



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	8001		
Country/Region:	Chad		
Project Title:	Community-based climate risks management in Chad		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5430 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,250,000
Co-financing:	\$16,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,400,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mame Diagou Diop

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	YES. Chad is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the operational focal point and dated September 3, 2014, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The proposed grant is available	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access	from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) cites outcomes associated with the 2010-14 Programming Strategy on Adaptation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please review the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) against the latest results framework of the GEF Adaptation Program and ensure that the indicative breakdown of grant and co-financing per strategic objective is in line with the scope and focus of the proposed project.</p> <p>01/29/2015 – NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Results Framework (Table A) has been revised and the project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2. Please note, however, that Table A in the GEF-6 FPS PIF template does not include a row for project management costs.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: In Table A, please incorporate project management costs into the grant and co-financing amounts associated with each strategic objective.</p> <p>03/19/2015 – YES. Table A has been revised as recommended.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards Chad's NAPA priorities associated with crop production and climate risk management. The project is also aligned with Chad's National Development Plan (2013-15).	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would build on and enhance Chad's existing information system for food security and the maintenance and operationalization of the country's hydro-meteorological observation network. The project would also build on the UN Agencies' Strategic Response Plan for the 2014-16 period; and UNDP's Programme of Support for Inclusive Finance.</p> <p>The scope of the baseline activities and projects could be further specified. The PIF does not provide the targeted areas or the intended duration of the aforementioned UN SRP and UNDP program. The indicative co-financing amounts associated with food security and climate information systems appear quite high given the state of those same systems, and these could be further explained. In addition, the maintenance and operation costs of Chad's hydro-meteorological observation network are already treated as indicative co-financing towards the recently recommended UNDP project 'Chad National Adaptation Plan' (GEF ID: 6968).</p> <p>Please refer also to Section 8 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i)</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>specify the targeted areas of relevant baseline activities and projects, as appropriate, and (ii) clarify and review the indicative co-financing amounts associated with each baseline initiative, particularly with a view to ensuring that these accurately reflect the baseline activities that would be enhanced through the proposed LDCF project; and with a view to avoiding double-counting across different LDCF projects.</p> <p>01/29/2015 – NOT CLEAR. The baseline investments and associated co-financing amounts have been clarified, but the PIF still does not adequately describe the baseline situation and the baseline scenario as it relates to the specific areas that the proposed project would target.</p> <p>While the PIF notes that the project would intervene in areas that are highly exposed to drought and floods, it is not clear to what extent the intended target areas overlap with the investments planned and underway as part of the UN SRP. As for PNSA and PAFIT, the PIF does not provide their target areas, or what activities may be planned or underway in the flood and drought-prone areas targeted by the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the previous recommendation regarding the areas targeted by the baseline initiatives.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		03/19/2015 â€“ YES. The re-submission clarifies the baseline scenario as recommended.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please revise the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>01/29/2015 â€“ NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>03/19/2015 â€“ YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p>	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>Given the size of the proposed project and the modest number of expected beneficiaries (2,500 and 500 for components 1 and 2, respectively), it seems evident that the project would focus on specific, vulnerable sites or communities. The PIF, however, does not specify what areas or communities would be targeted or what selection criteria would be applied to guide targeting.</p> <p>Moreover, with respect to Component 1, the recently recommended UNDP project â€˜Chad National Adaptation Plan' (PMIS ID: 6968) already seeks \$3 million to establish climate and socio-economic information databases to inform and guide climate-resilient policy and decision-making. It is not clear how</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the proposed project would build on and strengthen this existing proposal, and whether the executing agencies would have the capacity to absorb additional resources in an effective and sustainable manner.</p> <p>As for Component 2, it is unclear whether the proposed project would simply expand UNDP's Programme of Support for Inclusive Finance, or whether it would adopt a qualitatively different approach.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please strengthen the description of the additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits accordingly, with a focus on the sites or communities that the proposed project would target; and its added value vis-à-vis the 'Chad National Adaptation Plan' (GEF ID: 6968) and UNDP's Programme of Support for Inclusive Finance.</p> <p>01/29/2015 " NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>While the PIF notes that the project would intervene in areas that are highly exposed to drought and floods, this could apply to a very large share of the country's overall territory. Accordingly, the PIF could further clarify what selection criteria would be applied to guide targeting. In this regard, the overall</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>efficiency of the project could be considered: the number of expected beneficiaries remains very modest relative to the size of the project (\$1,750 in project grant for each beneficiary).</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, the proposed project would still seem to overlap considerably with the recently recommended UNDP project ‘Chad National Adaptation Plan’ (PMIS ID: 6968). In particular, it is not clear whether it would be efficient to procure hydro-meteorological equipment and to provide training to DREM under two separate projects that would likely be implemented in parallel.</p> <p>As for Component 2, please refer to Section 6 above. The specific baseline situation regarding access to micro-finance in the targeted areas, and the activities that would be carried out under PAFIT, remain unclear.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the outstanding recommendations in Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning and the description of adaptation benefits accordingly; and with a view to strengthening the overall efficiency of the proposed project as well as its synergies with the ‘Chad National Adaptation Plan’ (PMIS ID: 6968).</p> <p>03/19/2015 ‘‘ YES. The additional reasoning and the expected adaptation</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		benefits have been adequately clarified for this stage of project development.	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, has been adequately considered for this stage of project development.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>NOT CLEAR. Given past experience as well as the current political, security and humanitarian situation in Chad, the sustainability of investments in hydro-meteorological services and associated early-warning; as well as measures to improve access to finance should be carefully assessed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider, in Section A.4 of the PIF, risks associated with the sustainability of the proposed project outcomes, particularly in light of the prevailing humanitarian, political and security situation in Chad.</p> <p>01/29/2015 – YES. Relevant risks have been adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. It is not clear how the proposed project would build on and add value to the recently recommended UNDP project ‘Chad National Adaptation Plan’ (GEF ID: 6968).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 8, please describe accordingly how the proposed project would ensure complementarity and coherence with the recently recommended UNDP project ‘Chad National Adaptation Plan’ (GEF ID: 6968).</p> <p>01/29/2015 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above.</p> <p>03/19/2015 ‘‘ YES. The proposed Component 1 has been redesigned to avoid duplication with the UNDP project ‘Chad National Adaptation Plan’ (GEF ID: 6968).</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project’s innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project’s strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6, 8 and 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6, 8 and 11, please revisit the description of the project’s innovative aspects as well as its potential for sustainability and scaling up.</p> <p>01/29/2015 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>03/19/2015 ‘‘ YES. The proposed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	scaling up the project's intervention.	project would seek to strengthen the adaptive capacity of vulnerable populations through enhanced access to early warning and risk transfer. The project would build on and complement a number of highly relevant baseline initiatives and investments on climate-related early warning, food security and financial inclusion. These present opportunities to scale up and sustain the adaptation practices introduced through the proposed LDCF grant. The project would also strengthen the enabling conditions for rural development in the longer term by unlocking opportunities for private savings and investment.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly.</p> <p>01/29/2015 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		03/19/2015 â€“ YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please adjust the indicative sources, amounts and types of co-financing accordingly in Table C.</p> <p>01/29/2015 â€“ NOT CLEAR. The indicative sources and amounts of co-financing have been clarified. Please refer to Section 6 above, however, regarding the baseline activities and investments in the areas targeted by the proposed project.</p> <p>03/19/2015 â€“ YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>YES. At \$250,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for component 1 and 2, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs?</p> <p><u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>YES. \$150,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects up to \$6 million.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 01/29/2015 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 03/19/2015 " YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	December 15, 2014	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	January 29, 2015	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 19, 2015	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**