



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

GEF ID:	9497		
Country/Region:	Niger		
Project Title:	LCB-NREE Niger child project: Improving sustainable management of natural resources in Niger's Diffa region		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; LD-2; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$3,288,782
Co-financing:	\$20,661,500	Total Project Cost:	\$23,950,282
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Bamba DIOP

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		May 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		May 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		May 20, 2016 n/a AC

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		May 20, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		May 20, 2016 n/a AC
	• the focal area allocation?		May 20, 2016 Funds were approved under GEF 5 and are still available. Cleared. AC
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		May 20, 2016 n/a AC
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		May 20, 2016 n/a AC
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		May 20, 2016 n/a AC
	• focal area set-aside?		May 20, 2016 n/a AC
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		May 21, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		May 21, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared.  AC
Project Design	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?		May 22, 2016 Yes, however a clear and consistent language has to be maintained that PRESIBALT is the new baseline project, and this should reflect throughout the project. The title of the table that starts on p13 suggests PRODEBALT is also a baseline project of this project. On p15, why should national projects carry on PRODEBALT activities as well, as if it were also a baseline project "National projects will carry on the momentum of PRODEBALT and PRESIBALT, sustaining activities at local level where action is most needed." Similar observation on p25, last paragraph "The project will specifically try to address problems that arose out of the implementation of GEFID 767 and PRODEBALT as expressed in their terminal evaluations." Please adapt the language accordingly.  AC  19 October 2016 Adressed

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC  19 October 2016 We acknowledge the improved section and explanation added under A.5 regarding the incremental reasoning, thank you. Addressed.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	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?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC  19 October 2016 We acknowledge the alignment of the cook stove numbers with the PFD, thank you. Addressed.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		May 30, 2016 n/a AC
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		15 July 2016 According to the guidelines for GEF5, the amount requested should not exceed 5%. As the PMC is 10%, please provide the justification for exceeding the authorized limit and the detailed budget.  19 October 2016 Addressed.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes		May 22, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and outputs?		
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		<p>May 30, 2016 No letter to confirm cofinancing is attached to this project submission. Please provide the cofinancing letters. AC</p> <p>19 October 2016 Addressed.</p>
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		<p>May 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>15 July 2016 We note inconsistencies between SFM, Ex-Act tools and the project document (for instance, see the numbers for deforestation). Please ensure the coherence regarding the numbers (especially the different areas) between the documents provided.</p> <p>19 October 2016 - in all the TT, the co-financing amount has to be updated according to the last change. - BD TT: 2000 ha of SLM vs 2200 ha in the project document, where do the 189 ha come from in the project document? - LD TT: which expected outputs give a total of 700 ha of forestry? Is the SFM on 300 or 400 ha? Where do the surface and groundwater resources of 500 + 500 ha come from (please note the differences between the outputs of component 1 p.20 and the table B...)?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>-CC TT: the installed capacity of the renewable energy is not informed and please verify the coherence of the surfaces in LULUCF with the other documents</p> <p>-SFM TT: is the forest area targeted only 300 ha? why 400 and 420 ha of SFM while it is 300 in the project document?</p> <p>Please verify ALL the figures in the TTs and make sure they align with and they correspond to CLEARLY described activities and/or outputs in the project document. Please verify also the consistency of the numbers within the project document (for instance the output 1.1.1 is not aligned with the GEBs description, the area of SFM is 300 ha in table B and in the GEBs description but 400 ha in the expected outputs of component 2...).</p> <p>Regarding the GHG benefits and Ex-act tool: please verify the alignment with the other documents when the above mentioned comments have been addressed.</p> <p>5 December 2016:</p> <p>BD TT: 1- Please explain what are the 2000 ha of SLM in line 83. Isn't it 1700 ha as indicated in the project document and in the response to the review sheet? 2- Aren't there any protected areas within the landscape covered by the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>project as in other child projects? (line 57) Please inform if any.</p> <p>LD TT: which areas correspond to the 600 ha in line 11? Shouldn't it be 900 ha ? Please explain or adjust accordingly if needed.</p> <p>SFM TT: In the lines 49-56, how are distributed the 900 ha of forests taking into account that the 300 ha are part of the 1700 ha of SLWM? In other words, why only 600 ha of "Other naturally regenerated forest" along with the 300 ha of agroforestry? Where are the lacking 300 ha of forest (out of the 900 ha targeted by the project)?</p> <p>Regarding the GHG benefits and the estimated areas of sustainably managed lands and forests: 1- the CEO Endorsement request only reports those GHG benefits coming from the LULUCF sector: please add those coming also from the energy sector; 2- this Niger Child project has a budget of \$24 M and targets 2,600 ha of SLFWM to achieve 0,1 Mt CO<sub>2</sub>eq avoided. Of course each country faces a specific reality but it worth highlighting the difference with much more efficient projects within the same program, such as the Chad Child project that, with a budget of \$11 M, provide 10,200 ha of SLFWM and 1.2M CO<sub>2</sub>eq avoided. Please reconsider the GEB results of this Niger child project and if they are</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>confirmed, please explain the reasons for such different performance of the project.</p> <p>16 December 2016: Thank you for the adjustments and explanation for the relatively low results in terms of GHG. Addressed.</p>
	<p>28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&amp;E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		<p>May 30, 2016 Though the proposal includes an M&amp;E description, the proposed M&amp;E activities need a comprehensible budget and costing.</p> <p>Second, the proposed indicators on p40 are too many, and since they are performance indicators, they should be streamlined and linked to proposed project components and activities under each component. They need to be specified as well. Please, consider revising. AC</p> <p>19 October 2016 Thank you for budgeting the M&amp;E plan and for the additional comments regarding the indicators. Addressed.</p>
Agency Responses	<p>29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		<p>15 July 2016 We acknowledge the responses to the STAP comments dated on 8/10/2011, 2/11/2011 and 15/03/2012. Nevertheless, despite the response to the comments dated 15/03/2012 states that "each response has been adapted to the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>child project", we note that the responses in the table are the identical among the different child projects. Please explain how and precisely where the response has been adapted for this child project. In addition, please provide a clear mention stating that this update take into account the consultation occurred in May 2016 between the STAP and the agency.</p> <p>19 October 2016 Addressed.</p>
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		<p>May 30, 2016 Yes, annex C. Cleared AC</p>
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>15 July 2016 Not yet. Please, consider responding to the suggestions above in cells 11, 23, 25, 27, 28 and 29. AC and PM</p> <p>19 October 2016 Not yet. Please, address the comments above in cell 27.</p> <p>5 December 2016</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Not yet. Please, address the comments above in cell 27.  16 December 2016 Yes, the project can now be recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*		May 30, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		July 15, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		October 19, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		December 05, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		December 16, 2016

\* **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	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	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.