



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

Review PIF 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

3/22/2024

Review completed by PM

4/29/2024

Program Manager

Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes, the project meets the eligibility criteria for LDCF funding and the information table is correctly populated.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

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 results?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

We acknowledge the project's reference to the vulnerability drivers including those related to the political context in the region. Please summarize the climate problem, outlining the key climatic hazards (including current and projected) and their impacts on people and ecosystems

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

IFAD April 12 2024

The missing information was added in ?Project Summary?.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) Yes. The project aims to promote climate adaptive, viable and resilient enterprises for youth and women that create jobs and are integrated with agro-silvo-pastoral and fishing value chains in Chad.

b) Yes. The components, outcomes, and outputs are interconnected, and demonstrate a clear and coherent strategy for achieving the project objective. Each component contributes to this objective by addressing specific challenges and barriers identified in the project context. Component 1 emphasizes the importance of policy and institutional support, which is essential for addressing adaptation bottlenecks and promoting sustainable development in the target area. Component 2 directly addresses the need to provide climate-resilient livelihood opportunities for rural youth, which aligns with the project's objective of enhancing livelihoods.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

IFAD 12 April 2024

Noted, thank you.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes.

The project acknowledges the gender-related implications in the agro-pastoral and fisheries sector, and integrated these elements in the respective components and outputs (Components 1 and 2). It is also recommended gender markers and segregated data are included in component 3. A gender assessment and action plan has to be developed during PPG.

Knowledge management is addressed within Component 3, which is dedicated to project monitoring and evaluation. Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 focus on improving project knowledge management through better technical monitoring, adaptive management, and the development of mechanisms and tools for information collection, lessons learned, and dissemination. Further elaboration of the dissemination mechanisms, stakeholders and specific learning platforms will be useful.

Monitoring and evaluation are explicitly included as Component 3 of the project.

GEFSEC April 26 2024

PO Comments: Please ensure that the Gender Action Plan to be developed is budgeted, and gender-specific results monitored and reported on.

Agency's Comments

IFAD 12 April 2024

Gender and youth indicators were added to Output 3.1.2. 80% of the knowledge products will be focused on gender and youth.

Well noted. A Gender assessment and action plan will be developed during PPG. The Dissemination mechanisms were further elaborated under the narrative description of Output 3.1.2. Component 3 ? Project description (paragraph 52)

IFAD 29 April 2024.

Well noted, we will ensure this is done at PPG.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes.

GEFSEC April 26 2024

PO Comments : On the PMC Proportionality: there is no proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$33,638,100 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$1,681,905 instead of \$1,528,500 (which is 4.5%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will need to be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

GEFSEC April 29, 2024

Thank you for addressing comments. Cleared

Agency's Comments

IFAD 29th April 2024:

Cofinancing amount and contribution to PMC was revised and is now proportionate.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) In general, yes. Suggest providing a situation analysis for the fisheries sector, similar to that done for agriculture in Section A of the PIF, outlining the climate hazards and impacts.

b) Not yet. Barriers are implied in the description of the project rationale. Please outline the barriers and how the project design would address them. Similarly list some of the enablers that the project would put in place.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

IFAD 12 April 2024

a) A situation analysis for the fisheries sector is now provided in PIF paragraph 14.

b) A summary of barriers and enablers was added in PIF paragraphs 44 and 46.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) 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?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) In general, yes. This is implied in the project rationale but could benefit from further elaboration of the narrative.

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) No. There's a description of stakeholder engagement approach of the project, however the relevant stakeholders have not been identified. Please list all stakeholders (government, community groups, private sector, CSOs, etc) and the respective roles including the project planning, design, implementation, operation and maintenance.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Comment cleared

Agency's Commentsd) A list and description of all stakeholder involved and their respective roles has been added in PIF paragraph 66.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) The ToC has a clear logic to In strengthening the resilience of degraded agro-pastoral production landscapes and the livelihoods of vulnerable women and youth, the project is thus designed to establish an enabling institutional and policy environment as well as support concrete measures to build adaptive capacities to their support their ability to better respond and cope with the impacts of extreme weather events and climate change. We recommend elaborating the ToC to show the causal pathways and assumptions of the components/outcomes/outputs to the project objective.

b)

- Output 1.1 "The output will focus on the development and implementation of targeted policies at the regional level."

- Please provide a clearer distinction between the anticipated results for Output 1.2.1 and Output 1.2.2.

- Output 2.1.2 : "1,500 ha degraded land under climate adaptive production systems including digitalization within the target provinces" please elaborate on the digitization process in the project description.

- Output 2.2.1 "Increased capacity of 5 000 rural youth (50% women) to seize green employment and entrepreneurship opportunities through integrated agribusiness hubs." Please elaborate more succinctly on the specific metrics to assess the increased capacity. Would this be in the form of trainings/mentorships, jobs created, market access, financed provided? Consider breaking down the output into smaller, measurable

components. It would also be helpful to substantiate the "integrated agribusiness hubs" , where would these be hosted and what is the operations and management mechanisms that would be in place to ensure the long term support of these hubs to the rural youth beyond the project? Additionally, elaborate briefly on how the project will build structured collaboration among , private, public, youth groups, and civil society organizations (CSOs).

Output 3.1.3 Please note that a gender assessment and gender action plan needs to be prepared during PPG before project implementation. Likewise, the M&E plan which will guide the monitoring and evaluation of the project activities and outputs.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional clarification and inputs. Comments cleared

Agency's Comments

a) ToC was revised

b) Outputs 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 were merged in one: output 1.2.1 : climate information and early warning systems strengthened in targeted regions. Indicative project overview and project description were updated accordingly.

Details on digitalization process provided in project description (output 2.1.2)

Additional information provided under output 2.2.1 on metrics to measure increased capacity; implementation of the hub and collaboration built among private, public, youth groups, and civil society organizations

On Output 3.1.3 this is well noted, thank you.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Not yet. Please outline the incremental/additional cost reasoning of the project.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Comments cleared.

Agency's Comments Additional paragraph on incremental/additional cost reasoning provided in PIF paragraph 65.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) Not yet. Please describe the implementing framework in the project coordination section.

c) Yes.

d) Not fully. The project includes elements to capture and disseminate knowledge (component 3) but this needs to be further elaborated with specific details on dissemination mechanisms, the stakeholders and the strategy communication process. A communication plan should be developed during PPG.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional clarification and inputs. Comments cleared

Agency's Comments

a) Coordination section updated.

d) More information on dissemination strategies provided in component 3 (paragraph 52).

A communication plan will be developed during PPG.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) Yes. The project has the potential to target core indicator 5 of LDCF with focus on youth and women entrepreneurship in the agribusiness value chains (Component 2) . Please consider adding this.

b) Yes

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional clarification and inputs. Comments cleared

Agency's Comments Noted, thank you.

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) Yes

b) Yes. The analysis of the project situation and vulnerability drivers suggests that Chad is a fragile state with political instability and risks of terrorism. Although the proposed strategy to mitigate political and governance risks recognizes the challenges posed by this fragility, it's not clear whether the measures are strong enough to address the risks effectively. Therefore, it's recommended to consider additional measures and contingency plans to mitigate the risks more comprehensively.

c) Yes. ESS risk is rated Moderate.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional clarification and inputs. Comments cleared

Agency's Commentsb) Risk table updated.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

a) Yes The project proposal is based on a programmatic and integrated approach that addresses various dimensions of the adaptation challenges faced in the region including those related to institutional capacity, and climate-resilient livelihoods. Project interventions such as empowering marginalized groups (women and youth) through policy engagement, capacity building, rehabilitating degraded lands, and developing climate-resilient production systems and agribusiness opportunities have the potential to promote long term transformative adaptation benefits.

b) Yes, the project aims to introduce innovative approaches such as the integrated agribusiness hubs which combines talent, technology, know-how, and capital to support enterprise development and unlock green employment opportunities for rural youth. Successful demonstration of these hubs coupled with robust partnerships and collaboration efforts can facilitate the replication and in other regions of Chad or similar contexts.

c) In general yes. We note that Component 1 of the project focuses on strengthening the enabling environment for building climate resilience within agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries value chains at the subnational level, including through the development and implementation of subnational policy frameworks. It would be helpful to understand how these will complement or interface with national policies.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional clarification and inputs. Comments cleared

Agency's Comments) Additional information provided.

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

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes. The project aligns with all the three priorities of LDCF/SCCF GEF-8 strategy i.e. scaling up finance, innovation and private sector, and whole of society approach. However, the alignment with scaling up finance and innovation is not sufficiently embedded in the project components, outcomes and outputs. For instance, in the table (Section C) on alignment with GEF/LDCF programming, the project alludes to the provision of grant-based guarantees for MFI create lines of credit dedicated to microloans at accessible terms to help smallholder farmers and MSMEs to invest transitioning to climate resilient activities, but this is not evident from the project description. Please further elaborate and improve on the alignment.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional inputs. Comments cleared

Agency's Comments Additional information was added in PIF paragraph 51 under the narrative description of output 2.2.1.

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's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

No. We note the brief description of the policy context, (which highlights some of the countries' policies and development strategies to facilitate and guide its response to challenges of climate change in section A (Project Rationale). Consider moving this to Section C (Alignment with GEF and national priorities). and the narrative on how the project aligns with these strategies and other relevant ones should be strengthened.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional inputs. Comments cleared

Agency's Comments Section C. was updated accordingly.

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's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

No. The proposal states that the development of the PIF took into account the opinions and worries of different stakeholders at the national and subnational levels. However, there is no information provided about how these consultations were carried out. Could you please give me a brief summary of the PIF development consultations, including the dates and names of the stakeholders involved?

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Thank you for the additional inputs, pictures, dates and proceedings of the consultation meetings. Comments cleared

Agency's Comments A summary of the PIF development consultations was added to ?stakeholder engagement? section.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments
8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments
Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? s(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Not yet. Please upload letter.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Letter uploaded.

Agency's CommentsAddressed.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Letter not uploaded.

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Letter format is missing footnote and focal area. To be cleared with OFP

Additional PO comments : the template utilized for this project removed the footnote that conditions for the selection of the executing partner ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE). Also, the table misses the Focal Area Source - please ask the OFP to also include such Focal Area in the email.

GEFSEC April 29, 2024

Thank you for addressing comments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Addressed. We are aware that the OFP has omitted the footnote when signing. He has been requested to send IFAD an email in recognition of the missing footnote. He is in the process of sending us such email.

IFAD 29th April 2024:

Comment addressed. Revised LoE uploaded in Portal.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 5 2024

Not yet. Project needs to address comments and attach LoE

GEFSEC April 25 2024

Comments cleared

Agency's Comments

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC April 29, 2024

- Budgeted gender action plan, and monitoring indicators
- Indicators on the private enterprises that will be engaged and/or developed during the project.
-

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/5/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		