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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| GEF ID: | **5252** | | |
| Country/Region: | **Niger** | | |
| Project Title: | **GGW - Niger Community Action Program, Phase3 P132306** | | |
| GEF Agency: | **World Bank** | GEF Agency Project ID: | **132306 (World Bank)** |
| Type of Trust Fund: | **GEF Trust Fund** | GEF Focal Area (s): | **Multi Focal Area** |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | | **LD-1; LD-3; BD-1; BD-2; SFM/REDD+-1; CCM-5;** | |
| Anticipated Financing  PPG: | **$0** | Project Grant: | **$4,518,518** |
| Co-financing: | **$43,652,000** | Total Project Cost: | **$48,170,518** |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | **Jean-Marc Sinnassamy** | Agency Contact Person: | **Yves de Soye,** |

| 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? | | |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | | |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | | |
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | | |
| Resource Availability | 6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | | |
| | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | | |
| | • focal area set-aside? | | |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | | |
| | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified? | | |
| | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP? | | |
| | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes? | | |
| Project Design | 11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions? | | |
| | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project | | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | |
| | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning? | |
| | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear? | |
| | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate? | |
| | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | |
| | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly? | |
| | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience) | |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | |
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | | |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | | |
| | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | | |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | | |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| Agency Responses | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | • Council comments? | | |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| **Secretariat Recommendation** | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | **30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?** | No PIF is required, as this project is developed under a GEF5 programmatic approach developed by the World Bank | |

4

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Support the Great Green Wall Initiative, SAWAP/GGWI). | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? | | |
| | **33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?** | | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**


## REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|---|---|---|
| PPG Budget | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | **3. Is PPG approval being recommended?** | |
| | 4. Other comments | |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | |

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