



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

GEF ID:	5745		
Country/Region:	Nigeria		
Project Title:	Sustainable Fuelwood Management in Nigeria		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5366 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-2; CCM-3; CCM-5; LD-2; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$4,410,000
Co-financing:	\$15,900,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,430,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Marina Olshanskaya,

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 ?	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes. UNFCCC ratified in 1994. UNCCD ratified in 1997.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes. The endorsement letter signed by the GEF OFP Mr. Abu-Bakr Sulayman has been submitted.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	3/13/2014 JS JMS	

*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)
		Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	3/13/2014 JS JMS	
		Yes.	
	<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)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund • focal area set-aside? 	<p>3/13/2014 JS JMS</p> <p>Yes. However, the project is eligible to access \$1.16m from SFM/REDD+ incentive program. Please consider strengthening SFM aspects of the project and increasing the request.</p> <p>3/21/2014 JS JMS Addressed. SFM/REDD+ request has been increased.</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?</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>3/13/2014 JS JMS</p> <p>No. Table A indicates CCM 3 as one of the CC objectives. However, table B project component 2 and 3 outlines outcomes and output aligned with energy efficiency CCM 2 based on the energy efficient cook stoves distribution program production chain proposed and CCM 3 by sustainable utilization of biomass resources. Please clarify and if required, please revise. Also see comments in section 7.</p> <p>3/21/2014 JS JMS Addressed. CCM-2 has been added as an</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		appropriate strategic objective that the project contributes towards.	
	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?	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes.	
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?	3/13/2014 JS JMS No. Description of baseline scenario and projects are concise and helpful, but a few clarifications are needed. Fuelwood collection for domestic use has been cited as a main cause of deforestation nationally. A number of deforestation agents are of importance in Cross River State (CRS). a) Please demonstrate using relevant data that fuel wood collection is the most important driver in CRS that needs to be addressed through the project. In this regard please compare deforestation due to fuel wood collection against other noted drivers. b) In case the fuelwood collection is indeed the most important cause of deforestation, please explain if the risk is due to enterprises or individual households. b) A high level view of the barriers to sustainable fuelwood consumption and forest management is provided. Please	By CEO Endorsement Request a) and b) will be revisited during CEO endorsement stage. Component 2: Distribution and financing system will be assessed at CEO endorsement. Component 3: Among others, how the project addresses demand from urban areas through improved business plan will be assessed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>also focus on barriers specific to CRS region and the ones relevant to the proposed project's scope and financial capacity.</p> <p>3/21/2014 JS JMS Addressed. Clear and adequate explanation has been provided. Though secondary, risks of increased deforestation due to fuelwood consumption have not achieved as much attention as illegal logging, and another USAID plus UNREDD is attempting to address risks due to agriculture. It is understood that fuelwood collection is done by individual households and informal sellers/distributors. Barriers have been presented in context of the target area.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>3/13/2014 JS JMS</p> <p>No. The results framework is clear in its presentation but includes components that are too broad. Please streamline each component and combine components where possible. It is recommended that the project focuses on the prioritized gaps in the baseline projects only.</p> <p>Component 1: a) Given that CRS national park management services are limited and that encroachment in the buffer zones is worsening, please consider and analyze the adequacy of 50,000 ha forest for the increasing population and the risk of leakage.</p>	<p>By CEO Endorsement Request</p> <p>a) and b) will be revisited during CEO endorsement stage.</p> <p>Component 1 By CEO Endorsement: Please identify which elements in the country RPP the component will be supporting.</p> <p>Component 2: Distribution and financing system will be assessed at CEO endorsement. By CEO Endorsement: Please elaborate on how the project will help to link R&D with equipment production, which is identified as a</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>b) Introductory information on selection, design and operationalization of the community forest will be helpful.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement: Please identify which elements in the country RPP the component will be supporting.</p> <p>Component 2: b) The component needs to be significantly streamlined. Please build on the baseline projects and focus priority gaps that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Component 3: c) Same as for component 2. Please support how the component outcomes would remain sustainable after the project, in this regard please provide information on start-up and operating costs of these stoves.</p> <p>Component 4: d) Same as for component 2.</p> <p>3/21/2014 JS JMS Addressed. Adequate for PIF stage.</p> <p>(for PPG stage)</p> <p>Component 2 Please assess business viability of alternative energy sources during PPG stage. Please note that the GEF does not support fossil based fuels.</p>	<p>major technological barrier.</p> <p>Component 3: Among others, how the project addresses demand from urban areas through improved business plan will be assessed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Component 3: Please analyze during PPG phase how domestic and import markets can provide stronger solution together than if only one is emphasized. Please also use Clean Cook Stove Alliance quality standards.</p> <p>Component 5: Please see if linkages could be made with the Global Alliance for Clean Cookstoves in informing national level policies.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>3/13/2014 JS JMS</p> <p>Yes. 1) 50,000 ha of forests under improved community based forest management, 2) reduction in land degradation (measures will be specified during project preparation), 3) direct GHG emission reduction (20,000tCO₂/yr).</p> <p>The section will be revisited after revisions in sections 6 and 7.</p> <p>3/21/2014 JS JMS Adequate for PIF stage.</p> <p>It is expected that full ex-ante estimation of C benefits from community woodlots and sustainable forest management will be undertaken using EX-Act or other similarly robust methodologies.</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?	3/13/2014 JS JMS The section will be revisited after revisions in sections 6 and 7. 3/21/2014 JS JMS Adequate for PIF stage.	Integration of appropriate technologies to improve energy access for local communities and their involvement in the process, especially women, will be assessed during CEO Endorsement Stage.
	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)	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes for PIF stage.	Recommended By CEO Endorsement Please provide a comprehensive risk assessment, financial and technical. Assess potential risks related with the private sector on forest issues. Include potential indigenous and customary issues especially related to land tenure.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes for PIF stage.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <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 	3/13/2014 JS JMS No. Please support innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling up aspects of the project by using specific information about the project itself. As currently presented the same could be said of other projects in the country working on cookstoves. The section will be revisited after revisions in sections 6 and 7. 3/21/2014 JS JMS	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	intervention.	Addressed.	
	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?	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes for PIF stage.	Recommended By CEO Endorsement Please verify the cofinancing from the private sector and substantiate their credibility.
	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?	3/13/2014 JS JMS At 1:3.6 cofinancing ratio acceptable. Please include contribution from UNDP towards this project. 3/21/2014 JS JMS Addressed.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes for PIF stage.	
	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	3/13/2014 JS JMS Yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	NA	
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?	3/13/2014 JS JMS Not at this stage. Please address the comments in sections 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 13 and 17. 3/21/2014 JS JMS All the pending issues have been addressed adequately for PIF stage.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 14, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 21, 2014	
	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.**