



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS**

| | | | |
|--|--|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| GEF Program ID: | 4680 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Central African Republic, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Chad) | | |
| Program Title: | LCB-NREE Lake Chad Basin Regional Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Energy Efficiency (PROGRAM) | | |
| 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): | IW-1; BD-2; LD-1; LD-2; LD-3; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$20,313,084 |
| Co-financing: | \$172,563,158 | Total Project Cost: | \$192,876,242 |
| PFD Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | November 01, 2011 |
| | | Expected Program Start Dt: | |
| Program Manager: | Jean-Marc Sinnassamy | Agency Contact Person: | Kelly West |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document |
|-----------------|--|--|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible? | Yes all countries are eligible to receive GEF grants. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program? | <p>All operational focal points expressed an interest for the program with the situation below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 letter of endorsement for Chad, - 1 letter of endorsement for Nigeria (we consider the total GEF amounts, but please take note that fees for programmatic approaches developed by a GEF Agency with a Board, as the AfDB, are 8% of the GEF grant). - 1 letter of intent from Cameroon, who will confirm a letter while back at the office, - 1 letter of intent from CAR who is expecting a dialogue with convention focal points. - There is a message from Niger telling they will respond, but we do not know the meaning of this answer. <p>Please submit missing letters of endorsement.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>September 20, 2011 Letters of endorsement are promised by the Council date. Please clarify the situation with Niger.</p> <p>September 26, 2011 The situation for Niger has been clarified. However, please send the final letters of endorsement by the Council date. Thanks. Addressed.</p> |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported? | The AfDB has a strong portfolio in the region on relevant issues. |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it? | Addressed. |
| | 5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)? | <p>The Program fits with the AfDB's interventions in the Lake Chad Basin countries. These interventions are in line with sector strategic documents in the different countries and the AfDB's country strategy Strategy papers. There is however no information about the staff capacity in the countries. Please, clarify.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 This point has not been solved in the AfDB response or in the revised document. Please, clarify.</p> <p>September 26, 2011 Addressed.</p> |
| Resource Availability | 6. 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>September 18, 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The following comments are based on the table D, p.4 and 5 of the PFD, reflecting the country engagement. - It seems that there is a misunderstanding or mistakes in terms of budget breakdown. Please, be aware that STAR allocations, as well as the SFM/REDD+ incentive, include the project grant, Agency fees (8% for a PFD), and any management costs at project level. The table D should then reflect the whole GEF resources engaged by the countries from STAR and SFM. We based on our comments on a total resource programming of \$22,458,333. - This amount does not fit with the calculations provided in the table A and the table B (focal area strategy framework and program result framework), where 5% management costs are proposed in addition to the \$22,458,333. |

- Please, remind that other comments will be made on the implementation arrangements that can impact the way of calculation. If the AfBD is the GEF Executing agency, no management costs are expected. If the Program is country executed or executed by other partners, a maximum of 5 percent of total resources can be assigned to management costs. Please clarify, and revise accordingly.

- The resources proposed for this Program are based on STAR allocations and the SFM/REDD+ incentive program. The Program is estimated at \$20,661,667, for a total amount of \$22,458,333 including the fees. The statements below are based on the total commitment from the GEF, Agency fees included.

- Niger: From STAR allocations, \$3 million are currently available for Niger. However, parallelly to this PFD, we received a PIF with a letter of endorsement of \$2.5 million for a Niger-Nigeria Integrated Ecosystem Management Project. There is a potential over-programming of STAR resources. Please, clarify.

- Cameroon: The participation of Cameroon in this Program is compatible with the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise undertaken in August 2011. However, over the NPFE, the participation of Cameroon was programmed with a SCCF grant. Here, the participation of Cameroon is based on the engagement of the whole LD allocation (\$1,660,000). Please, confirm.

- Central Africa Republic: \$2,1 million are provided from STAR allocations with additional \$700,000 from the SFM/REDD+ Incentive Mechanism. This proposal is compatible with the availability of STAR resources (\$5,430,000).

- Chad: The commitment of Chad is compatible with the current availability of STAR resources (\$410,000 from Biodiversity, \$220,000 from Land Degradation, and \$1,470,000 from Climate Change). The SFM/REDD+ programme is leveraged for \$700,000.

- Nigeria: The commitment of Nigeria is compatible with the current availability of STAR resources: \$500,000 from BD, \$900,000 from LD, \$2,000,000 from CC. The SFM/REDD+ incentive is leveraged with \$1,133,333, applying the 3:1 principle.

September 20, 2011.

- The program will be implemented at national level and coordinated by the Lake Chad Basin Commission.

- Tables have been updated. However, please check the totals and avoid any rounding (see GEF amount, table A for instance).

September 26, 2011

- Tables and figures have been updated.
Cleared.

| | | |
|---------------------|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? | <p>19th of September 2011 (cseverin): \$7 mio including fee and potential ppg is available from the IW focal area.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Addressed. However, we understand by the revision of amount that no IW resources will be used for project development. Please, confirm.</p> <p>September 26, 2011 We take the point that a provision for a PPG has been made with IW resources. Adjustements will then be necessary at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access? | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | NA |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? | |
| Program Consistency | <p>7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The program is not a Knowledge Management Program. We will prefer to find a program result framework starting with the most important components (linked to activities on the ground to maintain the flow of ecosystem services or ensure the sustainability of practises using natural resources), then the knowledge component (s), and the management costs as a final component. There is a lack of a text explaining and detailing the different components of the program. It is then difficult to be accurate on the eligibility of activities and if the program is fully aligned with the multifocal area result framework. Please, include an annex detailing the contents of the components. All activities using GEF resources to incorporate sustainability or improve the use of natural resources are welcome (water use improvement on existing irrigation perimeters, conservation agriculture, soil conservation, Integrated Water and Land Management, land use planning, integration of environment and sustainability issues in sector planning, etc). A contrario, some activities are not eligible under the GEF: Afforestation is not eligible per se. However, natural regeneration approaches, notably Natural Farmer Managed Regeneration, are highly recommended. Aquaculture facilities are not eligible per se. The activities linked the improvement of knowledge management can be acceptable. Please detail the contents. The activities linked to the enhancement of capacities at the basin level (Lake Chad Basin Commission), national, and local level are also welcome if the strategy fits with the Strategic Action Programme and is well coordinated with other initiatives. We will prefer to see any capacity development associated to the other activities on the ground to improve chances of success, impacts, and |

sustainability.

- In the section B2, it is mentioned that the introduction of fodder crop species is foreseen in pastoral areas for Niger. If this practice can be understood in a baseline project, please confirm that GEF resources will not specifically be used for introduction of species. Please check that all activities are well eligible under GEF focal area strategies (recommendation: BD resources can be helpful under activities related to "mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in sectors and productive landscapes"; LD resources can help to maintain flow of agroecosystem services -LD1- or reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscapes -LD3).

- For Nigeria, please develop what activities are proposed for "fishery development" and under which focal area. Please remind that no IW resources may be justified for aquaculture investments.

- The document lists afforestation activities using SFM funding. SFM/REDD+ funds reforestation but not afforestation, which is a land use change. Afforestation is funded out of CCM-5.

- SFM/REDD+ funds are to be spent on forests, though in the wider landscape.
- 2500 per hectare for afforestation and natural regeneration (SFM funds, \$2.5 million for 1000 ha) seems high. Please justify the cost.

19th of September 2011 (cseverin): Furrow irrigation is not considered to be a water saving technology nor sustainable irrigation methodology. Please specify more water saving technologies, such as more sustainable drip irrigation.

Component 1, suggests IW funding going towards creation of a general database including biodiversity and energy uses. IW funding can not go towards biodiversity and energy uses database. Please take it out because it is not eligible for IW funding and reformulate so that the component instead of creating a database, will be working towards creating a data sharing and information clearing mechanism on surface and groundwater flow patterns in the Lake Chad Basin.

Activities such as training in database management should be funded by the co-financing to ensure that local resources go towards sustaining the investment.

Under component 3 it is still not clear which focal area that will be funding the suggested expected outputs. Please make it clear towards which outputs each focal area will be funding. Please in this process make sure that no IW funding

is going towards laying new lands under irrigation, however, sustainable drip irrigation (no furrow or other water intense applications would be applicable for IW funding) methods could be implemented on areas presently under irrigation. Further, as indicated previously in the reviewsheet, no IW funding can go towards aquaculture. Such activities would be a development project not an IW funded output.

Please include a results framework to explicitly include outcomes and quantifiable outcomes.

Please make sure to mention that the programme will be reporting using the IW and other relevant tracking tools.

Further, please make sure to mention that 1% of the IW funding will be going towards supporting IWLEARN activities, such as participation the IW conference, writing of atleast two IW Experience Notes, setting up a webpage in accordance with IWLEARN tool kit guidance as well as participation in regional IWLEARN meetings.

20th of september 2011

(JMS): We thank the Agency for the changes made to the document. Major points have been addressed:

- The result framework has been revised;
- An annex provide more details on the components.
- Non eligible activities have been removed.
- Explanations on some controversial activities have been clarified (fisheries, aquaculture, agriculture).
- Explanations have been done on the restoration costs per ha.

However, some points need to be clarified.

- Please, check that outputs are well in line with focal area strategies (e.g. see outputs SFM 1.2.1
- The GEF does not want to be associated with land use changes, as afforestation.
- If varieties or different species are used in agriculture or on pastoral lands, please develop sufficient safeguards and risk analysis to prevent any invasive phenomenon.

(cseverin): Some points addressed, some still pending, please be more explicit in what the knowledge management component will be working towards, e.g. an output like "creating a datasharing and information clearing mechanism on

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>surface and groundwater flowpatterns in the Lake Chad Basin".</p> <p>The second part of the knowledge management component suggests that IW funding will be going towards training staff, it is suggested that activities such as training in database management should be funded by the co-financing to ensure that national resources goes towards sustaining the investment.</p> <p>Table B is still not clearly displaying which of the listed outputs will be funded by what focal area.</p> <p>22nd of September 2011 (cseverin): Please be aware that activities directly on cattle management would not be eligible according to the IW GEF 5 Strategy.</p> <p>September 23, 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The point on the formulation of outputs (see SFM 1.21.) has not been addressed. please revise it asap. - The point on afforestation is taken. We welcome that the program will consider farmer managed regeneration. - All the points have been addressed. However, please check the cell. 28 that mention complementary points we will check at CEO endorsement. Thanks. |
| | <p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The language in Table A for CCM-1 does not match the GEF focal areas. CCM-1 is for Technology Transfer; CCM-3 is for Renewable Energy. The outcomes and outputs for each focal area are prescribed as shown in the template GEF5-Template Reference Guide 9-14-10rev11-18-2010_0. <p>It is difficult to tell from the PFD if the goal is CCM-1 or CCM-3 or some mixture. With the emphasis on enhancing RE use in fish production, the descriptions imply a better fit with CCM-3.</p> <p>Please clarify and modify the language to match the required template.</p> <p>DER, September 20, 2011. Document is modified to refer to CCM-3, Renewable energy. Comment cleared.</p> |
| | <p>9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p> | <p>The strategies used in the development of the Lake Chad Basin programme include the LCBC Strategic Action Plan (SAP) and the national strategies including Poverty Reduction Strategies and National Communications on conventions.</p> <p>Addressed.</p> |
| | <p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?</p> | <p>There is no description of how the GEF incremental funding will contribute to sustainable efforts after the project is over. Please clarify.</p> <p>September 20, 2011</p> |

| | | Addressed. |
|----------------|--|---|
| Program Design | <p>11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, express all projects amounts in US\$, even with approximative rounding. The amounts in UAC are not helpful. Thanks. - If possible, map the baseline projects, or at least confirm that they are all developed in the Basin Lake Chad (this comment targets some projects, notably for Nigeria, Cameroon, and CAR). - We understand that the PRODEBALT is providing the main source of information to justify the incremental reasoning and the added value of GEF resources for the conservation and the sustainable management of natural resources in the Lake Chad Basin. - Other programs/projects that are on the same orientations of sustainable nature resource management are also welcome - at least based in the information available in the document. We will be pleased that AfDB includes a serious risk analysis during the development of children projects, including potential controversial baseline projects or reputations risks. Please, confirm. - That said, we are less comfortable with other projects mentioning too much activities out of the scope of GEF activities (energy interconnector) or mentioning non eligible activities (aquaculture ponds, introduction of species, afforestation) or controversial themes (large dam, infrastructure). Please, check and confirm the baseline projects and the incremental reasoning. Many projects, notably for Cameroon and Nigeria seem difficult or risky to justify as baseline projects. Please, clarify. - Revise the reasoning under each project to well report the baseline scenario and what is the GEF alternative. - The descriptions of the baseline projects are difficult to align with the proposed GEF project. For CCM, renewable energy and IW, we would expect to see which baseline projects are being implemented that align with the goals of the GEF incremental funding. Then we would expect to see how the incremental funding would build on the baseline project to achieve global environmental benefits. It is not appropriate to include in the baseline projects that have no direct relationship to the GEF project. - Please, see p.10, third section: we do not see how GEF resources are going to be incremental on the energy projects that are described in this section. We do not discuss the need for energy. We do not express any advise on the rationale for an interconnector between Cameroon and Chad. We do simply not see the incremental reasoning to justify CC-M an renewable energy. Please, justify, or remove CC allocations. <p>September 20, 2011 (JMS) We thank AfDB to have addressed major issues.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We understand that important projects, but potentially controversial or with different risks have been removed. - The annex describing the baseline activities and the potentialities for the GEF is also appreciated. - With this annex, we can figure out how GEF resources might be used for LD, BD, and SFM resources. However, further information is requested on the use of GEF resources (see further DER's comments on CC): - Please, give an estimate of carbon benefits for SFM activities. - Please develop one-page or two-page project briefs describing the nature of interventions in each country or for the regional project. Please refer to other examples of PFD to apply a model giving the key information for the GEF (background, baseline situation, GEB, main objectives, activities, partners). <p>DER, September 20, 2011. The description of the baseline projects relationship to energy is not discernible from the revised PFD or the annex. The incremental reasoning is not sufficient because we cannot tell the scope of the baseline use of energy, and the intended substitution or replacement of that energy with RE. For example, how much unsustainable biomass energy is consumed and what proportion of that will be displaced?</p> <p>20th of September 2011 (cseverin): The baseline matrix included (pp 11-12) is a step in the right direction, however, it is still not providing adequate information. Please do provide more detailed information on the sub projects - their associated baseline projects, etc.</p> <p>September 23, 2011 All the points have been addressed, at least partially, but in the right direction due to the time and the available level of information. We have completed the cell. 28 to draw your attention on key elements that we will check in the project documents.</p> <p>September 26, 2011 Additional information is provided in the Annex 4. Cleared.</p> |
| | <p>12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A table with existing initiatives will be welcome to understand the big picture of partners and how the GEF will be positioned to fulfill some gaps or reinforce some needs at regional, national, or local levels. <p>September 20, 2011</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A table has been provided describing the main baseline project financed by the donor community (the PRODEBALT). |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>- Please, note that a deeper analysis of other initiatives is expected in each project document.</p> <p>- Please justify that the activities financed by the GEF will not materialize without GEF resources.</p> <p>September 23, 2011 Addressed. Here again, please check cell. 28.</p> |
| | <p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p> | <p>References to GEF incremental contribution and the resulting global environmental benefits in Section F are vague. The section appears to describe a mixture of baseline activities and GEF activities. Please clarify which are the specific GEF incremental activities and how they will contribute to global environmental benefits.</p> <p>For CCM/RE activities, we would expect to see an estimate of the likely locations for RE systems; the types of partners and businesses; the number of systems to be acquired and installed; the amount of energy to be generated; and the estimated emissions reductions.</p> <p>- If the SFM/REDD+ is triggered, an estimation of carbon benefits is expected at PIF/PFD level.</p> <p>DER, September 20, 2011. The requested clarifications have not been provided, either for the RE systems, or the SFM. We need estimated carbon benefits for all CCM funding requested.</p> <p>20th of September 2011 (cseverin): This remains a bit vague for BD, LD and IW too, maybe it will become clearer when the baseline investments have been closer tight to sub projects.</p> |
| | <p>14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p> | <p>1- Component 3 is identified as an investment component, drawing on funding from several focal areas. The PFD does not include a description of component 3 and how it will be implemented. Please clarify. For example, on investments in renewable energy, we would expect to see a description of the financial mechanisms that will be utilized to procure the RE systems. We would expect to see a description of how each project will identify the types of RE systems appropriate for the identified application. Please clarify how GEF funding will be allocated within the existing structures of PRODEBALT.</p> <p>DER, September 20, 2011. The response on the above comment is not adequate. Please respond to the comment.</p> <p>2- Maps of the basin will be welcome to illustrate many issues: evolution of the water surfaces, existing projects, planned investments and activities under the program, etc.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>3- 19th of September 2011 (cseverin): please make sure that it is clear what focal areas will be allocating funds towards which outputs, as i.e. aquaculture and irrigation such as furrow irrigation will not be eligible for IW investments.</p> <p>4- Further, please include a results framework, so that it is easier to understand what outcomes and outputs is expected from the investments. e.g. an quantifiable output indicator such as 25% reduction in water used for irrigation of existing irrigated areas, through implementing drip irrigation, would be the kind of output indicators asked for. In its present form the Programme Results framework does not lay out these details.</p> <p>20th of September 2011 (cseverin): Please address above comments</p> <p>5- Please clarify under which component following suggested activities will be taking place "the Program will also enhance the monitoring of surface water quality and quantity and the exploration of ground water resources (in collaboration with UNESCO) to assess the ground water potential and recharge capacity of the aquifers including water quality and potential water uses to augment the surface water resources." as mentioned on pp 13.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Please address points 1, 4, and 5 that have not been correctly addressed in the revised document.</p> <p>September 23, 2011 Addressed.</p> |
| | <p>15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p> | <p>See section G, p. 12. We understand and welcome the reasoning explaining that the program will mainly benefit to local communities in the basin. At CEO endorsement, please develop a detailed information for the basin and for the country, with a clear identification of targets at local level: community group, CSO/NGO, professional associations, traditional authorities, etc. The information that is currently provided is very generic and not specific to the Lake Basin. Thanks.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 - Please, note that it is not the Agency's responsibility to mention what information is requested at the concept level (PFD or PIF) or at CEO endorsement. - Because of the lack of information on each local situation of demonstration activities, please provide at least a checklist of information that will be available</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <p>in the child project documents about socio-economic benefits, including gender issues.</p> <p>September 23, 2011 Addressed.</p> |
| | <p>16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?</p> | <p>- Please develop on how public participation is take into consideration. - develop the roles of the various stakeholders. The lack of information on this point is drawing our attention on a possible concern on the way of preparing such program. Please remind that the ownership of the program by countries and targetted people, the participation of public, the dialogue with other initiatives are key points for the GEF. Without the insurance that these points are completed, it will be difficult to confirm the engagement of the GEF. Please, clarify.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Please, take note that these elements will particularly be reviewed in the child project documents. Addressed.</p> |
| | <p>17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p> | <p>- More description is required of how the investment components will be structured in order to understand if the GEF financing requested is at the appropriate level and concessionality. Will all focal area funds be mingled in a single investment vehicle per country? Will each project in each country create separate investment vehicles? Please clarify.</p> <p>DER, September 20, 2011. The response is not clear and is worrisome. Please describe specifically how each project will be designed, and how the investment components of the project will be structured. We do not understand the notion of mixing focal area funding within the same investment structure. Please clarify.</p> <p>- At CEO endorsement, a full risk analysis is expected, including reputational risks.</p> <p>20th of September 2011 (cseverin): Plese consider to include the potential risk of a continued lowering water table in the diminishing lake or elaborate on why this is not a risk to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>JMS: Please include a brief description of projects at national level to figure out how the GEF resources will be used.</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | <p>September 23, 2011 Addressed. See cell. 28.</p> |
| | <p>18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Program is apparently developed under the umbrella of the Strategic Action Programme and various national planning and strategic documents. - The cofinancing provided by other partners (bilateral cooperation, European Union, countries) reflects the coordination with other partners. Please, develop the acronyms and mention the nature of cofinancing (cash or in kind). <p>19th of September 2011 (cseverin): Please make sure to coordinate with upcoming investments in the basin, so that no overlap will be taking place. A project concept under development with UNDP and UNESCO may be targeting sustainable use and maintenance of the freshwater ecosystem and its resources in accordance with the implementation of the Lake Chad SAP.</p> <p>20th of September 2011 (cseverin) On pp 10, please correct INDP to UNDP. JMS: all other points have been addressed.</p> |
| | <p>19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p> | <p>Please, describe the implementation arrangements in the text and please complete, if necessary the part I " Program Identification" (p1). For the time being, without any mention of partners or other executing partner, we understand that the AfDB will be the executive entity. If AFDB confirms this position, this will impact the managements costs. No management costs are allowed for an GEF agency executing the project. Please clarify.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Later in the document, we understand that the Program will be implemented through projects executed by the Lake Chad Basin Commission and national institutions: a) Management costs can be accepted up to 5 percent of GEF resources (taken from STAR and SFM/REDD+ resources); b) the cofinancing ratio for the whole project must be in the comparable ranges for the management costs. <p>September 20, 2011 We understand that a regional coordination will be ensured by the LCBC. We also understand that other projects will be implemented at national level. When "national projects" are mentioned, please clarify if the executing agency is well a national entity (administration, department, agencies..) and that it is not the AfDB who is directly executing the national projects. This point might impact the level of management costs. Here again, a brief description of projects will surely address these questions.</p> |

| | | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| | | September 21, 2011 Addressed. |
| Program Financing | 20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate? | <p>- Please note the amount requested from GEF is above the 5% maximum and therefore requires justification. In addition, if the AfDB is the executing agency, then project management costs should be zero. Please clarify.</p> <p>- Following comments made above (see cell.6), please revised budget summaries, and check that all the tables are consistent.</p> <p>19th of September 2011 (cseverin): Please make sure to have coherency between the funding available (Table D sum) and the total in table B. Presently, the fee has been included in the total in Table B. The total of 20.661.667 (table D) has to be the same total in table B, including an eventual PM budget line.</p> <p>20th of September 2011 (cseverin): budgetary point addressed.</p> <p>Please make sure to clarify the point on PM budget in relation to excution of the sub projects.</p> <p>See also cell. 19.</p> <p>September 23, 2011. Addressed.</p> |
| | 21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | <p>- Table C: please indicate the nature of cofinancing (cash or in-kind).</p> <p>- Please, remind that at CEO endorsement, letters of cofinancing are expected with the final document package.</p> <p>22ndo of September 2011 (cseverin): The indicated co-financing to GEF IW funds is too low, please strongly consider to increase this to eg 1:3 or 1:4.</p> <p>September 26, 2011 Cleared.</p> |
| | 22. Comment on the indicated co-financing. | <p>- Please, confirm that no potential controversial projects or with serious reputation risks are used for cofinancing. Complete the analysis of baseline projects to better explain the business-as-usual scenario and what is the GEF alternative. Thanks.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 Addressed. But, please, develop the baseline projects to justify CC resources.</p> <p>September 23, 2011</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | The revised annex with the baseline project is very helpful. addressed. |
| | 23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles? | - The cofinancing is mainly provided from projects and investment programs from the AfDB that are well in the line with its role. Cleared. |
| Program Monitoring and Evaluation | 24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | |
| | 25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | |
| Agency Responses | 26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | |
| | • STAP? | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | |
| | • Council comments? | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | |
| PFD Clearance | 27. Is PFD clearance being recommended? | <p>September 19, 2011 - The PFD cannot be recommended yet. Please, address comments raised in this review. Tanks.</p> <p>September 20, 2011 - We thank AfDB for the significant improvements of the document and the responses that are made. However, please address the points above.</p> <p>September 23, 2011 - We thank the Agency for the work and note the improvement of the document. However, please first, note that minor points stay pending or some clarifications are necessary at CEO endorsement. Second, wrong fee calculation is still present in the table D (see total and breakdown per focal area and country). Third, project summaries are still expected with the PFD. And four, we accepted the explanations given by the AfdB about the support from the countries, but please consider that the final letters of endorsement will have to be updated by the Council date.</p> <p>Upon receipt of a revised document with the right numbers, the PFD will be recommended for clearance.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>September 26, 2011 We thank the Agency to have completed the PFD with project summaries, address minor points that were pending, and revise the numbers. Technically, we can recommend the document. However, please, be informed that we still found discrepancies between financing tables in the PFD.</p> <p>September 26, 2011- BIS All points have been addressed. The PFD is recommended for clearance. We take the points that all countries mention their support to the programmatic approach. However, please send the final letters of endorsement as soon as possible, and by the date of the Council.</p> |
| | <p>28. Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.</p> | <p>1) Please, confirm the cofinancing and document in detail. It should only involve activities that are aligned with the GEF objectives.</p> <p>2) Please, provide a deep analysis of project baseline, 1) confirming the incremental use of GEF resources and 2) reassuring that no controversial projects are used to leverage GEF financing.</p> <p>3) Please complete a deep risk analysis highlighting institutional issues, implementing arrangements, reputation risks, and ecological risks (notably to be sure that GEF resources are used to rationalize water uses, or that all measures are taken to avoid the use of exotic species with invasive risks).</p> <p>4) Please make sure that the IW funded sub-projects follow the IW GEF 5 strategies and only include eligible activities following GEF 5 IW objective 1. in this early form, the descriptions do not offer enough details to understand if this will be the case (activities such as following could be considered: community based drip irrigation, community based IWRM demonstrations, Wetland management and protection as well regional IWRM knowledge management would be among eligible activities)</p> <p>5) We would expect to see specific details of the baseline projects for each focal areas and how those baseline project align with the objectives of the respective GEF focal area. We would expect to see how the incremental funding would build on the baseline project to achieve global environmental benefits.</p> <p>6) Using the principal of incremental reasoning, specific carbon emission benefits and other benefits must be estimated and presented. These benefits estimates should be specific to the types and scope of each intervention for each project. Also, by using the principal of incremental reasoning, the GEF funding</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>for each intervention should be justified.</p> <p>7) Investment mechanisms to demonstrate or procure renewable energy systems under component 3 should be spelled out in clear and specific detail, with the types of systems to be used, the number, and estimated unit costs. The design and structure of investment mechanisms in each country should be documented.</p> <p>8) please, detail the monitoring at project and program level.</p> <p>9) please provide EIA to make sure that the suggested pumping of groundwater resources will not affect the lake and groundwater level negatively.</p> |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | September 19, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | September 20, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | September 23, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | September 26, 2011 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | September 26, 2011 |

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|---|--|---|
| Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program | 1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate? | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please, remind that many comments were made during the review to be clarified at CEO endorsement. Please, notably refer to the comments made in the cell 28 entitled "Items to consider at subsequent individual project submissions for CEO endorsement", and explain how these points are included in the PPG. - Please refer to the comments in the STAP review and responses from AfDB, especially on dealing with potential tradeoffs, master wood energy plan, and baseline for carbon estimation, and be clear the PPG includes activities to address the rating of "major revision". <p>Table B:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please explain in the text how the activities are going to provide the basic elements to develop the four components of the Program. - Please explain what are the expected results of this PPG: we understand that one regional project document will be prepared and potentially five national projects. However, the phrasing is not fully clear for us. Please, clarify. - The collection of information to identify the baseline scenario, the limiting factors, the risks, the existing approaches related to nature resource management and conservation, the energy consumption patterns, the political, institutional, |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| | | <p>organizational, and technical capacities of all stakeholders at regional and local levels, are typically eligible under a PPG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Confirm that a M&E and a capitalization strategy will be developed. - CCM and SFM/REDD+ objectives require credible estimates of carbon benefits, or greenhouse gas benefits more broadly if appropriate. Please, confirm that this analysis will be conducted. - Some type of carbon monitoring system is expected. Please confirm that this item is included in the tasks. - These elements have to be reflected in the ToR of the different specialists (carbon monitoring, renewable energy activities). Which specialist will be the experts on forest carbon issues, and which on renewable energy activities? - Please, explain how the tradeoffs will be handled if the activities are done in separate analysis. - Please remind that the funding from CC is for mitigation. Confirm that climate resilience issues are considered. - The activities 1-5 are welcome in a PPG (institutional analysis, component studies, environmental and social analysis, climate risk analysis, stakeholder consultation). - Please note that GEF resources cannot be used for coordination and management costs for a PPG (see p.2 and p6). - 2. Component studies: please note that the activity or the result entitled "project document finalized" is not eligible per se under a PPG. The PPG has to be used to prepare all preparatory activities and provide the basic information for the project document. But the project consolidation and finalization are typically activities that are expected from the Agency or the cofinancing. Please correct and confirm. - 6. As mentioned above, it is not possible to include GEF resources in the coordination budget (here \$56,000). Moreover, \$200,000 are shown as cofinancing for this component. We have difficulties to figure out how \$200,000 of cofinancing can be assigned to management costs while "only" \$130,000 are assigned to technical activities and consultations. <p>April 19, 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We thank the Agency for the thorough revisions. - If monitoring and evaluation activities are mentioned, there are no specifications about the METT. Please clearly make reference to the METT, as they are expected at CEO endorsement. <p>May 1, 2012 Addressed.</p> |
| | 2.Is itemized budget justified? | <p>No. We understand that the development of such program is difficult and need enough</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>resources. However, we expect that the programmatic approach will also be a way to be cost efficient and reduce transaction costs. Based on the PPG costs for individual projects, we are expecting a PPG under \$400,000 (equivalent to \$70,000 for each individual project and \$50,000 for the regional project). Please, revise.</p> <p>Table C - Please, provide the breakdown between focal areas and per country. We remind that the PPG is financed by Country STAR allocations used for the program. The table C has to reflect the detailed breakdown per focal area and per country.</p> <p>Table D - The part devoted to international consultants seem high. Please, justify or decrease the budget. - GEF resources cannot be used to finance coordination (cf \$40,000 in the table D). - We understand that the program need to develop consultation at regional, national, and local levels. Please, justify the amount of \$80,000 for consultations. - Please note that there are discrepancies in the cofinancing between the table B and the table D (respectively \$330,000 and \$150,000).</p> <p>April 19, 2012 - We take note that the budget has been revised down to \$400,000. - We take note that the PPG is not used for coordination and management costs and that \$1,000 in the component 6 is for communication activities. - We take note of the breakdown per focal area and per country. - We take note of the explanation provided for the costs (consultations, international consultants). - We take note that the number of weeks for international consultants has been decreased from 80 to 54 weeks.</p> |
| <p>Secretariat Recommendation</p> | <p>3.Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended?</p> | <p>The PPG cannot be recommended for approval. Please, address comments above, including issues raised in the STAP review and in the cell. 28 at PIF level (and below for the annex A).</p> <p>April 19, 2012 - Please include the METT in the activities given to the consultants. - Please, note there are discrepancies between the table D and the annex A (See the number of weeks for international consultants (58 versus 46) and local consultants (54 versus 64). Upon reception of a revised document, the PPG will be recommended for clearance.</p> |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|---|
| | | <p>May 1, 2012</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All points have been fixed. - However, we find a problem in the table C: the PPG should be financed from STAR allocations and not from regional budgets. Please revise the table. Please remind that the sum of the project amount plus the PPG should correspond to the amount endorsed. If needed, revise the amount of the project grants at CEO endorsement. <p>Upon receipt of a revised version, the PPG will be recommended for clearance.</p> <p>May 25, 2012 (Mohamed Bakarr)</p> <p>All amounts have been adjusted in the PFD to accommodate the PPG request. The PPG is now recommended.</p> |
| | 4. Other comments | <p>Annex A:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please revise the last column (tasks to be performed). The tasks are not described for all consultants (p.6 and all consultants p.7). - 80 weeks of international consultants at US\$ 3,000 seem a high amount. Please, justify or reduce. <p>May 25, 2012 (Mohamed Bakarr)</p> <p>Addressed</p> |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | March 15, 2012 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | May 24, 2012 |

* 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.