



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9166		
Country/Region:	Chad		
Project Title:	Strengthening agro-ecosystems' adaptive capacity to climate change in the Lake Chad Basin (Lac, Kanem, Bahr El Ghazal, and part of the Hadjer-Lamis region)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,050,913
Co-financing:	\$18,100,000	Total Project Cost:	\$22,150,913
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Katya Kuang-Idba	Agency Contact Person:	Caterina Batello

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3.</p> <p>Please refer to sections 4 and 7 below, however, and adjust the breakdown of grant and co-financing in Table A accordingly.</p>	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>GEFSEC, 4/30/2018 Same as at original submission.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards several of Chad's NAPA priorities, including in the areas of water resources management, agricultural diversification, land reclamation and pasture management.</p> <p>In addition, the project is aligned with key policies, plans and programs, including Chad's Strategic Development Plan; the Food Security and Nutrition Strategy; and the Strategic Plan for the Development of the Agriculture Sector.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 4/30/2018 At the time of original PIF submission, the proposal indicated that it would link with the forthcoming LDCF-financed NAP project in Chad. At this time, the NAP project referenced has been CEO endorsed and is expected to begin implementation. The PIF does not seem to indicate knowledge of this. The submission does indicate that FAO is involved as a delivery partner for GCF readiness.</p> <p>Additionally, a number of the national plans and strategies referenced in the original PIF submission are now</p>	<p>The need to coordinate with relevant initiatives is acknowledged. To ensure that this will happen the proposed design includes output 3.1.2 National level inter-sectoral working group/task force in place and strengthened defining the agenda for, and programming of local and national level CCA agricultural sector interventions, including the reinforcement and implementation of the Plan Stratégique de Développement (PSD), in close collaboration with the Chad National Adaptation Plan.</p> <p>The National development Plan (Plan Stratégique de Développement) has been updated and covers 2017-2021. The project is still aligned with priorities in the updated PSD.</p> <p>The Master Plan for Water and Sanitation (ASDP) 2003; the National Action Program to Combat Desertification (PAN / LCD) 2006 and the new land degradation neutrality (LDN) initiative which answers to SDG 15.3; the National Action Plan for the Environment (NAPE) 2002; and the updated National Plan of Livestock Development (PNDE) 2017-2021, are still relevant.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>either outdated or closed, including the PSD - Plan Stratégique de Développement (2012-2015); the National Plan of Livestock Development (PNDE) 2009-2016; the Master Plan for Water and Sanitation (ASDP) 2003; the National Action Program to Combat Desertification (PAN / LCD) 2006; and the National Action Plan for the Environment (NAPE) 2002.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION Please indicate if the project is in coordination with the LDCF-financed NAP project and advise whether there is any concrete coordination mechanism. Please also indicate how this project will inform both the GCF and LDCF financed NAP proposals.</p> <p>Additionally, please indicate if the policies and plans referenced are still the most current, up-to-date, and relevant.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/23/2018 - Cleared. The agency has indicated that it will oversee the creation of an inter-sectoral working group in coordination with the National Adaptation Plan process. It has also indicated that the national plans mentioned are still relevant.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 4 and 7 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACITON: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 4 and 7, please revisit Section 1.6 of the PIF.</p> <p>03/09/2016 – YES. Please refer to Section 4 below. Issues of innovation, sustainability and scaling up are adequately addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/2/2018 Yes, same as at original PIF submission.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a clear, general description of the baseline situation in the Lake Chad watershed and the barriers to effective adaptation.</p> <p>As for the baseline investments on which the proposed LDCF grant would build, the PIF could further clarify their intended duration as well as their on-going and planned investments in the four targeted regions, and the associated co-financing. It is not clear to what extent the baseline initiatives target</p>	<p>Relevant past projects are a good source of knowledge – lessons learned best practices and tools. This is the main reason they were mentioned under the baseline section. Revision made as suggested, now removed.</p> <p>The NAPA, while it is not strictly a baseline initiative is an essential basis for the proposed project. This is why it is mentioned in this section "1.2) The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects".</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the four regions that would benefit from the proposed project; and whether most of them would remain active beyond 2015. Moreover, a very large share of the indicative co-financing identified in Table C seems to be in the form of in-kind support associated with unspecified, on-going WFP and SODELAC projects; which does not seem credible.</p> <p>In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario beyond 2015, particularly in the four targeted regions, the additional reasoning for the proposed LDCF grant cannot be fully assessed. In particular, Component 2 would work alongside the World Bank –financed PROADEL II as well as WFP's "Food for Work" programs, but it is unclear what baseline investments would in fact be carried out and, given that PROADEL II is closed, whether those activities would continue beyond 2015. With respect to Component 3, it would seem to duplicate to a significant extent the technically cleared project 'Chad National Adaptation Plan' (GEF ID: 6968).</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) strengthen, in sections 1.2-1.4 of the PIF, the description of each</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>baseline initiative in terms of duration, proposed investments in the four targeted regions, and associated co-financing; (ii) ensure that the sources, amounts and types of co-financing identified in Table C are consistent with the former; and (iii) strengthen the additional reasoning, particularly for components 2 and 3, considering also other approved and technically cleared LDCF projects in Chad.</p> <p>03/09/2016 – YES. The re-submission provides a very clear description of each baseline initiative in terms of duration, proposed investments in the four targeted regions, and associated co-financing; and the additional reasoning has been clarified as requested.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/2/2018 It is recommended that the NAPA is not utilized as a baseline initiative. NAPAs are planning tools meant to identify and guide national priorities. It also appears that several of the initiatives described as baseline investments have closed, which is slightly confusing.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider removing all closed</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>initiatives, or moving them to a different section, on projects with which the proposed initiative will coordinate with, while clearly indicating that these projects are closed.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/23/2018 - Cleared. The Agency has removed references to the NAPA as a baseline initiative and clarified the baseline approaches adequately for this phase of project development.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 4 and 7.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 4 and 7, please revise Table B accordingly.</p> <p>03/09/2016 – YES. Please refer to sections 4 and 7.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/2/2018 Yes, same as at original PIF submission.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>YES. Socio-economic aspects, gender dimensions and public involvement are adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/2/2018 Yes, same as at original PIF</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		submission.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Given the two LDCF projects approved to date (GEF ID 4908; 5376), and two projects that have been recommended by GEFSEC (6968; 8001), Chad can access up to \$4.60 million from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access, whereas the proposed project seeks grant resources and fees amounting to \$6 million.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the LDCF request does not exceed the funds available to Chad in accordance with the principle of equitable access.</p> <p>03/09/2016 – YES. The proposed grant has been adjusted as requested. The project now seeks \$4.6 million from the LDCF, including project financing, PPG and fees, which is within the resources available to Chad in accordance with the principle of equitable access.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		GEFSEC, 5/3/2018 No change from original PIF submission.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 3, 4, 5 and 7.</p> <p>03/09/2016 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project may be processed for clearance/ approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/7/2018 Not yet. The Secretariat would like to request that the Agency provide a brief and concise description of how the PIF has been updated in the re-submission and how it is still relevant in light of changing circumstances in Chad, while also referring to Secretariat comments provided on Items 2 and 4 and resubmit.</p> <p>GEFSEC, 5/24/2018 Yes. The Secretariat's comments have been sufficiently addressed and this PIF is being recommended for clearance and PPG. The Agency has provided justifications for how this project is</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		still aligned with national priorities, as well as updates to co-financing.	
Review Date	Review	July 07, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 09, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 24, 2018	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		