



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

GEF ID:	9405		
Country/Region:	Niger		
Project Title:	Integrated Management of Oasis Ecosystems of Northern Niger (IMOIE -NN)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-2; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,596,588
Co-financing:	\$34,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$38,896,588
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Adamou Bouhari

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	To be demonstrated: - The use of BD resources in such integrated approach may be possible under the BD4 Program 9, if the benefit for a globally important biodiversity is demonstrated. Please, make reference to the Key Biodiversity Area that is targeted. - Please list the Aichi Targets the project will help to achieve and provide SMART indicators that will	

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>be used to track the project's contribution to these Aichi Targets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SFM: Can you provide a scientific reference to characterize the oases in the Air Massif as "forests" (to justify the use of SFM). How did you calculate the feasibility to classify and protect 40,000 ha of oases? <p>April 7, 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The first two points are addressed. We are taking the point on the definition of forests and the consideration of 40,000 ha of oases. - At CEO endorsement, we would like to see an analysis of the best practices and lessons from past projects notably on capacity building and scaling up (farmer to farmer training, etc.). - We invite the Agency to strengthen the reasoning on SFM to justify additional resources. A better focus on SFM2 (forest management) would seem appropriate to enhance the involvement and empowerment of local communities in SFM planning and implementation. <p>May 18, 2016 Addressed.</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>Yes.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Cofinancing: 1) Are all the partners mentioned in the table C aware that they are mentioned in this project? 2) Please, indicate the level of dialogue you had with these different partners, especially the main donors in cash (German Cooperation: PromAP and Prodec; AREVA, EU-KFW PICCT project, and water resources project). April 7, 2015 Addressed.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	- The text often mentions the notion of resilience and the importance of this project for the resilience of ecosystems and local communities against climate change. Could you include a tool or a set of indicators to measure this parameter? - Except the mention of the national center of ecological and environmental supervision in the table describing the national partners, we are not clearly seeing the science in this project, while a science based approach and monitoring seems necessary to design an oasis	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>management approach and scientifically monitor the evolution of the situation. Please, provide a basic list of scientific references on the topic of oases (especially applied to the Air Massif), and list potential partners and scientific institutions that could help in implementing and monitoring such project.</p> <p>April 7, 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Thanks for the clarifications. We invite the Agency to double check some scientific information (p6: evaporation of 2-4 mm per year?). - We still have some problems/questions about the carbon calculations: will the deforestation be stopped at 100% the day 1 of project implementation? We suggest a more conservative approach. Please, provide all the benefits with the same units (tCO2 equiv per time unit). The # of tons of dry matter/ha should be translated in tCO2/ha. We appreciate the extract from EXACT. However, the tables "Description" and "Land use Change" would also be appreciated to better understand the baseline situation and the hypotheses. <p>May 18, 2016</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - About carbon calculation, the reasoning and the numbers are much 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>better. Please note that the table for reforestation is still missing. Thanks to include it at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>May 24, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. Please, confirm the role and participation of local CSO at CEO endorsement.	
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? 	<p>GEF6 STAR allocations are available for Niger (BD \$1,500,000; LD \$1,251,154; CCM \$2,231,001) - This project requests \$3.5 million (project grant+ PPG + fees) with CCM \$1,250,000; BD \$1,000,000, and LD \$1,250,000.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	The project requests \$1,750,001 from the SFM programme. At the time this project will be cleared, it is not sure that SFM resources will still be available. This will be confirmed later by the SFM coordinator.		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>April 7, 2016 The comment about the SFM availability is still valid. Please note that the ratio STAR/SFM is 2:1: with the STAR amounts that are endorsed in this project, the maximum of SFM resources for the project grant would be \$1,545,674 (+146,839 of fees = \$1,692,513 including the fees).</p> <p>May 24, 2016 SFM resources are currently available; however, availability will need to be re-checked at time of actual work program inclusion.</p>	
<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet.</p> <p>April 7, 2016 Thanks for the revised document. Please address the items 1, 5, and 7.</p> <p>May 18, 2016 1) Please, update the section on the global environment benefits with the revised carbon calculations from the annex IV and 2) in the same section, include the benefits for key biodiversity areas and globally threatened species. Upon receipt of a revised project package, the PIF will be recommended for CEO approval.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		May 24, 2016 The PIF is recommended for clearance and the PPG is justified. SFM resources are currently available; however, availability will need to be re-checked at time of actual work program inclusion.	
Review Date	Review	March 09, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 07, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 18, 2016	

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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		

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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		