

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

Review PIF 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**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

8/17/2020

**Review completed by PM**

5/13/2022

**Program Manager**

Namrata Rastogi

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## PIF

**Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the CCM programming strategy.

Agency Response

**Indicative project/program description summary**

**2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Please revise the outputs so they are specific to Chad and the project. For example Output 2 and Output 3 state "technical support, training and tools provided to the country." The project's scope is not the whole country. Please also consider complementing the description of helping Chad "submit GHG inventories" to "prepare and submit GHG inventories".

5/13/2022: This has been addressed. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The output statements have been updated in line with the comments.

### Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

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

9/2/2020: Table C mentions that co-financing will be provided by Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries (MEWF). However, the section on incremental cost mentions that the co-financing will be provided through Ministry of Civil Aviation and National Meteorology, the Ministry of Environment, Water and Fisheries, and the Ministry of Energy. Please clarify.

5/13/2022: This has been clarified. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The section on Incremental costs has been correct to ensure alignment with the co-finance Table C.

### GEF Resource Availability

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: The proposed GEF financing in Table is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

## Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: As of this date there are sufficient resources in the CBIT set-aside to support this project.

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: N/A

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: Yes, a PPG of \$50,000 is requested and is within the allowable cap for an MSP.

#### Agency Response

##### Core indicators

**6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)**

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

9/2/2020: A target of 80 direct beneficiaries has been identified under Core Indicator 11. Please provide the methodology utilized in the space below the Core Indicator table, including providing information on how the split between transparency unit, data teams, focal points etc. was derived at. Also consider including information on any beneficiaries from training sessions etc.

Please note that by CEO endorsement we will also ask for the CBIT qualitative indicators to be reported on.

5/13/2022: Additional information has been provided. As mentioned at CEO approval stage, CBIT indicators will need to included.

#### Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

Further information has been provided on the estimated breakdown of direct beneficiaries.

We take good note of the fact that qualitative indicators will also have to be included in the CEO Endorsement document.

##### Project/Program taxonomy

**7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/2/2020: Yes.

#### Agency Response

## Part II ? Project Justification

### 1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

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

9/2/2020: The description provides details on the climate change issue in Chad. However, there is no description of the root causes and barriers to be addressed. The baseline scenario section provides some of this information. Please move this information to this section. Also provide details on barriers/constraints/root causes that may have been identified as part of the NC3 process and the BUR project currently underway. Specifically, consider including detailed information on the barriers/capacity constraints related to weak institutional arrangements and low technical capacities.

5/13/2022: The section has been updated. It is noted that additional details will be elaborated upon at the CEO approval stage.

#### Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The section has been further elaborated to include the main categories of gaps and barriers. The latest information from the NC and BUR processes will be further elaborated in the ?Root causes & barriers? section of the CEO Endorsement Document.

### 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

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

9/2/2020: Note there are acronyms such as MSC and NTCC used in this section. Please spell them out. Please address comments below:

1. Rather than outlining the outputs of the third NC project, the concept should explain what activities have been carried out and how and what barriers have been identified. Same with the BUR. Considering that these project will be finished before this project starts implementation, the CBIT project will not likely have synergies with the projects but rather build upon them (and potentially have synergies with follow up EA projects). Please also comment on the delays between endorsement and approval of the third NC and first BUR projects and their actual implementation and eventual submissions to the UNFCCC.

2. We welcome the description of the institutional arrangements under BUR1 (in the baseline scenario section). However, there is no clarity on the current institutional

arrangements for other reporting functions (such as NC) and generally for climate change. Please provide a summary.

3. In addition, it will be helpful to have information on what are the current technical capacities ? i.e. current use of IPCC 2006 guidelines, etc., timeline series, level of adaptation and financial reporting etc.

4. Among the projects identified as potentially relevant, please add timeline to the GCF/FAO readiness project. This project could have direct synergies with this project (if so, please add under the coordination section). Please clarify what ministry will be executing this project.

5/13/2022: We note the revisions made and that these will be further update and revised in the CEO approval document stage. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

Acronyms MSC and NTCC have been spelled out.

1. The TNC was submitted in September 2021, while the BUR1 is still under development (due to implementation challenges with the EA). Wording has therefore been adjusted to clarify that the CBIT project will build upon the TNC project's outputs and that the potential for the CBIT project to build upon the results of the BUR1 will be further elaborated in the full CEO Endorsement document during the PPG phase.

2. Your suggestion is well noted. The institutional arrangements for other climate change reporting functions in Chad will be elaborated in the CEO Endorsement Document, during the detailed project development phase.

3. Thank you for your comment. The current technical capacities in Chad will be assessed in detail during the project development phase, through the various consultation workshops to be organized with the PPG funding. These will then be elaborated in the 'Baseline scenario' section of the CEO Endorsement Document.

4. The GCF/FAO readiness project (also executed by the Ministry of Environment, Fisheries and Sustainable Development) has been included in the table. The synergies between the CBIT project and the FAO/GCF readiness project will be further investigated during the project development phase.

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Spell out MCANM. Please address comments below:

1. The behaviors identified in the table in this section are quite general and have not been explained in the previous two sections. This section needs to build on what has been presented in the previous sections (per the comments above). Please clarify.

2. Consider focusing on key needs and priorities from Chad's perspective and as an LDC in the context of ETF.

3. The Outputs focus on four key sectors: agriculture and land use, energy, transport, industries and waste sectors. However, Chad's NDC focuses on slightly different sectors (for mitigation: Energy, Agriculture/Livestock, Land use and forestry, waste; and for adaptation: water, agriculture/agroforestry, livestock and fishing). Consider aligning the sector focus in this CBIT project with the ones mentioned in the NDC or provide rationale for why the four sectors were chosen.

4. Please consider a stronger focus on adaptation sectors, including M&E of adaptation actions and processes. One might want to identify a specific sector and pilot M&E specifically for that sector within this CBIT project.

#### 5. Output 1

- Clarify what is meant by stakeholders. Since this output is clearly linked with strengthening institutional arrangements, it will be helpful to outline that stakeholders refers specifically to ministries or other institutions (internal and/or external).
- This output mentions establishment of four data collection and processing hubs. However, the deliverables do not fully align with this. Please provide further details, along with information on what is meant by such a hub ? i.e. is this establishment of a hub using IT infrastructure for data processing etc., a virtual network of experts etc. The table with the category ?desired/transformation behavior? mentions an online transparency portal while the section under core indicators mentions the establishment of a transparency unit. It is not fully clear from the current description in this output, exactly what is the output(s). Provide a clear summary along with supporting rationale.
- In this context, consider how information from such hubs could be used to inform the public more generally on climate change risks and its impact.

#### 6. Output 2 and 3

- We welcome the building of technical capacities for both GHG inventories and NDC tracking. We would like to see some additional information in relation to these activities since they remain fairly broad. For example, for Output 2, what is meant by field data teams and how might they interact with Output 2 and strengthening institutional arrangements? What specifically do the tools and protocols include, how will they build on existing gaps, and what is meant by ?test? in this context? Consider the importance of country-specific emission factors and why this is important.



### 7. Output 3:

- It might be worth streamlining this activity (Analysis of MRV practices and gaps) with Activity #1 of Output 1 where a holistic approach is taken to analyse both institutional arrangements and technical capacities for MRV and broader transparency goals. If this path were to be chosen, we would recommend considering a stocktake to identify the goals of Chad in relation to transparency and identify key priorities, especially from an LDC perspective. For example, this stocktake might identify adaptation reporting and international finance reporting as key to the country needs and transparency priorities. Based on this, the project would then frame the rest of its activities. Such an activity would also enable Chad to think about 'improving transparency over time', a key aim of CBIT.
- Related to the above point, we would recommend providing some additional detail on what is meant by NDC tracking, is it focused on mitigation and adaptation, and if so which one would be prioritized in terms of building technical capacities?
- It is not clear what is meant by an online transparency portal and its purpose, and if it is the same as the transparency unit mentioned under core indicators previously. Clarify how, if any, interlinkages or interactions this may have with the sectoral hubs. Please also clarify if this portal would build on any existing arrangements?
- Similar to the above points, it is not clear what is meant by design, test and operationalize an MRV system. Provide details on what systems and processes already exist, what is being defined by MRV system
- Consider building technical capacities leveraging existing networks and institutions such as the LDC Universities of Climate Change.

5/13/2022: We note that some comments have been addressed; and all comments will be fully addressed at the CEO approval stage.

### Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

Several edits have been made to the PIF to incorporate part of the comments above. Some comments will however require further and deeper consultations with the national counterparts? consultation which will be undertaken during the PPG phase as part of the workshops to be organized.

We acknowledge the importance and relevance of the comments and questions raised above, and as agreed with the GEF Sec we will ensure that all of these are further discussed with the national counterparts? during the various stakeholder consultation workshops to be organized during the PPG phase. As a result, all comments will be fully addressed and incorporated into the 'Alternative scenario section' of the CEO Endorsement document.

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes, the project is overall aligned with the CCM strategy.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: This section is very broad and general. Consider strengthening this section based on how this CBIT project will build and leverage other existing initiatives and not duplicate them (and based on the revisions from our previous comments).

5/13/2022: This has been addressed for now. At the CEO approval stage, please strengthen the language as mentioned above.

Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The section on ?Incremental costs? has been further amended.

**6. Are the project/s/program/s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes

Agency Response

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: The section under ?innovation? mentions several aspects of the project that are not detailed in the Output/Outcomes section. Please clarify and include. For instance, it mentions ?implement an integrated monitoring and reporting system rather than report on each sector emissions separately, which the project will develop in one platform?. Is this the transparency portal or the hubs that were mentioned. Additionally it states, ?State of the art science in monitoring and new technologies (e.g. machine

learning, remote sensing)? There is no mention of these in the project description. If independent monitoring will supplement government monitoring systems, there is no description of how these will be integrated and verified.

5/13/2022: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The 'Innovation' section has been edited to address the comments above.

#### Project/Program Map and Coordinates

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

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

9/2/2020: Yes, the project is a capacity-building project taking place at a national scale.

#### Agency Response

##### Stakeholders

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

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

9/2/2020: Please provide additional information on the Agence de realisation et d'ingenierie pour le developpement (AGRID). Their experience working on these topics and/or other relevant projects. Have they executed GEF projects before? Why were they selected as the executing agency for this project?

5/13/2022: This has been revised. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The project's Executing Agency will now be the Ministry of Environment, Fisheries and Sustainable Development (MEFSD). This Ministry has already been involved in the

execution of the NC and BUR projects. This has been updated in the revised PIF accordingly.

#### **Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes for this stage.

Agency Response

#### **Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes

Agency Response

#### **Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Please add risks related to low resource availability and ability to retain technically qualified people.

5/13/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The risks table has been amended to address the comment above.

#### **Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Per the comment above, please clarify why AGRIC has been selected as the executing agency and not the Ministry of Environment.

The description mentions a Project Steering Committee to be headed by the National Climate Change Committee. Please clarify if this a new committee that will be established, and if so how does this interact with the institutional arrangements. What role will such a committee have.

Based on comments in sections above, ensure that clear the description provides a clear summary of how specific areas of coordination and differentiate between activities/projects that will inform this project, activities/projects that will happen in parallel to this project and thus will require active coordination, and activities/projects that will be informed by this project.

5/13/2022: This is sufficient for now. Please elaborate further at CEO approval stage.

#### Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

As mentioned earlier, the project's Executing Agency will now be the Ministry of Environment, Fisheries and Sustainable Development.

The text on the Project Steering Committee has been adjusted. The exact members of the CBIT Chad Project Steering Committee will be determined during the consultation to be undertaken as part of the detailed project development phase (PPG).

Further information has been provided in the 'Coordination' section of the PIF, including on the synergies with the GCF/FAO readiness project in Chad. Coordination with other initiatives will be further explored during the project development phase.

#### Consistency with National Priorities

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Mostly yes. Please add the relevant NC and BUR as well as NAP.

5/13/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

**11 May 2022**

The section on ?Consistency with National Priorities? has been further amended.

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes, a ESS screen is provided and the project has been assessed as having low risks.

Agency Response

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country?s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Yes, the project is endorsed by Mr. Tambie Deuzoumbe Jean Nicolas.

## Agency Response

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

**Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: N/A

Agency Response

## GEFSEC DECISION

## RECOMMENDATION

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/2/2020: Please address comments.

5/13/2022: PM recommends technical clearance noting that additional comments will be addressed at CEO approval stage.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/2/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		<b>5/11/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**