



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 9886 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Mali, Niger, Chad) | | |
| Project Title: | Economic Growth and Water security in the Sahel through Improved Groundwater Governance | | |
| GEF Agency: | World Bank | GEF Agency Project ID: | 163252 (World Bank) |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | International Waters |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | IW-1 Program 1; IW-2 Program 3; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$183,486 | Project Grant: | \$13,577,982 |
| Co-financing: | \$104,000,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$117,577,982 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Astrid Hillers | Agency Contact Person: | |

| PIF Review | | | |
|----------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| Project Consistency | 1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹ | <p>(8/30/2017) Yes, the project is aligned with the IW focal area strategy and supports both foundational activities (IW1) and enhanced governance and management of groundwater (IW 2).</p> <p>We would therefore suggest to split in TABLE A of the GEF datasheet resources between IW 1- Program 1 and IW 2 Program 3. The intended innovations in groundwater assessment methodologies and</p> | |

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>development of groundwater management plans as well as the global activities listed are better aligned with IW-1 and provide information and a process in nature relevant and similar to the GEF TDA/SAP approaches.</p> <p>(9/14/2017) Comment addressed. Cleared.</p> | |
| | <p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p> | <p>(8/30/2017) Yes, the project is aligned with national strategies and with the regional development strategies under the Dakar Declaration.</p> <p>Please note and a small correction: para 20 states that RBOs in the region to not address groundwater in their mandates. While we agree that the situation is far from ideal in praxis, please note that e.g. Niger Water Charter does address groundwater (and the GEF/UNDP-UNEP Niger-Iullemeden project which is under preparation will support such conjunctive management considerations). Similarly the LCBC is executing two GEF funded projects (one via AfDB the other with UNDP as implementing/GEF agencies) which are both addressing groundwater knowledge and management.</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------------|---|--|-----------------|
| | | (9/14/2017) Comment addressed in response and the document. Cleared. | |
| Project Design | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation? | (8/30/2017) Yes, the PCN/PID describes the role of groundwater for water security and its role for human and economic activities including irrigation. The project will make an important contribution to enhance sustainability of groundwater use not only in the three countries but by including global and regional efforts to role out the FFA and development of a responsible code of conduct for groundwater use (through FAO). The divers are described and the project further will address a more detailed governance and resource diagnostic that will add granularity these overall drivers. | |
| | 4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning? | (8/30/2017) Yes, the project describes the incremental value of the GEF investments in relation to SAHEL irrigation. It will also add value of global value by increasing methodologies for groundwater assessments and considering the determination of limits f groundwater extraction and e.g. set-asides for human consumption, as well as differentiating economic limits to groundwater uses, and water quality considerations. | |

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|--|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>The regional and global implementation and dissemination of the global groundwater framework for action, code of conduct for responsible groundwater use, and interaction with regional basin institutions to enhance their consideration of surface and groundwater interactions further adds to the value of the project.</p> | |
| | <p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p> | <p>(8/30/2017) while the project is overall well designed we would like to point out a few items for enhancement:</p> <p>1. Please consider to further enhance the PDO to differentiate the end goal/objective and the means to get there. We would suggest to consider 'flipping the wording' to read "Contribute to regional water security through improved knowledge of the groundwater potential in the Sahel and through strengthening groundwater governance arrangements at local, national and regional level.</p> <p>It would also be good to reflect some similar consideration to enhance the project title (as this is quite a large project/GEF amount).</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>(9/14/2017) The project title now much better reflects the goal of the project. PDO revised and we understand that comments by the WB M&E experts. Comment addressed. Cleared.</p> <p>2. Please provide some indication on the type and expected scope of the pilots under component 2 and/or anticipated criteria for their selection.</p> <p>(9/14/2017) Text has been added to provide more details. Comment addressed. Cleared.</p> <p>3. It would aid the logic and mirror implementation if the global activities (e.g. via FAO and IWMI implementation (or "execution" in GEF terms) would be bundled within one component instead of appearing both in component 2 and 3. The sum of the nominal allocations for this work indicated in Annex II then should be embedded in that component.</p> <p>(9/14/2017) The additional table 1 clearly outlines the scope and resources of the local/regional and the global activities. Comment addressed. Cleared.</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>4. Please add FAO and IWMI as 'executing agencies' in the GEF datasheet (along with the agencies already listed). This will serve clarity and consistency between the PCN coversheet (and indicated implementing entities), the approach and component descriptions, and implementation arrangements para. (take note that the GEF/GEF datasheet and the World Bank PCN have different definitions and use of the terms for "implementing" and "executing" agency)</p> <p>(9/14/2017) Comment addressed - see above and mentioned in the implementation arrangements. Cleared.</p> <p>5. Please consider to add the 'voluntary code of conduct' in table B as it will be a major achievement the project is expected to support.</p> <p>(9/14/2017) Comment addressed. Cleared.</p> <p>6. Under coordination: - Please note that according to our knowledge the GEF/WB Volta Basin project is under implementation (not pipeline; see para 16) - Please add the projects mentioned</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| | | under question 2. above in para 23 under 'coordination with other'. (9/14/2017) Comment addressed. Cleared. | |
| | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered? | (8/30/2017) The PCN describes the gender dimension in sufficient detail at PCN stage. During project design and selection and design of the pilots more detailed and specific attention to gender dimensions and to mechanisms for inclusion of communities (incl. farmers and pastoralists) and gender dimensions needs to be detailed. | |
| Availability of Resources | 7. 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? | (8/30/2017). Yes, at present the project is within the available resources under the IW focal area. (please note that the 'economic analysis states a project grant of USD 15 million; yet part of this is actually agency fee and PMC. The project grant amount to 13.761,468) (9/14/2017) Comment addressed. Cleared. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access | N/A | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? • Focal area set-aside? | N/A | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? | N/A | |
| Recommendations | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified? | <p>(8/30/2017) Please address the comments above. Please also note that there are no PPG resources requested. As the project is only a partial blend, it is not clear if project preparation is still entirely funded by the SIIP.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to get in touch for any questions on how to address the comments.</p> <p>(9/14/2017) All comments have been addressed and the project is technically cleared and recommended for inclusion in a future work program.</p> | |
| Review Date | Review | August 30, 2017 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Project Design and Financing | 1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided? | | |
| | 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | | |
| | 3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective? | | |
| | 4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | | |
| | 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided? | | |
| | 6. Are relevant tracking tools completed? | | |
| | 7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented? | | |
| | 8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | | |
| | 9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| | 10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan? | | |

| | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| Agency Responses | 11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from: | | |
| | • GEFSEC | | |
| | • STAP | | |
| | • GEF Council | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat | | |
| Recommendation | 12. Is CEO endorsement recommended? | | |
| Review Date | Review | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.