

# Community-based Climate Risks Management in Chad

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

8001

**Countries**

Chad

**Project Name**

Community-based Climate Risks Management in Chad

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

9/28/2018

**Review completed by PM**

6/5/2020

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF** ☐

**CEO Endorsement** ☐

**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - Not clear. Please confirm that there have been no significant changes to the project structure since PIF stage submission. The table presented in Part 1 seems to provide a short description of numerous sections of the submission, but does not clearly indicate what specifically has changed since PIF submission.

**Recommended Action:** Please clarify the above in concise summary form what the exact/specific changes from PIF to CEO ER submission.

GEFSEC, 4/3/2019 - Cleared. the Agency has confirmed that there are no significant changes to the project design and structure since PIF submission, and the only changes are highlighted in Table 1 of the CEO ER.

## Response to Secretariat comments

26 Dec 2018 BL - CG

There are no significant changes to the project design structure since PIF submission. Only minor changes were highlighted in the table 1 in the CEO endorsement. The project remains aligned with the PIF and only had to re-adjust to the context due to the changes that occurred between the PIF submission and its endorsement (including minor changes in the outputs to avoid overlapping with on-going initiatives).

### 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

10/1/2018 - More information requested. Some of the outputs are written as outcomes, which make it difficult to measure delivery of outputs against the intended outcomes. For example:

- Output 1.3: The DREM and the NDM are supported to generate bottom-up reliable weather forecasts to disseminate to target population; **Please reword.**
- Output 1.4: The technical capacities of personnel of the NDM and DGRE, ministries and communities are strengthened to effectively run the Community Based-Early Warning system; **Please reword.**
- Output 2.3: Client's education and capacities are strengthened; **Please rewrite in quantifiable terms which can be measured against a deliverable(s).**

**Recommended action:** Please ensure that outputs are measurable and tangible against the delivery of the project's objective and outcomes. Additionally, there does not seem to be any component dedicated to KM and/or ensuring proper coordination and M&E. Please briefly justify how this will be done, considering that these activities are not accounted for or captured within the project design.

GEFSEC, 4/34/2019 - Cleared. The agency has made the revisions to the outputs to ensure they are tangible and measurable against a set of indicators.

## Response to Secretariat comments

26 Dec 2018 BL - CG

As recommended, the abovementioned outputs have been reworded. Please see below suggested rewording (pages 19, 20 and 23 of the Project Document).

- Output 1.3: Reliable agromet advisory and Early Warnings by DREM and the NDM to target population are generated and disseminated
- Output 1.4: Personnel from the NDM and DGRE, ministries and communities are trained to run the Community Based-Early Warning systems
- Output 2.3: Target communities are trained on financial services, index-based agricultural micro-insurance and climate risk management

Additionally, a KM strategy description has been added to Output 2.5 with reference to the coordination with the project M&E (page 24 of the Project Document).

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - More information requested. There does not seem to be any information regarding the cost effectiveness of the activities proposed or a cost-based rationale for activities under each component.

**Recommended action:** Please briefly indicate how the proposed activities are cost-effective in comparison with feasible alternatives and provide a brief cost-based reasoning for the activities chosen.

GEFSEC, 4/4/2019 - Not clear. More information requested. While the additional information added to section 6 is appreciated, there is no actual information regarding the cost effectiveness of the activities chosen.

**Recommended action:** Please briefly describe how the chosen activities under this proposal are cost-effective in comparison to feasible alternatives.

GEFSEC, 6/22/2019 - Cleared. The agency has provided some basis for cost-effectiveness in paras 44-50. The main basis is that the intervention is fully aligned and coordinated with the government of Chad's investments in relevant areas, particularly disaster risk management; as well as NAP-related activities.

**Response to Secretariat comments**

26 Dec 2018 BL - CG

The cost-effectiveness of the activities was already available in the Prodoc (page 34-35). The information has been also added in the CEO Endorsement Request (page 15-16).

UNDP, 2/5/2019 - As requested, this section has been reviewed and more information regarding cost effectiveness of the activities added. Please see pages 34- 35 and section 6 of the Prodoc, section 6.

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - Yes. The risk matrix is sufficiently developed at this stage.

## Response to Secretariat comments

### 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - Unclear. More information requested. No co-financing letters seem to be immediately available on the Roadmap section of the Portal submission.

**Recommended action:** Please indicate whether co-financing letters have been secure and whether they are available on the Portal Roadmap/documents section for this project.

GEFSEC, 4/5/2019 - Unclear. Co-financing letters are still not available on the roadmap section of the portal.

**Recommended action:** Please indicate where the co-financing letters have been uploaded or upload them.

GEFSEC, 6/22/2019 - Cleared. The co-financing letters have been uploaded onto the Roadmap section of the portal.

## Response to Secretariat comments

26 Dec 2018 BL - CG

Two letters of co-financing have been secured. One from UNDP for US\$ 4,500.000 and the other from the Government of Chad (Ministry of Production, Irrigation and Agricultural Equipment) for US\$ 8,000.000.

UNDP, 2/5/2019 - The co-financing letters have been reposted on to the road map section of the portal.

### 6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

GEFSEC, 4/5/2019 - As discussed during the last Adaptation Task Force meeting and the Agency retreat, we have been working to update the results framework and Core Indicators for the new LDCF-SCCF strategy.

In line with the Adaptation Program's efforts to align more closely with GEF Trust Fund procedures, we have developed four Core Indicators for PIF-stage (as well as subsequent-stage) submissions to the LDCF and SCCF. These will also contribute to an adaptation section of the [GEF Corporate Scorecard](#). Due to overwhelming demands on the Portal at the moment which preclude our being able to program them in, we would like you to please include a separate brief document (can be just a page) in your GEF-7 LDCF/SCCF PIF submissions to us, titled "Core Indicators".

The four **Core LDCF/SCCF Indicators** are:

**1. Number of direct beneficiaries (gender-segregated, M/F)** - Please include a breakdown of male/female beneficiaries. Please also note that "direct beneficiaries" in this case are those that directly benefit from adaptation technologies, improved livelihoods, climate-resilient facilities/infrastructure, and those with significantly reduced vulnerability to climatic hazards due to new or enhanced early warning systems. It does not include recipients of trainings or awareness-raising efforts (which is captured by Core Indicator 4, below). It also does not include an entire community far downstream of an area where a riverbank protection measure has been installed/improved, or the entire group of people who have downloaded an early warning app on their phones (many of whom may not necessarily be vulnerable).

**2. Number of hectares of land under climate-resilient management**

Please provide numbers for this indicator in hectares only. This indicator has been selected due to the large volume of LDCF/SCCF projects in the agriculture and food security sectors. If not relevant to the project, please omit.

**3. Number of policies, plans and development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience**

Please include regional, national, sub-national and sectoral plans that the project will mainstream adaptation in.

**4. Number of people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures (gender-segregated, M/F)**

This number may include government staff, communities and households, private sector workers, etc. Please include a breakdown of male/female beneficiaries.

GEFSEC, 6/22/2019 - The referred to "Core Indicators" attachment does not seem to be on the Roadmap section of the portal.

**Recommended action:** Please upload the Excel spreadsheet entitled "Core Indicators and Meta-data", which was circulated after the Adaptation Task Force Meeting on April 9.

GEFSEC, 8/27/2019 - More information requested. The Secretariat appreciates the information provided in the Core Indicators document, however, the number of direct beneficiaries is listed at 2,000; which seems very low for a project requesting a financing amount of \$5 million.

**Recommended action:** Please provided some justification or basis for the very low number of expected beneficiaries indicated in the spreadsheet.

GEFSEC, 9/25/2019 - Cleared. The agency has indicated that the previous figure was a mistake and has adjusted the figure on the Core Indicators spreadsheet.

### Response to Secretariat comments

UNDP – CG – 17/9/19: The core indicators were revised based on the data available in the project result framework (CEO Endorsement Request, Annex A). 2,187,706 direct beneficiaries are estimated. Mistakenly, only the 2,000 beneficiaries from the agricultural insurance were included. The revised core indicators file is uploaded in the Road Map section of the portal.

UNDP, 2/5/2019 - Please see the attached requested "Core Indicators" page

JP: 13Aug19: file uploaded.

**7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?**

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

NA

### Response to Secretariat comments

**8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?**

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - Clarification requested. The project is in line with NAPA priorities 3 and 10; as well as Chad's 2030 vision, specifically the objectives of "Pillar 4: Improving the quality of life of the Chadian population". It is also in line with sub-pillar 4.1 of the National Development Plan (NDP) 2017-2021 "A healthy environment with preserved natural "resources", in particular result 4.1.3 "Good management of natural resources is ensured", which aims to: (i) implement the policy of combating climate change and preserving biodiversity; (ii) introduce resilient agricultural practices with respect to climate; and (iii) roll out a mechanism for prevention and management of risks and natural disasters. Additionally, the project is well coordinated with both the UNDP-implemented LDCF NAP project, as well as the GCF NAP project. However, the LDCF NAP project seems to also have a component relating to climate information systems.

**Recommended action:** Please provide a rationale or justification clearly indicating how this project builds upon climate information activities financed under the LDCF-NAP project, instead of duplicating it.

GEFSEC, 4/5/2019 - Cleared. The agency has provided additional information regarding the activities in question. The project was designed to coordinate with the LDCF-NAP project to ensure that synergies are maximized. The climate information systems being financed under this project will focus on the regional/local level and are not being covered by the NAP project.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

26 Dec 2018 BL - CG

This project has been designed to coordinate and collaborate with the LDCF-NAP project to ensure that synergies are captured and duplication of efforts are avoided in terms of climate information. Additional details are provided pages 11 and 12 of the project document.

This project builds upon the activities financed under the LDCF in the sense that the NAP project operates at the national level and this initiative has a stronger focus on the regional/local level, targeting the identified zones. In order to avoid duplication and promote synergies between both projects, most of the climate information related activities will target the identified zones at regional/local level and the project's capacity building activities of the identified agencies (SISAAP, CDIG, DGRE and DNM) will not be done by the NAP. In addition, the acquisition of material stated on page 17 will only be applicable for the regions where the project will be implemented while the NAP will not finance acquisition of material in the project areas. A coordination mechanism will be created to ensure full coordination between both initiatives. More information is available page 16 of the Project Document.

**9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - Yes. A budgeted M&E plan is included in part c.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - More information requested. While section A.8 on KM states that "cross-community peer-review, learning and sharing mechanisms to support replication and up-scaling in other vulnerable communities are developed will contribute to the knowledge management strategy of the project. It will ensure that knowledge from lessons learned will be captured, systematized and incorporated into replication initiatives. This output will also coordinate with other CCA initiatives in Chad to develop a centralized data base for CCA lessons learned. This will support the development and dissemination of efficient practices at the national level and avoid the recurrence of failures. Under this output an activity will promote a partnership with other on-going adaptation projects, and will develop an on-line



platform for the sharing of lessons learned on climate change adaptation in Chad"; this seems like disparate activities , rather than a cohesive KM strategy. The CEO ER does not seem to contain the KM strategy mentioned above.

**Recommended action:** The Secretariat suggests a brief but coherent description of the KM strategy mentioned in Section A.8 in more detail - a KM strategy should refer to a mechanism within the project's design, which will create, share, use, and manage the knowledge and information generated in this project; both to document project achievements and results (such as M&E documentation) as well for sharing experiences and lessons externally.

GEFSEC, 6/22/2019 - Cleared. The KM strategy is adequately developed in section A.8

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

26 Dec 2018 BL - CG

A more detailed KM strategy description has been added to Output 2.5. (page 24 of the Project Document). The strategy has been summarized and provided under the section A.8 of the CEO Endorsement (pages 24-25).

#### **Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

**GEFSEC**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 9/25/2019 - Yes.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**STAP**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 10/1/2018 - Yes.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **GEF Council**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 10/10/2018 - Not clear. There do not seem to be responses to comments from Germany in the roadmap/documents section of this submission, nor are the comments included in the CEO ER itself.

**Recommended action:** Please kindly indicate if comments from Germany have been addressed and include them in the resubmission.

GEFSEC, 4/5/2019 - More information requested. The agency has indicated below that comments from Germany are included in the CEO ER in Annex B, however I could not locate them in the specified section.

**Recommended action:** Please kindly add the response matrix to comments from Germany onto the portal submission.

GEFSEC, 6/22/2019 - More clarification requested. The comments from Germany request the agency to elaborate on possible CBOs and NGOs that can be involved in project implementation. While the CEO ER contains a response to the comment from Germany in the annex, the revised CEO ER mentions only one CBO by name - CELIAF. At this stage of project development, it seems to be reasonable to request which specific NGOs/CBOs will be involved in project implementation.

GEFSEC, 8/27/2019 - Cleared. Comments from Germany have been addressed in the CEO ER, and are contained in Annex B. Additionally, as per the agency response below, specific NGOs which will participate in project implementation are: Humanitarian Initiative for Local Development, Humanitarian Organization for Development, OXFAM, and the Office of Studies, Liaison, and Support for Charities for Development (BELACD).

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

26 Dec 2018 BL - CG

The comments from Germany have been addressed in Annex B, page 34 of the CEO Endorsement.

UNDP, 2/5/2019 - The response matrix to comments from Germany has been provided as a separate document. However, you can still find it in Annex B, page 34 of the CEO Endorsement. see the text highlighted in blue in the CEO Endorsement.

UNDP, CG, 7/29/2019 – Additionnal NGOs with which the project will establish partnerships have been provided in the Project document, pages 28 and 29 in the section on Stakeholders' engagement (NGO's and Civil Society). This does not involve any change in the CEO Endorsement Request (the reference to the prodoc is still accurate). These NGOs include: Humanitarian Initiative for Local Development (IHDL); Humanitarian Organization for Development (OHD); OXFAM; Office of Studies, Liaison and Support for Charities for Development (BELACD).

## **Convention Secretariat**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

NA

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

#### **Recommendation**

#### **12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

GEFSEC, 1/2/2020 - Comments in this box seem to have been deleted, so re-entering the last comments provided by GEF PPO.

- 1- Co-financing letters need to be translated into English – we have reviewed all co-fin docs and found that all the amounts are matching, but could not check whether the type of co-fin (grant, in-kind) are correct. The Agency can translate (no need of official translation).
- 2- In Section Project Information, Executing Partner Type is incorrect – it cannot be GEF Agency. Please ask the Agency to amend.
- 3- The project document also mentions Annex L which refers to a Letter of Agreement. This may just be an omission as we do not see it in the submitted documentation. We need to request this document.
- 4- In the Project Document, there is a reference to XI. Legal Context providing a link to SBAA but the link did not work. We may want to request a copy of the SBAA if this is a supporting document that refers to Country and UNDP implementation/execution relationship.
- 5- The M&E Plan includes some budget lines that either cannot be paid from the M&E (i.e. the Audit as it has to be paid from the PMC, or the translations of the reports into English) or that are not applicable (i.e. tracking tools, as now projects have to report on Core Indicators) – please see screenshot below. Please ask the Agency to amend.
- 6- It is not specified who the Senior Supplier is. In most UNDP projects the Senior Supplier (whose role is an executing function) is UNDP, which is not allowed. Please ask the Agency to explicitly mention who the Senior Supplier is.
- 7- In the ProDoc – section Total budget and work plan (page 53 onwards), the pro-rata salary of the National Finance and Administrative Specialist + the Communications Specialist (who belong to the Project Management Unit) is charged to the project's components – these salaries have to be charged to the PMC – please note that PMC for this project is \$1,250,000 including the co-financing portion so it is completely feasible to cover the project's staff cost from the PMC. Also see the cost of Vehicle needs to be approved by the GEF Program Manager.

GEFSEC, 1/2/2019 - Not yet. Please refer to the numbered items addressing the responses to GEF PPO comments.

1. Minor clarification requested: Government co-financing letter is cleared. UNDP co-financing letter does not make it immediately clear what type of co-financing is being provided - Table C indicates that it is grant, so GEF PPO requests that the co-financing letter explicitly states that the co-financing provided is in the form of a grant.
2. Cleared.
3. NA
4. SBAA – Please clarify if the SBAA is Annex 1 on the portal roadmap? If so, this is in French and should be translated into English if it is relating to executing functions of the project.
5. Audit is not eligible as an M&E cost. The explanation here is not sufficient, as it's not immediately easy to understand. Please clarify if this means that audit and translation are actually billed to the PMC but just listed under the M&E budget?
6. Cleared. The Senior Supplier is the National Project Director, in the Ministry of Agriculture.

7. More information requested. The original comment is reiterated that these costs should be charged to the PMC. The explanation provided below is confusing and difficult to understand. Please clarify.
8. The original comment is reiterated. These costs must be charged to the PMC unless a strong substantive justification is provided for why these positions should be financed through the components. The below explanation indicating that the co-financing is in-kind is not sufficient.
- 9. Vehicle cost- Not cleared. The cost of the vehicles remain in the prodoc, and there is no cost justification -- \$180,000 is more than three times the amount we have seen in other proposals. The GEF Secretariat strongly prefers that vehicle costs are covered by co-financing. However, exceptions can be made on a case-by-case basis, if and when the agency does not have a history of working on LDCF or GEF-financed projects in the country. This is not the case for UNDP in Chad. Additionally, there is no detailed explanation of why a vehicle is being purchased instead of rented and what the cost-differential is, depending on how often the vehicle would be used. Lastly, what becomes of the car once the project closes?

**GEFSEC, 3/18/2020 - All items under the previous comment cleared except number 4. The SBAA has not been located in the portal roadmap. Please provide and resubmit for clearance.**

**GEFSEC, 3/23/2020 - The last comment above has not been addressed. The agency response from the last review says the english translation of the SBAA is uploaded onto the portal. Where is it? We are not able to locate it.**

GEFSEC, 3/25/2020 - This comment is cleared.

**GEFSEC, 4/16/2020 - Several issues still persist**

1) On Executing Partner - UNCDF is indicated as other Executing Partner but there is no mention of this in the Portal data nor in the Project Document. Please either change this to match the submission or remove it if it's incorrect.

2) On Budget:

- Contractual Services in components 1 and 2 – (L2 and L15) – costs associated to the Project Management Unit – per Guidelines, these costs should be covered by PMC – this project has \$250,000 from GEF and \$1,000,000 from co-financing – please cover these costs using PMC.

- Equipment and Furniture between L21 and L22: there is no explanation on how \$88,000 will be utilized. It is required to transparently explain how the GEF funds will be utilized.

· Training, workshop and conferences: as per L25, \$7,500 will be utilized to pay the “Costs for inception workshop” – however, they already charged \$11,000 for the inception workshop in the M&E Plan – this is double tipping – please remove this from the budget.

· Maintenance and other equipment: as per L28, \$6,000 will be utilized to “Operation and maintenance required for the implementation of the activities under outcome 1 and 2” – this explanation is not only vague but unacceptable. Please transparently explain how the GEF funds will be utilized.

GEFSEC, 5/14/2020 -

1. UNCDF has still not been removed. Please remove.

2. a) This is cleared.

b) cleared

c) Please indicate this clearly in the review sheet.

d) Noted.

GEFSEC, 6/5/2020 -

1) Cleared.

2) c. Cleared.

2.

1.

3.

1.

4.

1.

5.

## Response to Secretariat comments

CG - 13Nov2019

1. Co-financing letters were translated and submitted in the portal
2. In the GEF Portal, the partner Type was wrongly indicated. It should read “Government”. The required change has been communicated to the GEF Sec IT department as the Portal does not allow us to make the changes.
3. The list of annexes was not accurately reflected in the table of content – but was available p65. This has now been updated and does not include the LoA as no DPC have been budgeted under LDCF resources.
4. The SBAA was added as an annex and uploaded in the portal.
5. The M&E budget is an indicator of all the costs related to M&E, which are later spread into the project budget. M&E costs include audit and translation which are budgeted under project management costs in the total budget (see section X. Total budget and workplan, budget lines L24 and L27, p59).
  - i. The costs for the update of the tracking tools: this was deleted from the M&E budget and replaced by the costs for the monitoring of core indicators. The change was made both in the project document and the CEO Endorsement. Please note the document was first submitted in September 2018, when tracking tools were still requested.
6. In the section on Governance and Management arrangements the senior supplier has been specified and is the National Project Director, in the Ministry of Agriculture.
  - i. support the trainings conducted under outcome 2 with technical guidance and inputs. Under the component 1, the project manager will assist the coordination of early warning activities with other projects (activity 1.1.5), he will also technically support the trainings conducted under output 1.3 and 1.4 and will engage with the beneficiaries to ensure the knowledge is retained and applied, in particular within the targeted agencies (NDM, DGRE and ministries).
  - ii. Finally, the US\$1,250,000 includes US\$536,000 of cash co-financing and the remaining is in-kind co-financing provided by the government through the provision of office space, material, technical support by the ministry, etc. and cannot cover the costs of project staff as suggested in the comment.

JP, 5 Mar 2020

1. An updated letter of co-financing stating that UNDP will provide co-financing in the form of Grant has been uploaded in the portal.
2. Noted.
3. Noted.
4. The English version of the SBAA has now been uploaded in the portal.
5. Please note that the section “VII. Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) Plan” was revised accordingly with the new UNDP Prodoc template. The template was revised following the GEF’s recent comments on UNDP projects. The Audit and Translation costs have now been withdrawn from the M&E budget provided in this section. They remain budgeted under PMC (see budget lines L27 and L29).
6. Noted.
7. The communication specialist does not only perform project management function and should therefore be also included in the project component costs instead of only PMC. Part of his costs have been included under PMC and the rest remains under the different components. His role will be to

improve the KM on the results of the project in order to (i) strengthen the ownership, (ii) increase the understanding of climate change and the project for project beneficiaries and other stakeholders and (iii) enable the upscaling. Another option would have been to recruit a national consultant to intervene punctually, but it is considered less efficient in the case of this project. More specifically, he will play an important role for the implementation of the output 1.2 and 2.5. The responsibilities of the communication specialist were provided in the ToRs in Annex C of the Project Document. The ToRs were revised to insist on his technical role.

The costs of the Finance and Administration specialist were entirely imputed to the PMC.

The costs of the project coordinator were partly re-allocated into the outcomes as the project coordinator technically supports the achievements of the outcomes and is not solely responsible for the management of the daily activities. The project coordinator will have a strong background on adaptation, with a focus on financial risk transfer, and will be qualified to technically support the two project components. The project manager will be working with the different experts for the design and the implementation of the activities based on the results of the market analysis conducted under output 2.1., he will provide guidance on the selection of financial risk transfer schemes to be tested through the project. He will also support the trainings conducted under outcome 2 with technical guidance and inputs. Under the component 1, the project manager will assist the coordination of early warning activities with other projects (activity 1.1.5), he will also technically support the trainings conducted under output 1.3 and 1.4 and will engage with the beneficiaries to ensure the knowledge is retained and applied, in particular within the targeted agencies (NDM, DGRE and ministries). These responsibilities are reflected in the ToRs available in annex C of the Project Document.

8. The costs of the vehicles were re-allocated under UNDP TRAC resources, and other expenses (including communication costs and audio-visual costs) were budgeted under LDCF resources (see budget lines L10 and L11 that were added under LDCF resources, while the vehicle costs are described in L22 and budgeted under TRAC resources. Only two vehicles will be procured. It might however be useful to note that the cost of the cars is especially high in Chad due to the importation costs. In addition, due to the poor quality of the roads and the need for field visits, hard-top cars need to be procured, which are expensive. Regular field visits and other travels within N'Djamena are requested for an efficient follow-up of the project implementation and using rental cars would not be efficient (both in terms of budget and efficiency). Once the project ends, the cars' ownership is transferred to the IP.

UNDP, 25 Mar 20, the translation of the SBAA is now uploaded to the Portal.

UNDP, 15 April 2020:

1. This is indeed a mistake and has been corrected.
2. On the budget:
- a. Following the GEFSEC comment, changes were made to the total project budget: (i) The project coordinator is now entirely budgeted under PMC, (i) the EWS Expert is fully budgeted under Outcome 1, (ii) the Insurance Expert is fully budgeted under Outcome 2, (iii) the M&E expert is spread between the M&E component and PMC, (iv) a driver is budgeted under each of the two outcomes. However, as was already discussed and cleared in the review sheet from GEFSEC on March 18th, 2020, the cost for the communication officer is split between the different components (25% under component 1, 25% under component 2 and 50% under PMC). Following is the justification provided by UNDP: "The communication specialist does not only perform project management function but also provides inputs across the technical components in terms of advocacy and awareness raising, beyond regular project progress update communication pieces. Therefore, the cost of service should also be included across the components instead of only PMC. The role of the communication specialist will be to improve overall knowledge management across all components and results of the project in order to (i) strengthen the ownership, (ii) increase the understanding of climate change risks and impacts among the project beneficiaries and other stakeholders and



(iii) facilitate the necessary sensitization and awareness for future upscaling. Another option would have been to recruit a national consultant to intervene punctually, but it is considered less efficient given the important role the communications specialist will play for the implementation of the output 1.2 and 2.5. The responsibilities of the communication specialist were provided in the ToRs in Annex C of the Project Document. The ToRs were revised to clearly capture the scope of the technical role.”

b. This is a typo, the information for the US\$88,000 was provided in the budget note L21 (mistakenly attributed to UNVs), while the following line was missing the indication of the budget note – hence the empty budget note number. This was corrected in the Prodoc budget.

c. The distinction between the M&E table (section VII of the Prodoc) and the total budget workplan (section X of the Prodoc) should be made. To avoid confusion, an M&E component was introduced in the budget and consolidates all the M&E costs – as per the table in section VII. This component includes (i) costs for the Inception Workshop (US\$7,500 for the workshop and US\$3,500 for the travel of participants and DSA), (ii) the IC and LC for the mid-term review, (iii) the IC and the LC for the Terminal Evaluation, and (iv) 50% of the costs of the M&E specialist – the activities performed by the M&E specialist are detailed under section VII.

It should be noted that the M&E section (section VII) is formulated to provide more clarity on the overall M&E activities to be conducted during implementation, and the costs are not additional to what already appears in the budget. This means that there is no double costing considering that the US\$11,000 are just a consolidation of what already appears in the budget.

d. More details were provided in the budget notes: “Operation and maintenance required for the implementation of the activities under outcome 1 and 2 (\$ 6,000). This includes maintenance costs for the vehicles (car and motorcycles) and other equipment (in particular office equipment)”

UNDP (30 May 2020)

1. UNCDF was withdrawn.

2. c) A mention was added in the CEO ER and Project document as a footnote to the M&E table clarifying this: “This table aims at providing more clarity on the overall M&E activities to be conducted during implementation, and the indicative costs are not additional to the total budget presented in section X of the project document (no double-costing).”

#### Review Dates

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

#### Response to Secretariat comments

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

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

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

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The project, Community-based Climate Risks Management in Chad, aims to strengthen the response capacity of vulnerable populations and enable them to cope more effectively with climate shocks through rapid responses to early warning and the introduction of financial mechanisms to transfer climate risks. With \$5.2m in LDCF grant resources, the project will achieve its objective through the implementation of two components: (i) Community-based early warning system for preparedness against climate related disaster risk; and (ii) Enhancing risks management capacities. The project will directly benefit more than 2 million people; mainstream climate adaptation and resilience into 5 policies/plans; and train 228 people. The project will improve the capacities of the populations of vulnerable communities in the face of various climatic risks, building on partnerships which will be established between the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries, NDM, the Directorate-General of Water Resources (DGWR), UNDP and other grass-roots stakeholders, to better meet early warning and index-based micro-insurance expectations.