



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

GEF ID:	5777		
Country/Region:	Nigeria		
Project Title:	Preparation of Third National Communication (TNC) to the UNFCCC and Capacity Strengthening on Climate Change		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5373 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-6;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,850,000
Co-financing:	\$8,600,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,450,000
PIF Approval:	April 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	May 27, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Yamil Bonduki

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 Nigeria is eligible to resources. Nigeria ratified the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) on the 29 August 1994.	Same as PIF stage. Nigeria submitted its second national communications on the 27th February 2014.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	A letter is on file from the operational focal point.	Same as PIF stage
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	US\$1,350,000 is available from the STAR Allocation.	Same as PIF stage
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of		

*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		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 	US\$500,000 is available from the 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>	The project is aligned with focal area results framework and objectives.	
	<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>	The project will allow Nigeria to prepare its Third National Communication to the UNFCCC.	The project is consistent with the country's national plans.
	<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 project will allow Nigeria to fulfill its obligations under the UNFCCC.	Same as PIF stage.
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	Yes the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework are clear, sound and appropriately detailed.	Same as PIF stage

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	N/A	N/A
	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?		Yes, there will be an analysis of the extent of gender mainstreaming in national and state level policies, strategies and programs.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Yes the role of public participation is identified.	The project will draw on the expertise from civil society organizations and academia.
	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 the project takes into account potential major risks and identifies sufficient risk mitigation measures.	There are no major risks with this project.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes the project is consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country.	Same as 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 	The project will contribute to the identification of procedures to establish a national greenhouse gas management system, involving a network or research institutes.	Same as PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 		
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<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?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>The GEF funding and co-financing is appropriate.</p>	<p>Same as PIF stage.</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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>The level of funding for project management costs is appropriate.</p>	<p>Same as PIF stage</p>
	<p>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</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval,</u> if PPG is completed, did Agency 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?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Yes the tracking tool is included.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes there is a budgeted M&E plan.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		The agency has responded adequately to the comment from council.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	The PIF is recommended for clearance and inclusion in the upcoming work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
	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.**