

# Strengthening rural and urban resilience to climate change and variability by the provision of water supply and sanitation in Chad

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10089

**Countries**

Chad

**Project Name**

Strengthening rural and urban resilience to climate change and variability by the provision of water supply and sanitation in Chad

**Agencies**

AfDB

**Date received by PM**

7/24/2020

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Katya Kuang-Idba

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF ☐

### CEO Endorsement ☐

#### Part I ? Project Information

##### Focal area elements

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/4/2020 - Clarification requested. This project is in line with the currently adaptation programming objectives for GEF-7 CCA-1(Reduce Vulnerability and Increase Resilience through Innovation and Technology Transfer for Climate Change Adaptation ); and CCA-3 (Foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation). The objectives currently included seem to correspond to the GEF-6 results framework - please clarify. It seems this was also an issue during PIF stage.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2021 - Thank you. This is cleared.

#### Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020

Thank you, this has been clarified. The adaptation programming objectives for GEF-7, CCA1 and CCA3 were corrected.

#### Project description summary

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/5/2020 - Clarifications and actions requested. 1) The project objective at the moment seems to be primarily focused on the baseline investment. Please pivot this objective to focus on the LDCF-financed portion of the project. 2) The components need to be interlinked and integrated - currently, the components seem to be a bit disconnected. Particularly, the component on climate information systems (which will provide climate data under component 3) should be linked with master plan development and designing of infrastructure (components 1 and 2).

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Thank you, this is cleared. However, there are still remaining issues with clearly articulated outcomes and outputs, which is addressed in the results framework item below. Please refer to that item.

- 

Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020

1. The project objective has been rephrased in order to take into consideration the GEF comments, notably to ensure that the LDCF-financed activities and goals are highlighted.
2. The objective now reads:

*Developing climate change resilience in the Chadian water sector by providing sustainable infrastructure and management tools to rural populations, and mainstreaming climate change risk and data at the national level*

3. The interconnectedness of the components has been explicated at the beginning of section 3 (The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project).

AfDB, 30/4/2021

Clarifications were provided on outputs 1.1.1, 3.1.1 and outcomes 1.1 and 2.2. to ensure that outcomes are presented as overarching achievements of the projects supported by SMART outputs.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

## Agency Response

### Co-financing

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

•GEFSEC, 8/4/2020 - Clarifications requested. Despite mentioning and providing so much details of the PAEPA project, it is not listed as a co-finance in Table D - why? Additionally, the rationale regarding the three co-financing entries listed as investment mobilized is not sufficient. What makes these investment mobilized exactly? Lastly, there is no time frame to reference for the co-financing projects listed (aside from that they are on similar timescales). Please indicate when these baseline initiatives which are providing co-financing are being implemented. Additionally, the projects described in this section do not seem to match the co-financing table in general. Either the labeling is non consistent (those financed by AFD, RWSSI, GIZ), or the projects described in the body text have changed and/or vice versa. Additionally, the description provided for the PAEPA project is adequate, and the Secretariat would appreciate a similar description for each project providing co-financing to the current project requesting CEO endorsement, so as to more easily evaluate the additionality.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Clarification requested. While the clarifications provided are much appreciated, the issue with the timeline remains. Given it is 2021 and this project has not yet been CEO endorsed and the PAEPA is expected to conclude by 2022, please clarify whether there is a second phase expected or how exactly the timelines of the two projects are compatible? While the items relating to PAEPA are cleared above, please indicate whether this is the ONLY initiative contributing co-financing while the others mentioned are part of the baseline? Thank you

- 
- 
- 

## Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020

Thank you for the comment. This has been corrected and the co-financing from the PAEPA (ADF and RWSSI financing) were clarified in Table D. Evidence for all three

sources of co-financing has been provided. Both the ADF and RWSSI co-financing are presented as investment mobilized as they are a sub-set of cofinancing that excludes recurrent expenditures. The co-financing from the government of Chad is presented as covering recurrent expenditures. Please note that both the ADF and RWSSI financing (including the co-financing from the government of Chad) represent the total co-financing from the PAEPA project. The evidence for the GIZ co-financing was not yet secured however, given the delayed processing of the project, it is proposed to be added as co-financing for this LDCF project and indicated in the relevant PIR and at MTR accordingly when the evidence is obtained. For now, it has been removed from Table D.

The presentation of the baseline projects has been improved under section 2 (?The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects?). It now includes details on COM-Nord, IDO, RWSII (funding for the PAEPSU MR), NAP (UNDP/GEF). There is also rewording around the PAEPA SU MR project as well for additionnal clarification.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The timeline issue was addressed as there is an ongoing process to extend the duration of the PAEPA project by 24 months for a tentative end date by December 2023.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

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

GEFSEC, 8/5/2020 - Additional information requested. Some information on how this project is cost effective in comparison to viable alternatives would be appreciated.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021- Thank you, this is cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

AfDB, 9/12/2020

Thank you for the comment. Additional information on the cost-effectiveness of proposed activities has been added. A one page summary regarding cost-effectiveness has been provided with the rationale behind the choice of activities and associated budget ? focusing on the complementarity of the project with other efforts and the large gap that needs to be addressed in the water sector.

#### **Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/5/2020 - Clarification requested - Annex C is missing from the Portal.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020

Thank you, the PPG table in Annex C has been added.

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?**

**Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Action requested. Please remove any entries from the Core Indicators table on the portal to avoid double counting, as the LDCF/SCCF uses its own spreadsheet.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021- Cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020

Thank you, the entries in the Core Indicators table have been removed from the portal to avoid double counting.

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - More information requested. While, the project title refers to urban resilience, there is very little in the body of the project concept that refers to the urban context and challenges which the project will address. There is no reference to the urban and peri-urban dimensions and context in the adaptation problems and/or barriers.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - More information requested. It is unclear where the update is (usually the new text is highlighted or something similar to indicate an update) -- but the issue pertaining to the urban element of this project still seems to be missing?

#### Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, the section regarding the global environmental/adaptation problems has been updated with clarifications on the dimensions and context of the interventions to better reflect the title and objectives of the project.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The changes made to the CEO Endorsement document package following the receipt of the GEFSEC comments in October 2020 are reflected in highlights. In response to the "urban element", the project documentation was accordingly revised to indicate that activities will target peri-urban areas.

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Please refer to the item on co-financing.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - There have been some changes to this since the initial submission. This being said, please provide slightly more context on how COM-NORD and IDO were identified? Was it due to the geographic overlap?

#### Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, a response was provided on the co-financing item.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The COM-NORD and IDO project areas were identified during the inception phase of the PPG. These were defined with support from various stakeholders to ensure geographic and technical complementarity with the GEF activities of the PAEPA project.

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 8/4/2020 - Clarification requested. It is understood that GEF financing will complement AfDB's Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Programs in the Semi-Urban and Rural Areas of 11 Provinces (PAEPA SU MR), Phase 1 (2017-2022). However, the way GEF funding's incrementality/additionality is defined seems to be only supporting AfDB's investment to make it climate resilient. The document says ? The overall aim of the GEF project is to ensure that the AfDB baseline project is climate resilient?. At this stage, it is the Secretariat's view that the AfDB should integrate climate in their investments on their own under their climate commitments. The Secretariat understand GEF funding will support strategic activities such as strengthening EWS and others, but the logic that GEF will influence their co-finance only is weak. Please reformulate any reference to the GEF financing as climate proofing to the baseline and refocus on how the project activities, on the aggregate, go above and beyond the baseline investments to increase the resilience of the target communities, while complementing those investments. Additionally, as mentioned in item 1, while the project title refers to urban resilience, there is very little in the body of the project concept that refers to the urban context and challenges which the project will address.

GEFSEC, 2/21/2021 -- Clarification please: Is it possible to highlight these changes? Currently it is difficult to determine where they have been made?

#### Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, additionnal information and clarification was added to demonstrate that the value added of the LDCF project is not to render the PAEPA SU MR related activities more resilient, but rather to multiply and complement the benefits generated from these activities, so that the overall combination of activities yield greater adaptation benefits. There has been a rewording of a number of sections (for instance, the incremental reasoning) in order to better reflect the standalone results of the GEF project, as well as its complementarity with the other baseline projects.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The changes made to the CEO Endorsement document package following the receipt of the GEFSEC comments in October 2020 are reflected in color highlights.

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request



GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Yes.

#### Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - The contributions of the GEF financing is clear, but more detail regarding the initiatives providing co-financing would be appreciated, as mentioned in the two items on baseline and co-financing.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Please refer to the item on co-financing. As the baseline scenario and co-financing have changed, some brief context on the changes would be appreciated in the submission itself.

#### Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, additional information and responses were provided on the two items on baseline and co-financing. Furthermore, Table 2 provided in the section 5 (incremental reasoning) has been improved to i) better reflect the current scenario with all the baseline projects (not just the PAEPA SU MR) as well as highlight the root causes/risks that are still existing and ii) better demonstrate how the proposed GEF project will complement the baseline and help resolve the root causes/lessen the remaining risks.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The changes made to the CEO Endorsement document package following the receipt of the GEFSEC comments in October 2020 are reflected in color highlights. Additional information had already been added on relevant ongoing co-financing initiatives including a more comprehensive incremental reasoning table.

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - More information requested. More elaboration on how the GEF financed activities under this project will result in the increased resilience of the target communities to the negative impacts of climate change. How will the climate information and EWS financed under component 3 contribute to increased water security? How will mainstreaming adaptation into WSMP support the creation of an enabling environment for effective climate adaptation? Will this support the NAP process? This is the place to elaborate on the adaptation impact of this initiative, and it is appropriate to integrate comments from previous reviews in a brief summary here.

## Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you for the comment and the questions. The Global Adaptations Benefits section has been reworded to clarify the effects of the GEF financed activities from the local to the national level, by component.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

Additional text in color highlights was added in the section.

The project will help promote the incorporation of climate change risk and adaptation within the water sector in Chad, by providing infrastructure, awareness raising and training at the local level and national level. Among the projected benefits:

- Within the project area, at least 1,100 ha of land will be restored or under climate-resilient management. This will directly restore the productivity and resilience of the land in the face of climate change, which in turn will promote the food and economic security of the local populations. It will also ensure protection of the groundwater sources, permitting better recharge rates and protection against increasing water stress and anthropogenic pollution.
- The provision of safe drinking water and sanitation. Over 2.1 million people will benefit from improved climate resilient water supply infrastructure in the semi-arid regions, improved livelihoods and reduced vulnerability to climatic hazards due to new or enhanced early warning systems. The direct benefits from here are multiple - time savings from closer and cleaner water supply and waste disposal, especially for women and children; health benefits through the reduction of waterborne diseases; education benefits as absenteeism will decrease from water related chores or sanitation.
- By promoting the integration of climate change risk into the new WSMP, the national water sector will be primed to implement actions promoting climate change adaptation and resilience. This will foster conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation at a national level, both in the private and public sector, notably through the training of at least 40 water professionals.
- The strengthening of the climate, meteorological and water resource networks will provide necessary data both at a national and local level to better monitor and manage water resources and water related disasters, increasing water security at both levels. The development in infrastructure and technology is coupled with increased capacity with at least 20 personnel trained in maintenance, repair and cost-effective technologies in order to promote the resilience and sustainability of the network. This particular

effort is complementary with those of the NAP, which is also increasing the meteorological and climate network in the Sudanian and Sahel region, therefore fortifying the network at a national level, and promoting conditions for integrated and effective climate change adaptation.

- The early warning system will provide the local populations a better understanding and awareness of climate related disasters, such as droughts, flooding and extreme weather events. In light of the projected increase in all of these events due to climate change, communities will be better prepared to avoid infrastructure and human life loss.

- Finally, the project, through its knowledge management and M&E, will promote the upscaling of these efforts, ensuring effective knowledge and technology transfer on local, regional and national scales.

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Yes. The project approach presents a replicable model for mainstreaming climate change risk and vulnerability in arid areas to be used at a national level. This is facilitated through an innovative multifaceted approach, notably institutional change (Component 1), a dual approach in target areas of infrastructure provision (drinking water access) and awareness raising (Component 2), and the development of a reliable and targeted water and climate monitoring and early warning system using technology, capacity building and awareness raising (Component 3). Furthermore, certain elements of the project (e.g. infrastructure development) is already tried and tested, ensuring that some of the scaling up potential is practically foolproof.

Agency Response AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Well-noted, thank you.

#### **Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Yes.

#### Agency Response

#### **Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the  
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of  
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - The stakeholders engaged during PPG are listed, but no detailed report is available, nor is there any plan for implementation stage and ongoing stakeholder engagement. Please clarify.

Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you for the comment, a related excel file was added with the relevant tables (as per the GEF 2018 Stakeholder Engagement guidelines).

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Yes. There is some private sector engagement through the infrastructure component of the project.

## Agency Response

### Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - More information requested. The list of risks here seems incomplete - please provide more information on the AfDB's risk assessment of this project -- i.e. relating to fiduciary risk, political risk, institutional risk, etc.

GEFSEC, 1/25/2021 - This information is appreciated thank you. More information requested - In light of the current context, the Secretariat is asking agencies to provide a more detailed section regarding COVID risks as well as opportunities and how this project will navigate both.

## Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - More information has been added on the AfDB's risk assessment of this project, including its categorization according to the Bank's Integrated Safeguards System (ISS) in Part 2. section 5 (risks). These include: (i) risks of conflicts in the management of drinking water; (ii) risks of erosion and/or land pollution as a result of the use of phytosanitary products for market gardening; (iii) risks of pollution and contamination of water and soil after emptying latrine waste and wastewater; (iv) risks of accidents for workers and populations during the construction phase; and (v) probable drop in the level of the water table as a result of water withdrawals and climate change. Consequently, the project is classified as Category II given the small scale of the infrastructure that will be built. A range of mitigation measures were also suggested.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

Additional information was added under this section in relation to COVID-19 related risks in color highlights. The rise of the Covid-19 2020 pandemic has raised a new series of risks and opportunities for this project; as such, a **Covid-19 action framework** has been devised in order to respond to the new risks but also opportunities arising. As an overall approach, the project will ensure that all national guidelines related to the Covid-19 pandemic are adhered to. An additional set of mitigation measures are proposed in a table responding to the main risks identified.

## **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

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

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Clarification requested. Implementation arrangements indicates consultancies as implementation partners along with water user associations and other youth and women groups. CSOs are listed as part of the Stakeholder engagement, but it is unclear if they were serve as implementation partners -- Please consider CSO partners as on-ground implementation partners for better reach to communities instead of relying on consultancies only.

- 

Agency Response AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you for the comments. Additional information was added to the section on stakeholders (Excel sheet) which includes collaboration with CSOs as partners. They could be engaged to share knowledge and/or benefit from the implementation of certain strategies (e.g. soil restoration, agroforestry, water conservation).

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

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

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - More information requested. During the PIF stage review, it was indicated that the project team would establish more specific linkages with the NAP process and the NAP Readiness program. This information does not seem to be available in the CEO ER. Please advise and elaborate on how this project is aligned with the NAP process and specific coordination mechanisms.

GEFSEC, 1/26/2021 - Thank you, this information is appreciated and noted.

Agency Response AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you for the comment. Additional information on linkage and coordination with the NAP process has been added. The NAP Project (UNDP/GEF) has been included into the CEO Endorsement form in all relevant areas including in the "baseline" sub-section, the "incremental reasoning" sub-section and the "Consistency with National Priorities" sub-section.

### **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Yes. the KM approach is sound and captured within each component, and encapsulated within the final component.

**Agency Response**

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - No. Please provide the ESS Screening, in line with the current GEF Policy.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Not cleared. Please refer to :

[http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.C.55.07.Rev\\_.01\\_ES\\_Safeguards.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.55.07.Rev_.01_ES_Safeguards.pdf) ;  
and [http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/gef\\_environmental\\_social\\_safe\\_guards\\_policy.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/gef_environmental_social_safe_guards_policy.pdf)

Agencies must submit an Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening at the time of CER. This is usually submitted as a separate document.

**Agency Response**

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, additionnal information was added on the screening, risk identification, categorization and mitigation measures in Part 2. section 5 (risks).

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Program in Semi-urban and Rural Areas (PAEPA SU MR) in eleven regions of Chad (including the GEF-LDCF activities) is classified as Category II, given the small scale of the infrastructure to be built. This program does not foresee the implementation of works in protected areas and other

sensitive natural habitats. Environmental and Social Screening documents and technical annexes on the environmental and social components were attached.

#### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

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

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

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Yes, this is included. However, it is difficult to review, as there is no budget presented in Annex F nor does there seem to be a prodoc included.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - This item is not cleared. Please review.

#### **Agency Response**

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The prodoc had already been submitted with the CEO Endorsement package in April 2020. Although there have been some changes since, we are submitting it again here for your reference.

In addition, this section was revised in December 2020 and is also reflected in color highlights. Budget amounts were included in Table 7 on Summary of the M&E activities and their allocated GEF funding. In addition, budget tables were also added.

#### **Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

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

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Yes. This is cleared. A stronger link to the adaptation benefit would be appreciated though (more relevant to item 6 on adaptation benefits).

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - It is unclear where this has been added, but please highlight the changes so that it may be more easily ascertained.

#### **Agency Response**



AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you for the comment. Additional details have been added, particularly in the Adaptation Benefits sub-section of the CEO Endorsement, and taking into consideration previous comments as well.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

This section was updated in December 2020 and color highlights were added to reflect the changes made.

## **Annexes**

### **Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

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

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - No. Action required - Annex C and F are missing.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Partially cleared. Annex F has not been provided.

#### **Agency Response**

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, Annex C was added along with Annex F.

AfDB, 30/4/2021: Annex F on the Core Indicator Worksheet had already been added. It was added here again.

## **Project Results Framework**

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

GEFSEC, 8/6/2020 - Clarification(s) requested - please ensure the outcomes are written as such throughout the document. For example, currently development of a water and sanitation master plan is listed as an outcome. Please reformulate this to make this an output and ensure outcomes and outputs are clearly articulated as such.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Clarifications remain on outputs 1.1.1, 3.1.1 and outcomes 1.1 and 2.2. Please ensure the outcomes are the overarching achievements of the project, while the outputs are easily measurable actions or deliverables that contribute to the achievement of those outcomes.

#### **Agency Response**

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, the document has been cross-checked to ensure that outcomes are listed as outcomes and outputs as outputs.

AfDB, 30/4/2021

Clarifications were provided in color highlights on outputs 1.1.1, 3.1.1 and outcomes 1.1 and 2.2. to ensure that outcomes are presented as overarching achievements of the projects supported by SMART outputs.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 -  
Yes, the Secretariats comments are available on the portal.

**Agency Response**

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - No. Action requested - please indicate where the responses to the Council comments from Germany are located and include the comments themselves in Annex B if possible.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - This is cleared.

**Agency Response**

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Please indicate where the responses to STAP comments ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/Copy%20of%20Final%20STAP%20Screen\\_PIF10089\\_Strengthening%20rural%20and%20urban%20resilience%20to%20climate%20ChadCW\\_1.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/Copy%20of%20Final%20STAP%20Screen_PIF10089_Strengthening%20rural%20and%20urban%20resilience%20to%20climate%20ChadCW_1.pdf)) can be found and whether the recommendations have been integrated into this CEO ER.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response AfDB, 9/12/2020 - The responses to STAP comments have been added to the GEF reviews section in the portal. The recommendations have been taken into consideration and integrated in the CEO Endorsement document.

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Action needed - Please provide this information in Annex C.  
  
GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, information was provided in Annex C.  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Yes this is cleared.

Agency Response  
**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
NA  
Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

## Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

## Agency Response

## GEFSEC DECISION

## RECOMMENDATION

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged comments and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 2/17/2021 - Not yet. Please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration. In addition, please consider the comments below;

1. In light of the current pandemic situation, please add additional text in the portal on how this project is addresses both the risks and opportunities presented by COVID-19 in this project.
2. Where is the Prodoc/Appraisal document? At this stage, a comprehensive project budget is expected.
3. In addition to a section addressing the risks and opportunities of COVID-19 within the context of this project, please also provide additional information in the risk matrix. There are only 4 identified risks which does not seem like a robust framework for risk management here -- fiduciary risk, technological risk, risk of conflict, etc. all seem like they could potentially arise within the context of this project implementation.

## Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**First Review**

**8/10/2020**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

|   |                  |
|---|------------------|
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> | <b>2/17/2021</b> |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> |                  |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> |                  |
| <b>Additional Review<br/>(as necessary)</b> |                  |