

# Restoration of the ecological corridors of Mayo-Kebbi, Tandjil? and Fitri in Chad, in support of multiple land and forest benefits

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11138

**Countries**

Chad

**Project Name**

Restoration of the ecological corridors of Mayo-Kebbi, Tandjil? and Fitri in Chad, in support of multiple land and forest benefits

**Agencies**

IUCN

**Date received by PM**

6/27/2024

**Review completed by PM**

10/28/2024

**Program Manager**

Ulrich Apel

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**CEO**

**Part I - General Project Information**

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Project Summary.**

**a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

**c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

- Please add a paragraph that explains that the project is part of the Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Program (ERIP) and the specific role and contribution that the child project will make to the parent program.

- The GEBs listed in the summary are not fully consistent with what has been entered into the Core Indicator table, which also includes additional GEBs under CI 4. Please add and make the list consistent.

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

Project summary references the ERIP programme as well as identifies how it will contribute.

The GEB and core indicators have been clarified and updated throughout the document:

?The project will contribute to a number of key indicators of the GEF through this project; in addition, as a child project of the global Ecosystem Restoration Integrated Programme (ERIP), the project will also contribute to generate multiple durable global environmental and socioeconomic benefits by applying integrated and innovative approaches to restore degraded ecosystems. The expected results are:

? 208,520 ha of terrestrial protected areas under improved management (29% of the ERIP target) and 64,695 ha of landscapes under improved practices.

? 135,498 ha of landscapes restored, including 60,000 ha of cropland (35% of ERIP target), 40,000 ha of rangeland/pastures (5% of ERIP target), and 35,498ha of forest (4% of ERIP target).

? 13,746,147 t<sub>eq</sub>CO<sub>2</sub> of greenhouse gas emissions sequestered over a 20-year period (direct) (10% of the ERIP target).

8,758 direct beneficiaries (3,500 women and 5,258 men).?

### 3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?

- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

- c) Please double check the area targets for consistency with targets listed in the core indicator table.
- d) Gender dimensions have not been included into the outcomes and outputs. Please include.
- e) PMC is not co-financed. Please allocate commensurate co-financing to the PMC. As per guidelines on the proportionality of the PMC, if 5% from GEF Resources have been allocated to the PMC the same amount should apply to the co-financing portion of the PMC.

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

#### Agency Response

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

- c) Core indicators have been revised and project outputs realigned.
- d) Gender dimensions are now included in outcomes and outputs ? for instance:

Outcome 3.2 *Gender-responsive* restoration and increased productivity of degraded soils

Output 1.1.2. The capacity of grassroots organizations to restore and manage natural resources (including forests and lakes) in a *gender responsive manner* has improved.

Output 4.1.1. *Gender-responsive* communication strategy is updated and implemented.

Gender has also been mainstreamed under outcome/output description. Please see answers to Q5 for further detail.

- e) Co-financing has been secured from the Chadian government, and covers the PMC proportion of the co-financing [1,157,366 USD] (and more).

#### **4. Project Outline**

##### **A. Project Rationale**

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **5 B. Project Description**

- 5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?**
- d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**
- f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**
- g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**
- h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**
- i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**
- j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**
- k) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

j) On Gender: In addition to above comment on the outcomes and outputs, please ensure that the outputs and activities developed in the gender action plan are also integrated into the project. In this regard, please ensure that:

- 1). Women, Women's organizations and gender experts are meaningfully included in decision making processes and training activities, e.g. Output 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.5, with an emphasis on the lack of access to financial resources for Output 2.1.3.
- 2). Frameworks, Policies and Mechanisms are gender responsive, e.g. Outputs 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 3.1.2
- 3). KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment.

m) On Transformation/Innovation: The project description is missing a description on how it is aligned with the ERIP, in particular which lever of transformation it will address. Each Child project is expected to work at least on one of the levers (finance; governance & policies; innovation; multi-stakeholder dialogues) in coordination with the Global Coordination Program activities on the respective Communities of Practice.

It is noted that there is a mention of the alignment to ERIP in the Alignment Section, however, this alignment has to be clearly incorporated into the project design and its activities. Further, this will also need to be reflected in the budget to enable the project to participate in global /regional activities (refer to comments on the budget).

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

j) The gender action plan has been integrated, so that it is clear how women are included. For instance, under outcome 3.2, women and men farmers will be equally represented in training. Similarly, under outcome 3.1, training related management and use of forest resources will target men and women in ways that respect their current use and knowledge: ?In addition, the focus on both wood and NTFP allow to provide opportunities for both men and women, which will further strengthen the overall sense of ownership and shared responsibility at community level of the forests. This will in particular help strengthen the institutional framework promoted through Component 1 and provide legitimacy for women?s involvement in these fora.?

1) Under output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2, the onus is on ensuring that women are identified as a separate group with specific needs and opportunities. This has been integrated, e.g. ?In particular, this output will focus on ensuring that women, youth and other vulnerable groups are better integrated into local organizations managing natural resources. This will be done by specifically assessing the needs and opportunities of women and youth (activity 1.1.1.1) and providing reasonable quotas of women participation considering the make-up of the institutions.?

Under 3.1.1, as highlighted above, the project hone in on the specific usages of each stakeholder groups, and create opportunities for dialogue and recognition of shared responsibility for management.

2) Frameworks and policies are identified as gender-responsive, with reference to specific activities or mechanisms to achieve it.

3) Communication plan is identified as gender-responsive. Communication plans will consider the characteristics of each stakeholder group (literacy, activity profiles, etc.) adequate media proposed

m) the alignment of the project with the ERIP levers of transformation is included in the theory of change section ? in particular see pg 18 of the CEO Endorsement form.

Specific allocations have been made in the budget, namely for participation in regional and international events (up to 140,000 USD) and dissemination of knowledge products (USD 80,000).

## **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

**a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**

**b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**

**c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

**d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

1) The proposals states that "IUCN will provide support to Ministry to ensure effective and efficient execution of administrative and financial tasks and assist in key technical and scientific issues" will also provide guidance? facilitating workshops and convening key stakeholders??. From this statement it is a bit unclear whether IUCN will provide execution support services or not. Please revise as appropriate. Please also refer to comment on budget table where "EA" is unclear to which entity it refers.

2) In line with comments made above, please elaborate on the framework for coordination and collaboration with ERIP and demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change.

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

1) The IUCN's role as implementing agency has been clarified in the narrative (pg. 47), and within the budget table, the responsibility of each line has been clarified.

as noted above, reference to the ERIP programme is now included in the project (Component 4), with adequate budgeting (see comment above). In terms of coordination, the coordination with the GCP Implementing Agency identified as the IUCN's role, as implementing agency for the CP.

### 5.3 Core indicators

**a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**

**b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

- Core indicator 6: Under "Core Indicator" section of the CEO endorsement document, the emissions mitigated have been added under Sub-core Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector. Please move them to Sub-core Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector.



Core Indicator 6 has been calculated using the Ex-Ant Tool. The spreadsheet with the calculations has been provided, which has helped tracking the GHG calculations. Overall, the value of 39 million tCO<sub>2</sub>eq seems too high. Please consider using a more conservative value for the forest degradation level without the project intervention, instead of 'extreme' the project could consider 'large' (the degradation level remains the same without the project intervention) and/or consider 'moderate' instead of 'low' with the project intervention.

Explain why an implementation and capitalization phases of 4 and 20 years respectively have been used. The common practice is 5 years for the implementation and 15 years for the capitalization.

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

Core indicators have been revised.

In particular, the suggestions made for Core indicator 6 have been included:

- ? Core indicator 6 now refers to 6.1 (instead of 6.2)
- ? Forest degradation has been reduced: 'large' instead of 'extreme' without project, and 'moderate' instead of 'low' after project.
- ? Capitalization has been reduced to 20 years (5 years for the implementation and 15 years for the capitalization).

Core indicator 6 now stands at 13,746,147 tCO<sub>2</sub>eq.

### 5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

The project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate. However, we cannot locate the ESS risk assessment document in the Portal.

- 1) Please attach the ESS risk assessment document. In addition, the environmental and social risk section said that "Competition over land use is a source of conflict between stakeholders."
- 2) Please provide more information about risks related to natural resource conflict and fragility risk (Chad is one of the countries listed as the "Institutional and social fragility situations" in the FY24 WBG FCS list), and detailed risk management and mitigation plan with budget and timeline for those risks.
- 3) The following risks are missing the rating "Political and Governance" and "Institutional and Policy". Please insert.

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

- 1) ESS screening is now included.
- 2) The risks related to natural resource conflict are highlighted in the ESS screening, and an Access Restriction Mitigation Process Framework will be provided. The project is working on local management of natural resources, capitalizing on the achievements and lessons learned during RECONNECT 1. The project specifically works on decreasing vulnerability of local populations to climate change (through improved practices), as well as self-financing, with the focus on value chains and micro-grants, as well as the sustainable financing mechanisms under C2.

It also takes an inclusive stakeholder approach, including "formal" government (central and decentralized), local governance, community ownership, and also highlighting the opportunities for vulnerable people, such as the self-identified indigenous groups and women (as outlined in the Stakeholder Engagement table and Stakeholder Involvement Plan).

"Political and Governance" and "Institutional and Policy" are both listed as "moderate" risks.

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request: n/a

## Agency Response

**6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

**Agency Response**

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

07/10/2024: Clarification question.

Has alignment/coherence with the Great Green Wall Initiative (GGWI) been considered? Please assess the potential of coordination with the GGWI, and in particular with the GEF-8 GGWI program #11455, in which Chad has a child project.

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

**Agency Response**

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

The project sites are outside of the GGW within Chad (bar Lake Fitri, but current project activities are focused on fisheries at that site). However, the project will share best practices and lessons learned with the National Great Green Wall Agency, which is also hosted by the MEPDD.

Description of this has been provided on page 33 of the CEO Endorsement Form.

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

**Agency Response**

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
07/10/2024: No.

As above mentioned:

1. The project's overall ESS risk is classified as moderate. However, we cannot locate the ESS risk assessment document in the Portal.

Please attach the ESS risk assessment document. In addition, the environmental and social risk section said that "Competition over land use is a source of conflict between stakeholders." 2) Please provide more information about risks related to natural resource conflict and fragility risk (Chad is one of the countries listed as the "Institutional and social fragility situations" in the FY24 WBG FCS list), and detailed risk management and mitigation plan with budget and timeline for those risks.

10/21/2024: Addressed & ESS risk document uploaded in portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

15th Oct 2024

See answers above.

## **8 Annexes**

### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that**

apply):

**STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request n/a

Agency Response

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
07/10/2024: Not fully.

There is a small discrepancy between the total PPG and the total of utilized/committed.  $150,000 - 54,744 = 95,256$ . This does not match the amount committed in the table. Please check and correct where necessary.

10/21/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

## Agency Response

15th Oct 2024

This has now been adjusted.

### 8.3 Source of Funds

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request 07/10/2024: Yes.

## Agency Response

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

- Please submit letter of co-financing for SURRAGWA (FAO-GCF): soil restoration activities and PRAPS 2 (WB): pastoral corridor and infrastructure setup. Transhumance monitoring for amount of \$5,000,000 each.

- The following sources of co-financing also do not have a letter of support and partially completed the co-financing table. Please complete the fields for these sources along with the letter of co-financing support or remove them: IPIDACC: Integrated Program for Development and Adaptation to Climate Change??- Mayo Kebbi and Tandjile, PARIIS: Regional Support Project for the Sahel Irrigation Initiative - Batha/Fitri and Mayo Kebbi Ouest, and RePer: Strengthening the productivity of family agropastoral farms and resilience -??Batha/Fitri

- In-kind is ?recurrent expenditure? normally. Please revise where in-kind is classified as ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures?.

- Please also include a brief explanation on the low level of co-financing by describing the challenges of raising co-finance and opportunities during project implementation.

10/21/2024: Not fully addressed.

- ?In-kind? is ?recurrent expenditures? normally. Please revise the ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for the Minist?re de l'Environnement, de la P?che et du D?veloppement Durable.

10/28/2024: Has been revised in the cofinancing table in the portal.

Cleared

Cleared

## Agency Response

28<sup>th</sup> Oct

Revised as requested.

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

Co-financing has been updated, with the secured letters. Currently it stands at 3,784,174.

Most of the projects identified as potential co-financing in the project area during the PPG phase were close to termination, which has made it difficult to obtain co-financing letters. While some may have subsequent projects or programmes, they were not yet able to provide sufficient details to secure cofinancing.

Some partners in the project area, such as the European Union, do not have co-financing mechanisms for this type of project in their procedures.

### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

**e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request07/10/2024: Yes.

Agency Response

**Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating**

**8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Not fully.

Rating has been provided. However, reviewer could not locate the document.



10/21/2024: Uploaded.

Cleared

## Agency Response

15<sup>th</sup> Oct 2024

ESS screening is provided and the Access Restriction Mitigation Framework, ESMP and SIP are currently being finalised.

### **Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: Comments on the budget:

- 1) Please explain abbreviations used in the budget table.
- 2) Please provide detailed justification for the purchase of motorized vehicles for consideration by the reviewer. Justification should include where the cars will be used and why the specific types has been selected.
- 3) Costs for vehicle maintenance and fuel should be covered by PMC and co-financed as needed.
- 4) Please also clarify which budget lines will enable participation of the project in global/regional activities under the ERIP.
- 5) Please provide detailed information on what ?National Consultant ? Fees? entail.
- 6) Please include the name of the agency executing each budget line items in the budget table
- 7) Project Manager should be charged to PMC but not to project component. Please revise the budget accordingly.
- 8) Please clarify type of equipment to be eligible under the budget lines ?Equipment for ILOD/ADC? and ?Equipment for MEPDD?.

10/21/2024: Partly Addressed.

on (2): Program manager approves the purchase of motorcycles based on the justification provided. This is cleared.

on (5): Explanation of National Consultants ? Fees: while we thought that this was an administrative cost, the Agency response indicates this ?represent the average daily rate for national-level consultants. Per diems and travel is included under travel?. It looks that there was a misunderstanding, we asked for detailed information of this budget line ? for instance, it is important to understand the composition - which positions are considered here? Please itemize this budget line so one can reasonably assess what is being paid for.

on (6) In the budget table, it is still not clear who is the executing entity responsible for the management of the resources ? while in the Project Information Table the executing partners are the Ministry of Environment and Fisheries, Republic of Chad through the General Technical Direction of Forestry, Fauna and Fishing Resources and the Direction of Forestry and the Fight against Desertification, in the budget table the Responsible entities are the Project Management Unit (which is not an executing Partner), or "EA" (which acronym does not match with any of the executing partners). Kindly amend,

- Please also present the budget table in a more readable way because as it is, figures are often truncated and presented over two lines, perhaps reducing the size of the numbers may help.

10/28/2024: One Issue remaining to be addressed.

re (5): Clarification provided and accepted. Cleared.

re (6): Responsible entities have been entered. Cleared.

Issue remaining:

- Now there are included all three budget tables in the CEO Endorsement Request Portal view ? three budget tables create confusion:

Please remove the second and third table, leaving only the first one that correctly identifies the MEPDD as the executing partner (this budget was reviewed, and it is correct).

## Agency Response

28<sup>th</sup> October

The project will employ around 15 national consultants on an ad hoc basis. They will be recruited for specific tasks, either capacity-building or carrying out a study. They will be paid according to the number of days of intervention (see App7 tab in the Detailed Budget excel spreadsheet).

These consultants are summarized below:

- National consultant in institutional framework
- National consultant in forest and lake management capacity building
- National consultant in land restoration
- National capacity-building consultant on the legal and regulatory frameworks for agriculture
- National consultant in community development (transhumance and agriculture)
- National cartography/GIS consultant
- National consultant in the development of sustainable financing mechanisms
- National consultant in protected area planning and management
- National consultant in non-timber forest products
- National consultant in fisheries and value chain
- National consultant on human-wildlife conflicts
- National consultant in green micro-enterprise
- National One Health Consultant
- Agroforestry Consultant
- National Consultant in Restoration Opportunities Assessment
- National Consultant in Climate Change

15th Oct 2024

- 1) Abbreviations have been clarified.
- 2) The vehicles have been removed, as the government (MEPDD) has been able to identify in-kind cofinancing. The motorcycles however remain, as they are indispensable for the field activities considering the remoteness of the communities and are much more prone to wear and tear.
- 3) Noted. However, motorbike fuel has been included under the activities, as they will be used to help facilitate the implementation of ground activities (and extension of sites), rather than PMC.
- 4) Under travel, there is a line ?Participation to international events per person? which is to be allocated to participation in global/regional ERIP activities (as described in activity 4.1.1.3)
- 5) National consultant fees represent the average daily rate for national-level consultants. Per diems and travel is included under travel.
- 6) Done.
- 7) Done.

These have been clarified in the item description, as well as other items.

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria:**

co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

07/10/2024: No. Please address comments made in this review.

10/21/2024: No. Please address outstanding issues as described in the review sheet.

10/28/2024: No. One issue remaining (see above).

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/10/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/21/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO  
Approval

Response to Secretariat  
comments

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>
---