



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

GEF ID:	8020		
Country/Region:	Niger		
Project Title:	Planning and financing adaptation in Niger		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5336 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$8,925,000
Co-financing:	\$27,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$36,075,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	

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. Niger is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the operational focal point and dated December 24, 2014, is attached to the submission.	
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?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The proposed grant is available	

*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)
	equitable access	from the LDCF in accordance with 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 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
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>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, outcomes 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3.</p> <p>Please note, however, that Table A in the GEF-6 FPS PIF template does not include a row for project management costs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: In Table A, please incorporate project management costs into the grant and co-financing amounts associated with each strategic objective.</p> <p>03/19/2015 – NOT CLEAR. Table A still includes a row for project management costs.</p> <p>04/27/2015 – YES.</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>YES. The proposed project would address several of Niger's NAPA priorities particularly in the areas of water resources management and agriculture. In addition, the project is aligned with the country's 2012-15 Economic and Social Development Plan, the Initiative: Nigeriens Nourish the Nigeriens (I3N), and recent initiatives</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		launched by the National Mechanism for Disaster and Food Crises Prevention.	
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>NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a concise analysis of the baseline situation, relevant barriers, and baseline initiatives.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, however, it is not entirely clear wherein the indicative co-financing of \$7 million would consist and how it relates to the sources and amounts of co-financing listed in Table C. Moreover, as for coordination, the integration of climate risks and adaptation into policies and plans, and efforts to strengthen the associated institutional and technical capacities; it is unclear what progress has been achieved, particularly in the context of Niger's SPCR and “ more importantly “ what support is planned for the coming years.</p> <p>With regard to Component 2, the associated sources and amounts of co-financing also remain unclear. How do these relate to those cited in Table C, and to what extent could the proposed LDCF project enhance the National Programme on Access to Water and Sanitation, which is due to close this year? Moreover, the PIF does not provide any indication of what areas would be targeted by the proposed project, and what the specific baseline situation and scenario is in those targeted areas.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (i) how the indicative sources and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>amounts of co-financing relate to the baseline scenarios and relevant baseline investments, particularly under components 1 and 2; (ii) provide further information regarding the dynamic baseline scenarios associated with planning, coordination, capacity building and access to water and sanitation “ how would the baseline situation evolve in absence of the proposed project, particularly given on-going and planned PPCR and LDCF investments; and (iii) provide further details on the baseline situation and scenario in the areas that would be targeted by Component 2.</p> <p>03/19/2015 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies the baseline scenario as well as the relevant baseline initiatives and associated sources of co-financing as recommended.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the project framework if necessary.</p> <p>03/19/2015 “ YES. The project framework is sound and appropriately detailed.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline situation, the baseline scenario, and the baseline investments on which the proposed project would build and that it would</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>enhance, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, specifically, the PIF should clarify what gaps and needs the proposed project would fill, given the investments that are planned and underway particularly in the context of Niger's SPCR, but also other LDCF projects. In addition, the PIF should clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Planning and Finance and CNEDD as it relates the coordination of Niger's NAP process.</p> <p>As for Component 2, and given that the National Programme on Access to Water and Sanitation is due to close this year, the PIF could explore other baseline initiatives and investments that may be implemented in conjunction with the proposed project, and that could directly be enhanced through the adaptation strategies and measures proposed.</p> <p>Moreover, given the large share of the proposed grant being associated with this component, the PIF could clarify “indicatively” the proposed scope of the investments, e.g. the number of people and hectares that could be reached through the proposed 15 hybrid systems and two multi-purpose infrastructures. Finally, the PIF does not specify what areas or communities would be targeted or what selection criteria would be applied to guide targeting.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please (i) strengthen the additional reasoning and description of adaptation benefits accordingly; (ii) clarify the respective roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Planning and Finance and CNEDD as it relates the coordination of Niger's NAP process; (iii) explore ways to broaden the range of baseline initiatives on which Component 2 would and that it would seek to strengthen; and (iv) provide more information regarding the indicative scope of the investments proposed under Component 2.</p> <p>03/19/2015 – NOT CLEAR. The re-submission clarifies the additional reasoning for the proposed LDCF grant as well as the expected adaptation benefits, as recommended.</p> <p>The roles of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Planning, however, while mentioned in the Agency's response to GEFSEC comments in Annex B of the re-submission, are not reflected in Section A.2 of the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that Section A.2 of the PIF clarifies the respective roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Planning and Finance and CNEDD as it relates the coordination of Niger's NAP process.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		04/20/2015 â€œ YES. The respective roles and responsibilities of the Ministry of Planning and Finance and CNEDD as it relates the coordination of Niger's NAP process have been clarified as recommended.	
	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 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?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. The role of the Ministry of Finance and Planning, indicatively one of the main co-financiers of the proposed project, remains unclear, particularly as it relates to the proposed coordination mechanism under Component 1. 03/19/2015 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. 04/20/2015 â€œ YES. Please refer to Section 8 above.	
	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)	YES. Relevant risks are adequately considered for this stage of project development.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 and 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please revisit Section A.5 of the PIF with a view to ensuring that it clearly captures ongoing as well as planned investments, particularly in the areas that would be targeted under Component 2.</p> <p>03/19/2015 “ YES. Coordination with other relevant initiatives has been clarified as recommended.</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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please revisit the description of the proposed project's innovative aspects, sustainability strategy, and potential for scaling up.</p> <p>03/19/2015 “ YES. The proposed project would combine national efforts to integrate climate change risks and adaptation into Niger's principal development planning and budgeting frameworks, while advancing the dissemination of more efficient, climate-resilient water infrastructure. Thanks to clear entry points in the country's national planning and budgeting processes; opportunities to complement and advance existing initiatives, particularly under Niger's SPCR; and a focus on building the institutional and technical capacities as well as evidence-based monitoring systems for adaptation; the proposed project could make a substantial</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		contribution towards a continuous, progressive and iterative NAP process in Niger; while addressing the urgent adaptation needs of some of its most vulnerable regions and communities.	
	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>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly as appropriate.</p> <p>03/19/2015 “ YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per components seem adequate and appropriate.</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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please (i) revisit the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing accordingly and (ii) ensure that Table C is consistent with the description</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		of the baseline scenario and initiatives in Section A.1.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	03/19/2015 “ 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?	YES. At \$425,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the proposed LDCF funding amount for project management is appropriate.	YES. \$200,000 is sought in line with the norm for projects up to \$10 million.
	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			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 03/19/2015 â€œ NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 8 and 10 above. 04/27/2015 â€œ YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	January 30, 2015	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 19, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 27, 2015	

* **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.**