

[Home RoadMap](#)

Strengthening Agro-ecosystems' Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in the Lake Chad Basin (Lac, Kanem, Bahr El Ghazal, and Part of the Hadjer-Lamis Region)

[Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement](#)

Basic project information

GEF ID

9166

Countries

Chad

Project Name

Strengthening Agro-ecosystems' Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in the Lake Chad Basin (Lac, Kanem, Bahr El Ghazal, and Part of the Hadjer-Lamis Region)

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/25/2020

Review completed by PM

6/10/2020

Program Manager

Katya Kuang-Idba

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Project Design and Financing

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/25/2020 - Yes. The CEO ER is largely in line with the original PIF, with the objective and component structure remaining consistent with the original submission.

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/27/2020 - Clarification requested. Components 1 and 3 seem to have significant overlap. For instance there is work relating to provincial adaptation plans in both components - please clarify why activities relating to provincial adaptation planning are not all under one component; and why it doesn't make more sense to have all activities at each level of governance executed under the same component, so as to present a more cohesive project design and approach.

GEFSEC, 3/17/2020 - Cleared. The justification provided is sufficient.

Response to Secretariat comments

Components 1 and 3 are connected but seek to solve distinct problems. Component 1 is addressing barrier 1 and component 3 is addressing barrier 4 described in section 1.2.3 in the FAO Project Document.

The aim of component 3 is to mainstream climate change adaptation into key national policies, specifically those related to governance of land and natural resources – through the ongoing national land reform process. At the same time, it is important to create a strong linkage between the national and provincial levels, in terms of translating national policies into implementation at local level, and mobilizing resources with leadership of an integrated national team.

In this way, sustainable financing of provincial adaptation plans is mainstreamed into national priorities. This linkage and connection between the provinces and the center is crucial.

Component 3 formulation, outcome 3.1 description in particular, has been slightly modified to better clarify.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/25/2020 - Not clear, more information requested.

Recommended action: Please provide a brief explanation (a few sentences is fine) indicating how the project activities are cost-effective in comparison to viable alternatives.

GEFSEC, 3/17/2020 - Cleared, a brief explanation on the cost-effective rationale has been included in the portal review sheet as well as the prodoc.

Response to Secretariat comments

A paragraph (125) has been added in the FAO Project Document.

The project is cost-effective in a number of ways, including:

- Implementation of activities is mostly through national and provincial institutions, which also ensures sustainability of capacities and continuous implementation of provincial adaptation plans beyond the project;
- Catalyzing partnerships and investments from financial and technical partners, as reflected in the co-financing commitments already made.

Furthermore, the project seeks to create an enabling environment to attract investments to the provinces through strong support to public services to derisk the context and create business opportunities through innovations, especially for women and youth.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/25/2020 - One clarification requested. While the risk matrix is sufficiently developed, accompanied by appropriate mitigation measures, the Secretariat would like to reference the comment from the German council member expressing concern regarding the co-financing from ANADER. Taking into consideration this comment, would this risk be embodied in the 5th row on the risk table? Would it be possible to reference the specific concern raised by the German council member in the risk table?

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - Cleared. The agency has incorporated the above as suggested.

Response to Secretariat comments

Yes, this is an important risk regarding the capacity of ANADER and how to ensure the organization has a meaningful role in the project. This has been taken into consideration in the design.

As described in the response matrix: the project has given important consideration to the need to strengthen capacities of decentralized technical services and ANADER, through vigorous capacity development programs, and ensuring that direct engagement applying the capacities in the execution of the project components.

Now reflected in the risk matrix as well.

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/25/2020 - Acton requested. Signed co-financing letters in French have been provided.

Recommended action: The Secretariat requests that the co-financing letters be translated. An unofficial translation is acceptable. Please also ensure that the type of co-financing is clear in the letter (grant, in-kind, etc).

GEFSEC, 3/17/2020 - Cleared. Translations are included.

Response to Secretariat comments The letters have been translated and attached.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 2/26/2020 - Yes. The CCA tracking tool is completed and uploaded onto the portal.

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/27/2020 - Not clear. There are numerous LDCF-financed initiatives in Chad, as well as the GCF which are not mentioned in the CEO ER. Additionally, there does not seem to be any information regarding climate change policies, aside from those related to the UNFCCC process.

Recommended action: Please indicate how the project is coordinating with previously financed initiatives by the LDCF, to prevent any duplication and ensure the maximization of synergies. Please also indicate whether and how the project is coordinating with any GCF-financed initiatives in-country, as well as the National Adaptation Plan process, which is not referenced in the submission.

GEFSEC, 3/17/2020 - Cleared. The requested information has also been added to Section A.6 of the portal submission.

Response to Secretariat comments

The comment has been addressed under section 1.7.1 knowledge sharing – revised entirely to address the recommendation.

9. 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, 2/26/2020 - Clarification requested. While there is a budgeted M&E plan in the prodoc, the Secretariat would appreciate if this information is also made available in the CEO ER on the portal.

Recommended action: Please insert the M&E plan in the portal submission.

GEFSEC, 3/17/2020 - Yes, this has been added. Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments The budgeted M&E plan has been added in the portal.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/26/2020 - More information requested. The Prodoc section 1.7.3 refers to the project's "Communication Plan," but this does not suffice as a knowledge management plan. A KM plan should describe how project knowledge will be created, captured, shared, and managed. Please refer to the GEF's suggested approach on KM, which was introduced in GEF-6 and captured here: <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/events/Knowledge%20Management%20Requirements%20Jan-2020.pdf>

Recommended action: Please add slightly more detail and develop the KM approach (this can be brief, as long as it encapsulates the requirements outlined in the link above) in line with GEF requirements.

GEFSEC, 3/17/2020 - Cleared. The agency has provided additional detail and clarity on the KM approach.

Response to Secretariat comments Section 1.7.1 on knowledge sharing has been revised to address the weaknesses pointed out in the review - much more clearer presentation of the knowledge management plan.

Agency Responses

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

GEFSEC

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 2/27/2020 - Yes.

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 2/27/2020 - Yes. Responses are included in Annex B.

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 2/27/2020 - Yes. Responses are included in Annex B. However, please refer to Item 4, which requests a clarification.

Response to Secretariat comments Item 4 recommendation addressed. Thank you.

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 2/27/2020 - Not yet. Please address flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

GEFSEC, 3/27/2020 - Final clarification needed on the below text, which implies that FAO will be undertaking executing duties in this project. As far as I recall, there was no written agreement from the OFP on this arrangement. Please clarify and remove all references to direct execution by FAO on the activities implemented as part of this project. As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. Apologies if I have missed something.

Based on consultations with the Government (Ministry of Agriculture and the GEF Operational Focal Point), given the fragile security situation in the Lake Chad region and lack of expertise at the national level and considering the absence of national and local institutions with fiduciary capacity and strong presence in the target provinces, it was recommended that FAO directly executes, together with partners, sub-components of the project. FAO direct execution of specific

subcomponents is proposed with the main objective of supporting a learning-by-doing process for local institutions, which will play a major role in co-execution and in future scale-up (Please also see the GEF Council comment related to capacity of implementing partners – Annex B).

GEFSEC, 6/22/2020 -The execution arrangements have been changed from PIF, and FAO plans to carry out both functions. However, as the GEF Fee Policy explicitly precludes the merging or crossing over of the implementing functions of the GEF Agencies and the execution functions undertaken by EAs. In exceptional cases, a beneficiary country can make a request for execution support from the agency through a letter signed by the OFP that outlines the specific execution functions, why and for how much. The GEF Secretariat assesses the request and decides whether to approve it. While a letter has been provided, it does not sufficiently explain why it is requesting the FAO to carry out the execution functions (which should be the last resort) instead of a third-party. Please request that the government to consider alternative options to include a third party entity to take on the EA roles instead of FAO. Otherwise, this request needs to have a stronger justification.

Response to Secretariat comments

As stated in the Project Document, and as now confirmed and formalized through a letter from the GEF OFP, the government of Chad has requested FAO to support the project's execution. The Government's request was based on the project's technical and cross-sectoral nature and on the government's recognition that, as a neutral partner, FAO is uniquely positioned to work with a wide range of entities in view of building national capacity for cross-sectoral landscape level management, in particular line ministries and subsidiary entities in charge of the Agricultural and environmental portfolio at the national level, alongside Provincial district and other national partners.

The project focus is on strengthening agro-ecosystems' adaptive capacity to climate change in 4 provinces (Lac, Kanem, Bahr El Ghazal, and part of the Hadjer-Lamis Province). In order to achieve this goal, the project will specifically strengthen the capacity building of institutions such as the **CPA/Local Planning Unit (ULP)**; **The National Agency for Rural Development (ANADER)**; **The Great Green Wall National Agency (ANGMV)**; the **High Council of Autonomous Communities and Traditional Chiefdoms (HC-CACT)**; national **NGOs and Producers' and livestock breeders' federations**. The engagement of these partners in the project execution will constitute a capacity development process, and the proposed model-cases of land and forest management will be replicated beyond the project timespan.

The Ministry of Land use Planning, Housing Development and Urban Planning (MLPH) and its provincial delegations is responsible for the implementation of the National Territorial Development Scheme (NTDS, 2014-2035) and provincial land plans. This ministry also has the specific mandate over land tenure, in particular through its role as chair of the national committee on land reform. MLPH is a key player in the provinces but to be effective, it needs to develop planning, coordination and monitoring capacities.

The ultimate goal of this arrangement will be that national and provincial entities have the full capacity to carry out PCCAPs (Provincial Climate Change Adaptation Plan) and make the rural territories attractive for investment. Developing national capacity is the ultimate intent of Project Management Unit (PMU) arrangements. All core project activities will be rolled out by the PMU through different governmental institutions, both at the national and/or local level. As a specialized UN agency, FAO is expected to facilitate together with beneficiary and host institutions in the government the recruitment of project staff (setting up the PMU). FAO's role in the recruitment processes will be to ensure the upholding of both technical and procedural standards. Government will draft the ToRs for consultants to be hired in

consultation with FAO. Such exercise had not been previously experienced in Chad and it requires inter sectorial cooperation, the availability of specialized expertise and a focused capacity-building program. FAO will help on these aspects through its role as foreseen in the Project Document.

FAO will facilitate the planning and monitoring processes at provincial level through the use of landsat images. The local delegations of MLPH will be the main FAO partner to formulate the five-year Provincial Climate Change Adaptation Plan in close collaboration with land users organized into collaboration platforms. These Local Bodies for Orientation and decisions comprising agropastoralist organizations and traditional chiefdoms will be created and activated by identified national civil society organizations. FAO will facilitate an inclusive policy dialogue on land reform to better address Climate Change; inequalities and discrimination against women; youth and vulnerable groups' access to land and ecosystem services, In order to reduce conflict between land users. FAO will support the national team including the five focal points to facilitate central-provincial connections for resource mobilization to support the implementation of the provincial plans.

The government of Chad maintains its leading role in the project. **The steering committee (Comité de pilotage (CP))** led by the Ministry of Agricultural, Production, Irrigation and Equipment (MPIEA), consists of five (5) focal points (GEF, Ministries of Environment, Livestock, Land Development and Planning), AGNGMV (1), representatives of NGOs and civil society (2) and the Project Manager (1). Its role is to make decisions in case of political or security difficulties and to facilitate the integration of services

As for FAO's role as both a GEF Agency and a specialized UN Agency, it is worth mentioning FAO is in full alignment with the GEF Project and Programme Cycle Policy. FAO's roles and responsibilities with respect to project management has an established firewall between the execution and implementation functions. This is done by securing the segregation of duties associated to internal FAO roles, namely the Budget Holder (BH), Lead Technical Officers (LTO), Funding Liaison Officer (FLO), Office of Evaluation (OED), and Corporate Units as described in the PRODOC. In connection with it, FAO would like to reiterate that all project grants would be disbursed on the ground for the timely delivery of project outputs, while the agency's oversight and supervision functions will be undertaken by its own staff and funded by the agency's fees.

Review Dates

	Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		