



Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Chad to comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10644

Countries

Chad

Project Name

Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Chad to comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

1/2/2024

Review completed by PM

1/12/2024

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

**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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: Duration has been adjusted to 48 months. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Please correct the end date to match the project duration or correct the duration to match the expected implementation/completion dates.

Submission Date 1/2/2024	Expected Implementation Start 7/1/2024	Expected Completion Date 6/30/2028
Duration ⓘ 36 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 99,275.00

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. The project duration is revised in the GEF Portal (48 months) with the support of the GEF IT team to match the expected implementation/completion dates.

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 1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, the project structure is appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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
2/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. A USD 150,000 Grant from UNDP has been indicated as Investment Mobilized. Cleared.
2. A summary of how the investment mobilized was identified has been provided. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. Grant is investment mobilized. Please replace 'Recurrent expenditures' to 'investment mobilized' for UNDP for amount of \$150,000.

2. Please provide a summary of investment mobilized co-financing reported in the Investment Mobilized description section.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. Grant revised to Investment mobilized in the table ?C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE?.
2. A summary of investment mobilized co-financing reported in the Investment Mobilized description section provided.

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 1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, the financing presented is adequate and demonstrates a cost-effective approach. Some allocations among components have changed, but the overall amount remains the same. Cleared.

Agency Response

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
2/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. The status of utilization of PPG is now individually allocated. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Though there is a detailed presentation of the activities, there is no individual allocation to those activities. Please amend it.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

The status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C revised to include details of expenditures at budget code level.

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 1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, from the PIF to the CEO Approval Document, in GEF Core Indicator 11, even though the total remains equal (80 beneficiaries), there has been a reallocation of 9% between male and female beneficiaries (augmenting the number of female beneficiaries), and they remain realistic. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, this has been elaborated. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 2/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. Information included. Cleared.
2. References to GEF-funded projects included for Third NC and First BUR. Cleared.
3. References included to World Bank, GCF, and African Development Bank funded projects. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Please address the following comments:

1. On the table: ?Summary of Project with key development partners some projects? (namely the National Adaptation Plan, TNA Phase III, Strengthening Rural and Urban Resilience to Climate Change and Variability by the Provision of Water

Supply and Sanitation in Chad), are missing an explicit timeline, including an estimated end date). Kindly include the estimated end dates for each of the projects and also make explicit references in the 'Relevance' column, not only how they are consistent with the CBIT but also how they are complementary to what the CBIT activities will be focusing on.

2. In addition, for the Third National Communication and First BUR, please include an explicit reference that these are GEF projects the first time they are mentioned in this section.
3. Per the Stakeholder Engagement Plan of the project, within the Development Partners and Donors list, the World Bank, the French Development Agency, the African Development Bank, and the Green Climate Fund are listed as donors with current projects in the country with a relationship with the CBIT. From this list, only the African Development Bank is included in the 'Summary of Project with key development partners' in the baseline section. Kindly include references to each to the World Bank, the French Development Agency, and the Green Climate Fund's projects in the 'Summary of Project with key development partners' to clearly establish complementarity with the CBIT and how the CBIT will interact with these projects.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. Estimated end date information added to the timeline column. Details on complementarity and coordination elaborated further under the relevance column.
2. An information Third NC and First BUR are GEF funded projects is added to the text the first time they are mentioned in Part II section.
3. References to the World Bank, the French Development Agency, and the Green Climate Funds projects in the Summary of Project with key development partners added.

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF:

General comments at the output level:

1. List of stakeholders and strategy to guarantee political buy-in to the extent possible included. Cleared.
2. The wording of Output 1.1 has been revised to ensure that the institutional arrangements to be formulated will be sustainable over time going forward. Cleared.

Specific comments at the activity / deliverable level:

1. The wording of activity 1.2.3 has been modified to reveal a more concise scope of work with limited funding. Cleared.
2. Activity 1.2.5 has been edited to confirm that a Training of Trainers Program will take place and will be hosted by the COTNACC. Cleared.
3. Gender considerations and targets added for Activities 1.2.6 and 1.3.7 and related deliverables. Comment cleared.
4. Stakeholders and references to CBIT GSP for activity 1.2.7 have been identified. Cleared.
5. Complementarity between activities 1.3.5 and 1.2.6 has been identified. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: The proposed alternative scenario is sound and adequate. However, the proposal would benefit from addressing the following comments:

General comments at the output level:

1. For output 1.1, kindly provide an initial list of the expected ministries/institutions and stakeholders that will take place in institutional arrangements for inter-ministerial coordination on climate transparency and describe what strategy (i.e., consultation process among these institutions) will be put in place to guarantee political buy-in to the extent possible.
2. The baseline scenario mentions that climate information currently available is approximately one decade old, and that information is currently dispersed in external sources that currently don't require sharing. Kindly revise the language of output 1.1 and their activities as deemed appropriate to ensure that the draft of the new institutional arrangements will not only make available to relevant stakeholders the historic climate information from the past 10 years but that such arrangements will also make the sharing of information sustainable over time going forward. Please amend the wording of output 1.1 to reflect the aforementioned.

Specific comments at the activity / deliverable levels:

1. Activity 1.2.3 "Develop emission factors for the four (4) key sectors", seems too broad and ambitious with limited funding. Please identify a couple of emission categories within the prioritized sectors for which emission factors will be developed and identify to what IPCC Tier they will be promoted to. Kindly amend the activity and relevant deliverables as necessary.
2. For Activity 1.2.5 "Develop a Capacity Development Strategy, possibly including a Training of Trainers scheme for continuous capacity-building and institutional development?". Considering the word "possibly," we recommend reviewing its language in order to ensure that a scheme for continuous capacity-building (be it the proposed Training of Trainers program or similar) is in place and provides sustainability of the output after project intervention and who will be hosting such a

training. Kindly amend the wording of the activity and relevant deliverables as necessary.

3. For Activity 1.2.6 ?Undertake training to 15 to 20 people (from the Hubs and MEFSD) in domestic MRV systems, enhancement of GHG inventories and emission projections, based on Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - IPCC 2006 latest guidelines / tools?; and Activity 1.3.7, 1.3.7. ?Provide training to 15-20 people (from the Hubs and MCANM) on the national MRV system and online climate transparency portal, monitoring of NDCs, and providing information in the CBIT global coordination platform? to the extent possible. Kindly include a mention to addressing gender equality considerations within the 15-20 beneficiaries of the trainings in the activities and relevant deliverables as necessary.
4. For Activity 1.2.7. ?Scale up lessons learned and best practices through peer exchange programs for stakeholders on transparency activities?, kindly indicate what type of stakeholders will be involved (public, private, academic, civil society sectors) and if such scale-up will make use the CBIT Global Support Programme mentioned in the baseline section. Please amend the activity and relevant deliverables as necessary.
5. For Activity 1.3.5. ?Provide training to MEFSD and Ministry of Civil Aviation and National Meteorology (MCANM) staff and local authorities and other relevant stakeholders on the MRV system, including (i) GHG emissions; (ii) mitigation measures; (iii) monitoring the support needed and received; (iv) Use and management of the online climate transparency portal? 1.2.6. ?Undertake training to 15 to 20 people (from the Hubs and MEFSD) in domestic MRV systems, enhancement of GHG inventories and emission projections, based on Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change - IPCC 2006/latest guidelines/tools?; the topics on GHG emissions is repeated in both trainings. Kindly indicate how these two activities differ or consider consolidating them in one activity, as deemed appropriate. Please adapt activities and related deliverables as necessary.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

Responses to General comments at the output level:

1. The tentative list of the expected ministries/institutions and stakeholders is added under Output 1.1. Throughout the project the engagement with the stakeholders will take place via structured meetings, interviews, workshops, and consultations. By understanding needs and expectations, communicating regularly and effectively, building relationships, seeking stakeholders' feedback, being proactive, the project aims to effectively engage stakeholders, ensure political buy-in, leverage insights, and contributions to address challenges, achieve consensus and deliver successful outcomes and outputs.

The engagement strategy is further described in the "Stakeholders Engagement Plan".

2. The wording of Output 1.1. and its activities revised to ensure the new institutional arrangements and sharing of information is based on sustainability going forward.

Responses to Specific comments at the activity / deliverable levels:

1. Activity 1.2.3. revised to ?Develop 02 emission factors for agriculture/livestock and energy sectors for emission category 1 and 2, based on the intermediate methodology of the IPCC, using Tier 2 approach?.

2. Activity 1.2.5. revised to ?Develop a long-term Capacity Development Plan, including a ?Training of Trainers? scheme for continuous capacity building and institutional development, with emphasis on gender mainstreaming.? The Training of Trainers will be hosted by the COTNACC (National Technical Committee on Climate Change) composed of high-level technical experts from public ministries, civil society, research centers and the private sector.

3. Gender considerations included into the activities and deliverables related to 1.2.6. and 1.3.7.

4. Activity 1.2.7 revised to indicate type of Stakeholders to be involved at the national level as well as use of the CBIT Global Support Program to scale-up lessons learned and best practices.

5. Activity 1.3.5. revised to ?Inform and raise awareness among local authorities and other relevant stakeholders on the enhanced transparency requirements, including: (i) GHG emissions; (ii) mitigation measures; (iii) monitoring the support needed and received; (iv) Use and management of the online climate transparency portal.

1.2.6. will be technical training while 1.3.5. will focus on awareness raising and sensibilization of stakeholders on ETF.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, the project is the proper elaboration of the project being aligned with focal area / impact program strategies. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: The incremental reasoning is clearly elaborated.

Agency Response

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

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: Sustainability has been ensured through the Training of Trainers Program and institutional arrangements through several specific outputs and activities of the project. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, this has been provided. Nevertheless, as referred to in the Proposed Alternative Scenario, we recommend reviewing the language of the sustainability section to ensure that a scheme for continuous capacity-building (be it the proposed Training of Trainers programme or similar) is in place after and provides sustainability of the project intervention. Kindly confirm which continuous capacity-building scheme(s) will take place in the project.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

Sustainability section revised. A long-term capacity development plan will be developed, and the country will increase the number of technical experts and trainers through a 'Training of Trainers' scheme for continuous capacity building activities after the intervention of this CBIT project.

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

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, this has been provided.

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

N/A

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. The Ministry of Industry and IPPU sectors have been removed from the project scope of work and stakeholders. Cleared.
2. References to CASAGC's role in the project are now in English. Cleared.
3. References to MTCANM are now explicit in the Stakeholders table. Cleared.
4. References to private sector stakeholders are explicit now in this section and throughout the document. Cleared.
5. Means and frequency of engagement have been added to each of the listed stakeholders. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Please address the following comments:

1. The Ministry of Industry is included with a role in the project in the Energy and Industrial sectors for emission factor development. Nevertheless, it is not until this section that the IPPU sector is mentioned in the CEO Approval Document. Please explain briefly in the preceding sections if the IPPU sector will be addressed by the sector and justify its relevance.
2. The role in the project of The Action Committee for Food Security and Crisis Management (CASAGC) is currently written in French. Kindly amend and revert its role in English.
3. The Ministry of Civil Aviation and National Meteorology (MCANM) has been mentioned as a key stakeholder throughout several sections of the document but is not explicitly included in this section. Kindly include the MCANM in this list and its responsibility and role in this project.
4. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan lists only Telecommunication companies as private sector stakeholders within the project. Nevertheless, the private sector

engagement section then cites other actors such as main consular chambers (chamber of commerce, industry, agriculture, mines, and crafts), large businesses from the energy, banking, as well as telecommunications, and innovative small and midsize enterprises (SMEs) and their roles in the project. Kindly include reference to these additional private sector stakeholders in the stakeholder engagement plan and update the Private Sector Engagement sector accordingly.

5. Please provide a brief description of the means and frequency of engagement for each of the listed stakeholders.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. The Ministry of Industry is removed from this list. IPPU sector not relevant in the Chad's context.
2. Text related to the role of CASAGC translated to English.
3. The Ministry of Transport, Civil Aviation and National Meteorology (MTCANM) included in the list
4. Private Sector Stakeholder list revised in alignment with the Private Sector Engagement section.
5. All key stakeholders, at different levels, have been engaged in the design of the project through sectoral consultations and national validation workshops. They will be continuously engaged in the implementation of the project through the institutional arrangement bodies, the steering committee meetings, specific working groups to address specific activities. The training sessions (both general training and training of trainers) will engage all stakeholders, with a focus on gender consideration. Information on means and frequency of engagement added for each of the listed stakeholders.

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

2/20/2024 WH/EBF:

1. Gender considerations added to activities 1.2.6 and 1.3.7, as well as throughout the document where applicable. Cleared.
2. Gender considerations have been added throughout the document, including the Indicative Project Overview table. Cleared.

3. Gender considerations have been considered in outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 3.1. Under M&E, an indicator of the Number of gender indicators in the M&E framework with a target of 10 minimum gender indicators has been included. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. As indicated before, kindly include a mention of gender considerations within the 15-20 beneficiaries of the training in at least activities 1.2.6 and 1.3.7 and relevant deliverables as necessary so that they become gender-responsive activities.
2. As per GEF guidance and policy requirements, gender dimensions have to be mainstreamed throughout the project, including the project description, project components, and outputs. While a detailed Gender Action Plan has been developed, it has not been integrated into the project description and activities. For instance, there is no mention of gender dimension in the Indicative Project Overview table.
3. Please integrate gender perspectives in Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3. In Output 3.1, please include lessons learned and good practices relating to gender results. Please also ensure that gender is considered and reported on under M&E.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. Reference to gender aspects and dimension added to relevant Outputs, Activities and Deliverables.
2. Reference to gender aspects and dimension integrated into the description of project activities.
3. Gender aspects and dimension integrated into Outputs 1.1, 1.2, 1.3. Project will be effectively monitored and evaluated, including gender consideration.

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: Private Sector Engagement has been adjusted. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Kindly adjust the Private Sector Engagement section according to the comments of the Stakeholders section above.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

Private Sector Stakeholder list revised in alignment with the Private Sector Engagement section.

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: Staff turnover in key government institutions has been added to the Risk section along with its Risk Treatment and Treatment Owner, which includes the Training of Trainer's Program and Guidelines and Methodologies in written format. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: We recommend including the risk of staff turnover in key government institutions in this section.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

The Staff turnover added to Risk log table for regular monitoring during project implementation.

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. Notes on the Direct Project Costs for the USD 21,999 of internal execution requested by UNDP have been added to the Budget table. Cleared.

2. Coordination of the CBIT project with related projects with funding from GEF, GCF, the World Bank, the French Development Agency, and the African Development Bank have been added. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: The institutional arrangements are described. However, please address the following comments:

1. UNDP will provide internal execution of USD 21,999 (2.10% of the Total GEF Grant). The request from the OFP, the justification, and the authorization by the GEF Secretariat are provided in the documents section of the project. Please refer to the comment related to the budget table in this regard.
2. As it has been stated for the Third National Communication Project in this section, explicit references to how the CBIT project will coordinate with the ongoing projects from international cooperation is missing, e.g., funding from the GEF (particularly, Chad's first BUR), the World Bank, the French Development Agency, the African Development Bank, and the Green Climate Fund. Please briefly explain how the CBIT project will coordinate with each of the aforementioned ongoing projects.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. Addressed in the comment related to the budget table in this regard.
2. In Chad, most of the initiatives to combat climate change supported by bilateral and multilateral partners are anchored either within the sectoral ministries that are sensitive to climate change, or by international agencies or NGOs. And these structures are represented on the steering committees of the various sectors. This will facilitate coordination and synergy of action with the CBIT team in the context of collecting data on inventories and training the main players. The UNDP, as co-leader of the Technical and Financial Partners (TFP) cluster on climate change and the environment, will also facilitate communication between CBIT and other ongoing projects. The links between these various projects and CBIT are set out in the table summarising projects with key development partners. Ongoing projects are also added to the Coordination section of the CEO ER.

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: Chad's Nationally Determined Contributions have been added to the list of Strategies, national plans or reports, and evaluations. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Kindly include the alignment of the CBIT with Chad's Nationally Determined Contribution in the current list of Strategies, national plans or reports and evaluations.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

Alignment with NDC is included.

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. Activities 1.2.5, 1.2.6, 1.2.7, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, and 1.3.7 and their related deliverables have been added in the table for Key Knowledge Products, Timeline, and Budget for Delivery. A communication strategy, timeline, and budget have also been included. Cleared.
2. The wording of Component 3 has been clarified. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF:

1. Kindly explicitly include activities 1.2.5, 1.2.6, 1.2.7, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, and 1.3.7 and related deliverables in the table for Key Knowledge Products, Timeline, and Budget for Delivery and provide a description of a communication strategy for the project, including a timeline and a budget for implementation.
2. Clarify the outcome listed for Component 3 on KM to explain what is meant by the statement "Expected Outcome 3: Project is capitalized."

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. Activities 1.2.5, 1.2.6, 1.2.7, 1.3.5, 1.3.6, and 1.3.7 and related KM deliverables included in the table with the indicative budget of USD 50,000 USD.

2. The description revised to ?The results of the project are documented, used and serve as a basis for other similar initiatives.?

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

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, these are well documented, and it has been marked as low, cleared.

Agency Response

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

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: The Monitoring and Evaluation Budget table has been included in section 9. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: The Monitoring and Evaluation Budget table is missing in section 9. Please include it.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

Monitoring and Evaluation Budget table added to section 9 of the CEO ER.

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

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, this has been elaborated. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/20/2024 WH/EBF:

1. Cleared.
2. Cleared.
3. The vehicle expense is included as part of UNDP's cash co-finance. Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF:

Regarding the budget table:

1. Correct the margins between the first and second columns, some of the text is overlapping.
2. As mentioned earlier, we take note that UNDP will conduct an internal execution of USD 21,999 (2.10% of the total GEF grant). Please specify in the budget table which budget line will be allocated to UNDP to provide their execution services of USD 21,999.
3. Please clarify why a vehicle of \$67,000 (\$14,000 is charged to PMC) and a driver (amount unspecified under PMC) are required by the project.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

1. The overlapping text is corrected. The titles of the budget categories appear in order on our end.

2. In the GEF budget table, the two budget lines for the execution support services of USD 21,999 are clarified under the detailed description column. The related lines are "Sub-contract to executing partner" (Line 3 and Line 4). The description reads as follows:

"Execution support services: Direct Project Costs (Total amount: USD 21,999) for services rendered by UNDP to the project, according to the Letter of Agreement (Annex 11 in ProDoc)

are the costs of administrative services (such as those related to human resources, procurement, finance, and other functions) provided by UNDP in relation to the project. Direct project costs will be charged based on the UNDP Universal Price List or the actual corresponding service cost, in line with the GEF rules on DPCs. The amounts here are estimations. DPCs will be detailed as part of the annual project operational planning process and included in the yearly budgets. DPC costs can only be used for operational cost per transaction. DPCs are not a flat fee.?

3. The expenses related to the vehicle cost (USD 67,000) will be covered through UNDP cash co-financing. This is explained in the Agency Project Document's Total Budget and Work Plan section [P. 60 and P. 62, budget note # 32]. The vehicle cost is presented under PMC budget, yet it is separated from the GEF funding. The vehicle will facilitate liaison among UNDP and PMU which will be based at the Ministry in line with the project's implementation arrangements and will facilitate travel of national and international consultants for data collection. The unique country context of Chad requires a means of travel for the Project Management Unit to facilitate transportation, also when needed outside of the capital city for stakeholder engagement, and access to training areas in different cities.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, this has been included. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: Cleared.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Please refer to the comment related to Annex C.

Agency Response

Agency response, 19 Feb 2024

The status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C revised to include details of expenditures at budget code level.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Yes, 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

N/A

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 RequestN/A

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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2024 WH/EBF: The PMs recommend the project for further processing.

1/22/2024 WH/EBF: Please address the comments in the review sheet and **highlight them in yellow** in the portal form.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/22/2024	2/19/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/22/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations