



Innovative approach to protect ouadis through the promotion of non connected mini-grid solar energy in 3 municipalities (Mao, Kekedena and Nokou) of Kanem region-Chad

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10998

Countries

Chad

Project Name

Innovative approach to protect ouadis through the promotion of non connected mini-grid solar energy in 3 municipalities (Mao, Kekedena and Nokou) of Kanem region-Chad

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

6/23/2023

Review completed by PM

6/21/2024

Program Manager

Jean-Marc Sinnassamy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

**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 Addressed.

Quality control

A correction was previously requested on this point, but it seems that the expected implementation/completion dates does not match the duration of the project. Please, correct.

Submission Date 6/23/2023	Expected Implementation Start 9/1/2024	Expected Completion Date 8/31/2024
Duration ⓘ 48 In Months		Agency Fee(\$) 280,681.00

February 12, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

Project duration:

- If the project starts on January 31 2024 and closes on December 31, 2027, the project duration should be 47 months and not 48. Please, clarify and adjust.

Rio Markers:

1) There is a discrepancy between the ranking in the portal and in the CEO endorsement request (2 for the CCM marker in the portal; 1 in the CEO endorsement). As requested at PIF stage, the Rio Marker for CCM should be 2. Please, correct and make information consistent in the different documents.

2) In the portal, Rio markers for BD, LD, and CCM are 1. In view of the project and its financing, it is disputable. We would suggest considering 2 for CCM and LD and 0 for BD. There is no reference to Global Important Biodiversity in the project (no KBA, no globally threatened species). The improvement of vegetation cover under SLM cannot be considered as a Global Environment Benefit from a biodiversity angle. Please, correct and make information consistent in the portal, the CEO endorsement, and the project document.

Agency Response

02 July 2024

The 48th project duration are confirmed as from 1st September 2024 to 31st August 2028 (in 2024: 4 months; 2025: 12 months; 2026: 12 months ; 2027: 12 months and 2028: 8 months. It will then be : $4+12+12+12+8= 48$.

Jan 22, 2024

The following comments are well noted and appreciated.

1. Project duration: updated accordingly
2. Rio Markers: As advised, the Rio Markers have been changed as follows: CCM2; LD2, and BD0
 - Reference to BD GEB has been amended

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
June 21, 2024

Addressed

June 10, 2024

Details:

- In the Table B, 'Component 1' is missing before the name of such component. This has been updated in the word version of the proposal but not in the GEF Portal view. Please, correct.
- As per the Agency, the acronym IPOPRoNoG was replaced by IAPROMSOK. However, IPOPRoNoG still appears twice in the GEF Portal view. Please remove any reference to IPOPRoNoG.

February 12, 2024

Thanks for the improvements and the clarifications provided. However, some comments (both from GEFSEC and/or STAP) need additional information:

- Outputs expected under component 2 are a mix of investment and technical activities, i.e. , output 2.1.1 'Solar water pumps infrastructures' is an investment activity while output 2.1.2 'Gender-responsive power purchase agreements' is a technical activity. To differentiate between technical assistance and investment activities, please create in Table B two rows for Component 2, one row for the outputs with technical assistance activities (i.e. 2.1.2) and another row with the outputs for the investment activities (2.1.1).

- Similarly, outcome 2.1 is linked with output 2.1.1. but not necessarily with output 2.1.2. Please consider adding a new outcome to match outcome 2.1.2.

- Further clarification has been added with regards to the business model for the deployment of the solar panels. However, it is not fully clear how the business model may work: could you please provide the study made during PPG? Please, elaborate on the results of this study: For instance, what is the willingness to pay for energy services? This question is particularly sensitive with covery poor communities. What are the potential uses of energy identified? What is the expected average of the cooperatives and the mini-grids?

- A Detail: in the Table B, ?Component 1? is missing before the name of such component.

- Another detail: We found the acronym " IPOPRoNOG" in the title of the project document. However, we are not fully seeing what it means. Could you please spell it out?

August 17, 2023

- The project document is missing.

- The CEO endorsement request: this 106 page document contains a lot of descriptive information, sometime out of the subject (waste, urban environment...). A more streamlined document would have helped to better understand the logics and the ToC.

Component 2

o The business model for the deployment and use of the solar panels is unclear. While we understand the owner of the solar panels are cooperatives, which are also in charge of their maintenance, it is unclear the role of SNE and why a PPA is required since these areas are not connected to the grid. It is also unclear whether they will be enough demand for a minigrid or the project will focus exclusively on isolated solar panels. If information has been collected at PPG, it would be helpful to have an idea of the size of the cooperatives and the mini-grids.

o As per the project, women and local communities cooperatives will be structured and capacitated to manage the solar water pump systems, including the solar panels. Who will be conducting this capacity activities? Would the procurement of the solar panels be conducted by the project implementation unit?

o Also, please confirm whether there has been any initial discussion with UNDP Africa Mini Grids Project in Chad about the most suitable business model for Chad.

o The stakeholders? section mention the mini irrigation networks with solar energy project. Please indicate if at PPG stage the agency has been in touch with the implementing unit of this project and, if yes, what are the lessons learned which are relevant for this project, particularly with regards to the business model for the deployment and maintenance of the

solar panels, the use of energy, sustainable irrigation practices, ownership within the community, creation of jobs, etc.

o Following previous comment at PIF stage, kindly note the output expected under component 2 are a mix of investment and technical activities, i.e. output 2.1.1 ?Solar water pumps infrastructures? is an investment activity while output 2.1.2 ?Gender-responsive power purchase agreements? is a technical activity. To differentiate between technical assistance and investment activities, please create in Table B two rows for Component 2, one row for the outputs with technical assistance activities (i.e. 2.1.2) and another row with the outputs for the investment activities (2.1.1).

o Similarly, outcome 2.1 is linked to output 2.1.1. but not necessarily with output 2.1.2. Please consider adding a new outcome to match output 2.1.2.

o Annex H on ?Thematic Studies Report? is missing in the ProDoc document. Please share/attached this Annex as it may provide useful information to address some of the questions above.

Minor/editorial comments

- Table B. For sake of clarity, please add ?Component 1? before the name of such component.

– Project Acronym: IPOPRoONOG seems to be the acronym of the project. Please spell it out the first you is being used.

- Several acronyms have not been spelled out the first time they are used, i.e. IGMV, CDA, OCB, CELIAF, CNCPR, etc.

Agency Response

11 June 2024

Component 1 is now reflected in Table B of the portal.

IAPROMSOK has replaced IPOPRoNoG in the two instances it appeared in the portal.

24 May 2024

Outputs expected under component 2 are now separated as Investment and As Technical Assistance

- New Outcome 2.2 is now created to link with output 2.1.2.

- With regard to the clarification of the business model, additional information relevant to the request has been provided on pages 34 ? 35.
- The Report of the study on mini grid is now included in the Package as requested
- The Component 1 is now included in the Table B before component 1 short description.
- IPOPRoNoG was meant to be an abbreviation of the project title. Since it was less intuitive to the reader, it has been replaced with IAPROMSOK, and the letters involved have been emboldened in the title for legibility. This change is reflected throughout the document.

January 22, 2024

Comments are well noted and appreciated to overall improve the quality of the document. In response:

-Project document missing: Attached

-Length of the document: Efforts have been made to streamline the document, and now stands at 85 pages without annexes.

AToC has been included.

However, UNEP would like to recall that some issues (e.g. Waste sector in Chad) included in CEO endorsement document are a response to the request of Council comments. Furthermore, it will be very difficult to talk about the energy sector context without making the linkage with Urban setting.

Component 2:

Business model: The information under component has been improved to demonstrate the feasibility of the business model, and how it will draw on lessons from previous experiences such as those of the World Food Program. It has been clarified that SNE will be critical as a state actor to provide policy guidance but also purchase surplus energy as one of possible buyer in line with national electrification .

Cooperative capacity development and procurement: Information is included in the description of the component that the PMU will be fully involved in the procurement process of installation of equipment. The procurement will be conducted by the Procurement Unit of the EA in full compliance with national procurement procedures.

Discussion with UNDP: There have been already two rounds of discussion with UNDP and Chad AMP and commitment are made from both sides (UNDP and UNEP) to work together and to ensure synergies and complementarity. Also the World Bank has a \$280 million Chad Energy Access Scale Up Project that will provide additional lessons for this project. During PPG, discussions have been had with project units to learn from the viability of the business model within the Chadian context. Lessons have been learned and relate to capacities required for Cooperatives, institutional arrangements at Cooperative level, Cooperative-SNE relations and PPAs. On these lessons, this project has been structured for all that is related to mini-grids.

Discussions with other project units: Please, refer to the aforementioned point, but also a new section is added under lessons learned to address the comment related to lessons learned from particular partners,

Investment and technical activity distinction: As recommended, this has been done for component 2.

Annex H: As recommended, the thematic studies have been attached to the ProDoc

Editorial comments:

-Table B: ?Component? has been added

- IPOPRoONOG: The acronym has been spelt out.

-Acronyms: Efforts have been done to spell out in full the various acronyms in the document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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 Addressed.

Quality Control

- The letters of support are dated in June 2023. Please consider including an updated estimation of the actual amount that the Agency (with the help of the co-financier if possible) think will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both the co-finance and the GEF project.

- Please request agency to submit all 4 letters of co-financing support in English (translation). (done)

February 12, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- The letters of cofinancing are in French: please provide at least an informal translation in English.

- The notion of " investment mobilized" is not explained below the cofinancing table. Please, complete. The current sentence below the table does not provide the requested information.

- In the CEO endorsement Request, the mention of announcements at the One Planet Summit cannot be used as proofs of cofinancing. Please, clarify the cofinancing from the GGW Direction.
- An explanation of the nature of all investments and activities from the cofinancing partners would help to better understand the logics and the complementarity. Please, complete. This observation is also connected to the identified problem of " weak and inequitable management of public resources", p11.
- The Letter of Cofinancing from the Great Green Wall direction mentions \$3.7 million in-kind, but says nothing about the use of \$8.3 million: we do not know the origins (project?), the nature (grant?), and the purpose. Please, clarify and eventually correct.
- The letter from the "National Agency for Domestic Energy and Environment" does not specify whether the co-financing is in kind or grant. To be corrected.

Agency Response

Jan 22, 2024

Comments noted and appreciated. In response:

-Letters of cofinancing translation:

-Mobilized financing: Provided under the cofinancing table

-One Planet Summit announcement for cofinancing clarify

-An explanation of the nature of all investments and activities from the cofinancing partners:
Provided

-The Letter of Cofinancing from the Great Green Wall clarify

-The letter from the "National Agency for Domestic Energy and Environment clarify

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
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

See comments on cofinancing and the budget.

Agency Response
Jan 22, 2024

The comment is well noted and appreciated. In response:

See responses on the cofinancing and the budget.

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
Addressed

February 18, 2024

See the pending comment on the business model (PPG study).

August 17, 2023

See comment below.

Agency Response

24 May 2024

Kindly see response provided above

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 Addressed.

June 21, 2024

Quality control: On Core indicator: Under CI.11, People benefiting from GEF-financed investments has decreased from 3000 to zero. Please check with agency whether this is an oversight or not.

June 17, 2024

- Thank for clarifying the GHG estimations for the solar panels are using the standard CO₂ value of the US-based National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). However, in the extract provided the calculations are done using a value of 0.3 kg CO₂eq (see image below) while the NREL value is 0.4 kg CO₂eq. Please clarify this inconsistency and/or amend as need be.

*This means that each of the two systems has an emission ratio to be av
0.3kgCO₂eq/kWh.*

-
-
-

- GHG value for the solar panels. Likewise, the CEO endorsement document estimate that the GHG emissions avoided due to the use of solar panels are 1,264,322 tCO₂ eq while the figures are different from the extract report (see below) shared in this last round of comments. Please clarify and amend accordingly.

System. Installed	PCE (kW)	Uptime (h/year)	Energy (kWh/year)	tCO ₂ eq Avoided/year	tCO ₂ eq Avoided over 20 years
20 solar pumping systems in Wadi de Lac	90	3000	270 000	72	1 448
1 Mambou solar mini-grid (Kanem)	33	7200	238 000	63	1 275

-
-

●- **Core Indicator 6.** Kindly note that under the Core Indicator 6 the emissions reductions due to land practices shall be reported under indicator 6.1. Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU sector, while emission reductions due to the installation of solar panels shall be reported under Indicator 6.2. Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided outside AFOLU sector.

●

●**June 10, 2024**

We thank the agency for sharing the NEXT excel with the calculation for the GHG avoided through the land practices accounting to 20,544 tCO₂eq. However, we could not find in the portal the excel sheet with the calculations for the GHG reductions resulting from the use of solar panels. Can you please share this excel sheet or any information that can help tracking the calculation and checking the assumptions made?

February 12, 2024

- Thanks for the file about the estimation of the GHG emission reductions resulting from the land component. However, the excel sheet with the GHG emission reductions expected from the use of solar panels seems missing. Please provide the spreadsheet for the solar component so the GEF team can track the 1,264,322 tCO₂ expected from the solar component of the project.

August 17, 2023

- Core Indicator 6.2: We take note that carbon gains are estimated at 1,284,866 t of CO₂e over a 20-year period. However, in the incremental reasoning, we can read ?? in the order of 20,544 tCO₂ as result the use of solar panels?. Please, confirm if carbon gains and GHG emission reductions come from land management practices and/or the installation of solar panels. Please clarify and amend accordingly.

– Core Indicator 11. This indicator has identified out of the 3,000 total beneficiaries, 1,500 are men and 1,500 are women. However, the project states that almost 75% of the ouadis population is women due to men's migration. Please, adjust and/or add an explanation on the difference on these numbers.

- At the same time. we are seeing in this project an opportunity to not miss in targeting women for training, information, awareness, create opportunities (platforms?), and improve their roles in decision-making, notably in natural resource management (Component 1) and agriculture (componen 2). Please, revise and increase the number of female beneficiaries, if feasible.

Agency Response

02 July 2024

Core indicator updated to 3000.

21 June 2024

The Agency appreciates the review which draws attention on discrepancies of figures and methodologies. The Agency has communicated with the Country experts in that field who have now provided a simplified explanation of the method used which is based on 0.3kgCO₂eq/kWh by similar solar systems installed in the Sahel region. Ref: Analysis of the Development of Renewable Energies/Mini-Grids in the IPPCC Directive 2006 Level 1-Sahel. See the attached document.

The Core indicator 6 is now disaggregated to reflect the emission avoided in the AFOLU sector and outside AFOLU sector (Solar Panels). Ref: See Core indicator in page 15 of the CEO endorsement request.

11 June 2024

The calculations for the GHG reductions resulting from the use of solar panels, is based on the analyses of different available options and use of standard including the US-based National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL). See Core Indicator 6 footnote of the CEO Endorsement Document.

Furthermore, during the PPG, the Solar Energy Expert Study Report (See extract attached) and the full report in the PPG Thematic Studies folder already provided, provided description of the options and how the calculation was done (item 12 of the Report).

24 May 2024

As requested, an excel sheet has been provided to track the project's emission reduction from solar installations.

Jan 22, 2024

Comments well noted and appreciated. In response:

- Core Indicator 6.2 (Carbon gains and GHG emission reductions): As recommended, the sentence has been changed accordingly, and now reads as, ??totaling 1,284,866 tCO₂

emissions (1,264,322 t CO2 avoided from solar emission reductions and 20,544 t CO2 emission avoided thanks to sustainable land management practices on 3,000 ha of agricultural production landscapes).?

- Core Indicator 11: The comment is appreciated, and a footnote has been added in the table of core indicators; highlighting that even if there are more women than men in the target area, there is still a population of men who should be involved at equal representation with women to support women involvement in the project and to be exemplary to other men, particularly those seeking to leave the area.

-Increasing women representation: The comment is even more true as based on evaluation of partners in project area, the successful initiatives are those led by women and the project has plan to design a model which will capitalized on that. This may lead a more increase in women in the project and will report a project impact rather than given higher ambition which may not materialized. However, for a start, based on the gender dynamics in the target area, we suggest that we keep the current proportion so that the project is not viewed as a project for women only which may have a backlash from males. The equal representation takes into account the gender balance as it plays out in the target area. What is possible, however would be to continue looking for opportunities to increase women representation as the project implementation evolves, building on lessons being learned in the process.

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
February 18, 2024

Addressed

August 17, 2023

There is a lot of descriptive information from various sources that make the document difficult read, but the Theory of Change helps to synthetize the logics.

Agency Response

Jan 22, 2024

We are grateful that the reviewer finds that the Theory of Change helps to synthesize the logic that underpins the project.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed

Agency Response

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

Addressed.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

The Theory of Change helps to understand the project logics.

- However, please, note that the impact of the project cannot be its objective. There is a problem of hierarchy. To be corrected.

- We can understand the reasoning leading to 1) the adoption of specific SLM measures in Ouadis, 2) the financing of solar water pumps and 3) develop knowledge, policies, and communication. This approach may work if underground water resources are available. However,

1) there is no baseline information on this point. Please, provide elements.

2) Cofinancing or additional resources for water monitoring would be welcome (see UNESCO, AFDB, IW projects and bilateral partners).

3) Sustainability and up-scaling strategies should be anticipated, including with domestic finance, especially in a project that only mention domestic cofinancing. Please complete.

Agency Response

Jan 22, 2024

Comments well appreciated, and in response to improve the, please note the following additions:

1) Baseline elements: two sections have been added with information added, as recommended.

2) Cofinancing or additional resources for water monitoring: this is well noted, and efforts will continue to look for additional resources to support water monitoring. This will be furthered through discussions with other partners such as UNESCO, AFDB, IW projects and bilateral partners. It is recalled that the UNEP team recognizes the need to support continued discussions and engagements with other players in the country. The process of engagement has not been closed with the development phases of the project.

3) Sustainability and up-scaling strategies: As advised, additional information has been provided to complete on sustainability and scaling up potential.

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
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- We suggest removing the text that is too general or theoretical.
- What is expected is here is a justification of the LD and CCM benefits measured through the core indicators 3, 4, and 6. Please, revise the text to explain how you will reach 2,500 ha of productive landscape under SLM (4.3) and 3000 ha of restored grass and woodland areas (3.3).
- Please clarify the reasoning and assumptions made to calculate the carbon benefits from SLM and avoided emissions from the solar pump (1,284,866 t of CO₂e out of AFOLU sector? and 20,544 t CO₂e from SLM? Please clarify).
- As mentioned at PIF stage, kindly provide an excel sheet with the GHG emission reductions calculations, including assumptions. Please also share the NEXT excel sheet so the GEF team can easily track the estimations and assumption made. As a clarification note, the GHG estimations shall be done based on the estimated lifetime of the solar panels. Under the sustainability section, it is mentioned that "these panels last around 25 years?". Clarify whether 25 year will be used for the calculation of the GHG emission reductions. If so, 25 years is on the high-end range, so please explain how the project will ensure that the solar panels to be bought by the project are "good quality?".

Agency Response

Jan 22, 2024

Comments well appreciated, and in response to improve the, please note the following additions:

-Too general or theoretical: As recommended, some information has been deleted ? we are of the view that part of the information be retained as this lays foundation for the scientific basis of the project?s design logic.

-2,500 ha of productive landscape under SLM (4.3) and 3000 ha of restored grass and woodland areas (3.3): 3,000 ha will be restored with appropriate SLM practices. Under the section on GEBs, additional information has been provided with SLM practices envisaged to reach 3,000 ha. With regards to 12,500 ha, it has been estimated for land use plans based on the average size of the three Ouadis that have been targeted for the plans under the project.

-Reasoning and assumptions made to calculate the carbon benefits from SLM and avoided emissions from the solar pump: The calculation of the GHG emission reduction was based on the standards of solar panel emission reduction based on figures provided by many research work including the US-based National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL) which estimated that solar power produces lifetime emissions of 40g CO₂ equivalent per kilowatt-hour. At CEO endorsement, the calculated total emissions from solar panel emission reduction is 1,264,322 t CO₂. At CEO endorsement, an estimated total of 20,544 t CO₂ from ecosystem restoration of 3,000 ha has been estimated. Therefore, the total estimated GHG emission reductions are 1,284,866 t CO₂eq. The carbon levels from land rehabilitation has been estimated based on the Nationally Determined Contributions Expert Tool (NEXT) as detailed under the table of core indicators.

-Sharing NEXT excel: The NEXT excel has been shared, as requested. Additionally, the calculation of carbon emission mitigation does not refer to the 25 years which refer to the usable life span of the solar panels. Regarding the quality of the solar panels, the number of years come from a detailed study conducted at PPG which also included the calculations of carbon emissions to be mitigated. The project will follow strict procurement procedures that will go through a vetting process by quality personnel. It should be noted that the eventual procurement will have to receive a no objection from UNEP which will provide another layer of verification for the panels to be procured.

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
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- The sections on innovation is welcome.

- The sections on sustainability and scaling up need to be more proactive and concrete: exploring domestic strategies and finances, exploring projects and initiatives from donors, etc. Scaling up cannot be considered as a spontaneous approach based on positive outcomes. Please, revise.

Agency Response
Jan 22, 2024

Comment is well noted and appreciated. In response:

Sustainability and scaling up: As recommended, aspects of exploring domestic strategies and finances, exploring projects and initiatives from donors, etc to support sustainability and scaling up have been added under both sections.

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 Addressed.

Control Quality

- On Geolocation (comment provided by Omid): In Annex E on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

June 21, 2024

Yes

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
NA

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
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- Annex I ?Meetings with stakeholders and partners? is missing in the ProDoc. Please attach this annex as it seems to provide relevant info on the stakeholder consultation undertaking during the PPG stage.

- Please elaborate whether this project will benefit or impact any Indigenous or minority Peoples and Local Communities. If so, please show evidence that they have been consulted with the project impacts. Please indicate which stakeholders will be affected by the project on ground and how they have been consulted.

- Please include the component Sahel Solaire among the list of potential stakeholders as potential local provider for the project. Has the project at the PPG stage reach out to Sahel Solaire? The could provide important lessons learned on the deployment and maintenance of solar panels in Chad. Also, do they have an estimated lifetime for the solar panels they manufacture?

Agency Response

Jan 22, 2024

Comments well noted and appreciated. In response:

Annex I meeting in the ProDoc: As requested, the ?meetings with stakeholders and partners? annex has been added in the ProDoc as appendix 17

Stakeholders on the ground: During the PPG stage and based on the population within the target Kanem region, no category of stakeholders were identified and categorized as indigenous communities. Under the section on ?Introduction to the Projet Site: The Kanem Region,? a paragraph has been added about the target population. Also, in the section on stakeholders consulted, the ones to be impacted directly are local communities that include

women. The section indicates that "since the project focuses on sustainable land management in the Ouadis, women constitute an important target group in its implementation.

Inclusion of the Sahel Solaire: Under the section Institutional Arrangement and Coordination, additional information has been provided indicating that the project will engage the company for technical and quality assurance.

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
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- In the result framework, please consider replacing "gender-sensitive" by "gender-responsive".

Agency Response
Jan 22, 2024

Comments well noted and appreciated. In response:

- "Gender-sensitive" has been changed to "gender-responsive".

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
Addressed.

Agency Response
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
Yes.

Agency Response
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
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- Please confirm whether there has been any initial discussion with UNDP Africa Mini Grids Project in Chad about the most suitable business model for Chad.

- Please, confirm the level of discussions with WB and AfDB and the considered projects.

Agency Response
Jan 22, 2024

Comments are well noted, and in response:

During PPG, development partners have been engaged. We wish to confirm here that there have been already two rounds of discussion with UNDP and Chad AMP and commitment have been made from both sides (UNDP and UNEP) to work together and to ensure synergies and complementarity. Similarly, discussions have been had with WB and AfDB. These will be pursued further during the project implementation phase, and these partners will certainly be engaged during the inception workshops. They have lessons and experiences from which the project will draw, besides forging partnerships for scaling up and sustainability.

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
Addressed.

Agency Response
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
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- Please consider replacing ?gender-sensitive? by ?gender-responsive?.

Agency Response
Jan 22, 2024

Comments are well noted, and in response:

- ?Gender-sensitive? has been changed to ?gender-responsive

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
Addressed.

Quality Control

- On Environmental and Social Safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). SRIF said that "there is security issue in areas surrounding Lake Chad including the project area. There is heavy presence of military and security personnel who may be requested to ensure the safety of the project sites and project equipment. The project awareness raising and sensitization will include those activities targeting security personnel." and recommended to carry out further assessments and impact assessment and develop a management framework/plan. However, it is not clear how these awareness raising and sensitization take place as a part of the projects in addition to the further assessment and risk management plan, particularly about local conflicts and security issues. Please elaborate further and provide more detailed information on how to assess and manage local conflicts and security issues of the project sites.

- Please, confirm that the security of the project team and partners is well included in the risk analysis, with mitigation measures.

February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

"At CEO Endorsement/Approval, Agencies provide additional information regarding the relevant Environmental and Social Risks and Impacts associated with the proposed project, and associated measures to address such risks and impacts, including any environmental and social assessments carried out, and any Environmental and Social Management Plans or the equivalent?: is there a revised document since the SRIF from April 2022?"

Agency Response

July 5, 2024

Paragraphs (page 72) are now added after the risk Table to address the assessment and management of local conflicts and security issues of the project sites and security of the project team and partners.

Jan 22, 2024

Comments are well noted, and in response:

We confirm that the SRIF has been updated from April 2022.

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
Addressed.

Quality Control

M&E Plan (US\$ 305,000) is 10.5% of the GEF Financing, which is double of the suggested threshold for projects up to US\$ 5 million. Please, revise.

February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

– M&E budget in the Annex does not match the budget under the M&E section. Please, correct.

Agency Response

05 July 2024

M&E budget revised and updated

Jan 22, 2024

Comments are well noted, and in response:

-The budget in both the annex and the M&E sections have been synchronized as \$305,000

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Addressed.

Quality Control

- On Gender: Please ensure under M&E that gender-related results are monitored and reported on thoroughly, and gender experts are engaged in all steps.

On the budget:

a. The total per component in the budget table does not match the total per component in Table B. Please request the agency to review and correct where necessary.

Project title: Innovative approach to Protect Ouadis through the Promotion of non connected mini-Grid solar energy in 3 municipalities (Mao, Kikledena and Ndiou) of Kanem region- Chad (IPOHONOG)									
Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template									
Expenditure Category	Detailed description	Component (US\$eq.)				M & E	P M C	Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving Funds from the DEF Agency) ¹⁾
		Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Sub- Total				
	Outcome 1.1		Outcome 2.1	Outcome 3.1	0		14,910	Project Management Unit	
Grand Total	Audit	1,134,095	1,129,699	268,000	2,528,794	305,000	140,690	2,954,484	

Component 2: Investment to support local communities (men and women) access to solar energy for irrigation and economic benefits	Investment	2.1: Investment in high capacity solar water pumps to provide water for both women and men production systems which integrate best SLM practices and access to solar energy for multiple benefits	2.1.1 Solar water pumps infrastructures to benefit both women and men (boreholes, Solar panels, Batteries, network of irrigation tapes) established in at least 3 pilot ouadis in 3 Municipalities of Kanem	GET	1,140,069.00	8,000,000.00
Component 2: Investment to support local communities (men and women) access to solar energy for irrigation and economic benefits	Technical Assistance	2.2 Gender-responsive power purchase agreements enhance the participation and empowerment of women while aligning objectives between Cooperatives and the Societe Nationale d'Electricite (SNE)	2.1.2 Gender-responsive power purchase agreements are negotiated and agreed upon between the cooperatives and possible buyer including the Societe Nationale d'Electricite (SNE)	GET	80,000.00	2,000,000.00
Component 3: Establishment of long-term gender responsive Knowledge management and monitoring system of Ouadis ecosystems men and women	Technical Assistance	3.1. Men and women from Chad and Kanem region including those involved in ouadis, natural resources management and energy sector are actively engaged and exposed to the potential best SLM practices for Ouadis restoration and introduction of solar energy	3.1.1 Policy brief and guidelines to promote the use and scaling up of good SLM practices for Ouadis restoration and Solar water pumps developed and disseminated 3.1.2 Communication and knowledge products generated by the project and	GET	320,000.00	3,449,000.00

b. The budget table shows that the Project Management Unit will be executing the entire project ? what it is expected in the column is to include the institution that will be responsible for each activity (presumably the Ministry of Environment and National Great Green Wall, which have been identified as the executing agencies) ? please amend as appropriate.

Project Title: Innovative approach to Protect Ouadis through the Promotion of non connected mini-Grid solar energy in 3 municipalities (Mao, Kekedena and Nokou) of Kanem region Chad (IPOPONOG)									
Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template									
Expenditure Category	Detailed description	Component (USDeq.)			Sub- Total	M&E	P M C	Total (USDeq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) ²⁰
		Component 1 Outcome 1.1	Component 2 Outcome 2.1	Component 3 Outcome 3.1					
	Agricultural practices	100,000			100,000			100,000	
	Land use plans of 3 pilot Ouadis developed and implemented using good SLM practices and solar water pumping system	100,000			100,000			100,000	Project Management Unit
	Publications				0	30,000		30,000	Project Management Unit
	Mid Term review				0	20,000		20,000	Project Management Unit
	Terminal Evaluation				0	40,000		40,000	Project Management Unit
Salary and benefits / Staff costs					0			0	
	Project Director				0	48,000		48,000	Project Management Unit
	Admin & Fin. Officer				0	25,000		25,000	Project Management Unit
	M&E Officer				0	60,000		60,000	Project Management Unit
	Gender-Public Inclusion Specialist				0	40,690		40,690	Project Management Unit
	NRM officer	20,000	12,000	8,000	40,000			40,000	Project Management Unit
Trainings, Workshops, Meetings					0			0	
	Inception Workshop				0	25,000		25,000	Project Management Unit
	Ass of Project progress and mean of verification				0	30,000		30,000	Project Management Unit
	Technical reports					20,000		20,000	
	Steering Committee Meeting				0	40,000		40,000	Project Management Unit
Travel					0			0	
	Travel/Field Visits				0	40,000		40,000	
Office Supplies					0			0	
	Office supplies, computers, other equipment				0	7,690		7,690	Project Management Unit
Operating Costs					0			0	
	Audit				0	19,310		19,310	Project Management Unit
Grand Total		1,134,095	1,126,699	268,000	2,528,794	305,000	140,690	2,954,484	

June 10, 2024

Addressed.

February 18, 2024

- About the budget, thanks for the clarifications. Sorry to not have raised this question before, but can you explain how some high amounts have been estimated and if some details are available (line 12 on the three solar pumps for an amount of \$1,104,699 and lines 8, 9, and 10 on plans, land restoration, and agricultural practices for \$914,095).

August 17, 2023

- Annex I ?Meetings with stakeholders and partners? is missing in the ProDoc. Please attach this annex as it seems to provide relevant info on the stakeholder consultation undertaking during the PPG stage.

- Annex H on ?Thematic Studies Report? is missing in the ProDoc document. Please share/attached this Annex as it may provide useful information to address some of the questions above.

Budget (Excel table and portal):

- Is the Project Implementation Unit the same as PMU? If so, please unify and use only one terminology across the proposal.

- As per the budget table, the ?gender-response purchase agreements? are implemented by the Executing Agency. Please clarify if this is the PMU and, if so, amend and unify accordingly.

- Line 14: We can read " Global Mechanism, Office of the Ivorian Prime Minister" - please remove.
- Line 16 and 17: without further information, the costs of international consultants seem excessive in view of the expected results (\$100,000 and \$260,000). Please, clarify and adjust.
- Line 21: " Gender-responsive power purchase agreements are negotiated and agreed upon between the cooperatives and the Societe Nationale d'Electricite (SNE)". We wonder the nature of work for \$80,000. Please, clarify. What " executing agency" means in this context? Please unify the wording.
- Line 22: " Climate resilient Agricultural practices adopted" : please, clarify the nature of work for \$100,000 and revise the formulation.

Agency Response
July 5th, 2024

Gender indicators monitoring and reporting are now included in the M&E

Budget:

- a) **The total per component has now been corrected**
- b) **The budget table is now corrected to address the concerns raised.**

24 May 2024

In the budget, some line items are high for the following key reasons:

1. The targeted pilot Oasis is large and provide high potential for multiples activities with a large number of population. Currently the Solar System being established per municipality in Chad is around XAF 500 million (\$1million). This amount covers both the Solar Energy infrastructures (the panels, the batteries, and the wire network) and irrigation infrastructures (borehole, the tanks, the platform to support the tanks and the pipes). Based on the experiences in some pilot sites established by the Great Green Wall National Agency in Chad, it appears that only One Solar system may not be enough for One Oasis because of the competing use by large herds of animals including for migrant pastoralists. The System visited during the PPG shows a kind of Organisation which allows the animals to use the system in the half of the day and other half reserved for women gardening and domestic uses.

To overcome this limitation, the project envisages to installed system with enough panels or in some cases installing more than 1 system for One Oasis.

2. The SLM activities to be conducted in Communal Plans are planned to be intensive and sufficiently enough to create impact within the communities. The cost per ha for Land Restoration is estimated at \$277/ha during WB/GEF SAWAP program but recent information indicates that this cost is now as high as \$600 per ha because of many factors including cost operations the area is sandy and fuel consumption can be more than 3 times the normal consumption, insufficient labor as most those that can be hired have moved to other areas where Gold mining seems to be more attractive. In addition, ClimateSmart Agriculture to be promoted will sufficiently be enough to create impacts and to cover large number of communities and women. The restoration of Oasis will not only be in 1 Oasis per Municipality, but extended to the Oasis where communities continue to exploit but face challenges related to Salinization and other restriction factors like lack of compost and adapted crops species. The remoteness of the area also will require facilitating products access to markets or alternatively conservation of products for better price at the best periods of the year. All the above increase the cost of promoting productivity in the project areas.

Jan 22, 2024

Comments are well noted, and in response:

-Annex I ?Meetings with stakeholders and partners? is missing in the ProDoc: Noted and added as requested

-Annex H on ?Thematic Studies Report? is missing in the ProDoc document: Noted and added as requested

Budget comments

-PMU/PIU: Efforts have been done to maintain ?Project Management Unit (PMU)

-Implementation of gender-response purchase agreements: Comment noted with thanks, and this has been corrected to Project Management Unit

- Line 14: Comment noted with thanks, and this has been deleted

-Line 16 and 17: The lines have been adjusted to \$60,000 and \$80,000, respectively

- Line 21: The works in this amount will include capacity development and sensitization, facilitation of negotiation sessions, consultants to prepare the agreements and legal fees, and management of post-signature activities include enforcement mechanisms, dispute resolution procedures, and periodic reviews for updates or amendments, where necessary.

-Line 22: The formulation has been revised. This will involve a suite of activities including farmer training and education programs provide knowledge about climate-smart techniques like crop diversification, conservation tillage, and efficient water management; establishing community-based farmer groups encourages knowledge sharing and collective action; policy and advocacy activities, among others.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestYes. Responses from Council comments are available (Canada, Germany, and Switzerland).

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

- STAP comments are integrated in some responses made to GEF Secretariat's comments. However, we should find a table of responses from the STAP comments at PIF level. Please, complete.

Agency Response
Jan 22, 2024

-STAP comments: The comments and provided responses have been included as suggested.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
Addressed.

Quality Control

- On the utilization of the PPG: please request the agency to provide additional details on the activities finances (i.e. consultancies for various thematic studies). Please, follow the eligible activities for PPG as presented in Guidelines

February 18, 2024

Addressed.

August 17, 2023

Annex C: if \$85,000 were spent on a \$100,000 PPG, we should read " 15,000" in the last column. Please, correct (CEO endorsement request).

Agency Response

July 5th, 2024

In addition to the folder previously provided on the different PPG reports, detailed information are now provided on key activities conducted and related products.

Jan 22, 2024

Comments are well noted, and in response:

-Out of the total \$100,000 in PPG, \$87,500 has already been spent. The remaining balance is \$12,500. This remaining amount has already been committed to an inception workshop, which means it is still available to be spent at the event. Thus, the \$12,500 in the bottom right corner of the table refers to the amount committed but not spent.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestOK

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

NA

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 RequestNA

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 RequestNA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 8, 2024

All points are addressed. The project is recommended for clearance and Council consultation.

July 1st, 2024

Please, address the comments raised by the Quality Control as soon as possible, as this project already exceeded the 18-month period since PIF approval. If UNEP cannot resubmit a revised package with all comments addressed in the coming days, this project is under threat of cancellation.

June 21, 2024

All points are addressed. The project is recommended for Council circulation before CEO endorsement.

June 17, 2024

The new documents bring complementary observations. Please address the questions above.

June 10, 2024

Most of the comments have been addressed. However, please, see the items #2 and #7. Upon receipt of a revised package with satisfactory information, the project will be circulated for Council consultation.

February 18, 2024

Thanks for the improvements and clarifications. However, The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the remaining comments.

August 17, 2023

The project cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/18/2024	5/24/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/10/2024	6/11/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/21/2024	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations