,000
Co-financing:	\$44,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$51,200,000
PIF Approval:	March 22, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	May 02, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Fareeha Iqbal	Agency Contact Person:	Hatem Fellah

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. Benin is a LDC and has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. An OFP endorsement letter dated November, 9, 2012 has been submitted.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. AfDB's program includes contributing to Benin's agricultural priority investment plan (PIA 2011-2015). It has been working in the agriculture sector of the country and is familiar with its agriculture and rural development activities.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	Yes. The project consists of a soft loan and AfDB is capable of managing it.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the	Not clear. The alignment of the agency's program with the proposed project is	

		<p>provided about the staff capacity.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please provide information about the capacity of the in-country staff to undertake the project responsibilities.</p> <p>1/25/2013 Requested information regarding the in-country staff capacity has been provided.</p>	
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	Yes. The funding requested under this project is available for Benin under the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. The project is well aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project will contribute to all three LDCF objectives.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NADA, NCSA, or NIAD?	Yes. The project is well aligned with the country's NAPA and the National Communication, both of which prioritize development of hydro-agricultural potential of the Ouémé valley.	

	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>No. It is stated that the baseline project through its activities will ensure inclusion of budget for promotion of agro-hydro infrastructures. However, the proposed project does not include policy formulation or improvement to facilitate such activity. Also, the training of the farmers' associations does not include the management of improved infrastructure. Changes in the related policies and involvement of farmers will contribute towards sustainability of project outcomes.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please include the appropriate policy interventions in the project that will contribute towards the sustainability of the project outcomes. In the training activities please also include educating the farmers on the need for improved infrastructure and their role in the infrastructure management.</p> <p>1/25/2013 Provided explanation is sufficient for the PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Actions by CEO Endorsement Stage: Please provide more details on the local/district/national level policies that will be formulated or reformed to ensure long term sustainability of the target infrastructures.</p>	
	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on</p>	<p>Yes. The agriculture sector in Benin is dominated by small scale farms, and they are highly vulnerable to climate variability and change. Production of</p>	

Project Design		<p>becoming more reliant on food imports. Lack of reliable water control infrastructure and transport connectivity to the production area are stated as the main problems.</p> <p>The baseline project focuses on rehabilitation of rural infrastructure in Oueme valley that has a high agricultural potential and also on commercialization of agricultural products from the area.</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. The proposed project will make the rural infrastructure more resilient to the floods that are becoming more frequent in the valley. The project will focus on dykes and food storage systems in terms of infrastructure, and it will also introduce seeds and agricultural practices that are more resilient to the expected change. However, the links of the awareness activities on diarrhea and malaria with the overall project goal and the associated additional reasoning is not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please provide clear additional reasoning for the awareness activities on water-borne diseases and their linkage with the overall project goal.</p>	1/25/2013

		<p>water borne diseases under awareness activities. It seems to be an oversight, so kindly clarify.</p> <p>Please provide major themes of these awareness campaigns and link them with the overall goal of the proposed project.</p> <p>3/19/2013</p> <p>As requested activities related to water borne diseases have been removed. Awareness will be raised regarding water management techniques, including flood management and sustainable land management, i.e. topics that are in-line with the project goals.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Not clear. Monitoring and evaluation of the project should not be in the knowledge management component. Also, it is not clear what adaptation knowledge products will entail.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please move monitoring and evaluation of the project to the project management section. Please explain what kind of knowledge products will be developed in the project.</p> <p>1/25/2013</p> <p>Requested changes in the placement of M&E costs have been made. However, description on the types of knowledge products to be developed is still missing. Please describe the types of knowledge products to be developed through the proposed project.</p> <p>3/19/2013</p>	

		knowledge products on flood risk management and agricultural practices that will be affected by climate change.	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	Yes.	
	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>Not clear. Details on the inclusion of gender dimensions are not provided. It is stated that the project will make contributions at the national level as well. However, it is not clear how such contributions would be made.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please describe the approaches the project will take to identify and reduce climate change vulnerabilities that women in the project area face. Please provide a clear explanation on how the project will contribute at the national level and please support the explanation with specific project activities geared towards national level results.</p> <p>1/25/2013 Yes. Additional information provided is adequate for the PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action for CEO Endorsement: Please provide more details on how women will be involved in the project activities, and on how activities will be designed to ensure benefits to women. Also please provide details on the policies the project will develop that will have national level influence.</p>	

	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>No. The PIF has not clearly identified national, district and local level bodies that would be involved in the project. It is understood that the Ministry of Agriculture will be the Executing Agency but other relevant governmental and non-governmental bodies and their respective roles need to be identified.</p> <p>Recommended Actions: Please identify national, district and local level bodies and their respective roles in the project. Please also identify NGOs and CSOs that could make contributions to the project.</p> <p>1/25/2013 Yes. Provided additional information is adequate for the PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please ensure that roles of various partners are clearly articulated and re-evaluate the participation of the health department depending on the revised awareness activities .</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>Yes. The PIF has identified potential major risks and has provided appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>No. Some organizations and implementing agencies with experience in rural and agricultural infrastructure have been identified. However, related projects that could benefit the proposed project have not been identified.</p>	

		<p>Please identify ongoing, completed or planned projects that could benefit the proposed project. Please investigate how the proposed project could build linkages with such projects.</p> <p>1/25/2013 Yes. Identification of relevant projects in the country is appreciated and the information provided is sufficient for the PIF stage.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please develop mechanisms to collaborate with the suitable projects and clearly describe them in the CEO endorsement request.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>No. Please see section 17.</p> <p>1/25/2013 Yes.</p> <p>Recommended Action by CEO Endorsement: Please see recommendations for sections 17 and 19.</p>	
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>Yes. The requested project management cost is 5% of the total grant request.</p>	

	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes. About 72% of the requested grant is allocated for concrete investment related activities.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The indicated co-financing for the proposed project is \$44 million. The co-financing will be "in-kind" and "soft loan."	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes. The AfDB is bringing \$40 million in form of a soft loan 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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not yet. Please see comments for sections 5, 13, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20. 1/25/2013 Not yet please see comments for sections 13 and 14. 3/19/2013 Yes.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please see sections 10, 16, 17, and 19.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG		

	commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	January 07, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 25, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 19, 2013	
	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?	Yes. The PPG will support relevant preparatory studies for implementation and coordination of the project activities defined in the PIF.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes: (i) half of the PPG amount will support studies leading up to climate resilient agricultural investments; (ii) the total grant of \$250,000 is matched with AfDB co-financing of \$265,000; and (iii) the Agency fee is 9.5% of the total grant.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	YES. The PPG is technically cleared. However, the PPG will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	June 10, 2013
	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.