

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

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

4/14/2022

Program Manager

Aloke Barnwal

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. 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. 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

GEFSEC, AB, July 19

Thanks for the response. Comment cleared.

-
-
-

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?

GEFSEC, AB, 7/19/2021- The urban aspect of the project is still not very strong. The project objective emphasizes rural only. In the project components and outputs also, it is not clear if the project will deliver any benefits in cities. Further, peri-urban areas are typically not governed by urban administrations. If the project doesn't have a specific core urban focus, it may reflect so in the project title and across other sections. Some addition of peri-urban term is noted in the highlighted text in incremental reasoning, but it is not clear. Also, the highlighted section is very hard to read due to dark highlight color used.

The results framework mentions peri-urban resilience instead of urban resilience. The project needs to be consistent in use of these terms. In a few places the term semi-urban is used.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022- OK

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.

AfDB 02/12/2021

The project was reviewed for consistency regarding peri-urban resilience. Color highlights have also been changed (to grey and yellow) to facilitate the reading and review of changes.

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?

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021- Thanks. Comment cleared.

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?

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021- The highlighted section is very hard to read due to dark pink color. Kindly change the highlight to a more readable color. Please do it in the entire document.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - OK cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you, additional information and clarification was added to demonstrate that the value added of the LDCF project is not to render the PAEPA SUMR 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.

AfDB 12/2/2021

Highlights have been changed to yellow and light grey.

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.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021- the highlights are very hard to read.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - OK

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.

AfDB 12/2/2021

Highlights have been changed to yellow and light grey.

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 previews reviews in a brief summary here.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021

- Reference to second bullet in the response: Please clarify how early warning system will support drinking water supply and sanitation.
- While provision of basic water supply infrastructure will indeed improve adaptive capacity, please elaborate how these structures will be made climate resilient. Will their design be made to withstand climate extremes and variability?
- All points below refer primarily to EWS and its contribution. EWS is a very small component of the project. The majority of investment is in building water supply infrastructure and soil and water conservation. Please elaborate more on the benefits from these.
- The document indicates construction of boreholes. Evidence suggests that boreholes may worsen ground water depletion. Please indicate if this has been considered.

1/24/2022 - It does not seem that the above comments from July 2021 have been responded to adequately.

11th April 2022- Thanks for the responses. The comment is cleared.

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.

AfDB, 2/12/2021

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. This includes:

- at least 1,100 ha of land will be restored or under climate-resilient management.
- The provision of safe drinking water and sanitation for over 2.1 million people
- the training of at least 40 water professionals.
- 20 personnel trained in maintenance, repair and cost-effective technologies in order to promote the resilience and sustainability of the network.
- An 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

- transfer of effective knowledge and technology on local, regional and national scales
- the implementation of a solar-powered infrastructure for a pump station
- Please clarify how early warning system will support drinking water supply and sanitation

AfDB, 09/02/2022

The program relies on population-based early warning tools such as: risk knowledge, monitoring and warning service, dissemination and communication, and response capacity.

Within this framework, the program provides various capacity building trainings in collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and the deconcentrated services. These mechanisms will contribute to the management of drinking water supply and sanitation services.

Through the water monitoring and management system is essential to have a chance to cope with climate hazards. In the case of PAEPA SU MR, the project has planned the realization of piezometers all along the depression of Faya largeau to allow the Directorate of Water Resources to ensure regular monitoring of the water table. The Directorate of Water Resources is supposed to monitor the water table and alert if possible.

While provision of basic water supply infrastructure will indeed improve adaptive capacity, please elaborate how these structures will be made climate resilient. Will their design be made to withstand climate extremes and variability?

AfDB, 09/02/2022

The populations of the SU MR PAEPA action area are highly dependent on infrastructure systems to provide drinking and irrigation water.

Climate hazards can impact water supply infrastructure in the following ways: i) failing systems; ii) : Reduced sources of drinking water due to increased frequency of droughts. Indeed, in times of drought, water supply infrastructure can be strained due to the mismatch between supply (less surface and groundwater available due to drought or decreased water quality) and demand, which increases adaptation strategies have been adopted to reduce or eliminate the impacts of climate change on water supply infrastructure.

Through the IEC actions, the PAEPA SU MR will put in place a framework for action at the level of the action area, which promotes resilience by developing a modern and rigorously enforced code of conduct for water supply.

- All points below refer primarily to EWS and its contribution. EWS is a very small component of the project. The majority of investment is in building water supply infrastructure and soil and water conservation. Please elaborate more on the benefits from these.

AfDB, 09/02/2022

Access to water and sanitation is one of the main challenges for Chadian households. Not only are access rates among the lowest in the world, but progress has been marginal in recent years. There are many reasons for this, both on the supply side, such as the disorganized institutional framework and the lack of budgetary resources dedicated to this sector, and on the demand side, such as the lack of initiatives by user groups.

Chad is a Sahelian country facing multiple water-related challenges. The scarcity of rainfall in recent decades, climate change and the presence of bedrock areas on about 25% of the surface area, constitute major problems in the mobilization of water resources. Indeed, despite the achievements made in the field of water, the rate of access is still low. At the national level, the rate of access to drinking water is estimated at 61.5% for a population served of about 9,036,000 inhabitants out of an estimated total of 4,650,152 people in 2017. Population growth (3.5%/year) also increases demand and reduces the rate of access to drinking water. This is why this program is designed to increase the rate of access to drinking water and improve the effectiveness of public interventions and those of the country's partners (Ministry of Water and Sanitation; 2017, NDP 2017-2021).

In order to meet these two challenges, the Government of Chad, with the support of its technical and financial partners, is committed to gradually financing the drinking water supply and sanitation sub-sector in semi-urban and rural areas, starting with the areas where the rates of access to drinking water supply and sanitation are among the lowest in the country.

Thus, the Government preferred to start with the regions deprived of access to drinking water and/or relying on poor quality water sources (marigots, traditional wells, rainfall, etc.) where the current rates of access to drinking water in 2017 are very low. These are: Borkou (19%, population: 120,104), Ennedi (8%, population: 77,795), Tibesti (5%, population: 32,704), Logone Oriental (27%, population: 1,026,242) and Logone Occidental (16%, population: 907,338) regions .

According to several studies, thousands of people, especially children, die every year from diseases caused by water that is not fit for human consumption. Chad, having taken the weight of this need, has developed a Water and Sanitation Master Plan to provide a supply of drinking water and sanitation to the Chadian population. This feat has led to progress in the execution of water supply projects.

Thus, SWC/RSD measures stabilize people's livelihoods, reduce their vulnerability to external shocks such as climate change, and contribute to building resilience. These are the benefits of soil and water conservation.

- The document indicates construction of boreholes. Evidence suggests that boreholes may worsen ground water depletion. Please indicate if this has been considered.

AfDB, 09/02/2022

People will be benefiting 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 which incorporate data on groundwater recharge/availability.

The early warning system will support the supply of drinking water and sanitation by disseminating and communicating climate information to the project to a) anticipate forecasts of areas at health risk related to floods, heat waves and occurrences of dust, b) rainfall weather forecasts (at risk of flooding), c) wind forecasts and information for secure water management, making it resilient to the vagaries of the climate and allowing the intervention areas to better resist droughts and floods, phenomena whose variability is increasing due to the evolution of climatic conditions.

Also for the infrastructure and the construction of boreholes, the project plans to set up a system (piezometers) to monitor the water tables in the project intervention area and generate useful information for early warning and decision-making. More specifically, this will involve: (i) monitoring the fluctuation of groundwater in the project area; (ii) monitor the quality of groundwater and (iii) regularly produce information on the hydrogeological situation and the quality of groundwater.

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.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021 - The attached excel sheet is fine. The current text in the portal entry is not clear. It reads more like project's implementation arrangement instead of stakeholder engagement plan. Please modify the portal entry.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 -Cleared.

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).

AfDB, 12/21/2021 - The portal entry has been modified. A stakeholder engagement plan has also been attached in English.

The project is undertaken in close collaboration with a wide range of stakeholders, including local communities, provincial and national agencies and ministries, civil society organizations, national and international organizations of the Chadian state. This collaboration is effective following Phase I of PAEPA SU MR and is constantly being strengthened through individual consultations.

Local stakeholders also participated in the design of the project by organizing on-site focus groups to discuss the project's objectives and activities and assess their interest in the project.

Stakeholder participation will include: stakeholder identification and analysis; stakeholder engagement planning; information disclosure; consultation and participation; complaint management mechanism and ongoing reporting to relevant stakeholders.

More information can be found in the attached document.

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.

GEFSEC, AB, 7/19/2021- Thanks. Comment cleared.

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.

-

- GEFSEC, 7/19/2021

- The response is not very clear. As commented above, the project may benefit more from more implementation role of CSOs instead of consultancies. The response indicates that CSOs will be mainly the beneficiaries and their engagement will be only for knowledge sharing.

Also, please provide some more details of the implementation arrangement depicted in the diagram e.g. role and constitution of PMU and Steering Committee. Also, the implementation structure doesn't elaborate how the project will engage with other relevant GEF- Financed initiatives in the region.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2021 - OK.

Agency Response

AfDB, 9/12/2020 - Thank you for the comments. Additionnal 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 restauration, agroforestry, water conservation).

AfDB 12/2/2021

During the identification, preparation, and appraisal missions, a consultative process was adopted, through meetings and discussions with Chadian authorities, TFPs, but especially management committees, water users' associations, women's associations, youth associations, CCLS, and the private sector in the project area.

Indeed, the implementation of the selected works and activities will allow: (i) the decrease in the prevalence of waterborne diseases especially for children under 5 years of age, from 23.6% in 2017 to 3% in 2030; (ii) the profit margin/operating revenue¹ of the mini-castles increases from 34.08% in 2018 to 54.88% in 2030; (iii) five (05) youth

cooperatives and five (05) women's cooperatives are operational; (iv) the time saved on the usual chore of fetching water is devoted to IGAs; (v) the incomes of young people and women are improved by at least 50%; (vi) the gross enrollment rate for girls increases from 88% in 2018 to 98% in 2030; and (vii) at least 80% of the beneficiaries adopt new and positive behaviors in environmental protection, hygiene and sanitation, and climate change adaptation.

At the regional level, the existing Regional Action Committee (RAC) was to be strengthened and expanded to include the local elected officials involved in monitoring the project activities. The RAC will be chaired by the governors of the targeted regions and will meet once a quarter. At the level of the prefectural capitals, the Local Action Committee (LAC), expanded to include local elected officials, administrative authorities, regional delegates of the MEEP, presidents of water users' associations (AUEs)/farmers, representatives of CCAGs, youth representatives and women's associations and groups, will be responsible for monitoring activities.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021

Also, please provide some more details of the implementation arrangement depicted in the diagram e.g. role and constitution of PMU and Steering Committee. Also, the implementation structure doesn't elaborate how the project will engage with other relevant GEF- Financed initiatives in the region.

AfDB 12/2/2021

- The project's implementing agency is the African Development Bank (AfDB). The Executing agency is the Ministry of Environment, Water Resources and Fisheries (MEWF), and more specifically the Technical Directorate General in charge of the following technical departments: Drinking Water Supply, Sanitation and Pastoral Hydraulics.
- The PMU will work under this Directorate and will be the existing PAEPA SU MR team to ensure smooth transition and consistency with the baseline projects. The use of this existing PMU not only ensures that only minimal GEF funds be allocated to project management (<2%), but also that there is a seamless coordination with baseline projects (notably in terms of the geographic complementarity between the PAEPA SU MR WASH infrastructure and the GEF funded activities).

- The PMU will rely on two Monitoring and Support Units (one for the north and one for the south) which will be there direct link with the WSUs.
- Program activities will be monitored at the central level by the Technical Monitoring Committee/Steering Committee (TMC) already in place. The STC is a permanent structure that ensures the steering of all programs and projects in the rural development sector. The STC will have to approve the activity programs, the annual budget, the annual reports and will have to ensure the good progress of the project activities.

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 ;
and http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/gef_environmental_social_safeguards_policy.pdf

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

GEFSEC, 1/25/2021

The ESS document attached seems to be of the co-finance project only. Please prepare an ESS document for the LDCF funded project

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - Cleared.

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.

AfDB, 12/2/2021

An ESS document for the LDCF funded project was 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.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021: Comment cleared.

Agency Response

AfDB, 30/4/2021

The prodoc had already been submitted with the CEO Endorsement package in April 2020. Although there have 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 appreciate 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.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021: Thanks. It looks fine. However, the section is extremely difficult to read with the dark pink highlight. Please change the color.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - Cleared.

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.

AfDB 12/2/2021

Highlights have been changed to yellow and light grey.

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.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021: Annex F now added. Annex E on Project Budget should include budget items. Currently it only indicates the distribution of the funds across different components and outputs. It doesn't indicate where the funds will be spent e.g. personnel, infrastructure procurement, travel, supplies, etc.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - OK.

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.

AfDB 12/2/2021 Annex E on Project Budget includes budget items.

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.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021: Outcome 2.2 is still not clear and reads incomplete. In the LDCF indicators tracking sheet, please review to check for right boxes and estimated beneficiaries under output 1.1.3 related to climate information services. Given that the project has a strong focus on this, this indicator seems quite relevant.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - The above comment does not seem to have been responded to

GEFSEC 4th April 2022- Thanks. The comment is cleared now.

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.

AfDB, February 2022

Outcome 2.2 has been clarified and targets were filled in and checked in the LDCF indicators tracking sheet.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 8/10/2020 - Yes, the Secretariats comments are available on the portal.

GEFSEC 4/26/2022- Please address the following comments from GEF PPO and resubmit the project.

1. On Project Information: please correct the implementation start date for a future date.

2. On the budget: the project budget table, in annex E, is not readable. Please use the template provided in the guidelines. The purpose of the template is to facilitate consistent review, reduce the need for follow up information requests and improve reporting on project costs by assessing the reasonability of charging activities to the three different sources (project's components, M&E and PMC). The project budget table will be reviewed once it is readable, at this point no further comments can be provided.

3. On co-financing: it looks like AfDB is providing a co-financing of 2.8 Million on behalf of the Government of Chad. As per guidelines please request the agency to request a signed a dated letter from the entity that provides the co-financing. In addition all co-financing information should include the type co-financing (as stipulated below) and the time from over which it will be provided.

4. On M&E: There is a difference between the amount stipulated for Component 4 (\$110,000 for KM and M&E), in Table B, and the amount in the M&E budget provided in section 9 (\$ 190,000). Please verify and confirm all the amounts match across Table B, M&E Budget, and over the project budget in Annex E.

5. On the Utilization of PPG: the amount committed should be the difference between the budgeted amount and the amount spent to date. Please correct.

6. On Council Comments: there is a Council comment that was not addressed. Please include the answer to the Council Member from Germany in Annex B.

7. On Gender: It is noted that the project has carried out gender analysis and outlines some activities. The project states that it expects to contribute (1) Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; (2) Improving women's participation and decision making; and (3) Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women. It does not, however, include any gender sensitive indicators to monitor progress in most of these areas. Please review its results framework and or provide information on project plans to contribute to these three results areas on gender

GEFSEC May 6, 2022

Thanks. Comment cleared for final review by PPO.

Agency Response

1. The implementation start date has been updated.
2. The project budget table (green highlight), in annex E, has been added as a JPEG to avoid any unintended transformation when submitted through the portal.
3. The AfDB cofinancing letter has been revised in such a way that it refers only to AfDB's cofinancing (ADF and RWSSI). In addition, the government co-financing letter has been attached.
4. On M&E: The amount stipulated for Component 4 has been corrected and corresponds to \$230,000 (with \$40,000 for KM and \$190,000 for M&E), in Table B. Please note that M&E activities also correspond to a budget of \$190,000 as shown in the Total Budget Table in Annex E and the M&E budget provided in section 9.
5. The amounts committed in the PPG table has been corrected.
6. Regarding Council comments (in green highlight), comments from Germany in Annex B have been added and are addressed.
7. The results framework now includes gender related information (green highlights).

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) 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.

GEFSEC, 7/19/2021: Please address additional comments provided in the review sheet and resubmit the project for consideration.

GEFSEC, 1/24/2022 - A number of the comments from July do not seem to have been addressed. Please see item 6 under Part II as well as the item on the Results Framework.

GEFSEC, 4/11/2022- Yes, the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

GEFSEC, 4/26/2022- Please see additional comments in the section GEF Secretariat Comments. Please address these and provide a response on how these comments have been addressed.

GEFSEC, 5/6/2022

The project is cleared for final review by PPO. All comments have been addressed.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/10/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/17/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/19/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/24/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/11/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The LDCF funded project " Strengthening rural and urban resilience to climate change variability by the provision of water supply and sanitation in Chad" aims to strengthen climate change resilience in the Chadian water sector by providing sustainable infrastructure and management tools to vulnerable populations, and mainstreaming climate change risk and data at the national level in the country. The

project will directly support adaptation of nearly 2.15 million vulnerable population in rural and peri-urban areas in Chad and improved climate resilient management of 1100 hectares of land. 50% of the project beneficiaries are women. The project will also work closely with local communities especially youth in decision making on climate resilient water and land management in the target regions. The LDCF will provide 8.7 million USD for this project and with a co-finance of 13.7 million USD grant funding by AfDB and 2.8 million USD in-kind funding from Government of Chad to scale up adaptation benefits in the country.

The project will deliver adaptation benefits through four inter-related components. First, it will support mainstreaming climate adaptation in national water and sanitation planning by strengthening institutional capacity of relevant government departments and integrating climate change adaptation in national level Water and Sanitation Masterplan. Second, it will support implementation of water supply infrastructure and soil and water conservation solutions in selected regions of the country where water water supply and access has been highly affected by climate change. Third, it will strengthen climate information and early warning systems which will inform decision making and planning of river basin and groundwater resources in the country. Finally, the project will capture best practices and disseminate knowledge on adaptation for long term sustainable impact.

The project adopts an integrated approach by working at national policy level for climate mainstreaming and also working at local level with local governments, communities and CSOs to implement urgent adaptation solutions in the highly vulnerable water sector in North Chad. The Early warning System and Climate Information Services supported through the project will not only inform this project but will also enhance awareness of climate change impacts and build capacity in tackling climate related risks. The project also aims to work with private sector, especially SMEs in the provision of water supply services to vulnerable communities.

The project is country-led and as such takes into consideration national strategies and plans. In particular, the project is part of the 2017-2021 National Development Plan, which also lays the foundations for Chad's 2030 Goals. The project will directly address a number of priorities identified in Chad's NAPA and will contribute to Chad's NDC by focusing in priority vulnerable regions and climate information services. A strong ownership of the government is strongly evident from the project design and implementation approach.

Finally, the project has clearly articulated COVID-19 related risks which are mostly operational in nature and has proposed relevant mitigation measures. By ensuring climate resilient water supply in highly vulnerable water scarce regions, the project will provide communities with infrastructure that can dramatically improve the communities health and sanitation, and also create awareness related to basic hygiene, including

hand-washing and sanitation which is fundamental to resilient recovery from the pandemic.

The project overall demonstrates a good value for LDCF fund and is therefore recommended for CEO Endorsement.