



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

GEF ID:	4748		
Country/Region:	Regional (Central African Republic, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Chad)		
Project Title:	Improving Lake Chad Management through Building Climate Change Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem Stress through Implementaion of the SAP		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4797 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,830,000
Co-financing:	\$33,484,250	Total Project Cost:	\$39,314,250
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Mame Dagou Diop

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?	13th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the countries are eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	13th of December 2011 (cseverin): Attached to the Central African Republic, Niger and Chad endorsement letters have been included in the PIF submission. Please forward the remaining endorsement letters. 5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Endorsement letter have been forwarded for Cameroon. The PIF mentions that endorsement letter from Nigeria can be expected to be arriving prior to webposting. (9 April 2013; AHillers): Yes, endorsement letters for all five countries have been submitted (Cameroon, CAR, Chad, Niger, Nigeria).	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and	13th of December 2011 (cseverin): The GEF agency were part of developing the SAP for Lake Chad together with the World Bank in the project titled: "Reversal of land and Water Degradation Trends in the lake Chad Basin Ecosystem. " hence the agency have substantial comparative advantage.	

		project - as mentioned. In addition, the proposed small grants component is based on years of SGP experience. UNDP will also coordinate and collaborate with efforts of World Bank and its aims for enhanced engagement in Lake Chad region.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N.A.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	13th of December 2011 (cseverin): The agency have field presence in the five Lake Chad countries.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	13th of December 2011 (cseverin) & (9 April 2013; AHillers): The requested funds are available under the IW focal area allocation.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>13th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the project is aligned with the IW focal area results framework with its expected outcomes and output indicators.</p> <p>However, please do rework the included output indicators that are not quantifiable in their nature. The presently, included output indicators are appropriately linked</p>	

		<p>indicators towards which it will be easier to measure progress.</p> <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): At time of CEO Endorsement, PLEASE DO rework/reformulate the output indicators so that they will be easier to measure, i.e. they need to be quaitifiable in nature.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. The comments in this review sheet refer to the revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2012; AHillers): The need to refine outputs and indicators still holds in part. Links and synergies between project components should also be made more clear. For example, output 2.2. and 3.2 seem very similar. For further details see comments under question # 14.</p> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers): The revised PIF is overall consistent with the GEF IW strategy Objective 1. Yet , the reference to what exactly is implemented of the SAP and its indicators needs to be more specific components/the content of the Chad Basin SAP. See also comments below under question # 14. For example, component 2 capacity strengthening just refers to any capacities needed for all/any actions in the SAP - please be more specific to be able to assess the extend/scope of capacity enhancement in ministries and academic institutions; the type or scope of intituiional and policy reforms aimed at.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed.</p>	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/N PIF objectives identified?	<p>13th of December 2011 (cseverin): yes, the relevant GEF 5 IW-1 objective has been included.</p>	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFF.	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the proposed project is in line with the countries national strategies and plans, as it will be implementing the Strategic Action Programme that was signed between the countries in 2008.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - The PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p>	

	NAP?	<p>endorsed by all countries. The current PIF does not elaborate linkages with other relevant national strategies, such as PRSPs or their equivalent which may have been updated since 2008 (i.e. since endorsement of the SAP). As the project will aim to enhance the LCBC's and the riparian countries' capacities to address climate variability and change, it also would be useful to briefly reflect on NAPAs and other country based strategies in the final project document.</p> <p>Please address in project design/by CEO endorsement.</p>	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): The project will among others work through the Lake Chad Commission as the central coordination body for the project and its activities, hence the capacities built, will be part of the sustainability for the entire project implementation as well as the long term sustainability strategy for project outcomes. Further, activities will be coordinated with national governments, as well as local governments and community organisations.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2013; AHillers): The revised PIF aims at strengthen capacities on national level in terms of institutional structures, policy reforms, and monitoring capacity to implement and update the SAP and align NAPs with the SAP. It also aims to strengthen the capacities of LCBC especially with regards to assessing impacts of climate variability and change in the SAP update and investment plans. Building of national capacities to achieve regional outcomes is sound, yet the project description and the project framework should be more specific on what policy and institutional type/scope of reforms are envisioned to implement what priorities of the SAP (e.g. is the focus on water/food security hence SAP priorities related to restoring or maintaining surface and groundwater quantity/quality and related secosystems & effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwater?; - just as example, it is unlikely for one project to effectively cover all topics/issues in the SAP; please spell out which are main areas that are intended to be addressed). Please be more specific in this regard in components 2 and 3. In addition, the title of component 3 would greatly benefit from rewording to indicate the goal of this component in substance more clearly - the SAP is a tool to achieve certain objectives; hence "achieving and sustaining the SAP" is not a goal in itself.</p> <p>Please address in revised PIF.</p>	

Project Design	<p>11. 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>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the baseline projects seems to be built an healthy assumptions. However, please do make sure that there is no double counting between the 17 mio included as the national contributions from the Water and Environment ministeries and what has already been counted against the AfDB Lake Chad programme.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers): The baseline is described in the revised PIF. Some of the baseline projects seems to be rather part of alternative (i.e. are co-finance to alternative) - such as UNESCO work, AWF, EU, GIZ, BGR, EU, and IUCN co-finance. This is consistent with the list of co-financing partners. During project design (by CEO endorsement), please provide mechanisms/explanation on how all these related intitatives are coordinated on an ongoing basis to create/harness synergies and avoid overlaps.</p> <p>- Please elaborate/explain for UNESCO as well as project activities the need for signing general commitment to conjunctive management of surface and groundwater or adoption of the UNGA resolution on TB groundwater. As it stands, this seems to be well addressed in the Water Charter of May 2012.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed. This was dropped as this is already addressed in the Water Charter.</p> <p>- Please also explain linkages with the ongoing GEF finance for Lake Chad (AfDB as implementing agency) - it is mentioned in some table , but a short para would be needed to address this in more detail as these are related GEF finance aiming at SAP implementation.</p> <p>Please address in revised PIF.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</p> <p>- LCBC has plans on interbasin transfer from Congo basin (listed under projects on LCBC website). A feasibility study has been recently concluded. Please provide assurance that GEF alternative is not linked to an effort that is unclear at this point of its environmental and social impacts.</p>	
----------------	--	---	--

		<p>Please address in revised PIF (e.g. under risk matrix) .</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the GEF funded activities are based on a incremental reasoning.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:</p> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers): please update text of incremental cost reasoning to reflect that the LCBC has finalized the Water Charter in May 2012 (text pg. 11 states that it "would be finalized"); while not ratified by countries yet. The component description has been updated already.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the project framework is based on a sound set of IW outcome indicators, however, please do make sure to rework the output indicators so that they become more quantifiable and easier to measure progress towards. Further the output indicators would also benefit from an overhaul to make them come closer to the output indicators in the IW GEF 5 strategy.</p> <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Please do make sure, at time of ceo endorsement, that the included OUTPUT indicators are aligned with the IW GEF 5 strategy as well as made more quantifiable, in order to be able to easier to measure progress.</p> <p>Further please also make sure to include specific wording that speaks to the effect</p>	

support IWLEARN activities, such as setting up a webpage according to the IWLEARN guidelines, writing up at least two IW experience notes, participating in regional IW meetings as well as the IWCs during the project lifetime.

Moreover, the document at CEO endorsement should also include a sentence on the fact that the project will be reporting using the Consolidated IW tracking tool.

(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF:

Component 1:

- There is a need to not only update, but overall revise the present SAP. We appreciate/comment the projects aim to strengthen SAP with regard to addressing climate variability and change and enhancing attention to conjunctive management of surface and groundwater. Additionally the updated SAP needs to be integrated/aligned with broader development and investment plans - this is somewhat indicated in output 1.3, but the link to all productive sectors is not spelled out (e.g. to address entire span of food/energy/water/ecosystems nexus). Kindly also provide a clear reference for the 'LCBC investment plans' (which? - e.g. food security and livelihoods etc. would figure in there - correct?).

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in the project document.

- The reason for separating components 1 and 6 in that regard is not clear and not articulated in the PIF. The combination of components 1 and 6 (you may even consider to merge 1 and 6 during project design) should include an assessment of socio-economically and environmentally viable opportunities on one hand and constraints on other hand to development in the basin and underlying reasons for these (including water availability/decrease in lake levels; options to increase climate resilience/climate resilient development; ...). Such assessment(s) and updating TDA and SAP would necessarily be linked. Please consider during project design/by CEO endorsement.

- Component 1.4 : it appears the riparians envision drafting the environmental (and other outstanding annexes) after ratification of the Water Charter. This will require time; how is this expected to align with the project timeframes? Also, the text (pg. 11) states that the project will support the adoption of a "LCBC Biodiversity Protocol " - please clarify and make sure project FW reflects this consistently.

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.

Component 2 and 3:

- Please be more specific of what parts of SAP/which SAP priorities are being implemented (incl SAP targets/indicators) and hence would need to be supported by the enabling conditions described such as enhanced national capacities, policies and legal reforms that are envisioned with project support. Based on this, please tighten the indicative output/deliverables of components 2 and 3.

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed.

- also see comment #10- the title of component 3 would greatly benefit from rewording to indicate the goal of this component - the SAP is a tool to achieve certain objectives; hence "achieving and sustaining the SAP" is not a goal in itself. Same is true for the expected outcome of component 3.

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed.

- Outputs 2.2. and 3.2 appear very similar given project description.

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed. This has been revised/clarified.

- Please clarify what funding mechanisms besides GEF are in place for SAP finance (pg 14).

- Please specify in more detail what IWRM and water efficiency strategies are aimed (pg 15 , top) - "optimum and efficient water use for ALL (?) purposes" is a very good objective overall, but does not give a realistic picture of what this project will be able to address and deliver.

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed.

Component 4: Please elaborate more clearly the role of UNESCO as executing agency in the component description(s).

The outputs of component 4 seem ambitious and not entirely realistic to be all achievable with current level of finance/co-finance (flood and drought early warning systems; lake monitoring system (see below); regional groundwater model; regional information sharing system).

appreciated. Both actions will differ in data and information needs on regional and national level. Within this effort, please note that national hydromet stations are considered to be actions of countries. They should be financed out of national budgets not regional GEF funds; this is to ensure that these installations (incl. O&M) are part of national sector activities and budgets to assure sustainability.

- The lake monitoring system appears ambitious in addressing surface and groundwater quality, quantity and ecosystems status. In addition the text states that a wetlands monitoring and management system be put in place (pg 11). Further, it is not clear what the Lake Chad "Indicator Program" is to encompass.

Overall, component 4 seems to be tackling too many items that are each complex - unless the baseline description is missing to outline in enough detail already ongoing/existing efforts e.g. through BGR, GIZ, EU, and others. Please comment/address in revised PIF (incl. considering greater relative allocation to this component by decreasing funds to another component).

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments regarding component 4 have been addressed in the revised PIF.

Component 5: During project design/by CEO endorsement, please consider to not limit "promotion of women involvement ..." to Chad and overall reevaluate and allow for stakeholder drivenness on what small grants are delivered where. Please also elaborate in project design how to supervise these decentralized efforts based on security situation in large parts of basins.

- In revised PIF - please indicate the approximate scale/scope of the two or more pilot projects. How was it decided (or will it be decided) what number and type of pilots will be?

(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed.

Component 6 - see comments under component 1. Please align both components in project design or merge these efforts. Collaboration with the World Bank mainly on component 6 - and in substance likely also much of component 1 (and possibly 4)- is going to benefit countries through providing base and leveraging substantial investments to improve natural resource management and livelihoods.

Please address above comments in revised PIF (unless indicated specifically to be addressed during project design stage/before CEO endorsement).

		<p>- Sustainability: Please address how the LCBC is presently financed. In project design/by CEO endorsement built in a proposed system to be agreed by countries to assure financial sustainability of the institution.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p> <p>- Other project design/sustainability: In project design/by CEO endorsement - please elaborate on project execution details - such as need for intermediary to handle funds for LCBC (UNOPS was used in first project) and if so how LCBC FM and procurement capacity will be strengthened during the project.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the methodology have been properly tested with successful outcomes in other basins, which would then also be expected in this case.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - PIF has been revised to account for new developments such as signing of Lake Chad Water Charter. Comments on revised PIF: overall Yes, but the impacts on addressing water availability challenges and specificity on what specifically of the SAP is implemented needs to be clarified (which SAP priorities/targets).</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p>	
	16. 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?	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF explains clearly how engagement of local communities and proper gender mainstreaming will be key components of the successful implementation of the project.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: Gender dimensions and livelihoods improvements outside the SGP component need to be strengthened during project design/by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p> <p>The aim to link with other development partners closely to catalyze a broader set</p>	

	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes the local communities are foreseen to be properly engaged in the proposed project.</p> <p>However, please do include a stronger explanation how the project seeks to engage with the CSO community.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: The PIF highlights engagement of civil society and strengtening of NGO networks. We are looking forward to seeing this carried through and elaborated in project design.</p>	5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Please do at time of CEO endorsement, include a stronger and more detailed strategy for engagement of the CSO community.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin); Yes the PIF includes a risk matrix including climatic variability and change as well as a number of suggested mitigation measures.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: the PIF includes a risk matrix. Project design will need to address challenges based on the specific security situation in parts of the basin in implementation and supervision of on the ground measures.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): The project will be coordinating its efforts with the Lake Chad Programme implemented by AfDB. However, even though it has been mentioned that deep consultations are planned, please include a suggested mechanism for undertaking these consultations so that it is ensured that they will take place.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: see comments on baseline re link to the GEF funded project implemented by AfDB.</p> <p>Please further elaborate and design an effective coordination mechanisms among on going activities to build on and harness synergies and avoid overlap with e.g BGR, EU, GIZ - funded projects/efforts.</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): Comment addressed in PIF and will be further elaborated in project design.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution	<p>15th of December (2011): (Cseverin): The arrangement has not been explained in detail, please include.</p>	

	adequate?	(9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: above comment still holds and should be elaborated during project design (by CEO endorsement - incl. the roles of LCBC, UNESCO, link with BGR, etc.)	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested project management budget is accordance with the GEF budgetary guidance. <hr/> (9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: see above.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	15th of December 2011 (cseverin); Yes, the funding and associated co-financing seems to be adequate to undertake the suggested activities. However, there please check the focal area strategy framework for consistency with the numbers provided for co-financing in project framework as well as co-financing table. further, please also check for consistency between the amount of requested GEF grant mentioned in the project framework compared to amount listed in the table on the amount requested by agency from the focal area. 5th of January 2012 (cseverin): addressed <hr/> (9 April 2013: AHillers) - comments on revised PIF: - Please address inconsistency in numbers of co-finance and addition of numbers in PIF tables	

		- Please keep total project grant amount within amount endorsed by the countries. (12 April 2013; AHillers): Comments addressed in revised PIF.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	15th of December 2011 (cseverin); the suggested co-financing is presently at 1:5.3, which is considered to be in accordance with the budgetary guidance.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	15th of December 2011 (cseverin): Yes, the co-financing is in line with the agency's role, and even seem to be considerable higher than what is normally expected from the agency in question.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF		

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>15th of December 2011 (cseverin): No, there is a number of issues that needs to be cleared up prior to PIF approval can be recommended. Please see reviewsheet.</p> <p>5th of January 2012 (cseverin): Yes, as the last remaining points will be addressed at time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>18th of January 2012 (cseverin): No, the project is not a priority at the moment considering the extensive programme recently approved on Lake Chad.</p> <hr/> <p>(9 April 2013: AHillers) - revised PIF: The scope of PIF and link with partners - including UNESCO and the World Bank - aims to deliver the base for considerable investments and impacts in the basin. Some 22 million people in the region are dependent on the water resources of the basin and dramatically reduced Lake levels are a grave concern for environment and livellihoods of people in the region.</p> <p>Please submit revised PIF addressing comments under questions 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 24 (with exceptions of those comments that are indicated to be addressed during project design).</p> <p>(12 April 2013; AHillers): The comments have been addressed in the revised PIF and additional details will be further elaborated in project design.</p> <p>The PIF is technically cleared and recommended for possible inclusion in a future work program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please address comments raised in questions/issues indicated to be addressed at CEO endorsements as elaborated under questions 9, 11, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		

	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 12, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* 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.