



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 Program in The Niger Basin Programme.		
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; CCA-1; LD-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$219,813	Project Grant:	\$18,205,000
Co-financing:	\$75,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$93,424,813
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
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	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.</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 funds being endorsed by all OFPs and showing firm commitment for this regional effort and hence regional IW funds. Preallocation by country would</p>	

		For LDCF: Yes.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	GEF IW funds are available in the amount requested	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	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. For Chad, the amount requested is available under the ceiling.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	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 achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	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. LD: LDCF: It is not clear which climate	

		project intends to support.	
	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?	<p>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.</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>	
	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 activities.</p> <p>LDCF: Not clear. The problem and baseline project as it relates specifically for Chad should be described in more detail.</p>	
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<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 	

		<p>- the latter then needs to align with the incremental cost reasoning.</p> <p>- 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 promiss large water savings and have potential for wider- scale replications at the same time.</p> <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>GEFSEC teams from respective FA will only be able to provide more detailed comments once we receive a revised document.</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 activties which are clearly incremental in terms of uses of IW funds, this is less clear in the investment</p>	

		<p>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> <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>9. Is there a clear description of:</p> <p>a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and</p> <p>b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<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>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>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.</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>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country</p>	<p>The project has taken explicit efforts to align with the SAP and is coordinating with a UNDP/UNEP submission for</p>	

		<p>implementation in the Niger basin. Both projects aim to submit a common annex 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>LDCF: Not clear. Please explain how the project is consistent and coordinated with Chad's adaptation-relevant initiatives.</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>LDCF: This question will be revisited upon revision of the PIF.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear</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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	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. LDCF: This question will be revisited upon revision of the PIF.	
	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 with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	There is substantial, explicit co-finance provided by AFDB. LDCF: This question will be revisited upon revision of the PIF.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Project management costs in table B are just under 5 %. Please note though that the decription of component 1 includes substantive items related to the PIU that are actaully project management related. Please address (i.e. do not mix project management and project activities). LDCF: Yes.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from 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> .	PPG is requested and is within the norm. 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.	

	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	There is no non-grant GEF related instrument in the proposal.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<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),</p>	

		consistency of funding figure by FA funds in tables A, B, and D.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	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.