



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

GEF ID:	9143		
Country/Region:	Nigeria		
Project Title:	Food-IAP: Integrated Landscape Management to Enhance Food Security and Ecosystem Resilience in Nigeria		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5578 (UNDP)
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-4 Program 5;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$7,139,450
Co-financing:	\$57,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$64,339,450
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Phemo K. Kgomotso

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>Yes. Changes are explained and justifications have been provided.</p> <p>- However, the project now focuses on LD objectives 1, 3, and 4. Please, remove the mention of the BD objective 3 on page 13 of the Request for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>- The list of acronyms is embryonic. Please, complete.</p> <p>April 6, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>- The project targets are quite ambitious. However, the distinction between the activities financed by cofinancing - mainly the States - and the activities financed by the GEF is not clear. Please revise the section A.1.2 detailing the baseline situation and the cofinancing projects. A table with the baseline situation, the role of cofinancing, and the added value of GEF activities will help.</p> <p>- The particular focus on eight value chains makes this project a potential good candidate to benefit from the regional and cross-cutting hub, especially under the second component on scaling up. Don't you</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>think you could better develop the linkages with AFIM led by UNDP (African Facility for Inclusive Markets)?</p> <p>April 6, 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The changes are noted. We appreciate the better connection with the African Facility for Inclusive Markets (AFIM). - Can't you propose a better formulation for the project objective? "to contribute to enhancing long term environmental sustainability...." is not very specific, measurable, or specific. - The component 1 will help the development of PPP on three value chains (cassava, rice, and sorghum). Eight value chains are mentioned for the component 2, but ten are mentioned: Please, clarify. <p>June 13, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table A: the sum for the cofinancing (\$51 million) does not match with the breakdown (10m +25m+ 11m =\$46 million). - The project is based on \$51 million of cofinancing, including \$50 million in kind. It is a significant amount and contributions from the States: 1) We need more details on the activities 	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>financed by the States to figure out these baseline activities and 2) We need to better understand the incremental role of GEF resources - please explain the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>April 6, 2017 Point taken.</p>	
	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)	Yes.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>- Table C: Please make the distinction between in-kind and cash cofinancing.</p> <p>- Please, check the letters of cofinancing: there are three letters for \$6.5 million (UNDP, Jigawa State, and WOFAN), but the table C mention \$50 million from the government.</p> <p>April 6, 2017 Thanks for the letters of cofinancing.</p> <p>- However, the letter of \$5 million cofinancing from the Benue State is still missing.</p> <p>June 13, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	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. See p. 28-29 (Great Green Wall Initiative and several Federal and State initiatives).	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Yes.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	The last comments from April 2017 have been addressed. Cleared.	
	• STAP	Addressed.	
	• GEF Council	Comments made at PFD level (Germany, US, and Canada). The comments from the UK Council member made during the Council information period have been addressed. June 13, 2017 Addressed.	

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"> Convention Secretariat 	NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the points above.</p> <p>April 6, 2017 Thanks for the responses and the improvement, but the project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the remaining points (see cells 2 and 5).</p> <p>June 13, 2017 All the points have been addressed. During the Council information period, UK made comments. UNDP addressed them. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 06, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 06, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 13, 2017	