



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

GEF ID:	5376		
Country/Region:	Chad		
Project Title:	Enhancing the Resilience of the Agricultural Ecosystems		
GEF Agency:	IFAD	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF	Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$7,305,936
Co-financing:	\$20,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$27,505,936
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Bonizella Biagini	Agency Contact Person:	Mr. Naoufel Telahigue

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	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 of Chad, and dated April 5, 2013, 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 equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$7.306 million) is available from the LDCF in	

		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>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards focal area objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	
	<p>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?</p>	YES. The proposed project addresses several of Chad's NAPA priorities in the areas of agricultural production, water resources management, erosion control and agro-meteorological information services. The project is consistent with Chad's PRSP (2013-15) as well as the findings of its Initial National Communication (2001).	
Project Design	<p>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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides an overview of the baseline situation in terms of key socio-economic data, as well as environmental and climatic indicators. The document does not, however, describe a baseline scenario and associated projects, on which the proposed LDCF grant would build and towards which it would contribute.</p> <p>P. 10 of the PIF refers to an IFAD-financed "SMART programme", which appears to represent a baseline project for</p>	

		<p>be required in Section A.1 of the PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe the baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects in the targeted areas, as well as the problems these seek to address.</p> <p>05/16/2013 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies the baseline scenario, the IFAD baseline project and the problems it seeks to address.</p>	
	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 under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the project framework accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>05/16/2013 -- YES.</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. In absence of a description of the baseline scenario and associated projects, the additional reasoning cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please provide an additional reasoning to justify the request for LDCE resources for the activities outlined under Components 1 and 2.</p> <p>05/16/2013 -- YES. The additional reasoning has been adequately described for this stage of project development, and well summarized in Table 3 of the revised PIF.</p>	

	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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would target farmers' organizations, but the means of engaging CSOs and other local-level stakeholders in project design and implementation could be further clarified.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify how CSOs and other local-level stakeholders would be engaged in project design and implementation.</p> <p>05/16/2013 –“ YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, has been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	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)	YES. Risks and relevant mitigation measures have been adequately identified for this stage of project development.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF notes that the proposed project has been designed in consultation with key stakeholders with a view to ensuring complementarity and coherence. The document does not, however, name any relevant partners or initiatives, with which coordination would be sought.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please</p>	

		<p>initiatives, with which coordination and collaboration would be sought.</p> <p>05/16/2013 “ YES. The re-submission provides further information on coordination and collaboration with other relevant initiatives, and outlines the complementarities between the proposed project and other IFAD investments in the targeted areas.</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 scaling up the project’s intervention. 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Section A.1 of the PIF does not address innovative aspects, sustainability or potential for scaling up.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 8, 10 and 12, please describe, in Section A.1 of the PIF, innovative aspects associated with the proposed project, and outline the project's strategy for sustainability and scaling up.</p> <p>05/16/2013 “ NOT CLEAR. Please refer to the above recommendation.</p> <p>05/30/2013 “ YES. YES. The re-submission describes adequately the innovative aspects associated with the proposed project, as well as sustainability and potential for scaling up. The project would develop early-warning systems for climate change “induced natural disasters, strengthen capacities for cereal management and climate-resilient post-harvest processing, and promote small-scale irrigation for market gardening.</p> <p>The project is closely integrated with the IFAD baseline investment, and thanks to a value chain approach it presents a clear strategy for sustainability and scaling up.</p>	

	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 under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the indicative grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>05/16/2013 – YES. The proposed LDCF and co-financing amounts per component are adequate and appropriate.</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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please ensure consistency between the indicative co-financing figures provided in tables A-C, and the baseline initiatives described in Section A.1 of the PIF.</p> <p>05/16/2013 -- YES. In line with its role, IFAD would bring \$17.2 million in indicative co-financing towards the proposed project.</p>	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	NOT CLEAR. At \$365,297, or 5.3 per cent of the sub-total for components 1-2.	

		<p>management slightly exceeds the recommended level.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the LDCF funding level for project management does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1-2.</p> <p>05/16/2013 “ YES. The proposed LDCF funding level for project management has been reduced to \$300,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1-2.</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? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	NO.	
	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?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17 and 18.</p> <p>NOT YET. Please refer to Section 13.</p> <p>05/30/2013 “ YES. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	April 22, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 16, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 30, 2013	

* 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.