



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	9161		
Country/Region:	Nigeria		
Project Title:	LCB-NREE: Component Nigeria: Comprehensive management of natural resource in Borno State		
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:	\$4,141,429
Co-financing:	\$31,697,500	Total Project Cost:	\$35,838,929
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Diop Amadou Bamba

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		Addressed.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Addressed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		Addressed.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		Addressed.
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 		<p>- Please, revise the project grant and the breakdown of resources per focal area. Refer to the PFD and the revised financing table.</p> <p>- The GEF project grant should be \$ 4,141,429 (fees: \$331,315). BD: \$822,195; LD: \$822,195; CC: \$1,827,102; SFM \$1,035,357</p> <p>- \$56,101 were set aside for the PPG (+\$4,488 of fees). BD \$6,188; LD: \$11,138; CC: \$24,750; SFM \$14,025</p> <p>- The total GEF grant = \$4,533,333.</p> <p>March 05, 2016: Not addressed: The new proposal states that revisions in financing tables have been made. Nevertheless the document does not reflect the requested revision to include \$56,101 PPG from set aside and \$4,488 in fees. The table in annex C has no information. Please complete the requested information.</p> <p>17 October 2016 Not addressed. As already mentioned in the previous review, the table in annex C has no information. Please complete the requested information.</p> <p>5 December 2016 Addressed</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 		Cleared.

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		<p>See above for the SFM resources.</p> <p>March 05, 2016 Not addressed: Please refer to the comment above regarding the \$56,101 PPG from set aside and \$4,488 in fees.</p> <p>17 October 2016 Not addressed. Please refer to the comment above regarding the table in annex C.</p> <p>5 December 2016 Addressed</p>
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		<p>The table B proposes a result framework where each component represents a focal area. The notion of integration has been lost. We would like to understand the linkage with the result framework approved in the PFD that was proposing: 1) Increasing the efficiency of tools and approaches for SLM and energy, 2) Incorporating sustainability in productive landscapes, 3) Strengthening capacity and knowledge and sustainable financing for climate resilient mobilization for IWRM and WUE in the Lake Chad basin, 4) Strengthening of water and ecosystems management and riparian collaboration.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>March 05, 2016</p> <p>LD: The components have been adjusted to maintain consistency with the results framework in a manner that demonstrates integration with BD, CCM and SFM/REDD+.</p> <p>Addressed.</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		<p>Table A: Please, strictly follow the language approved in the GEF5 strategies for the outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Remove the additional language: sustainable management of wetlands, sustainable dryland forest management, investment to ensure...agro-services, sustainable management of Forest. - Revise the two SFM outputs. <p>March 05, 2016</p> <p>LD: The language approved in GEF-5 LD Strategy has been adopted in table A, including the two relevant LD outcomes.</p> <p>BD: The activities on the ground related to BD management are not enough to demonstrate outputs compatible with the BD2 objective. Either you have to include a sub-national plan that incorporate BD and ecosystem valuation, or you can adjust the proposed forest plan to include these elements.</p> <p>CCM: please explain how the project will create an enabling policy environment to facilitate and scale-up the adoption of these new technologies and explain the scope and the mechanism of technology co-operation</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			and transfer. 14 October 2016 Addressed
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		Addressed.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		Sustainability issues are not addressed. Please, include a section, or refer to the relevant section in the project document. March 05, 2016 Addressed.
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?		We understand that the GEF project is developed to complete the PRESIBALT. However, the structure of the PRESIBALT is very different than the proposed result framework. It is difficult to understand the linkages and the complementarities of both investments. Please revise. March 05, 2016 Addressed.
	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?		Yes. Section B3. Addressed.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?		Many activities are not eligible per se under the GEF5 strategies: - 1.1.4. Invasive aquatic plants mechanically controlled;

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1.5. Bird migration corridors in the wetlands areas identified. - Without more information, the outputs 1.1.6 and 1.1.7 are certainly not eligible under the BD2 objective - Same comment for the outputs 2.1.1, 2.1.3., 2.1.6. under CCM3 <p>March 05, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		<p>See cells 7 and 13.</p> <p>March 05, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		<p>Addressed.</p>
	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?		<p>Gender issues are mentioned. However, the elements provided in the text are not verified in the result framework and the M&E. Please make gender issues more visible in the result framework, the indicators, and the M&E.</p> <p>March 05, 2016 Addressed.</p>
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		<p>We understand that the capacities of local stakeholders, as NGOs, are low. However, we would like the insurance that CSO as local communities, farmer organizations, as well as NGOs, will be involved at the best. The diversity of partners on the ground seems an important element of success rather than a project execution by the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			administration. Please, clarify and confirm. March 05, 2016 Addressed.
	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)		No. A comprehensive risk analysis was requested at CEO endorsement. We take note of the list of risks and the risk mitigation measures that are proposed. However, there is no mention of environmental risks (climate change, water management, droughts, natural habitat change). Please revise. March 05, 2016 Thanks for the revised risk assessment. We understand the risks are high in terms of security threat in the region. We of course recommend to the Agency to take all measures to ensure the security of the project team. As it is mentioned, such project, based on participatory approach, benefit sharing, and local governance will hence regional security on the long term. Addressed.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		- The request for CEO endorsement was sent alone, without any project document. The text refers to a Project Appraisal Report for the Lake Chad Regional Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Energy Efficiency (LCB-NREE). Is this report distinct from the PFD? - Can you clarify the linkages with the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>PRESIBALT? Is the project document available?</p> <p>March 05, 2016 Thank you for the complement provided. The link with the project activities would need further clarification. Due to the importance of the PRESIBALT, please briefly describe for each component of the project the complementarity between both initiatives.</p> <p>14 October 2016 We note that the information provided about the complementarity of the GEF project is general for the entire program, including this child project. Addressed.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?		<p>No. Please, include a section, or refer to the appropriate section in the project document.</p> <p>March 05, 2016 Addressed Cleared.</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>See cell 7: the revised result framework is not a progress in comparison with the one included and approved in the PFD. The notion of integration has disappeared.</p> <p>March 05, 2016 Addressed Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		5.6%. It is higher than expected (5%), but acceptable due the complex situation. Addressed.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		It is difficult to be conclusive without the project document and more information on the baseline project(s). Can you clarify the linkages between cofinancing and the use of GEF resources? - Table A: see the total. Management costs are missing. The GEF grant and cofinancing should match with tables B and D. Please correct. - Table D: provide the numbers in US\$, remove cents. March 05, 2016 The funding levels of Co-finance for tables A, B and C should be the same. However, table A has a different amount from tables B and C. Please, revise the tables accordingly. Also refer to cell 6 on STAR allocation section. 17 October 2016 Addressed
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated		- Please, provide the proof of

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		cofinancing (AfDB, \$34,425,500). March 05, 2016 Not addressed 17 October 2016 Addressed
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		Yes.
	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		March 8, 2016 The Tracking Tools are not fully completed or aligned with the project proposal. The attached LD tracking tool does have not any information in section 5 'measurable global environmental benefits in the project target area.' What about envisaged development benefits in the project target area under section 6? In the CCM and SFM TTs, information regarding CO2 emission avoided does not appear, the grant is different from the project document, the surfaces targeted not clearly reflect what is written in the project document (for instance, where are the 750 ha agroforestry or 1500 ha of restored degraded forest in the proposal? what about the 5000 ha benefiting from reforestation measures)? At CEO endorsement, please revise all the tracking tools, fill them completely and make them consistent with the project proposal. 14 October 2016 - LD: the figures in the TT are unclear

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>as regard to the project document and particularly the table B: for example, if the outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.3 concern agriculture, how the area of agriculture land targeted could be 3,500 ha? How is calculated the area of 14,000 ha? Is the irrigation implemented on 500 ha as stated in the project document or 1000 ha in the TT? How do the re-vegetation/reforestation of 1,000 ha in the TT correspond to to the reforestation of the component 1.2.1 on 4,000 ha? All these figures do not appear neither in the description of the components so that it is difficult to understand how the TT relate and align with the project document.</p> <p>BD- To which land and project outputs correspond the area of 3,5000 ha of SLM? In the project document, it is written that on of the GEB is:6000 ha of forest areas under sustainable management practices... and another one is: Increased land area under SLM (3000 ha).</p> <p>CCM: The co-financing is incorrect. The RE part needs to be completed (Installed capacity per technology directly resulting from the project).</p> <p>SFM and Ex-Act tool: again, the justification of the figures are unclear. In Ex-Act tool, the box H13 of the degradation tab is not informed, which change much the final result of GHG avoided emissions...</p> <p>Please revise ALL the tracking tools, fill</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			them as needed and make them CLEARLY consistent with the project proposal. Please ensure that the figures in the TT be reflected in the project document (table B and components description). Please, make visible the changes made in all the documents. 5 December 2016 Addressed
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Addressed.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		Not at CEO endorsement. Responses were provided at PFD level on November 2, 2011. It is recommended to update the comments with recent results, those from the PRODEBALT for instance. This project was initially identified as the main source of cofinancing. March 05, 2016 Addressed Cleared.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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>No. Please, fill in the annex C.</p> <p>March 05, 2016 Not addressed: The included Annex C on page 55 of the submitted document is still empty.</p> <p>14 October 2016 No. The table in Annex C remains empty. Please complete.</p> <p>5 December 2016 Addressed</p>
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>March 22, 2016 Not Yet. Please address the comments above. In addition, please consider providing the 2 following elements: 1- the evidence of the co-financing 2- the calculation of the GHG emissions benefits</p> <p>14 October 2016 Not yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>6 December 2016 Yes, the project can now be recommended for CEO Approval.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*		September 09, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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. 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	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.