



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

GEF ID:	5535		
Country/Region:	Regional (Burkina Faso, Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Algeria, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria, Chad)		
Project Title:	Improving IWRM Knowledge based Management and Governance of the Niger Basin and the Iullemeden Taoudeni Tanezrouft Aquifer System (ITTAS)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP and UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$13,425,000
Co-financing:	\$77,956,945	Total Project Cost:	\$91,681,945
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Mane Dagou Diop

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	Yes, the participating countries are GEF eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Eight out of 11 countries endorsed the project as per PIF and only seven letters (Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, and Niger) were attached to be submission.</p> <p>Please submit the missing endorsement letters.</p> <p>(9/27/2013 ah): Endorsement letters for Benin, Cameroon, Chad, Cote D"ivoire, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Burkina</p>	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Faso, and Nigeria are attached. Please submit the missing letter for Algeria.</p> <p>(1/23/2014 AH): The implementing agency states that the procedures for obtaining LOIs from Algeria has changed and is causing delays. Algeria has therefore been removed from PIF and is expected to join the effort during project preparation.</p> <p>Additional funds have been added to the groundwater demonstrations (less than 10% of grant) which is technically beneficial and justified transferring lessons from GEF interventions in the N/W Sahara aquifer. GEF Management is accepting the present letters of endorsement for work program entry and is nevertheless requesting GEF agencies to work with countries to obtain new LOIs soonest to correctly reflect the slightly increased grant amount requested. GEF would like to obtain as many letters as possible prior to WP posting and urges the two implementing agencies to urgently engage with the countries to that effect.</p>	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	Yes, the requested amount is within expected GEF 5 IW focal area allocations.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Yes, the project is aligned with the IW focal area objectives 1 and 3.</p> <p>It is innovative in aiming and coordinated governance and management of surface and groundwater resources.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>Yes, the project is overall aligned with national and regional priorities, such as the SDAP/SAP which was approved on ministerial level. By CEO endorsement the descriptions of the link to national sector and agency strategies in participating countries should be strengthened.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. 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?</p>	<p>Yes, the baseline of actions and finance of regional efforts to implement the Niger Basin Sustainable Development Action Plan is described.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>(8/27/2013): Overall, the effort to work on conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in the Niger basin is highly appreciated. This PIF builds on previously separate draft PIFs for the Niger Basin and Iullemeden/ITTAS aquifer system. Given the findings of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>previous GEF supported project on the Iullemeden aquifer a separate/parallel effort would not have made sense.</p> <p>In light of these integration needs and to both address IW objective 3 and 1 for SDAP/SAP implementation, we have the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please provide a cleared indication of the respective roles of the executing partners in the project. <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please strengthen/clarify the link that the ITTAS TDA and SAP would have in relation to the SDAP; it is not clear what 'complementing' means in practical terms. It seems logically -to be effective- that the groundwater related ITTAS SAP would form an amendment or annex to the existing SDAP/SAP and would be endorsed by the same ministerial counterparts. Increase in irrigated agriculture in some of the basin countries will add pressures on ground- and surface water and intersectoral, integrated management of these land and water resources will be of tremendous importance moving forward. While ground-and surfacewater basins do not entirely overlap in terms of their aerial extend, they are in this case integrally linked with the Niger river forming one of the major natural outlets of the gw system. Hence the need to link/integrate 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>strategic actions plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please consider strengthening output 1.3 to clearly aim not only at regional recommendations for conjunctive management, but also address reforms of national policies and plans accordingly and in line with article 11 of the Niger Basin Water Charter. Recommendations and advocacy actions alone (see PIF text) are not tangible enough for a project of this duration and size. In addition, as already mentioned above regarding the regional SAP , the National Action Plans for the IAS to be developed need to be integrated with or at minimum aligned and approved by same actors as the Niger Basin NAPs. <p>(9/27/2013 AH): the PIF addresses some of the comments above, but lacks to address (or outline a process for the project to address) a clear relation between NBA and the Consultative Mechanism/between NBA and OSS - see also comment under component 3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The agency response outlines the role of executing partners in more detail, yet the PIF still would benefit from more clarity in this. - A key unclarity remains in substantive terms on how the relation between NBA's mandate (and member countries) and OSS and ITTAS system riparians is planned to evolve. The PIF is silent on mentioning how e.g. it will be addressed that the NBA - and hence the Water Charter - does not include all riparians of 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the larger Niger-ITTAS system; noted: this is not an issue for Iullemeden- Niger.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How will the project create a functioning legal/institutional link between the NBA and the Consultative Mechanism for the shared management of the IAS? see also comments under component 3. - Please modify in component 1 (opening para) and 1.2 to state that the ITTAS TDA and the IAS SAP will be a compliment to the Niger Basin SDAP (not just the SAP as the latest SDAP is now incorporating and hence encompassing the SAP) and will be adopted as such by the same ministerial actors as the SDAP/SAP. Please note, that we are aware that this may just be a drafting/revision issue as this point appears more clear in the description of component 3. - Editorial- the co-finance number in the text (USD 5.8 million) does not fit the number in table B. <p>(1/23/2014) - The comments have been sufficiently addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>(8/27/2013) Component 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community based actions are appreciated and important to create benefits on the ground and improve livelihoods. They are are, however, in most cases not resulting in larger stress reduction. Hence the indicated amount of USD 7 million for this is too large in relative terms for Niger SAP implementation. Just as example : there 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>are valid/valuable community projects for pollution control proposed (2.5). While these are likely benefitting on local scale, the project in the end will risk to reach any scale to address the wider actions on water quality control outlined as priorities in the SAP under LTEQO 4 to address water quality threats e.g. from mining, agro-industries, irrigation, and others) through actions on regional and national level. Please comment and address.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is also unclear why the previously anticipated flood and drought early warning system is not included in the present PIF anymore (unless anticipated in the parallel anticipated AfDB support to the Niger Basin or done by others). <p>(9/27/2013 AH):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The longer explanation and reference to the success of the SGP activities under the previous project is appreciated. Please address remaining points (for additional clarity elaborated below): - Output 2.1. the component description focusses a lot on addressing the removal of invasive weeds through community based activities. While this has been done in other circumstances/locations and can be effective, it is not clear how this effort - or how the project as a whole - will address the root causes for the spread of aquatic weeds identified in the TDA/SAP. - The agency response mentions aim for water quality protection on community scale, yet the PIF is less clear on it (yes/no?). Can you please explain. 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Again, in terms of SAP implementation please explain how - or why not - key sources of pollution identified in the TDA are SAP are addressed (e.g. mining, industry/urban expansion, agriculture/agro-industry, etc.).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The comment in the agency response on the AFDB PIF covering a larger, regional water quality strategy is noted. - in Component 2.3. please delineate what is to be addressed by this project and what by the AFDB project which appears to now mainly focus on watershed and sustainable soil management. - Training on water quality: with regards to tanneries which are specifically mentioned : will this mainly address issues related to handling of animal remains and/or address use of chemicals (such as Chrome 6 discharge)? How will both aspects be addressed through training only? <p>(1/23/2014 AH): The comments raised above on component 2 have been addressed. The revision of scope and mechanism in addressing key concerns on water quality identified in the SAP (mining and other industries, urbanization, and other) is appreciated.</p> <p>The additional pilot/demonstrations to address innovative methods and/or best practice for the management of shared groundwater makes sense.</p> <p>In additon, the clear delineation of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>activities under 2.1. will facilitate coordination with planned activities by AfDB.</p> <p>(8/27/2013) Component 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 3.1. - please see comment above on 'policy recommendations' versus actual reforms of policies and recommendations especially on national level. The current output 3.1 appears too vague on the extend and value of policy recommendations for translation of UN Resolution 63/124 into regional and national management actions, e.g. how will conjunctive management in the basin be addressed institutionally (management role & actions of NBA and national agencies for management of transboundary aquifers and conjunctive management; relation to/role of OSS, NBO, etc,) and will key national reforms be addressed by the project (e.g. assuring that land uses are considering and coupled with clearly agreed/regulated water uses in future to avoid overabstraction and pollution)? On regional level, the Niger Basin Water Charter should in its present formulation (e.g. its definition of 'watercourses' which includes surface and groundwater and commitment of basin states in Article 11) forms a sufficient basis to address both surface and groundwater. - other actions on component 3, incl. supporting wider collaboration and coordination of actions to implement the SDAP; collaborative action with IUCN 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and GEF support to collaborative monitoring and greater knowledge of transboundary wetlands and other key ecosystems; and transboundary learning mechanisms are appreciated and are aligned with e.g. LTEQ7 etc. of the Niger SAP.</p> <p>(9/27/2013 AH) - component 3: Comments are only partially addressed: - There is still unclarity in the relation between how to build conjunctive management of Niger basin surface and groundwater. What is the envisioned relation between the NBA and the consultative mechanism for the Iullemeden ? It appears as if action of both may be rather handled in parallel with the Water Charter on one side - which addresses both surface and groundwater - and a search of "translating UNGA resolution 63/124 into regional and national actions" "through the consultative mechanism" on the other. Does that aim at another regional agreement on groundwater ("translating UNGA resolution 63/124 into regional actions"??), a protocol under the water charter ??, or what 'action' is aimed at on regional level .</p> <p>- In terms of national sectoral policy and regional reforms - please see previous comments on specific reforms: while specific items may not be able to be mentioned at PIF stages , it would be important to emphasize at least key sectors to be addressed (such as e.g. agriculture, mining, and other) and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>mention working through interministerial committees at national level to address issues of conjunctive management of surface and groundwater.</p> <p>(1/23/2014 AH): Comments have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>(9/27/2013 AH): By CEO endorsement please provide clarity on complex endeavors mentioned, such as PES schemes, carbon credit, etc. in collaboration with IUCN.</p> <p>- At CEO endorsement, please clearly allocate 1 % of GEF grant to participate in IWCs, regional IWLEARN meetings, website following the IWLEARN guidance, production of experience notes and results notes.</p> <p>- Kindly submit to us a copy of the 2012 SDAP and IP which now incorporates SAP actions into the SDAP and is now the main reference document for support to the joint development process in the Niger Basin.</p> <p>(9/27/2013 AH): comment/request remains. Appreciate to receive a copy of final/current SDAP document.</p> <p>(1/23/2014 AH): Please see request immediately above.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning</p>	<p>Yes, both the description of GEBs and incremental reasoning are valid and appropriate for PIF stage.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sound and appropriate?		
	9. 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?		Yes, there is description of overall, larger context and importance of conjunctive management of surface and groundwater e.g. for food security. Gender dimensions are well outlined for a PIF and related to outcomes of the community measures.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	UNDP and UNEP haven demonstrated their experience and understanding of the needs for wide consultations of a range of stakeholders in TDA/SAP formulation. In addition, community measures proposed build on long established models of the GEF Small Grants Program.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	The project is build with the threats of climate change in mind and important role that groundwater will assume in times of drought. Also,the project is implemented in a very strong collaboration effort in the Niger Basin to implement a wider, cross-sectoral program outlined under the Niger Sustainable Development Action Plan. The risks section though seems to be entirely written based on the ITTAS/groundwater collaboration. It is lacking realistic assessment of risks working with large numbers of countries; risks to get traction on needed national reforms to move to effective policy, regulatory and management actions for conjunctive management (such as the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>challenge to connect land and water uses), and limited capacities on national level as well as any specific, relevant country risks. Please strengthen the risk section.</p> <p>(9/27/2013 AH): The risk section has been expanded. The point on "weak adhesion to regional governance structures" addresses groundwater only. While rightly indentifying the risk on this regard , there is no mention of risks to not see coordination between surface and groundwater governance and management gel.</p> <p>(1/23/2014): The PIF has been enhanced in this regard.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>Yes - see above comment on the strong collaboration and coordination efforts in the Niger Basin.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>The project is a key effort to build on the advance the transboundary management of the Niger Basin and the Iullemeden aquifer (and wider ITTAS) and support effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. This is in itself is innovative in its own and a challenge not only on the African continent, but still on global scale. Sustainability of efforts are supported by a strong collaborative effort and solid finance by deveopment partners in the Niger basin and awareness and engagement of highest levels of government in the overall collaborative efforts . The project has good potential for large regional impacts</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and comments provided should be addressed to increase this potential.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, GEF finance and co-finance are overall adequate.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	The amount of composition of cofinance is solid. Please revise tables and assure that co-finance amounts across tables A, B, and C in terms of totals and co-finance by source are consistent. (9/27/2013 AH): Comment addressed. (1/23/2014 AH): Please assure that co-finance numbers across tables are consistent. Please resubmit with corrected numbers asap. (1/27/2014 AH):	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, it is at 5 % of GEF subtotal in table B.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification	The requested PPG is in line within the overall norm. Please correct the agency fee for the PPG to 9% (instead of 9.5%).	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	(1/23/2014 AH): Addressed.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of refloes included?	N/A.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		N/A at this stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>(8/28/2013 AH): No, the PIF is not yet recommended for approval. Please submit missing endorsement letters and respond to comments above (under questions 7, 11, and 17).</p> <p>(9/27/2013 AH): No, the PIF is not yet recommended for approval. Please submit missing endorsement letter and respond to comments above (under questions 7 and 11). Please also correct the agency fee for the PPG (section E).</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(1/23/2014 AH): All technical comments have been adequately addressed. Please resubmit to address in consistency in co-finance numbers (overall project info and across tables A,B, C).</p> <p>(1/27/2014 AH): Table B co-financing figures have been revised by UNDP and hence the discrepancies in co-finance numbers been addressed. The PIF is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	<p>25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>(8/28/2013 and 9/27/2013 AH) : This will be addressed after re-submission of the PIF.</p> <p>(1/23/2014 AH): Please see previous comments under question 7 highlighting items to be addressed by CEO endorsement. We also hope that Algeria will join during ppg phase.</p> <p>Please secure revised letters of co-finance in line with increased grant amount.</p> <p>This is an innovative project in addressing conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. In addition to clearly allotting 1 % of the project grant to participation in IW:learn activities, please assure additional budget for knowledge management and learning.</p> <p>Especially with a revised focus in terms of addressing water quality threats</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		through engagement with main industrial players. please more explicitly address and include private sector entities as stakeholders in project design (e.g. missing from PIF section A2.).	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	August 27, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 27, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 23, 2014	

* **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.**