



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

GEF ID:	9136		
Country/Region:	Niger		
Project Title:	Niger: Food-IAP: Family Farming Development Programme (ProDAF)		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	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):		LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; LD-4 Program 5;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$70,000	Project Grant:	\$7,636,422
Co-financing:	\$60,320,000	Total Project Cost:	\$68,026,422
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Naoufel Telahigue,

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		
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,		

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?		
Availability of Resources	7. 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		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?		
Review Date	Review		
	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?	<p>- This is a child project under the Food Security IAP program, for which PIF stage was not required.</p> <p>- We suggest to revise and simplify the table A to keep the most appropriate focal area objectives and outcomes: the proposed project responds largely to the LD3 Program 4 ("outcome 3.2 Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities), but also makes frequent reference to Aichi Targets, which correspond to BD-4, Program 9 (Outcome 9.1 Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into their management; and Outcome 9.2 Sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations).</p> <p>July 19, 2016 Thanks for the clarifications and explanations. Points taken. - However, please confirm the breakdown of resources in the table A (check that it is compatible with the table of response). - Check and confirm also the table E</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		and the Corporate Results 3 and 4 (# of watershed and carbon). Addressed (with a revised submission as soon as possible).	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	- In the current result framework, we do not find explicit mention of monitoring and assessment of global environment benefits and resilience. Please, explain the activities that are included in the project, and adjust, if necessary, the formulation in the result framework. July 19, 2016 Addressed.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Addressed.	
	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)	Addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Addressed.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Addressed.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes (but see cell 9 on the linkages with the regional and cross-cutting project). July 19, 2016 Addressed.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	- In the section 5) (p14) there is a description of the global environment benefits (land and water rehabilitation, sustainability of ecosystems, resilience of farming systems, impact on food security, carbon storage, rehabilitation of Ramsar sites). However, we did not find enough elements to well understand how these elements will be monitoring and assessed. It seems essential to clearly express and budget these monitoring activities, and reinforce the demonstration that ecosystem services, productivity, livelihood, and food security at the end, are linked. - These monitoring activities should also be considered in association with the regional and cross-cutting project (RCCP), notably its third component with CI and UNEP. These activities should eventually be included in the "hybrid work plan" with the RCCP.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		July 19, 2016 Addressed.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>In the section A.2 (p15), we appreciate to find out the specific activities that makes this project part of a larger program (exchange and training, KM, monitoring, and evaluation).</p> <p>However, we would like to see better explanation on the two following elements:</p> <p>1) The big picture is missing. We will appreciate a text explaining how this project is responding the three Food-IAP components (1) Institutional frameworks for influencing sustainability and resilience, 2) Scaling up integrated approaches for sustainability and resilience, and 3) Monitoring and assessment of ecosystem services, global environmental benefits and resilience).</p> <p>2) IFAD being the IAP lead agency, we would like to see more details on the "hybrid work plan" with the cross-cutting regional project. It will also be a way to strengthen the outputs and outcomes of this project on the assessment of ecosystem services, GEB, and resilience.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		July 19, 2016 Addressed.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP	No. A table of response is missing. July 19, 2016 Addressed.	
	• GEF Council	No. Please, provide a table of response to explain how this project has included the comments from the US and Canada Council Members expressed at PFD level. Please, also respond to the specific comments made by Germany on the Niger project. July 19, 2016 Addressed.	
	• Convention Secretariat	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	We thank the Agency for the very high standard of this child project, but the project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above. July 19, 2016	

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
		All points have been responded. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement (however, if necessary, please send a document with confirmed and revised tables A and E).	
Review Date	Review	June 10, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 19, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		