



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5487		
Country/Region:	Regional (Burkina Faso, Benin, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Guinea, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Chad)		
Project Title:	Integrated Development and Adaptation to Climate Change Project in The Niger Basin		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1; IW-3; CCA-1; CCM-5; LD-2; SFM/REDD+-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$400,000	Project Grant:	\$13,969,798
Co-financing:	\$74,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$88,369,798
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	GARBA, LAOUALI

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 ?	Yes, the participating countries are GEF eligible. Chad , Guinea, and Burkina Faso are also eligible under the LDCF.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>Endorsement letters are provided for all funds for participating countries.</p> <p>For GEF IW: Please note that IW funds are regional in nature and should not be endorsed as 'country allocations'. This is especially relevant here as there seems to be even differentiations between countries allocating specific, differing IW amounts to countries. This is inconsistent with the IW strategy. By CEO endorsement, please provide letters which (on IW side) show the entirety of IW</p>	

*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 January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>funds being endorsed by all OFPs and showing firm commitment for this regional effort and hence regional IW funds. Preallocation by country would not align with the GEF IW use of funds.</p> <p>For LDCF: Yes.</p> <p>(3/20/2014): The project has been revised to not include STAR from Guinea, but STAR/SFM for Burkina Faso (CCM, LD, and SFM)- other funds remain in nature the same. A revised LOE for Burkina Faso has been submitted. Algeria may join effort at later stage.</p> <p>Please note above comment to revise LOEs by endorsement to reflect regional nature of IW funds.</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	<p>October 10, 2013</p> <p>LD: No. The initial submission included a number of countries proposing to utilize STAR resources. Although Guinea is a flexible resources, the country no longer has any resources in its STAR allocation for this project. The countries allocation of US\$5.93 million has being programmed as follows: \$1.665M for SGP; \$2.964 million for Biogas; and \$1.19 million for Mano River.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>3/20/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>Funding for CCM component will be taken from Burkina Faso STAR allocation. Please note that CCM allocation left for the country is \$1,382,500, for LD \$980,000 is left and \$160,000 has been overdrawn from BD FA.</p> <p>Please make sure you do not exceed STAR allocations as else the funding request would need to be readjusted accordingly.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>GEF IW funds are available in the amount requested</p> <p>October 10, 2013</p> <p>No for the LD focal area, for which Guinea is requesting resources in the latest submission.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>IW - yes, the proposed amount remain available within the IW FA envelope.</p> <p>LD - Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>For Benin and Guinea, the requested funding would exceed the amounts currently available under the principle of Equitable Access for LDCs. Therefore, until additional financing becomes available, this project cannot be considered for LDCF support as proposed.</p> <p>For Chad, the amount requested is available under the ceiling.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>CCA Update 10/10/2013: It appears that only funding for Chad is being requested under the LDCF. However, please note that Table D lists LDCF funds as a source for LD activities in Guinea. Recommended action: Please correct Table D.</p> <p>CCA update 3/20/2014: This has been done.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	<p>October 10, 2013</p> <p>No set-aside funds are being requested.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>(3/20/2014): For SFM/REDD+ Yes. The project is eligible for SFM/REDD+ funding as it invests > \$2.0 million of combined STAR into forests. The funds are available.</p>	
<p>Strategic Alignment</p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>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 progress toward</i></p>	<p>IW: the project overall aims at the implementation of the Niger SDAP and SAP which is in alignment with the GEF IW FA objective 1. Yet, as raised under review question 7, there is not sufficient clarity between what is to be funded in terms of investments by either IW or LD. In addition, there is unclarity created due to not clearly articulating the project descriptions in table B and project components and vice versa.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<i>achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	<p>(3/20/2014): The project is aligned with IW focal area objectives 1 and 3. It is mainly a SAP implementation project and most IW resources are correctly allocated to this objective.</p> <p>(9/25/2013) above holds true. Please separate IW and LD support in table B more clearly and align component description and table B -right now these have a different structure and keeping both table B and the text description in a "component by component" structure would be much clearer to follow (as per our phone conversation).</p> <p>LD: LDCF: It is not clear which climate adaptation strategic objectives this project intends to support.</p> <p>LDCF update 10/10/2013: The climate adaptation strategic objective has been identified -- CCA-1.</p> <p>October 10, 2013</p> <p>The project includes a component that is adequately aligned with the LD focal area strategy.</p>	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	The project is overall aligned with the regional SAP and the SDAP. The SAP was GEF funded under the previous GEF IW foundational project. The alignment with national sector strategies is not well articulated. Please be specific on how the project aligns with these.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(9/25/2013 IW) - not adressed.</p> <p>LDCF: It is not clear how the proposal is consistent with country's national strategies and plans related to adaptation, particularly NAPAs, but also NCs and others.</p> <p>LDCF update 10/10/2013: The revised proposal provides clear linkages with NAPA, as well as referencing consistency with PRSPs and NFPS, albeit namely of the baseline project.</p> <p>(3/20/2014): The project is aligned with the Niger Basin SDAP/SAP as well as the NBA stratege plan. It clearly spells out which priiroities of the SDAP/SAP and NBA Strategic Plan are addressed. Alignment with the national priorities and AfDB strategies is sufficiently elaborated at PIF stage.</p>	
Project Design	6. 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?	<p>The baseline project is described in the PIF and issues to be addressed are building on the SDAP and SAP; yet in a resubmission baseline and increment descriptions are expected to be revised according to revised project ativities.</p> <p>(9/25/2013 - IW): The baseline description is not representing well the ongoing efforts in the basin with regard to the project components (incl. for example, ongoing donor coordination efforts that the project aims to strengthen;</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>also the type of other financed efforts within the SDAP/SAP would be good to be described to make the argument more clear why the specific described SAP implementation components for the IW funds (increment) are selected -a ssuming this is done to complement other efforts).</p> <p>LDCF: Not clear. The problem and baseline project as it relates specifically for Chad should be described in more detail.</p> <p>LDCF update 10/10/2013: The problem and baseline project description are much improved.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>IW: Comments have been addressed and range of baseline projects are well described as well as the complementarity to the proposed project.</p> <p>3/20/2014 CCM JS</p> <p>The focus of the component is clear and so are coordinating partners relevant for the component. However, given that CCM component was added later in the project design phase, we seek:</p> <p>a) Thorough studies and consultations with stakeholders during PPG to prioritize the identified drivers, and to provide adequate support to demonstrate that the proposed approach of tackling deforestation through reforestation of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>degraded areas is sufficient.</p> <p>b) Given that it is a MFA project and strives to be integrated in its approach, the project must describe the climate change risks regarding reforestation in the area especially given the project's focus on water availability in the region. An analysis and integration of such a study in project design is expected by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>c) A working plan that shows the role of different local communities in direct project activities.</p> <p>d) For output 5.2, studies on revising harvest quotas is appreciated, however the GEFSec expects full implementation of such studies in the target areas.</p> <p>e) PES mechanism for the proposed project does not establish a clear linkage with its purpose of supporting REDD+. Please clarify. Please refocus this output to include elements that would be directly contributing to the gaps in the FIP and/or FCPF programs in the country. For example: carbon assessment and monitoring in accordance with REDD+ methodologies would be an option.</p> <p>f) CCM financing for the project is contingent upon the project addressing all the comments provided above by CEO Endorsement Request.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>While the GEF TF portion of the project is aimed at the implementation of the agreed SAP and SDAP, both table B and the project component description require major rewriting, including for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - aligning table B transparently with the project component description. Right now table B seems to differ in substance from the component description, - For IW, clarify please what is TA and what is investment. - Please clearly indicate what is to be financed by LD and what by IW funds. - the latter then needs to align with the incremental cost reasoning. - once this is clarified, we will be able to comment on eligibility under the respective funds. Please note, e.g. that IW funds are only in very exceptional cases to be used/are incremental when it comes to irrigation improvement. Such exceptional cases may be considered in cases where highly innovative technologies/approaches would promise large water savings and have potential for wider- scale replications at the same time. <p>(9/25/2013) - we note that the description has been improved and the comment with regard to irrigation has been taken on board. Otherwise, above comments - as noted earlier and discussed on the phone - still hold overall. Please structure the component description by consecutively describing each component so that there is clear "mirror" in the project framework/table B. Please separate IW and LD finance in table B (and delete LD</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>funds as STAR resources have been exhausted). Numbering components in table B and the text would be helpful to the reader.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please revisit the PDO to be more specific to the project and its goal it is aimed at. - Please also note that the items to be funded and described in the component text are not all found in table B even though quite substantial outputs - such as Flood and Drought Early warning. with regard to the latter we note that this was explicitly take out of the UNDP/UNEP PIF as this was expected to be addressed by the AfDB project. - Also, the PIF needs to be strengtened in terms of specificity of what is to be funded and have some quantification in terms of expected outputs (and anticipated impact). At various parts of table B (e.g. component on sustainable management of NR investments) language appears to be more or less taken from the SAP - more clarity woud aid in what the level of effort is at each site and how this alignes with other parts of increment (as well as other baseline efforts). - Please also provide somewhat more deatil in component 1 - strengthening NBA and some sort of legal reforms and harmonizatio in general are GEL eligible - but the text would need to address to some degree what has been done (in baseline) and what roughly are the gaps (while ultimate details are of course only to be defined during project design). This is especially true as there are multiple 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>ongoing efforts already being implemented in the Niger basin.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please refine the wording of outcomes in terms of what the activities are aimed at - what is the goal/outcome that is to be achieved. - Kindly submit to us - for information - the sediment study mentioned in the text. - We cannot comment on finance level in detail right now before seeing the revised PIF. Presently the requested IW funds seem high based on current PIF. <p>LD: PIF does not adequately reflect a carefully thought through, country-driven initiative for such an important River Basin. The justification for STAR resources under BD and LD is lacking, particularly in light of the random nature in which the amounts are utilized by countries. The PIF should be resubmitted with clearly articulated and consistent arguments about why the proposed multi=focal / multi-trust fund approach was chosen over a purely IW basin management initiative</p> <p>LDCF: Chad-specific adaptation actions to be supported by LDCF financing need to be clearly outlined.</p> <p>LDCF update 10/10/2013: Similar to the updated comments above, more specificity and clarity with respect to activities, outputs, and desired outcomes would be useful.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>IW: The PIF has been to large extend been rewritten. It describes well how it alignes with the SDAP/SAP and what priorities are addressed. It is appareciated that each component description sets out to make this link as well as providing a rational for each component together with specific indicators.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement: - The PIF does a very good job to describe related regional finance by GEF and others and stresses the need for collarboration and coordination. It also mentions that a mapping excercise of funded activities on national scale will be carried out early during the PPG phase. This is important. Please assure that this will include all relevant GEF co-financed activities. We recommend to attach such "mapping" as an annex to the project document/PAD at endorsement stage (or as seperate docuement for information).</p> <p>- Please provide a copy of the EIA for us to rest assured that the sustainability of water uses has been assessed for the overall IPDACC project financed by AfDB and that the GEF finance is part of. There are quite a number of reservoirs and irrigation expansions part of the finance and assessment to assure sustainable use of the surface and groundwater resources needs to be part of project design.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Output 1.2. Please keep consistent wording on IW funds to finance measures to increase climate resilience (whereas LDCF finance addresses adaptation). <p>Component 2/3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please take on board lessons in design & implementation of watershed management plans e.g. fro other GEF finance (e.g. with SIP such as Lake Tana watershed and others succesful large watershed management intervotions) to address specific, local relevant drivers of watershed degradation and emphasizing the need for a livelihoods based approach in watershed management. - The emphasis to concentrate on the poorest communities and most degraded areas is commendable, yet please keep in mind that these are often alos the most remote areas. This needs to be considered in project design. - There is a seemingly strange deviation between components 2 and 3, e.g. 2.2 finances the development of watershed management plans while 3.2 fund their implementation. It may be worth to reevaluate during project design if this division/cut of the components will proof viable/else revise. - Output 2.1.: USD 3 million to be distributed among up to 30 communities implies average grants sizes of > or equal 100K. By experience from SGP and other, these are large envelopes on level of CSOs. Please consider to increase # of 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>communities/decrease size of average grant commensurate with capacities of CSOs to implement such finance.</p> <p>LDCF: The activities, outputs, and outcomes under the LDCF-funded component have been described in sufficient detail for the PIF stage.</p> <p>CCM:</p> <p>Comments component 5</p> <p>The focus of the component is clear and so are coordinating partners relevant for the component. However, given that CCM component was added later in the project design phase, we seek:</p> <p>a) Thorough studies and consultations with stakeholders during PPG to prioritize the identified drivers, and to provide adequate support to demonstrate that the proposed approach of tackling deforestation through reforestation of degraded areas is sufficient.</p> <p>b) Given that it is a MFA project and strives to be integrated in its approach, the project must describe the climate change risks regarding reforestation in the area especially given the project's focus on water availability in the region. An analysis and integration of such a study in project design is expected by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>c) A working plan that shows the role of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>different local communities in direct project activities.</p> <p>d) For output 5.2, studies on revising harvest quotas is appreciated, however the GEFSec expects full implementation of such studies in the target areas.</p> <p>e) PES mechanism for the proposed project does not establish a clear linkage with its purpose of supporting REDD+. Please refocus this output to include elements that would be directly contributing to the gaps in the FIP and/or FCPF programs in the country. For example: carbon assessment and monitoring in accordance with REDD+ methodologies would be an option.</p> <p>f) CCM financing for the project is contingent upon the project addressing all the comments provided above by CEO Endorsement Request.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The project aims at SAP implementation. While the TA type components aim at regional activities which are clearly incremental in terms of uses of IW funds, this is less clear in the investment components at this point (see questions 7).</p> <p>Overall, the incremental cost reasoning outlines general benefits in terms of improving sustainable livelihoods, water availability and food security. The articulation of addressing GEBs should be strengthened.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>(9/25/2013 IW) - please address in a revised PIF. There seems to not be a clear description of what is incremental reasoning. GEBs are described under heading of increment.</p> <p>LDCF: The adaptation benefits are not clearly defined. Furthermore, adaptation benefits resulting from LDCF support need to reflect Chad's priorities, as indicated in NAPA and other strategic documents on adaptation, as appropriate.</p> <p>LDCF update 10/10/2013: The adaptation benefits need to be listed in terms of expected results and outcomes, rather than general activities. Promoting climate change adaptation activities that are not considered by the baseline project are certainly additional, but need to be clearly spelled out in this section.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>IW: In rewriting the PIF, the submitted document is now much more clear and outlines the incremental reasoning and GEBs well and in sufficient detail at PIF stage.</p> <p>LDCF: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. 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</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	<p>The PIF emphasises the need for involving broad range of stakeholders and taking a participatory approach.</p> <p>LDCF: This question will be revisited upon further revision of the PIF.</p> <p>LDCF update 10/10/2013: A list of stakeholders, including CSOs and indigenous people should be provided, at least provisionally. Alternatively, a clear plan on defining those and engaging them, starting with engaging them during the project preparation phase, should be outlined. Please also include gender considerations, where possible.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>IW : yes, this is sufficiently described for PIF stage. The project design is such that there are regional, as well as a community driven/bottom-up components. Participation by a broad range of stakeholders as well as gender consideration is evident and will be expanded in project design.</p> <p>LDCF: Cleared.</p>	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient	Due to expected changes in project design in a resubmission we will comment on this again. The analysis of project risks will need to be strengthened.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>(9/25/2013 IW) - please address and include in revised PIF a more comprehensive description of major risks and mitigation measures.</p> <p>LDCF: The project does not address major risks. Please list all major types of risks along with measures to mitigate them.</p> <p>LDCF Update 10/10/2013: The major risks have been identified. Stronger risk mitigation measures may be needed in order to ensure support for and/or sustainability of the regional components.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>IW : The resubmitted PIF is addressing major risks and specific catered to address climate resilience of rural communities as well as - on regional level - assessing climate impacts on the regional SDAP/SAP.</p> <p>LDCF: By CEO Endorsement, please consider implementing stronger risk mitigation measures in order to ensure support for and/or sustainability of the regional components.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>The project has taken explicit efforts to align with the SAP and is coordinating with a UNDP/UNEP submission for conjunctive management/SAP implementation in the Niger basin. Both projects aim to submit a common annex</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>that shows each others project activities in relation to the SAP. Please note that the draft table we received informally (i) does not align well enough with table B and the project component description and (ii) while mostly showing distinctive roles of each project also shows a few overlaps that need addressing (see e.g. LTEQO 11).</p> <p>Please address how the project aligns with activities funded by the development partner consortium for implementation of the larger SDAP. This is not clear at present.</p> <p>(9/25/2013 IW) - not sufficiently addressed in the current submission (as described above in earlier questions)..</p> <p>LDCF: Not clear. Please explain how the project is consistent and coordinated with Chad's adaptation-relevant initiatives.</p> <p>LDCF Update 10/10/2013: Same comment as previously made.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>Yes, the PIF is explicit about coordination with relevant project especially at regional level. As outlined under Qu. 7: The PIF does a very good job to describe related regional finance by GEF and others and stresses the need for collaboration and coordination. It also mentions that a mapping exercise of</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>funded activities on national scale will be carried out early during the PPG phase. This is important. Please assure that this will include all relevant GEF co-financed activities. We recommend to attach such "mapping" as an annex to the project document/PAD at endorsement stage (or as seperate docuement for information).</p> <p>LDCF update 3/20/2014: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>As the resubmission is expected to result in major revisions, it is not useful to comment here at this point.</p> <p>(9/25/2013 IW) - please address in revised PIF and we will comment in the revised version.</p> <p>LDCF: This question will be revisited upon revision of the PIF.</p> <p>LDCF Update 10/10/2013: Same comment as previously made.</p> <p>(3/20/2014): The project is designed to seek coordination and complimentarity of a regionally agreed framework for soft and hard investments and national implementation and considering impacts across sectors and borders. Its design fosters replicability and makes considerable effort to caputure and disseminate lessons across countries and stakeholders. It also will employ innovative measures to raise finance for watershed measures trthrough PES and by that aiming to distribute costs and benefits.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>LDCF update 3/20/2014: The project appears to be innovative in mainstreaming adaptation measures into an international watershed, namely through investing in the capacity communities to manage fishery resources in a sustainable and climate-resilient way. This component is proposed to be financed in Chad, with potential for regional replication.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
<p>Project Financing</p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>For IW: the suggested GEF IW grant finance appears large, but that may be better articulated/justified in a revised version providing more clarity on project outputs. as mentioned earlier, sizable outputs in component descriptions cannot be found in table B. To be commented on again in a resubmission.</p> <p>(9/25/2013 IW) - this still holds. We will revisit and comment in the revised PIF.</p> <p>Also, please address and check the following: - consistent co-finance by trust fund in tables A and B.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- project fees - to be 9 % not 9.5 % - separate IW from LD funds in table B & delete LD funds as STAR resources exhausted (see previous comment) - Change IW fund in table D to "regional" from "Chad" - please keep project management as possible within 5 % of SUB-total in table B</p> <p>LDCF: This question will be revisited upon revision of the PIF.</p> <p>LDCF Update 10/10/2013: The GEF funding and associated cofinancing as indicated in Table B are fine. However, please correct the source of funds for the LD component in Table D.</p> <p>(3/20/2014)</p> <p>IW; The indicated finance and co-finance is adequate and assured through AFDB co-finance.</p> <p>Please assure that numbers for GEF grants and all GEF co-finance are consistent and add up across tables A, B, and C. Please revise and resubmit.</p> <p>LDCF Update 3/20/2014: The table D has been corrected.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line</p>	<p>There is substantial, explicit co-finance provided by AFDB.</p> <p>(9/25/2013 IW) - as discussed with the agency in more detail already, it needs to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>be clear what of AfDB cofinance in Niger basin aligns with the project components. Not all AfDB may be co-finance to the increment.</p> <p>LDCF: This question will be revisited upon revision of the PIF.</p> <p>LDCF Update 10/10/2013: Yes, it is adequate, and the amount is in line with the agency's role.</p> <p>(3/20/2014): IW: The indicated finance and co-finance is adequate and assured through AFDB co-finance and in line with AfDB's role.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>Project management costs in table B are just under 5 %. Please note though that the description of component 1 includes substantive items related to the PIU that are actually project management related. Please address (i.e. do not mix project management and project activities).</p> <p>(9/25/2013 IW) - project management costs are above 5 % of grant sub-total in table B. Please adjust. LDCF: Yes.</p> <p>(3/20/2014): IW - the project management costs exceed 5 % of the grant sub-total. Please provide a justification for this or revise and resubmit.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from</p>	<p>IW: PPG is requested and is within the norm.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>LDCF: The PPG requested is within the norm, even though the LDCF grant support would have to be revised to exclude countries that are unable to access funding at this time.</p> <p>LDCF Update 10/10/2013: The PPG requested is still within the norm, following the revision of the LDCF grant support request.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>The requested PPG is above the norm, which is reasonable for a regional and multi-focal area project. Please provide such justification in the PIF.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>There is no non-grant GEF related instrument in the proposal.</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
<p>Secretariat Recommendation</p>			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<p>Recommendation at PIF Stage</p>	<p>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</p>	<p>No. The PIF will require major revisions in terms of points raised in previous comments to clarify components and outputs in alignment with each fund which can then be more effectively reviewed for eligibility. Also, due to limited availability of LDCF funds a revised PIF will differ in scope.</p> <p>LD: In addition, the PIF resubmission needs to clearly articulate and provide consistent arguments about why the proposed multi-focal / multi-trust fund approach was chosen over a purely IW basin management initiative.</p> <p>Please before resubmission, clarify point raised under 2,3, 5, 6, 7, 8, (11), 12, (13), 16, 17 and 18. Please also review consistency of funding figure by FA funds in tables A, B, and D.</p> <p>(10/25/2013 - REVISED PIF). No, the PIF is not yet recommended and many of the previous comments need to be addressed further. We are looking forward to working with the team along the way.</p> <p>LDCF Update 10/10/2013: No, the PIF is not yet recommended.</p> <p>(3/20/2014):</p> <p>IW: The PIF will be technically cleared once remaining issues regarding finance have been addressed. See questions 16,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>18, and 19. Please also make sure that the agency fee does not exceed 9 % (please check each row/GEF funding source). Please check all numbers/totals and sub-totals in tables A, B, C, D and readjust fee also in Part 1.</p> <p>LD & SFM: Earlier comments have been adequately addressed. The resubmission has made the case for LD & SFM funding within the IW context and is herewith technically cleared.</p> <p>LDCF: The PIF will be technically cleared subject to taking into considerations the comments above on the issues of finance. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval by the LDCF Council only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please consider comments/points provided under question 7 which should be addressed during project design (specifically for IW and CCM)	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	September 25, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 20, 2014	

* 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.