



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:	\$167,857	Project Grant:	\$14,235,000
Co-financing:	\$75,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$89,402,857
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):		
	<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>	
	<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>	
	<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> <p>CCA Update 10/10/2013:</p>	

		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.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/a	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	October 10, 2013 No set-aside funds are being requested. Cleared	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></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> <p>(9/25/2013) above holds till 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>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>	
	<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?</p>	<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>(9/25/2013 IW) - not addressed.</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>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>	<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>(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</p>	

Project Design		<p>efforts that the project aims to strengthen; 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>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 promiss 	

wider- scale replications at the same time.

(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 funds as STAR resources have been exhausted). Numbering components in table B and the text would be helpful to the reader.

- 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 strengthened 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 would aid in what the level of effort is at each site and how this aligns with other parts of increment (as well as other baseline efforts).

detail in component 1 - strengthening NBA and some sort of legal reforms and harmonization 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 ongoing efforts already being implemented in the Niger basin.
- 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.

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

LDCF: Chad-specific adaptation actions to be supported by LDCF financing need to be clearly outlined.

LDCF update 10/10/2013:

		more specificity and clarity with respect to activities, outputs, and desired outcomes would be useful.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<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> <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>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>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>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>(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.</p>	

		needed in order to ensure support for and/or sustainability of the regional components.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<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 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>	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for ..	As the resubmission is expected to result in major revisions, it is not useful to comment here at this point.	

	<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>(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>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?	<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 revise and comment in the revised PIF.</p> <p>Also, please address and check the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consistent co-finance by trust fund in tables A and B. - project fees - to be 9 % not 9.5 % - separate IW from LD funds in table B & 	

		<p>exhausted (see previous comment)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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>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>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?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</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 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>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</p>	

		table B. Please adjust. 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> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	IW: 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. LDCF Update 10/10/2013: The PPG requested is still within the norm, following the revision of the LDCF grant support request.	
	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?	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	

		<p>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>	
	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)	September 25, 2013	
	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.