

Strengthening the resilience of smallholder farmers and ecosystems to the effects of climate change (STRADAP)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11550
Countries
Chad
Project Name
Strengthening the resilience of smallholder farmers and ecosystems to the effects of climate change (STRADAP)
Agencies
IFAD
Date received by PM
6/20/2025
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
FSP

PIF
CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Not yet. Please select applicable Rio Makers in the Project Information table.

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

Thank you. Comment cleared

Agency Response Rio Markers filled.

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Fairly, yes. Suggest incorporating information on current climate trends and projections that will strengthen the climate vulnerability of the target location, thereby highlighting the climate problem as well as how the proposed adaptation solutions/strategies aims to deliver the adaptation benefits.

b) Yes. See comment above

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

Thank you for the revised and succinct Summary. comment cleared

Agency Response

Information on current climate trends and projections included in the project summary.

More details were added in the Climate trends and Climate projections paragraphs under PROJECT OUTLINE ? A. Project Rationale; and Annex H1 ? Climate trends.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Yes

b) While the components, outcomes and outcomes are generally sound and support the achievement of project, we note some disconnect and potential ambiguity between the components and outcomes/outputs. For instance, Component 1 and Outcome 1 : Not clear how enabling environment to building climate resilience in agro-sylvo-pastoral and translates into integration of "green jobs" into policies. Given the somewhat broad definition of green jobs, suggest restructuring these outcomes to be more agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries specific in terms of job creation. We note the outcomes described in the Project Description section are missing in the Project Description Overview. Please reconcile. Use the official GEF CEO document template.

c) On gender: Yes the project components explicitly include activities that will target and empower women and youth. We also recommend precise phrasing in the narrative on gender mainstreaming, statements such as "At least 80% of knowledge products will be focused on gender" (Output 3.1.2) could come across as vague. Stating that the knowledge products will incorporate gender perspectives, for example, is a lot clearer in its intent.

Knowledge management (Component 3). The project activities include development of a communication and knowledge management strategy to strengthen the skills of stakeholders in knowledge management through specific training, as well as capitalization workshops and self-evaluation meetings that are expected to serve as mechanisms for collecting, analyzing, and valorizing lessons learned.

M&E dimensions are incorporated in the component 3

d) Yes

e) Yes

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

b) Thank you for revising and harmonizing the components, as well as including the indicators and targets in the Project Description table. Comment cleared

c) We note the clarification on the learning products targeting women and youth. Under M&E, please include the monitoring and regular reporting of the implementation of the gender action plan and other gender-related activities.

Agency Response

b) The project outcomes and outputs were reworded to ensure clear alignment. The missing outcome 1.2 and output 1.2.1. in the project overview table have been inserted.

Different sections and annexes presenting the project outcomes and outputs were revised accordingly: Indicative project overview table, Project outline (B-Project description, Theory of change; component 1 and component 2); Annexe C result Framework.

The revised document follows the official GEF CEO document template.

c) On gender. Some examples of potential learning products related to gender and youth investment are shared in output 3.1.2 under PROJECT OUTLINE ? B. Project description)

30/08/2025

c) Gender dimensions. Under M&E, the gender action plan is already included in the M&E plan. To be more precise, the output 3.3.1 has been rephrased to emphasise on the regular monitoring of the Gender action plan and the M&E plan. The project progress report will include the implementation status of the Gender Action Plan.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Yes, the project clearly describes the multi-pronged challenges - socio-economic and environmental- in the target location, that is reflected in the project design.

b) Yes. the role of private and local actors are described in respective project components.

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

Comment cleared

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits

identified?

- e) **Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?
- f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?
- g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?
- h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?
- i) **Gender:** Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?
- j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?
- k) **Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?
- l) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

- a) Yes. The ToC adopts a robust approach, clearly defining the project logic, and causal pathways necessary impact, supported by concrete activities and assumptions.
- b) Yes
- c) Project design is based on an integrated and systems approach to addressing Chad's fragility and climate vulnerability by aligning governance/ policy reform, inclusive economic development, natural resources management. A few comments:
 - Please ensure the components, outcomes and outputs in the project table are harmonized as described in the project description section. We note some outcomes are missing in the table.
 - As noted above, ensure clearer logic between components, outcomes, outputs and activities. e.g Output 1.1 is expected to focus the development of policy frameworks at the provincial level but most of the activities is on the establishment on the establishment and operationalization of agribusiness hub.
 - the document frequently references "green jobs" "green wages, "entrepreneurship/self-employment", "agribusiness hubs" but these are not consistently defined or connected. The project suggests the agribusiness hubs would offer two pathways for employment opportunities - self employment and wage employment - how do these connect to the green jobs in component 1 (which seems to refer to broader employment that may not necessarily be linked to the target sectors)? Suggest providing clear definition for these terms.
 - Clear distinction between what is funded through RENFORT and the GEF/LDCF funded activities. We note that the proposed activities appears extensive. Suggest streamlining and clarifying the flow of activities to enhance coherence and reduce long winded text.
 - the project notes that "the political context of Chad does not readily support the participation of women and youth in key political and policy decision-making processes". On activities in output 1.1.3, it may be useful to clarify how the consultative platforms being proposed will formally connect with subnational decision-making bodies or provincial development structures. likewise how does the training of the 500 rural youth and women on leadership, climate resilience and

lobbying create an entry point for their in local and provincial policy dialogues and decision-making processes? Are these youth already engaged in policy dialogue or the project aims to foster this process in light of the political sensitivity. Suggest more elaboration

d) yes

e) Not fully. Suggest a short explicit description of the socio-economic benefits in the project description section

f) yes

g) The project addresses multiple drivers of vulnerability?climate, socio-economic and institutional dimensions in Chad. Creating and fostering youth employment is central to building climate resilience. That said, sustainability and exit strategy mechanisms would be useful particularly for such fragile, politically volatile context. Suggest including how interventions would be financially, technically and institutionally sustained beyond the project.

h) Yes. The roles of relevant stakeholders have been clearly defined. There's reference to women and youth groups in only Output 2.1, while the project is designed to target them, their engagement could be further reinforced and mainstreamed in all components of the project.

i) yes

j) yes

k) Not fully, the project acknowledges the weak institutional and policy capacity, lack of a dedicated policy on youth agribusiness hubs (an existing youth entrepreneurship strategy is referenced) but does not identify any policies or subsidies that may incentivize unsustainable agriculture practices, or undermine youth employment in target sectors- suggest including a short subsection in the project description section on a potential policy coherence strategy.

l) Yes the project has the potential to be transformative. The project would benefit from subsection that provides a more explicit and structured approach to scaling up interventions including those related to private sector engagement, youth agribusiness, policy etc.

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

c) Thank you for clarification on the green entrepreneurship/jobs, the consultative platforms and the proposed activities to strengthen the participation of women and youth in decision-making processes.

e) Thank you for additional inputs on the socio-economic benefits

g) Additional input noted.

h) Thank you for clarifying the roles of women and youth as both beneficiaries and stakeholders in the project components. We also note details of engagement articulated in the GAP and Gender Analysis

k) We note the subsection on the project's efforts to support policy coherence

l) Thank you for the additional inputs on scaling up the project activities including innovative approaches.

Comments cleared

Agency Response

- a) ToC : outcomes and output reworded to be consistent with the result framework.
- c) Outcomes and outputs in different sections of the document are harmonised as describes in the project description sections. The missing outcome 1.2 and output 1.2.1 in the Project overview have been corrected.

As output 1.1.1 is focused on policy and framework, the 4th activity on support to the implementation and operationalisation of the youth green agribusiness hubs was removed.

The definition of the green jobs/ opportunities was added in the Project description section.

Youth and women entrepreneurship (in form of employee or self-employment) is the focus of RENFORT which developed the framework and implements the support mechanisms for targeted commodities. The GEF funded activities are focused on the promotion of green jobs and opportunities, related policy, framework and enabling environment (land restoration to settle youth for example). The GEF funded activities are built on mechanism developed by RENFORT.

Regarding output 1.1.3 on the 500 youth empowerment, the objective is that they get sufficient skills and knowledge to participate in local decision-making process and policy dialogue to voice their right and to voice for the green opportunities and climate resilient investment. Participating in a policy-dialogue need specific skills and knowledges, thus a number of trainings planned, which are not limited to leadership (useful to raise trust and credibility) but extended to advocacy, negotiation skills, etc.

The consultative platform will be funded by RENFORT, and no investment is expected from GEF. It has been removed from the document.

- e) Other benefits. Texts on socioeconomic benefits have been added, and the Economic and Financial analysis is detailed in Annex H8.
 - g) Sustainability. A new section on sustainability was added in the project description.
 - h) Youth and women role. Youth and women will be involved in policy dialogue after their training (outcome 1.1), expected to become a climate agent to foster resilient farming ecosystem; develop, implement and disseminate land and natural resources management (including soil fertility, water and sustainable post-harvest management, etc.).
- The Gender Action Plan and Gender Analysis in Annex H4 provides details on women targeting and involvement in the project activities.
- k) Policy coherence strategy. A new section added in the project description.
 - l) Scaling-up section added with some examples.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Yes.

c) Yes

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Yes. But needs to effectively captured using the official GEF CEO document.

b) Not yet

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

Thank you. Comment cleared

Agency Response a) Official GEF CEO document used.

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Not yet, Missing full description of environmental and social risks as well as proposed mitigation measures. The project also suggests low capacity for implementation but rates the risk as low. Please ensure all risks and mitigation measures are clearly elaborated with the proper rating.

c) Yes.

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

Additional Comments

On E&S- The explanation the E&S in the risk table is lacking concrete, measurable mitigation measures. Please elaborate core issues related to the impacts from the project activities and

concrete actions that would be undertaken to mitigate them including reference to the safeguard instruments and grievance redress mechanisms if applicable. Note the following

1. In Annex F, Supporting Document SECAP:

a. Page 21, 10. Environmental, Social and Climate Management Plan (ESCMP) Matrix? . Action: Include measures addressing any potential risks linked to Chad?s classification in the World Bank?s FY25 List of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations ? Institutional and Social Fragility.

b. Key actors consulted. Action: Explain how youth, women, and/or Indigenous Peoples (Indigenous youth or Indigenous women) were consulted during in preparation of this proposal, or how their perspectives were integrated, as none of these stakeholder groups are explicitly listed in the table on page 21.

c. Page 35, ?Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Checklist?: Action: Reassess the column ?If Relevant for Procurement (include action)?, as some responses are limited to ?Yes/No.? Where ?Yes? applies, include specific mitigating actions. For example, on page 37, item 4.1 notes the use of a PFIC and FPIC Implementation Plan (place also in the right column).

d. In line with comment 1.c, Section 2 ?Risques et impacts sociaux, environnementaux et climatiques potentiels du projet?. We acknowledge and appreciate the detailed description of each safeguard; however, mitigation measures are not clearly specified for each standard/risk. While some appear in the Matrix on page 21, others are missing. Action: In Section 2, specify mitigation measures for each identified safeguard.

2. We acknowledge the inclusion of a Stakeholder Engagement Plan. Action: Identify or propose ways to ensure the meaningful participation of Indigenous Peoples in the project, upholding their FPIC, and, in line with the project, if possible, ensure specific attention to Indigenous youth and Indigenous women.

3. In the PD, Table of Key Risks. Action: Include a summary of key risks together with the corresponding mitigation measures and mention the grievance mechanisms are set or will be set in place.

On Innovation Risk: It is unclear whether the ratings and description under the Innovation Risk categories actually reflect project-level innovative features, particularly under the Institutional and Financial categories. If not, the related fields should remain blank; if they do, the link to innovation risk should be clarified.

On Stakeholders: it seems unlikely that that the risk rating for stakeholders is low considering the context of this project. Agency should elaborate in the risk table on risks identified on stakeholders (including civil society, local communities, Indigenous Peoples, women and youth groups), and include a summary of measures and plans to engage and consult these in project implementation.

Agency Response

a) and b) Risk section updated with relevant rating and mitigation measures.

30/08/2025

1. Annex F- SECAP revised to integrate: concrete mitigation measures and fragility assessment (extracted form the Chad COSOP), consultation of indigenous people, youth and women, revised Environmental and Social Safeguards Screening Checklist

2- A new paragraph has been inserted in the ?stakeholder engagement? section in the project document to provide details on the consultation of indigenous people.

Youth and women were also consulted during all consultations of stakeholder and the validation workshop. The women umbrella association CELIAF, and youth incubation centre and there youth members (Job Booster, Wenak Lab) took part in all consultation workshops and in the field trips during the design. (see Annex H3- Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan ? table 4 ? Civil society organisation and table 5 ? Private sector).

Rural youth and women were visited and consulted during field trip and the ministry of youth and women at national and local level were also consulted to ensure the integration of their perspective in the project. They are member of the steering committee of RENFORT.

3- Risk section and table (5.4) in the project document has been revised.

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes

Agency Response

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

it is noted in the stakeholder engagement plan (SEP) that the budget for the activities is zero, please clarify and further elaborate in the SEP the key stakeholders roles related to project components and outputs.

Agency Response

30/08/2025

The stakeholder engagement plan has been revised with the appropriate budget for each activities.

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes, co-financing commitment letter attached

GEFSEC 8/18/2025

Additional comments: The cofinancing currently lacks a breakdown by financial instrument (grant/loan), so the amounts cannot be verified. Please include these details in the updated letter or in the cofinancing description section. Also, the cofinancing letter from the Ministry of Agricultural Production and Industrialization, Chad lists USD 3.5M as in-kind contribution without specifying its intended use. Given that this is a relatively high amount for in-kind support, please include details in the updated letter or in the cofinancing description section.

Agency Response

30/08/2025

Project overview table and Financing tables (Annex A) have been revised to include the co-financing from the Government. The contribution from the Government will be in form of taxes.

IFAD co-financing letter has been revised to show breakdown by financial instrument.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

LoE provided at PIF stage

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes, in line with the LDCF Core indicators

d) Yes

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes locations of the three intervention areas provided

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes, the ToR is attached to the ProDoc. The ToR Knowledge and Communications Officer referenced in the project document ("The Knowledge management mechanism will build on the system established by RENFORT, primarily managed by its Knowledge Management and Communication Officer, and supported by all stakeholders actively involved in facilitating the capitalization committee") is missing. It would also be useful to specify which of the positions would be funded under the GEF vs the Co-financed (IFAD) project

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

Thank you for submitting the ToRs.

Additional comments on budget:

a) It appears that there is a two-dollar difference between the total for component 2 in the budget provided in Annex G (\$ 2,932,388 + \$2,335,172= \$5,267,560)and the total provided in the Project Description Overview table (\$ 5,267,558). Please review all the numbers and correct where necessary. We also suggest the agency to remove any cents to make the review of the budget easier.

b)We also noticed that RENFORT is the listed executing entity for some activities, but it is our understanding that RENFORT is a project and not a specific entity (rather a group of entities). Please specify which entity will be responsible for receiving funds from the GEF to execute each activity (note: the entity must match those included in the institutional arrangements).

c) There is an error in some activities in the budget where there is an amount in sub-total but there are no amounts in the components. If the sub-total is the amount provided in the M&E column then the sub-total amount should be equal to the Total and not the double like we are seeing now. Please address

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component 2(2025)					Total (USD)	Executing Entity (receiving funds from the GEF Annex G1)		
		Component 1		Component 2		Sub-Total			M&E	PMC
		Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2	Outcome 2.1	Outcome 2.2					
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Cost to Establish a coaching and mentoring program for young women in green entrepreneurship					26 221.16	-	-	26 221.16	RENFORT
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Cost to Develop awareness campaigns with content that is more sensitive to gender and climate change/environmental aspects					8 740.29	8 740.29	-	17 480.77	RENFORT
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Cost to Enhance traditional knowledge, expertise, and women's knowledge on sustainable natural resource management and strategies for climate risk management					9 244.23	9 244.23	-	18 488.46	RENFORT
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Cost to Strengthen the capacities of the project team and implementing partners on gender and climate change to better understand the issues and challenges					8 740.29	8 740.29	-	17 480.77	RENFORT
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Cost for the recruitment of GEF Project Officer					-	-	155 932.03	335 932.03	RENFORT
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Cost for the recruitment of Monitoring and Evaluation Assistant					86 836.36	86 836.36	-	379 672.71	RENFORT

Goods, services, and inputs	Cost for the Production and dissemination of case studies, thematic studies					96 059.31	96 059.31	-	192 118.61	RENFORT
Goods, services, and inputs	Cost for the Production of posters and brochures					7 745.54	7 745.54	-	15 491.08	RENFORT
Goods, services, and inputs	Cost for the Production and dissemination of articles, reports, and videos					12 606.09	12 606.09	-	25 212.17	RENFORT
Goods, services, and inputs	Cost for National kickoff workshop and startup report					17 154.68	17 154.68	-	34 309.36	RENFORT
Goods, services, and inputs	Cost for Mid-term and final evaluation missions					33 590.41	33 590.41	-	67 180.82	RENFORT
Goods, services, and inputs	Cost for Monitoring and supervision missions					130 081.07	130 081.07	-	260 162.13	RENFORT
Goods, services, and inputs	Cost for Field monitoring missions (jointly with RENFORT)					5 652.23	5 652.23	-	11 304.45	MoA (RENFORT) and ANGMW
Goods, services, and inputs	Cost to Equip STRADAP with an Inclusive Targeting Strategy for Adult Women and Vulnerable Groups					6 904.91	6 904.91	-	13 809.81	MoA (RENFORT)

Agency Response

c) The ToRs of the Knowledge and Communications Officer are provided in Annex H7 ? Knowledge management and learning report.

30/08/2025

a) ? All the figures has been corrected and the amounts in the Project description overview are coherent with Annex G and Annex A on financing table

b) ? The section under the ?institutional anchors? has been rephrased to better explain the role of each entity. The ministry of economy, budget and plan who represents the government will sign the financing agreement and will receive the fund. The project will be implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture through the RENFORT project. The cover page and the Annex G were corrected.

c) ? Annex G Table revised (sub-total of component 1 and component 2), all cents removed.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC 6/24/2025

Yes the project is recommended for approval contingent on addressing all comments. Importantly, resubmitting the project using the official GEF CEO document template.

GEFSEC 8/11/2025

Project is recommended for approval on the condition that agency addresses all comments. The project will deliver an innovative and integrated approach to promote climate-adaptive, viable, and resilient enterprises for youth and women that create jobs and are integrated with agro-pastoral and fishing value chains in Chad

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Approval Response to Secretariat comments

6/24/2025

8/6/2025

8/11/2025