



**Naoko Ishii**  
CEO and Chairperson

May 11, 2017

Ms. Adriana Dinu  
GEF Executive Coordinator  
United Nations Development Programme  
One United Nations Plaza  
304 East 45th St.  
FF Bldg., 10th floor  
New York, NY 10017

Dear Ms. Dinu:

I am pleased to inform you that I have endorsed the full-sized project proposal detailed below:

Decision Sought:	CEO Endorsement of Full-sized Project
GEFSEC ID:	4748
Agency(ies):	UNDP
Agency ID:	4797 (UNDP)
Focal Area:	International Waters
Project Type:	Full-Sized Project
Country(ies):	Regional (Central African Republic, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Chad)
Name of Project:	Improving Lake Chad Management through Building Climate Change Resilience and Reducing Ecosystem Stress through Implementation of the SAP
GEF Project Grant:	\$5,830,000
Agency Fee:	\$553,850
Funding Source:	GEF Trust Fund

Break-down of Indicative Agency Fee				
Agency	Trust Fund	Fees committed at Council Approval	Fees to be committed at CEO Endorsement	Total (US\$)
UNDP	GET	\$221,540	\$332,310	\$553,850

I am endorsing this project on the understanding that the GEF Agency will have its internal approval of the project no later than four months after the CEO endorsement.

This endorsement is subject to the comments made by the GEF Secretariat in the attached document. It is also based on the understanding that the project is in conformity with GEF focal areas strategies and in line with GEF policies and procedures.

Sincerely,



Naoko Ishii  
Chief Executive Officer and Chairperson

Attachment: GEFSEC Project Review Document  
Copy to: Country Operational Focal Point, GEF Agencies, STAP, Trustee



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the SAP			
Country(ies):	Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger and Nigeria	GEF Project ID: <sup>1</sup>	4748
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4797
Other Executing Partner(s):	LCBC	Submission Date:	1 Aug. 2016
		Resubmission Date:	5 April 2017
		Resubmission Date:	27 Apr. 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters	Project Duration(Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Project Agency Fee (\$):	553,850
For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/>			
For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>			
For PPP <input type="checkbox"/>			

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK<sup>2</sup>

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
IW-1 Catalyze multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in transboundary surface and groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change	<p><b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates transboundary IWRM principles (including environment and groundwater) and policy/ legal/institutional reforms into national/local plans</p> <p><b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Transboundary institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management demonstrate sustainability</p> <p><b>Outcome 1.3:</b> Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National and local policy and legal reforms adopted</li> <li>Co-operation frameworks agreed with sustainable financing identified</li> <li>Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments</li> <li>Enhanced capacity for issues of climatic variability and change and groundwater management</li> </ul>	GEFTF	5,830,000	236,282,304

<sup>1</sup> Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

<sup>2</sup> Refer to the [Focal Area Results Framework and LDCF/SCCF Framework](#) when completing Table A.

	sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection				
	<b>Outcome 1.4:</b> Climatic variability and change as well as groundwater capacity incorporated into updated SAP to reflect adaptive management				
<b>Total project costs</b>			GEFTF	5,830,00	236,282,304

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** To achieve climate resilient, integrated ecosystem-based management of Lake Chad Basin through implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity, and sustain livelihoods

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
<b>Component 1:</b> Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission	TA	<b>Outcome 1:</b> A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhance basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin	<b>Output 1.1:</b> <i>The 2008 SAP updated on the basis of the revised TDA</i>  <b>Output 1.2:</b> <i>LCBC Biodiversity Protocol developed and adopted by all parties</i>  <b>Output 1.3:</b> <i>Disaster risk reduction response plans developed to ensure the protection of people, the environment and water resources</i>  <b>Output 1.4:</b> <i>LCBC's coordination and monitoring capacity strengthened with effective reporting of performance to the Council of Ministers.</i>  <b>Output 1.5:</b> <i>Strengthening LCBC's capacity to develop and</i>	GEFTF	905,000	35,000,000

			<i>manage programmes and projects</i>			
<b>Component 2:</b> Establishment of effective, sustainable national governance structures to support the SAP and Water Charter	TA	<b>Outcome 2:</b> Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwater	<b>Output 2.1:</b> <i>Harmonising the national legal and policy frameworks for effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwaters to reflect the relevant provisions of the Water Charter</i>  <b>Output 2.2:</b> <i>Operationalize national inter-ministerial committees to improve coordination and support the policy mainstreaming process at the national level</i>	GEFTF	552,381	15,000,000
<b>Component 3:</b> Capacity of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to support the harmonisation of policies and improved monitoring and management of the Lake Chad basin ecosystem	TA	<b>Outcome 3:</b> Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels.	<b>Output 3.1:</b> <i>Training national authorities on technical and environmental management</i>  <b>Output 3.2:</b> <i>Increase capacity in national research and academic institutions in the basin to conduct assessments on emerging issues in the Lake Chad basin and produce policy and management recommendations</i>  <b>Output 3.3:</b> <i>Develop participation capacities and provide environmental awareness training of basin users</i>	GEFTF	1,150,000	18,000,000
<b>Component 4:</b> Monitoring, Modelling and Data/Information for	TA	<b>Outcome 4:</b> LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information	<b>Output 4.1</b> <i>Transboundary lake basin monitoring system</i>	GEFTF	610,000	35,000,000

Integrated Management of Basin Water, Land and Biodiversity Resources		System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management	<i>designed and agreed by all member states;</i>  <b>Output 4.2:</b> <i>Contribution to GEF IW:LEARN related activities for information sharing and knowledge management</i>			
<b>Component 5:</b> Implementing targeted community-based pilot projects to demonstrate local / national / regional stress reduction benefits in support of SAP implementation	TA	<b>Outcome 5:</b> LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods	<b>Output 5.1:</b> <i>Regional/National pilot projects to control invasive plant species;</i>  <b>Output 5.2:</b> <i>Promote ecosystem-based income-generating activities through sustainable financing schemes established at the national/local levels</i>  <b>Output 5.3:</b> <i>Development of National Replication sustainability strategies for community-based actions</i>	GEFTF	1,835,000	80,000,000
<b>Component 6:</b> Pre-feasibility studies to identify Lake Chad SAP investment opportunities	TA	<b>Outcome 6:</b> Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation	<b>Output 6.1:</b> <i>Assessment of potential investments based on the SAP recommendations</i>  <b>Output 6.2:</b> <i>Pre-feasibility studies on potential bankable investments with outline budgets, scope of work and timescales</i>	GEFTF	500,000	20,000,000
Subtotal				GEFTF	5,552,381	203,000,000
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>3</sup>				GEF TF	277,619	33,282,304
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>5,830,000</b>	236,282,304

<sup>3</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

**C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)**

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Cameroon	Grant and in-kind	692,000
National Government	Central African Republic	Grant and in-kind	\$2,900,000
National Government	Chad	Grant and in-kind	\$19,051,000
National Government	Niger	Grant and in-kind	\$136,460,000
National Government	Nigeria	Grant and in-kind	\$57,135,733
Other	LCBC	Grant and in-kind	\$5,884,250
NGO	IUCN	Grant and in-kind	\$2,500,000
Bilateral Aid Agency	GIZ and BGR	Grant	\$9,476,031
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	\$250,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Parallel	\$1,933,290
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>\$236,282,304</b>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEF-TF	International Waters	Regional (Cameroon, Chad, Central African Republic, Niger, and Nigeria)	\$5,830,000	\$553,850	\$6,383,850
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>\$5,830,000</b>	<b>\$553,850</b>	<b>\$6,383,850</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount(\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	230,000	1,500,000	1,730,000
National/Local Consultants	600,000	4,500,000	5,100,000

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

## A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>4</sup>

**A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

Since the approval of the PIF, LCBC (with support from the World Bank) has prepared the 'Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Plan' which was presented in December 2015 to the UNFCCC CoP in Paris. The revised UNDP-GEF project takes account of this plan and will continue to develop links as the project progresses. UNDP and the project will work closely with the World Bank who will start its support to the LCBC in implementing the Development and Climate Resilience Plan. The revised SAP, to be produced by the UNDP-GEF project, will be fully in line with these strategic documents and support their implementation.

**A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.**

N/A

**A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:**

N/A

**A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:**

N/A

**A.5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning:** describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated [global environmental benefits](#) (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

N/A

**A.6. Risks,** including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Risk	Level	Mitigation
Political instability could affect the implementation of actions at country level	M	UNDP and LCBC Secretariat will work closely with national representatives to LCBC to identify potential issues and recommend specific interventions to reduce the potentially negative impacts. The participation of all countries in the Project Board, and reports by LCBC to the Council of Ministers will also be a conduit for addressing any potential issues at the national level.
The multiplicity of interventions for SAP implementation without effective coordination by the LCBC could limit the expected results and duplicate efforts.	L	UNDP and other partners (GIZ, AfDB) have started working together to establish a platform of partners under LCBC (Project output 1.4) for better coordination of interventions and donors. The expectation is that this donor co-ordination function (together with related monitoring, evaluation and reporting of, for example SAP

<sup>4</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.



Risk	Level	Mitigation
		implementation) will be mainstreamed into LCBCs regular function and progress on donor actions will be reported annually to the Council of Ministers.
Environmental variability and climate change could alter ecosystem functions and reduce ecosystem services.	M	Key actions will be undertaken through the project (Component 5) and other partners' interventions (e.g. GIZ and AfDB) to improve management and resilience of basin ecosystems. This work will co-ordinate with the recent Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Plan (presented to the CoP 21 of the UNFCCC)
Insecurity in the area – terrorist attacks or regular banditry – may jeopardize the implementation and follow-up of the programme	H	Security and Intelligence Services of the LCBC member States have agreed to pool their efforts to bring a common and coordinated response to the current security challenges related to the threats posed by terrorism. The situation will also be advised by the UN's security assessments and briefings. UNDP will support LCBC and member states to mobilize resources on boarder management and preventing radicalization of youth, etc. at the national and regional levels.
Limited technical capacities of staff from line ministries to support implementation of activities	M	Relevant trainings are planned by the project, specifically in Component 3. The UNDP/GEF project has a focus on assisting countries capacities to meet the expected demands for data/information and policy harmonisation of LCBC's 'basin management') to support basin managers and user in supporting key activities.

#### **A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives**

This project has been finalized in close co-operation with the planned AfDB-GEF Lake Chad Project. The two GEF projects held a co-ordination meeting to ensure that the work planned was both complementary and co-ordinated to minimize overlaps and ensure synergy to benefit LCBC and the region. In addition, the co-ordination meeting included representatives of LCBC, GIZ, BGR and the World Bank to further foster co-operation and co-ordination of actions resulting in the development of a common 'mapping' of donors, plans and strategies within the region (included as Annex 3 in the Project Document). Both GEF projects will be executed from within LCBC premises that also house project teams of GIZ and BGR. This co-operation will be further extended through invitations to participate in Project Steering Committees and through the complementary support that both projects will provide to LCBC 'Donor Advisory Committee' established to provide long-term and sustainable means to co-ordinate future actions to restore the Lake Chad ecosystem whilst enhancing the livelihoods of the regions populations.

#### **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

##### **B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.**

Public participation and broad stakeholder engagements is key to the success of this project. An analysis of relevant stakeholders within the Lake Chad Basin has been conducted (see Section 1.6 of the UNDP Project Document). The project will ensure that beyond general awareness of the project's activities the project will actively work with:

- At the **local level**: communities, particularly with women's and other vulnerable groups, to engage them in designing and implementing specific pilots and community livelihood actions at the local and national levels. The project will also engage with community leaders and private sector (e.g. fisher folk and farmers) to engage them in the activities. LCBC, through its existing partnership, will work with IUCN to roll out local level activities who already has extensive field presence in the basin and has been implementing community-based activities to improve their livelihood and natural resources management practices while empowering them in the process. AfDB-GEF project is also working with IUCN on community-level activities. Working through the same partner will ensure close synergies and maximum effectiveness in delivering results to the basin communities.
- At the **national level**: Ministries, institutes, academics will be engaged to encourage the harmonization of policies and practices. The project will also contribute to national understanding of environmental issues in the Lake Chad basin, and support national progress towards Sustainable Development Goals, including SDGs 1 (poverty), 2 (hunger), 6 (water and sanitation), 8 (decent work), 13 (climate change) and 15 (sustainable terrestrial ecosystems).
- At the **regional level**: LCBC will facilitate the discussions through Council of Ministers and the LCBC's Donor Advisory Committee (supported by the UNDP-GEF project, Output 1.4) will ensure that the wider donor community is aware of the needs of the region. When a pipeline of concrete proposals becomes available through the pre-feasibility study (Component 6, carried out in partnership with the World Bank), LCBC will be better equipped to attract tangible investments from external partners (as well as from member states themselves) to address their priority needs.
- At the **global level**: LCBC will be communicating widely their experience and lessons learned through a number of continental or global networks, including communication tools and knowledge sharing events organized by the African Network of Basin Organization (ANBO) and GEF IW:LEARN. At least 1% of GEF fund allocated to this project will be committed to supporting and actively participating in the GEF IW:LEARN organized activities, such as participating the biennial GEF International Waters Conferences and other regional workshops when organized and producing IW Experience Notes.

The project will follow LCBC's policies on gender equality and involvement in all activities and will encourage the direct participation of women in revenue generating activities at the local level and policy harmonization and research at the national/regional levels. The project will develop a detailed communications plan (after inception) that will identify the mechanisms for engagement and the nature of information to be targeted towards specific stakeholder groups. The project will also ensure that the project info on internet (either on the LCBC website or IW:LEARN website) will be kept updated regularly.

The following table summarises the components and the role of various stakeholder groups in the UNDP-GEF project.

Outputs	Responsible institution and role	Stakeholders and role
<b>Component 1:</b> Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission	LCBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Central government of the members' states: contribute to update the SAP, DRR plans, and Biodiversity Protocol;</li> <li>– Local government to involve communities necessary for the update of the SAP</li> </ul>

Outputs	Responsible institution and role	Stakeholders and role
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– National institutes and academics involved with the SAP update</li> <li>– LCBC staff and management support the strengthening of their activities in programme management, donor co-ordination and reporting (to Council of Ministers).</li> </ul>
<b>Component 2:</b> Establishment of effective, sustainable national governance structures to support the SAP and Water Charter	Central governments of the Member States: coordination of activities at national/local level and ensure the involvement of key institutions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Target Ministries (water, agriculture, and environment) involved in Lake Chad basin resources managements: technical support and involvement in establishing IMC and developing key tools for the implementation of Lake Chad Water Charter.</li> <li>– Ministries of finance to assist with the development of sustainable financing for IMCs</li> <li>– Local government to involve communities.</li> </ul>
<b>Component 3:</b> Capacity of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to support the harmonisation of policies and improved monitoring and management of the Lake Chad basin ecosystem	Central governments of the Member States LCBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Target Ministries (water, agriculture, environment) involved in Lake Chad basin resources managements: identification of training needs and benefiting training activities;</li> <li>– Local government &amp; parliamentarian: involved and assist with the identification of training needs;</li> <li>– Academicians: identification of needs, undertake key research, develop training modules and support sharing of research;</li> <li>– Basin users' associations: to assist with communities (CSOs/NGOs) and engaging private sector groups.</li> </ul>
<b>Component 4:</b> Monitoring, Modelling and Data/Information for Integrated Management of Basin Water, Land and Biodiversity Resources	LCBC to co-ordinate monitoring and data needs	<p>Target Ministries (water, agriculture, environment): technical support to communities on participatory monitoring;</p> <p>Target ministries and communities to be engage in the data collection and on the use of collected information.</p>
<b>Component 5:</b> Implementing targeted community-based pilot projects to demonstrate local / national / regional stress reduction benefits in support of SAP implementation	Community organizations: ensuring involvement of target groups, contribute to the design and implementation of	<p>Target Ministries (water, agriculture, environment): technical support to communities</p> <p>Local authorities and communities (ensuring a representative gender balance) engaged in the design, implementation and replication</p> <p>Regional expertise on financing</p>

Outputs	Responsible institution and role	Stakeholders and role
	community based adaptation activities generating income, supporting sharing of experiences IUCN: supporting the communities to carry out the expected actions and sufficiently empower them to do so.	Community representatives Private sector representatives CSOs/NGOs
<b>Component 6:</b> Pre-feasibility studies to identify Lake Chad SAP investment opportunities	LCBC in partnership with the World Bank	Communities engaged in successful pilot and community projects  Potential future donors  Country representatives from ministries of finance, water, agriculture, environment, etc.

**B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels,** including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

Socio-economic benefits for the target communities in the riparian countries will be realized from a number of interventions proposed in the project. Through innovative actions on water management, the project will increase opportunities for improving livelihoods and provide concrete benefits to smallholder farmers and pastoralists, both men and women. By enhancing access to water and using it in a sustainable manner, local communities will benefit from increased food production, enhancing food security and restoring productive natural resources. Finally, through the concrete actions to be developed under Component 5 (Implementing targeted community-based pilot projects) aimed at reducing environmental stress and enhancing livelihoods. Where appropriate, these pilots will be the focus of pre-feasibility studies (Component 6) for future investments to upscale the experiences demonstrated under this project.

The socio-economic benefits of gender mainstreaming throughout the project, and in particular through Component 5 (community pilot actions) will serve to strengthen the sustainable impacts of the interventions on the management of the Lake Chad basin. It is expected that there will be a mutually reinforcing effect between and among the objectives of improving the environment, optimizing economic benefits and improving the role of women in project formulation and implementation. The project will monitor sex-disaggregated indicators to track the impacts of project interventions on women's socioeconomic status and well-being as well as women's contribution to the improved natural resources management practices in the basin.

**B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

The project will strengthen the governance of the Lake Chad basin (at the regional and national/local levels), enhance stakeholders' capacity to monitor, plan and manage basin water resources and associated ecosystems, sustain and enhance inhabitants' livelihoods. The project will develop upscaling and replication plans further enhance the outputs and outcomes achieved.

The project addresses priority transboundary problems that have been nationally and regionally agreed during the TDA/SAP process. The endorsement of the Lake Chad SAP demonstrates the participating countries' commitment to long term environmental objectives and their willingness to begin the process of SAP implementation that has been reinforced through the development of NAPs in all countries.

Implementing policy, legal and institutional reforms agreed under the Lake Chad Basin SAP, and providing to the countries and LCBC relevant, information (including information on the progress towards overall SAP implementation), capacity and management tools would facilitate the governance of the basin and environmental status improvements. Through the implementation of the project, it is anticipated that national budgets will increase to allow LCBC to fulfil its mandate and, implement restoration and management actions already planned. This will help countries to meet relevant commitments under the relevant components of the SAP/NAPs.

The project is also closely aligned with the LCBC's 5-year investment plan and the recent Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan. These plans have (and continuing to) attracted considerable international and national attention, and together with other donor actions (e.g. AfDB, World Bank, bilateral donors, etc.) will reinforce the actions and cost effectiveness of the UNDP-GEF project.

The main focus of the UNDP-GEF project is in support of national and local capacity building and strengthening local communities' abilities to sustain livelihoods whilst enhancing the environment. Whilst the current security issues in the region render it impossible to be precise on the communities and actions to be undertaken, it is planned that during the inception phase this will be resolved and indicators and targets on the actions strengthened. The focus on local and national actions (including assisting the countries identify sustainable mechanisms to support, for example, IMC meetings) will aid the ability of countries to respond to LCBC's requests and lake management recommendations in the longer-term.

Cost-effectiveness of this project is also conveyed through the close co-operation and co-ordination planned with other regional initiatives (including: GIZ, BGR AfDB PRESIBALT, BRIDGE, etc.). In particular, the project will operate closely with the planned AfDB-GEF project sharing information and attending each projects' 'steering committee' meetings (project managers, technical staff, key consultants, etc.). During the PPG phase the two GEF projects on Lake Chad confirmed their intention to share planning information and ensure that training programmes are implemented co-operatively, ensuring that the beneficiaries from both projects attend relevant events. In addition, assistance provided by the two GEF projects to LCBC to support donor co-ordination, and building on the initial work of GIZ, (with AfDB-GEF project supporting the meetings and UNDP-GEF project supporting the capacity strengthening for planning and reporting) further enhances the cost effectiveness of this project. An additional strength of these two parallel projects will be the ability to fund additional representatives from countries and LCBC to attend global events (such as IW Conference and twinning events organised by GEF IW:LEARN). This will be especially of value when more than one ministry is involved in the management of LCB.

The proposed project has the potential to provide experiences and lessons for application to other regions of the world. The project will document the lessons from demonstration projects, data sharing approaches, harmonisation of policies, basin management tools to facilitates their replication and will actively participate in GEF and other activities that seek to promote replication and sharing of experiences, such as IW: LEARN and the GEF IW Conferences.

## **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

The project will be monitored through the following M&E activities. The M&E budget is provided in the table below.

### **Project start:**

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months after the Regional Project Manager post is filled, involving UNDP, LCBC and its member states, IUCN and other stakeholders in the basin. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year's annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of all stakeholders, vis à vis the project team will be discussed, together with the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the GEF IW Tracking Tool, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule Project Board (PB) meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PB meeting will be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and will be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

The first Project Board meeting will usually follow right after the inception workshop to approve the annual work plan and the updated logframe, if applicable, which are reviewed at the inception workshop.

#### **Quarterly:**

Progress made will be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Project progress will be recorded in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform, based on the progress and financial reports submitted quarterly by the Implementing Partners (IPs). UNDP will require a separate financial report from each IP quarterly; however, the narrative progress report, which report technical progress against the approved annual work plan may be submitted as a joint report by the PIU that shows progress of all Components.

Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log will be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Updating of the risk log will be done by UNDP Chad, based on the updated risk description included in the quarterly progress reports.

Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) will be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

Other ATLAS logs will be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

#### **Annually:**

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (1 July to 30 June). The APR/PIR combines UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

- The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF IW Focal Area tracking tools) used by the IW Focal Areas on an annual basis.

### **Mid-term of project cycle:**

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Review at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Review will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organisation, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-Term Review will be prepared by UNDP Chad based on guidance from UNDP-GEF. The management response and the final MTR report will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems.

### **End of Project:**

An independent Terminal Evaluation will take place three months prior to the project closure and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The Terminal Evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The Terminal Evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by UNDP Chad based on guidance from UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre \(ERC\)](#).

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

### **Learning and knowledge sharing:**

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

### **Communications and visibility requirements:**

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at:

<http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects need to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The [GEF logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo) can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF\\_logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo). The [UNDP logo](http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml) can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08\\_Branding\\_the\\_GEF%20final\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf).

Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

### M&E workplan and budget

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Section 3 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome and will be refined and further elaborated prior to the Inception Workshop. The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators are summarized in below.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities. Indicators and their means of verification will be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the PCU but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators.

### M& E work plan and budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager LCBC and IUCN UNDP CO, UNDP W&O RTA	Indicative cost: 20,000	Within first two months of the regional project manager on board.
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	UNDP RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.	50,000	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on <i>output and implementation</i>	Oversight by Project Manager Project team UNDP-CO UNDP-RTA LCBC and IUCN	50,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR/PIR	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA	None	Annually



Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
	LCBC & IUCN		
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU LCBC & IUCN External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: 40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	Project manager and team, UNDP CO UNDP RCU LCBC & IUCN External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : 40,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	Project manager and team UNDP CO Local consultant	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager and team External support	Indicative cost per year: 10,000	Yearly
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) LCBC & IUCN Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 250,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	

**Audit:** Project will be audited in accordance with UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

### PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)


**A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
------	----------	----------	----------------------

Gustave DOUNGOUBE	OFP Central African Republic	Ministère de l'Environnement et de l'Ecologie	09/12/2011
Malam Gata Zouladaini	OFP, Niger	Ministère de l'économie et des finances commissariat charge du développement	10/20/2011
Gaourang Mamadi N'Garkelo	OFP, Chad Republic	Ministère de l'Environnement et des ressources halieutiques	11/29/2011
Nantchou NGoko Justin	OFP, Cameroon Republic	Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Protection de la Nature	11/29/2011
Mrs. Olabisi Bolanle Jaji	OFP, Nigeria	Federal Ministry of Environment	12/07/2012

## B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator		1 August 2016	Akiko Yamamoto	+251 91 250 3316	Akiko.yamamoto@undp.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

***See Section 3 of the UNDP Project Document***

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

The UNDP Project Document has been extensively redrafted since 1<sup>st</sup> submission (February 2015). The following responses are made to the specific GEF Secretariat's comments.

(NB: Yellow highlights indicate responses to GEFSec comments made on the 17<sup>th</sup> October 2016)

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<b>Question 3:</b> Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	
<p>(10/17/2016): UNDP, GIZ, and AfDB have been coordinating in the preparation phase and there is clear aim to cooperate in the implementation of the respective projects to assure complementarity and making use of comparative advantages of the institutions. Please explain briefly why the SGP implementation has been discarded and IUCN has been chosen to for delivery under component 5 (under alternatives considered).</p>	<p>IUCN was selected as a partner to implement some part of this project for their clear comparative advantages. IUCN currently run a few programs aiming to improve natural resources management as well as livelihood improvement in the basin. To implement them, they already have established field presence and networks with local communities as well as local NGOs, both of which will help the project and LCBC in implementing the UNDP-GEF project on the ground, especially for Component 5. Also, they have been selected to implement some of AfDB-supported activities on the ground. Furthermore, IUCN has been working with LCBC in the past to deliver community-based activities and they are currently discussing to renew the MOU between the LCBC and IUCN. LCBC considers IUCN as a suitable partner to support LCBC to implement community-level activities, for which neither LCBC nor national governments are not as strongly positioned. By choosing IUCN as a partner, we can ensure the close coordination and collaboration with the AfDB-supported (and other) activities on the ground at the community level and minimize the necessary start-up costs required for establishing field presence, identifying stakeholders, coordinating activities financed by the two projects.</p> <p>SGP can remain a partner in project implementation so that the project can take advantage of its existing network of communities in the basin. We can consider inviting SGP in the project steering committee meetings at either national or regional levels, as desired. However, SGP would not be a cost-effective</p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
	implementation vehicle for the project, as UNOPS, the agency implementing SGP would have to apply standard charges if the project fund were to be channeled through SGP.
<b>Question 7:</b> Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	
April 13, 2015). Yes, the project is overall aligned with the GEF 5 IW RF. Yet, please explain deviation from the outcomes and expected outcomes in the PIF to what is presented at endorsement stage. The delivery of the project appears substantially less than expected at PIF stage. The number of components and hence outcomes was reduced which appears a considerable change from the PIF. We suggest that in addition to a response matrix we also discuss directly	The project document has been reformulated to be consistent with the endorsed PIF (in structure and ambition) with minor changes to outcome and component title wording, and modifications to some outputs (justified in Annex B2 of this document).
<b>Question 8:</b> Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/N PIF objectives identified?	
(April 13, 2015). Yes. IW 1 - SAP implementation has been identified - and IW 3 in terms of institutional strengthening. PLEASE NOTE: under component 1.1. there is reference to the 5 year Lake Chad investment plan. Some of the listed activities in the plan are neither eligible for GEF finance nor should GEF finance be eligible to be used for feasibility studies; including interbasin transfers.	The reference to the LCBC 5-year remains a valid document but the Project Document makes it clear that the GEF resources would not be utilized in support of inter-basin transfers or peace & security (other than indirectly assisting the latter with livelihood strengthening). This is stated under the Baseline on the 5-year plan. The pre-feasibility studies would strictly be those related to identification and initial characterization of investments which support SAP implementation in areas where investments are required as has been the case with other GEF IW projects in the past.
<b>Question 9:</b> Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	
9 April 2013; AHillers): The project is consistent with the SAP which was endorsed by all countries. The current PIF does not elaborate linkages with other relevant national strategies, such as PRSPs	The text has been strengthened (section 2.2 Country ownership) where a number of plans, strategies, etc. are referred to.

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>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. Please address in project design/by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>(April 13, 2015). See comment of 9 April 2013 which remains to large degree valid. While the project is consistent with the endorsed SAP the description of alignment with national strategies and plans needs to be strengthened.</p> <p>10/17/2016): Comment remains valid. Please address and provide reference (incl. date) especially on alignment with national water resources strategies and reference to national biodiversity strategies (as relevant to component 1.2)</p>	<p>Additional information is included in Section 2.2 (Country Ownership) that details both the links and status NAPAs and the support this project provides to the DRR. New material is included for Lake Chad Member States on their NAPAs, biodiversity, water resources and poverty reduction strategies</p>
<p><b>Question 10:</b> Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	
<p>(10/17/2016): Component 3 budget for capacity building and training has doubled, yet the description in the text remains very general and with little specificity and clear indication of an end of project target (especially for 3.1) and contribution to project deliverables. Please address.</p>	<p>The focus by the UNDP-GEF project on national capacities has increased the number of potential ‘trainees’, hence the increase in budget. LCBC have developed a training programme for the regional needs (within the LCBC) but it was pointed out that a national-level training programs (included in the introduction to Component 3) corresponding to the regional training program must be developed by the countries for the effective implementation of the regional training program, under the guidance of the LCBC. During the development of a national-level training program, solid baseline data (which are currently lacking) will be established together with the intended targets. Current estimates are included in the</p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
	ProDoc for personnel to be trained under the three outputs (and included in the Project Results Framework), but it is recognized that these figures are tentative and subject to review/revision through the project steering committee after the national-level training programs are developed.
<b>Question 11:</b> 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>April 13, 2015). The baseline description in section I.7 needs strengthening; while it should be noted that the project is based on the TDA/SAP process - which includes data and information to substantiate project interventions, the project document itself should nevertheless include a more comprehensive baseline and strengthened rational with respect to the specific project interventions.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): The project description has been strengthened and especially on the regional level there is an updated and clarified cooperation agreement between key development partners on baselines and increment on regional level. Yet, there is very little of information on country baseline as it relates to the specific project activities. Please provide key information - e.g. in form of a short table focused on the specifics related to main project component deliverables (especially given the age of TDA/SAP baseline). This information could be provided upfront or within the component descriptions (again, brief/concise is sufficient at this stage but needed to underpin component activity design)</p>	<p>The enhanced baseline (section 1.7) and strategy (section 2) within the Project Document provides more evidence of previous work at the regional and national levels and relevance to national/regional policies.</p> <p>A new sub-section on national projects that are underway (or have been completed) and contribute to the SAP objectives are now included in the Baseline (Section 1.7) for each Lake Chad Member State</p>
<b>Question 12:</b> 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?	

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>April 13, 2015). There is little analysis to that effect obvious in the submission (section II.6). We would appreciate if UNDP could provide more information/explanation.</p>	<p>The section on cost-effectiveness has been extensively revised (see Project Document Section 2.6) and is also included in the CEO endorsement document (section B.3).</p>
<p><b>Question 14:</b> Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	
<p>(April 13, 2015). The project description and content appears to deliver much less than what was envisioned at PIF stage yet for the same amount of resources. –</p>	<p>The Project Document has been redrafted and is now in-line with the PIF (in structure and ambition).</p>
<p>We understand that some PIF envisioned deliverables are now taken up by developments partners - such as GIZ (TDA/SAP update) and BGR (groundwater balance and information systems). These partners are listed as cofinance to the project. Please assure that these complimentary activities which were initially part of the anticipated PIF outputs are mentioned in the letters of co-finance. –</p>	<p>GIZ is now undertaking the updating of the TDA and this project will update the SAP (Output 1.1). This project will work closely with GIZ and, on groundwater issues, with BGR. This co-operation has been further strengthened at a meeting of LCBC's partners in Frankfurt (Feb 2016) to discuss co-operation and to ensure actions by all (including the proposed AfDB/GEF project) are complementary and not overlapping</p>
<p>The PIF expected that the project would support drafting and approval of the environmental annexes to the Lake Chad Water Charter and development of the LCBC Biodiversity Protocol. Please explain if this remains part of the project and if not why. –</p> <p>.</p>	<p>The work on the Water Charter Annexes has been undertaken by FFEM and this project will reallocate resources from this PIF planned action to supporting LCBC's capacity to manage donors effectively and provide comprehensive monitoring, assessment, and reports to the Council of Ministers (Outputs 1.4 and 1.5)</p> <p>The LCBC BD protocol has been reinstated in to this project (Output 1.2)</p>
<p>The PIF also mentions management of the Lake Chad basin and a comprehensive lake monitoring system and regional information sharing system to be developed through the LCBC Environmental Observatory. Please confirm that these remain outputs of the project</p>	<p>In support of the LCBC's Observatory Division and co-operating with the work being undertaken by GIZ, BGR and AfDB, this project is focusing on supporting monitoring and data management through participatory approaches consistent with the Water Charter (Output 4.1 and 4.2), with a focus at the local/national level.</p>
<p>The prodoc component 1.2 addresses disaster risk reduction response plans which includes among other the 'definition of</p>	<p>The project will assist LCBC develop DRR (Output 1.3) planning to complement the work being undertaken by BGR and AfDB to rehabilitate in situ</p>



GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>drought and flood forecasting', which would to our mind include specs for a forecasting system ,but lagging far behind 4.2 expected deliverables in the PIF ("climate data system installed and made operational to support drought and flood management practices, development of Early Warning Systems and the prediction of future climate and its impacts in Lake Chad on both ground and surface water resources"). Notably a flood and drought early warnings system is not included as target in the project RF – please comment.</p> <p>–</p>	<p>monitoring equipment for flood forecasting. The work in developing the plan will also link with project output 4.2 on enhancing regional information systems to assist with flood /drought warnings (and again supporting national/local authorities on the use of this information)</p>
<p>Please more clearly elaborate how the project will enhance more effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwater and through which project deliverables.</p>	<p>Conjunctive management will be addressed in the project through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updating of the SAP (Output 1.1)</li> <li>• Harmonisation of policies (2.1)</li> <li>• Training of national authorities (3.1)</li> <li>• Training of academics (3.2)</li> <li>• Public awareness raising (3.3)</li> <li>• Monitoring and data management (4.1 and 4.2)</li> </ul>
<p>(10/17/2016): The project description has been significantly updated since the last submission and adjusted to realities of support by other development partners which are meanwhile being implemented. Please address comments below which are based on this rewritten/redesigned project document and hence do not and cannot necessarily build on previous comments:</p>	<p>OK – responses below</p>
<p>Component 1:</p> <p>- wording that projects are implemented successfully is noted but should not be limited to 'donor expectations' but include the country based stakeholders/ministries</p>	<p>This was an oversight. The outcome in the main text reads <i>A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin priorities expressed in the</i></p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
	<p><i>Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad basin</i></p> <p>The Component one description in the summary, Project Results framework, Total Budget and Work Plan and CEO Table B and Annex B2) have been corrected</p>
<p>- Flood and drought monitoring and response (components 1 and 4): Please clarify what forecasting system will be put in place? Flood and drought forecasting, monitoring and response differ substantially and there is little acknowledgement and detail provide across components 1 and 4 to acknowledge this or indicate partners and stakeholders that the project will partner with. Please add detail both in text and logframe/expected end of project deliverable.</p>	<p>Output 4.2 has been deleted (resources transferred to Output 4.1 – monitoring) to avoid potential overlap/duplication with AfDB-GEF project after having consulted with LCBC and AfDB. The DRR (output 1.3) is maintained and is supported by the monitoring activities under Output 4.1. The DRR is potentially also to be enhanced through parallel national projects on Early Warning Systems being developed by LCBC. Additional text on the role of LCBC and the role of the UNDP-GEF project has been added in Output 1.3 (DRR)</p>
<p>- How will this and component 4 efforts incorporate, build on and not duplicate GEF IW/AfDB activities on regular monitoring of basin surface - and groundwater resources and alert/early warning system, and ICT based modeling of water flow and lake levels (see Annex 3 - mapping matrix)? What more exactly is the division of labor in this regard?</p>	<p>Output 4.2 (developing an information system for early warning) has been deleted following close discussions with LCBC and AfDB. Resources have been transferred to Output 4.1 (monitoring)</p>
<p>Component 2: - Please provide some detail on deliverables under component 2.1. What are the major deficits that the harmonization of national policies with Lake Chad water charter needs to address (provides some examples; does not need to be all comprehensive but please indicate the main gaps that motivate the project</p>	<p>The deficiencies relevant to the implementation of the Water Charter were highlighted in the previous UNDP-GEF project through the TDA/SAP process and are summarized in the ‘problems to be addressed’ and the ‘threats and root causes’ sections. References to these deficiencies is included in new text in Output 2.1.</p> <p>Additional text to explain the links to conjunctive management are included in Output 2.1</p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>component activities and will be addressed during implementation).</p> <p>- Please detail in text what is envisioned to strengthen conjunctive management (page 29 prodoc does not mention this).</p>	
<p>comp 2.2. : please align timeline for 'functional SMCs' so these are functioning to support the SAP update in timely manner (i.e. before SAP update adoption by ministers in the basin) (please adjust in logframe to assure that SAP update approval is based in inter-ministerial discussions).</p>	<p>Text in output 2.2 and logframe reflects the IMCs' roles on SAP development and approval</p>
<p>Component 3:</p> <p>- See previous comment (under question on capacity building) and provide some clarity on scope and impact of training with respect to the project deliverables. The budget of component 3 has doubled, yet especially component 3.1. only provides a very general description and the logframe does not indicate number of people targeted. Please address.</p>	<p>See response under Q10.</p> <p>Component 3 is split between training of national authorities, research and academic institutions, and 'water users'. A first step will be to develop appropriate training needs assessment and training program for each of these groups building on the requirements of the Water Charter, the SAP and the regional training program for the LCBC.</p>
<p>Component 4:</p> <p>- 4.1 mentions the adoption of data exchange protocols in consistency with the Water Charter. Please reflect this in the logframe.</p>	<p>This has been included in the logframe</p>
<p>- 4.2: Please address together with the comment on flood/drought forecasting and DRM in component 1.</p>	<p>As explained above, output 4.2 has been deleted following detailed discussions with LCBC and AfDB.</p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>Component 5: SAP implementation and resilience will require measurable investments and deliverables on community level (among other). In that context the component is well placed. Only financing "pilots" is unlikely to meet SAP implementation requirements and please aim for impact - the wording of pilots indicates otherwise. In many of these topics one should be beyond a need for 'proof of concept' and looking at scale-up. Given the security situation in the region and difficulties to access certain areas, it is appreciated that not all measures and investments can be determined at present and additional detail will need to be developed during project design. This should be noted as an exception! It is unusual to encounter a project document with little to no indication of the delivery mechanism, detail of interventions and scope/targets. While there is mention of e.g. "10" community projects such as under component 5.1 this does not provide any idea of scale/budget or impact. Even given the specific situation and difficulties in work on the ground in parts of the basin we would expect to see some more clarity under 5.1. and 5.2. including (but not solely limited to) clear criteria for selection of pilots.</p>	<p>The wording of this component has been significantly strengthened. The proposal recognizes that the project will build upon concepts that have largely been demonstrated elsewhere and therefore the use of 'proof of concept' has been changed to better show that this project is demonstrating the potential to upscale investments at the local level.</p> <p>The text has been modified to include potential delivery mechanisms based on IUCN's experience in the region. This will be achieved through a consultative process and multi-stakeholder platforms to identify and then facilitate the project's activities. In execution a project committee (consisting of local community representatives) will oversee the project.</p> <p>Whilst concrete metrics are not possible until the sites/topics have been finalized (and this is noted as an exception!) potential indicators are presented that will be refined and targets quantified during project start-up.</p> <p>Potential criteria for site selection are presented in the introduction text of Output 5.1</p>
<p>Will 5.2 only develop finance mechanisms and/or what will it fund. The language as written is not clear.</p>	<p>The language has been clarified. 5.2 will promote ecosystem-based income generating activities among targeted communities through sustainable financing established at the national/local levels, not just establishing financing mechanisms.</p>
<p>- Please reflect some provision of scope, scale, envisioned impact of interventions in table B.</p>	<p>Included</p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>- Please also provide an estimated/indicative percentage of the budget under component 5 for investment versus exchange of experiences.</p>	<p>It is anticipated that the up to approximately 20% of the component's budget would be allocated to exchanges/replication activities to assist with upscaling. The rest would be for on-the-ground activities. This will be confirmed during the inception phase</p>
<p>Component 6: - Please align the logframe closer to the text on pages 40/41 of prodoc to assure consistency (e.g. the LF indicates 'two investments per country'. This wording does not seem to align with the intent of the component, please clarify.) Please indicate sex disaggregated data collection across all relevant component indicators in the logframe</p>	<p>Logframe adjusted to ensure the alignment as well as to explicitly present the project's strong emphasis on gender mainstreaming in the logframe.</p>
<p><b>Question 15:</b> Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	
<p>(April 13, 2015). The prodoc deliverables are in line with the SAP and main aim appears on mainstreaming the Lake Chad Water charter in the policies, strategies, and finance in the basin countries as well as finance of awareness and community based actions. While this is appreciated there appears a notable deviation in project scope and deliverables from the PIF that warrants a better presentation and further discussion.</p> <p>10/17/2016): The project document was revised, Please address comments on the new document</p>	<p>The description of the Outputs and activities has been enhanced in the redrafted Project Document and brought in-line with the endorsed PIF with regards to scope and ambition.</p> <p>Comments addressed under Q14</p>
<p><b>Question 16:</b> 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>	
<p>(April 13, 2015). The delivery of socio-economic benefits is not easy to quantify for some of the regional and national policy related and capacity building measures. It is</p>	<p>Socio-economic benefits and gender related benefits are presented throughout the revised Project Document, and summarized in Section B2 of the CEO Endorsement Request. In particular Component 5</p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>most easily done for components with the on-the ground livelihood measures. It will be important that there will be a solid baseline e.g. the 1000 people to benefits from such livelihood measures. As mentioned earlier, the cost benefit assessment of these interventions needs to be presented in more detail in the project documentation.</p> <p>(10/17/2016): comment remains. Please address by addressing comments under question 14.</p>	<p>(community based pilots) provides more details in the Project Document.</p> <p>Component 5 (introduction to the component's selection criteria) now is explicit at undertaking gender-sensitive, cost-benefit assessments to assist with the selection of appropriate demonstration activities</p>
<p><b>Question 17:</b> Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	
<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.</p>	<p>This has been enhanced in the Project Document annex 2 and included in the CEO Endorsement Request (B1)</p>
<p>(April 13, 2015). Please also more clearly address gender dimensions across all relevant components besides component 4 (community activities).</p>	<p>Gender considerations are included across the project and will follow the Water Charter (Chapter 12) and LCBC's in-house policies on gender</p>
<p>(10/17/2016): Comment remains - especially DRM plans and community project (component 3) need some indication of a strategy and inclusion of sex disaggregated information.</p>	<p>Under IUCN's actions in Component 5 a stakeholder participation plan and a gender strategy will be developed to guide the project's execution (under output 5.3)</p>
<p><b>Question 18:</b> 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>	
<p>(April 13, 2015). Suggest to upgrade the risk rating of risk number 1 /Political instability could affect the implementation of actions at country level. Please explain medium (3 out of 5) risk rating.</p>	<p>The risk rating for political instability is 'medium' but the risk rating for terrorist related actions is 'high' in the assessment (presented in Section 2.5 and Annex 1 of the Project Document and Section A6 of the CEO Endorsement Request)</p>
<p><b>Question 19:</b> Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>April 13, 2015). The project relates to activities by GIZ, BGR and AfDB PRODIBAL. While a designated component was included for alignment and finance of studies for finance by AfDB and WB in the PIF there is less obvious of an alignment of this in the prodoc. Please explain cooperation and coordination with AfDB and WB and/or others.</p>	<p>In discussions with GIZ, AfDB, BGR and WB (Frankfurt Feb 216) the UNDP-GEF project will take a lead in supporting LCBC with a Donor Co-ordination committee (see Output 1.4). A mapping exercise initiated by GIZ and further developed by AfDB and UNDP during the PPG phase will be ‘mainstreamed’ into LCBC’s routine operations to ensure a sustainable mechanism for donor co-ordination in future. A draft preliminary map is attached to the Project Document (Annex 3). Component 6 (pre-feasibility studies) has been reinstated into the Project Document in-line with the PIF’s expected outcome and outputs.</p>
<p>(10/17/2016): UNDP, GIZ and AfDB fielded a number of coordination calls during the PPG phase and held a physical meeting to produce a coordination matrix. There is also clear support by the projects to improve LCBCs capacity for donor coordination.</p> <p>- Please ask for a revised cofinancing letter of LCBC. Currently it remains to include the AfDB finance (PRESIBALT) as co-finance for the UNDP project which is not correct and is cofinance to the AfDB GEF project. - Furthermore, the LCBC letter lists the GIZ and BGR support which is also listed in the letter by GIZ. This appears to result in double counting of that support. Please address.</p>	<p>LCBC’s CF letter contains the correct CF (5.884 M\$). The letter also contains reference to the additional parallel funding from AfDB which previously (in error) had been included</p>
<p><b>Question 20:</b> Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	
<p>(April 13, 2015). The project will be executed by LCBC which is strengthening LCBC's capacity for handling substantial finance and for project execution. As such the combination and co-execution between LCBC and UNESCO envisioned at PIF stage appeared to provide solid backstopping to transfer capacity to LCBC.</p>	<p>LCBC will be the UNDP Implementing Partner for this project. UNDP Chad has conducted a capacity assessment of LCBC for its fit to act as a UNDP Implementing Partner (Annex 7 of the prodoc). The overall risk is assessed as Moderate (2<sup>nd</sup> lowest risk category in the 4-scale assessment). UNDP and the project will support the implementation of the recommendations throughout the project</p>



GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>Given that LCBC is now envisioned to be the single executing agency, please attach a UNDP assessment of LCBC fiduciary and RM capacity and experience to handle funds of this amount.</p>	<p>implementation as a capacity building support to the LCBC.</p> <p>All aspects of the Project will be under the supervision of the Project Board with close implementation oversight by UNDP COs and UNDP-GEF RTA.</p> <p>Although UNESCO was considered to be a co-implementing partner at the PIF stage, potential technical support expected from UNESCO on groundwater assessment is currently provided from BGR with its project management unit placed in the LCBC Secretariat; thus, it was considered by LCBC, the countries and UNDP that it is best for the UNDP-GEF project to collaborate closely with the BGR-supported project and BGR experts in the basin with overall coordination done by the LCBC to ensure that the conjunctive management of surface and groundwater is realized through the SAP implementation</p>
<p>(10/17/2016): the project management arrangements are spelled out in Annex 6. It mentions that the UNDP and AfDB project will attend each other's PSC/project board meetings. It is not clear if that pertains solely to the project managers of each project. Please also seriously consider to provide formal space/provision for AfDB to be invited as an observer (!) to the PSC (and vice versa).</p>	<p>The intention has been always there that both project's staff would attend PSCs – this is now explicit</p>
<p><b>Question 21:</b> Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>	
<p>(April 13, 2015). Please see previous comments requesting additional explanation of deviation from PIF outcomes and deliverables.</p>	<p>The Project Document, components, outcomes and outputs are now in-line with the endorsed PIF in structure and ambition.</p>
<p><b>Question 24:</b> Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	
<p>April 13, 2015). Please submit the missing letters of co-finance including all cash and in-kind. As per previous comment</p>	<p>All co-financing letters have been secured from the countries and partners with active projects supporting LCBC currently. All deliverables envisioned at the</p>



GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
<p>especially assure that co-finance letters from GIZ and BGR confirm the deliverables that were at PIF stage envisioned to be delivered by GEF finance.</p>	<p>PIF stage are brought back to the revised prodoc, except for those activities that are identified clearly that other partners are supporting through the donor mapping exercise that took place in Feb 2016. The detailed explanation is given in the Annex B2 below.</p>
<p>Please note that the LCBC letter lists in-kind (staff time, office space etc.) as cash contributions. Please clarify.</p>	<p>The project will be implemented in a fully integrated manner into the LCBC organizational structure with LCBC as the UNDP Implementing Partner for this project, unlike the previous phase which was implemented by UNOPS as an annex to the LCBC structure, so to speak. This arrangement will be only possible and will be only successful with considerable inputs from LCBC, including dedicate time from LCBC staff (both technical and operational) and various operating expenses covered from the LCBC's operational budget. These are all part of LCBC's cash contribution to the project. Regarding the office space that the Project will require, if it is found within the existing office space in the LCBC Secretariat building, it will be considered as in-kind contribution from LCBC to the project. If the space needs to be secured elsewhere in the vicinity of the LCBC Secretariat, all rental and security costs, etc., to be covered by the LCBC will be considered as cash contribution to the project. This will be determined as soon as we know when the project will start. Either way, LCBC has made a commitment to providing office space to the Project Management Unit in N'djamena.</p>
<p>10/17/2016): Please see earlier comments on the LCBC letter of co-finance (see question 19.)</p>	<p>The co-financing letter from LCBC specifies 5,884,250 \$ in total (3,884,250 \$ in-kind and 2,000,000 \$ in cash).</p>
<p><b>Question 25.</b> At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	
<p>10/17/2016): Country cofinance letters are substantial. As it is impossible to see from the letters of co-finance, please provide a simple overview of the projects referred to in these letters (simple table with name of project, implementation time frame - which</p>	<p>Addressed</p>

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
needs to align with the current project for endorsement - and source of finance).	
<b>Question 26:</b> Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	
(April 13, 2015). UNDP is providing substantial in-kind co-finance. Please confirm composition.	The composition of the UNDP co-financing is now clearly provided in the UNDP co-financing letter (Annex 6). In addition to cash contribution of \$250,000, all co-financing (parallel) projects listed in the letter contribute significantly to the objective and priorities of the Lake Chad SAP.
<b>Question 27.</b> Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable	
10/17/2016): TT has been submitted. Please revise/explain indicator in row 8 which currently lists conjunctive management as "not applicable"	Corrected
<b>Question 29</b> ....Other GEF Agencies?	
Please confirm that this draft endorsement package has been shared with AfDB.	Yes

STAP Comment	Response
6. STAP welcomes the fact that the project has a regional partner by virtue of the coordination role of the LCBC but the PIF is silent about how this relationship fits into the broader regional political economy. Accordingly STAP would welcome clarification in the full project brief. What would be the role of the African Union (if any) in the context of managing the complex Lake Chad region also considering other overlapping regional	<p>On water resources management, the Africa Water Vision for 2025, together with 10 goals embraced by the Africa Water Vision, endorsed by AU provided the strong foundation for the Lake Chad Vision 2025 and the Lake Chad SAP development. All these strategic document/visions aim to achieve an equitable and sustainable use and management of water resources for poverty alleviation, socio-economic development, regional cooperation and the environmental sustainability.</p> <p>Institutional architecture of regional cooperation (for regional security or regional economic growth or any other regional</p>

<p>economic frameworks that the counties are part of?</p>	<p>objectives) is characterized as highly polycentric and multilayered. It is more common than not that one country belong to more than one regional organizations. The Lake Chad Basin is no exception. While this polycentric nature and multilayered institutional landscape looks disordered and at times results in stretching limited resources too far and thin, Benedikt Franke (2010) argues that it offers advantages as well and such advantages are emphasized further through the presence of AU as a continental body.</p> <p>The Protocol Regarding the Establishment of the AU's Peace and Security Council (PSC) states that the modalities of the partnership between the layers shall be determined by the comparative advantage of each and the prevailing circumstances (Article 16b). LCBC's comparative advantage is its long history (established in 1964, one of the oldest regional cooperation in Africa and one of the oldest formal commission aiming for transboundary water cooperation in the world.), its mandates and interests in realizing security and development through regional integration (to settle disputes and bring these countries closer on development, security and integration issues) and in realizing the sustainable management of natural resources and freshwater ecosystems in the Lake Chad basin.</p> <p>For economic development of the Lake Chad region and security of the basin population, containing the regional expansion of Boko Haram has been the priority. As Boko Haram respects no national borders and affecting the regional security at large, not just that of Nigeria, the response should be also of regional nature.</p> <p>Member states of the Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC) – Cameroon, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria – as well as by a non-member state, Benin, jointly requested the AU's authorisation of the Multinational Joint Task Force (MNJTF). In Oct 2015, AU and LCBC signed an agreement for the operationalization of the MNJTF to counter the Boko Haram terrorist group. MNJTF is to be mandated to conduct 'operations aimed at preventing the expansion of Boko Haram, as well as other terrorist groups and eliminating their presence'. It also aims at facilitating 'the conduct of joint/simultaneous/coordinated patrols and other types of operations at the borders of the affected countries'. Whether MNJTF was the most effective response to the regional security crisis is subject to debate (Thérout-Bénoni, 2016), LCBC-led MNJTF has been commended by a number of international partners, including US, and successful in gathering regional and international pressure which have triggered a long-awaited national response against Boko Haram by the Govt of Nigeria.</p>
---	--

	<p>As Nigeria and its neighbours prepare to undertake major military operations, it is worth mentioning that any long-term solution to support the region's stability will require an approach that goes beyond security and military responses. Such an approach should also include development and policy responses that will make it more difficult for groups such as Boko Haram to tap into legitimate grievances of people in marginalised regions. LCBC can play a key role here as well by empowering the basin communities and build their capacity to help themselves, improve livelihood, manage natural resources they so much depend on sustainably with optimal benefits shared by all equitably.</p> <p>The upcoming UNDP-GEF project, implemented by LCBC, can and should be put in this larger context of the regional development and security to appreciate its real and potential benefits that go beyond the environmental sustainability. While UNDP has other initiatives contributing to the regional security implemented in the region (a few of them listed in the UNDP co-financing letter) or at the continental level in partnership with AU (e.g. preventing the radicalization of the youth in Africa, etc.), the upcoming project financed by GEF to improve Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through the SAP implementation will also certainly contribute positively to the region's socioeconomic development and improved livelihood of the basin population.</p>
<p>7. Finally the risk table outlines key risks in structured and realistic manner. However it is relatively weak in proposing how the project would mitigate the risks that are noted. Amongst the most significant risk noted is political instability. Coordination amongst stakeholders will not mitigate this risk alone. A strong effort towards building trust for cooperation and resilience in the region needs to be built. This can be linked to broader political and economic activities beyond the mandate of the LCBC (see #6). Similarly the risks related to environmental variability, insecurity and inter-basin transfer are correctly noted but the mitigation strategies should be further developed in the full proposal. In particular the full proposal needs to address broader sustainability factors related to the</p>	<p>Risk table has been updated/revised with regards to political instability.</p> <p>On the proposed LCBC water transfer scheme, the GEF project will <u>not</u> be addressing issues directly related to the evaluation or development of the proposed transfer scheme.</p> <p>Sustainability is addressed throughout the document, specifically related to the pilots and community projects (Component 5) and linked to Component 6 (pre-feasibility studies leading to future investments)</p>

governance framework and the role of tackling poverty and stimulating economic growth.	
--	--

## Comments from Council

### France's Comments

- The project will try to achieve climate resilient, integrated ecosystem-based management of Lake Chad Basin through implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity, and sustain livelihoods.
- Specifically the project will address the following issues:
  - Weak regional and national governance and cooperation frameworks for ecosystem-based management ;
  - Absence of sustainable financing mechanisms to support SAP implementation ;
  - Unsustainable practices for the sustainable use of riparian and lacustrine zones ;
  - Weak governance of groundwater and low incorporation of groundwater and climatic variability and change into the SAP.
- The project is well designed and documented, but, as there are many projects and programs with similar issues concerning Lake Chad sustainable development, the project should request some stronger analysis on existing data and initiatives.
- In particular, the Lake Chad preservation project cofinanced by the FFEM is a continuation of the ongoing Lake Chad Sustainable Development Program (PRODEBALT) in connection with the forward programs of FEM and the African Development Bank. It is intended to be a tool to assist with decision-making for defining a sustainable development policy for Lake Chad and integrates all of the existing data produced in connection with previous research and study programs as well as:
  - The planning model for water management in the Lake Chad Basin as a tool for managing water resources throughout the Basin ; This component is essential for taking into consideration all the compartments (Lake and aquifer, rivers, wetlands) and flows (precipitation, run-off, infiltration, evaporation) of the explanatory water cycle of the Lake's water balance. The Water Charter as a framework component for management of the Basin, for which the formulation of technical schedules leads to supplementary investigations.

*Opinion: favourable, with the above clarification on coordination between projects*

### Project Response to France's Comments:

*The project appreciates France's observations and confirms that other initiatives (e.g. FFEM's contributions to the Water Charter, AfDB's ongoing initiatives) are noted in the revised Project Document and mechanisms have been included to be mainstreamed into LCBC's on-going actions, to co-ordinate and oversee donors (see Project outputs 1.4 and 1.5 relating to support to the LCBC Donor Advisory Committee).*

### Japan's Comments

In implementing this project, please utilize the lessons learnt by the following projects listed below in order to maximize synergy effect.

Japan UNDP Partnership Fund

Global	UNDP/UNITAR/KIWC Training Workshop on Biodiversity in Asia and the Pacific	\$159,923
Niger & Namibia	Community-Based Adaptation in Namibia and Niger	\$400,000
Burkina Faso	CDM Capacity Development project in Burkina Faso	\$300,000

Rwanda	Capacity Reinforcement of Clean Development Mechanism Projects in Rwanda under Kyoto Protocol	\$300,000
Lao PDR & Philippines & Indonesia	Better informed environmental decision making through integrated spatial planning (ISP)	\$100,000
Maldives	Project on developing guideline on life-cycle management of safe shelter facilities of vessels in Maldives	300,000\$
Pacific and Caribbean	South-South Cooperation between Pacific and Caribbean SIDS on Climate Change Adaptation and Africa-Asia Drought Risk Management Peer	\$420,510
Africa-Asia	Disaster Risk Management Assistance Project	\$500,000
Mongol, Tonga, Solomon, Samoa, Parao, Marshall, Kiribati, Fiji	Regional Climate Change Ecosystems and Energy Programme from Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation	\$352,030
Indonesia	Support to Indonesia's Energy Efficiency Testing and Certification Facilities and Expertise	\$491,558

**Project Response to Japan's Comments:**

*Noted with thanks. Information will be collected during the project implementation to benefit Lake Chad region from the experiences of the above projects.*

## ANNEX B.2: JUSTIFICATION FOR CHANGES TO BUDGET AND STRUCTURE

### Changes from the PIF to the submitted CEO Endorsement Request

Minor changes in wording of Outcomes have been introduced to ensure clarity of focus and meaning

Outcome No.	PIF Outcome	Project Document/CEO Outcome	Explanation
1	A strengthened LCBC develop and implement policies, identify priority investments, and improve basin-wide monitoring, towards an integrated ecosystem-based lake basin management approach	A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhance basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin .	Outcome split into 'technical' and 'management' issues for strengthening
2	Legal, policy and financial instruments established at national level and harmonised across countries for greater water availability and effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources and related ecosystems	Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwaters	Improved wording
3	Capacity of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to support the development /updating of policy and identification of priority investments leading to better water and ecosystem management	Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels.	Improved wording
5	LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and 'proof of	LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and <i>upscaling</i>	Clarification that the pilot will test 'proven' concepts and this

Outcome No.	PIF Outcome	Project Document/CEO Outcome	Explanation
	concept' ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods	validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods	project will be promoting further upscaling of the pilot activities.

(no changes to the wording of Outcomes 4 and 6)

#### Component titles

Comp No.	PIF Component title	Project Document /CEO component title	Explanation
1	Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission and its subsidiary bodies	Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission	Minor change – the term 'LCBC' includes operational subsidiary bodies where needed
2	Establishment of effective governance & financial support mechanisms	Establishment of effective, sustainable national governance structures to support the SAP and Water Charter	To emphasise the focus on <u>national</u> and support to <u>SAP</u> and <u>Water Charter</u>
3	Strengthening national capacities to protect, manage and monitor Lake Chad Basin land, water, climate and biodiversity	Capacity of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to support the harmonisation of policies and improved monitoring and management of the Lake Chad basin ecosystem	Minor change to clarify subjects of the capacity building
5	Targeted community-based pilot projects to demonstrate local / national / regional stress reduction benefits in support of SAP implementation	Implementing targeted community-based pilot projects to demonstrate local / national / regional stress reduction benefits in support of SAP implementation	Minor wording change

(No changes to Component 4 & 6 titles)

#### Budget Changes at Component level

Comp No	PIF budget	Project Document /CEO Budget	Explanation
1	700,000	905,000	<b>Increase:</b> to accommodate the specific strengthening of LCBC to provide effective



Comp No	PIF budget	Project Document /CEO Budget	Explanation
			reports to Council and to plan/co-ordinate the inputs of multiple donors.
2	500,000	553,381	<b>Slight increase:</b> 10% increase budget to assist the re-establishment and activation of inter-ministerial committees at the national level in support of the Water Charter and SAP implementation
3	552,381	1,150,000	<b>Significant increase:</b> Emphasis on additional capacity building at <u>national</u> level to complement support provided by GIZ/BGR and AfDB-GEF at the regional level to LCBC.
4	1,500,000	610,000	<b>Significant decrease:</b> Recognising the important investments that GIZ/BGR and AfDB are making to upgrade or refurbish monitoring equipment in the region and enhancements in progress or planned to data systems within LCBC, the UNDP-GEF project will strengthen 'participatory' monitoring by stakeholders and the integration of multiple sources of information/data In addition, an output identified at the PIF stage (4.2) relating to flood/drought warning has been deleted as this is now addressed by AfDB-GEF
5	1,800,000	1,835,000	<b>Slight increase</b> (approx. 1%)
6	500,000	500,000	No change

(no changes to the Project Management Costs or the overall project budget)

#### PIF Outputs removed

- **PIF Output 1.2** Environmental Annexes - since the PIF was approved, the work has been undertaken by FFEM
- **PIF Output 2.3:** This output has been merged with PIF output 2.2 as they are both addressing national inter-ministerial co-ordination. **Output content maintained.**
- **PIF Output 4.2:** This output has been deleted following discussions with the AfDB-GEF project that is addressing flood/drought warning systems. **Output content eliminated**
- **PIF Output 5.3:** This output has been incorporated within CEO Output 4.3 (information sharing and IW:LEARN support) and CEO Output 5.3 (replication strategies for replicating pilot activities) to streamline the UNDP-GEF project. **Output content maintained**

#### PIF Outputs modified

- **PIF Output 1.1:** The focus is to update the 2008 SAP on the basis of a planned updated TDA supported by GIZ
- **PIF Output 1.4:** The output has been reworded to be directed towards Disaster Risk reduction response plans linked to the Lake Chad Climate Resilience Plan delivered by LCBC in 2015

- **PIF Output 1.5:** This output has been split into 2 outputs: (CEO outputs 1.4 and 1.5). CEO output 1.4 focusses on LCBC's pivotal role on co-ordination and monitoring of actions planned and taken by multiple donors and providing effective reports to Council.
- **PIF Output 4.1:** The revised output is supporting the actions undertaken by LCBC/GIZ/BGR and AfDB in renewing monitoring equipment in the Basin. The UNDP-GEF actions are directed more towards national support for participatory monitoring to complement actions of other donors and assist with developing an integrated and sustainable system.
- **PIF Output 4.2:** The focus is now directed towards assisting with data management and information system building on the extensive work undertaken by GIZ/BGR and planned by AfDB to provide information to assist with flood and drought early warning.

#### **Outputs added**

- **New CEO output 1.5:** Building on the work of other partners (e.g. GIZ), this output (split-out from PIF output 1.5) focusses on strengthening LCBC's capacity to develop and manage new projects

#### **Changes to CEO Endorsement Request**

- Changes highlighted
- Co-financing changes in Table B and C:
  - LCBC's co-financing letter identified 5,884,250 USD as co-financing plus 22,700,000 USD that could serve as parallel co-financing. This was included by error (giving a total 28.7 MUSD).

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>5</sup>**

**A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:**

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>\$300,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Draft project document development through baseline assessment and the detailed design of interventions	70,000	64,000	6,000
Stakeholder consultations (including countries, civil society representatives, and international partners)	90,000	78,000	10,000
Travel	100,000	82,000	18,000
Translation	25,000	18,000	7,000
LCBC Capacity Assessment	10,000	12,000	-
Printing	5,000	-	5,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>300,000</b>	<b>254,000</b>	<b>48,000</b>

<sup>5</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A



Empowered lives.  
Resilient nations.

## United Nations Development Programme

Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria

### PROJECT DOCUMENT

**Project Title:** Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Lake Chad basin

#### UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 Outputs& Indicator:

**Output 2.5:** Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation.

**Output Indicator 2.5.2:** Number of countries implementing national and local plans for integrated Water Resource Management.

#### UNDAF Effect -Chad:

Axis 2: Rural development and food security

Outcome 2.3: The sustainable management of natural resources/environment and the establishment of mechanisms for change climate adaptation/mitigation are supported

**Implementing Partner:** Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC)

**Responsible Party:** International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Programme Period:	2015-2019	Total resources required:	<b>\$ 242,112,304</b>
Atlas Award ID:	00093875	Total resources allocated:	<b>\$ 242,112,304</b>
Project ID:	00086651	Regular:	\$ 250,000
PIMS:	4797	Other:	
Start Date:	Jan 2017	• GEF/LDCF	\$ 5,830,000
End Date:	Dec 2021 (60 months after prodoc signature)	• Others	
Management Arrangements:	IGO Implementation (by LCBC)	o LCBC	<b>\$ 5,884,250.00</b>
		o UNDP (parallel)	\$ 1,933,290.00
PAC Meeting Date	1 June 2016	o Governments	<b>\$ 216,238,733.00</b>
		o GIZ	\$ 9,476,031.00
		o IUCN	\$ 2,500,000.00

#### SUMMARY DESCRIPTION:

Lake Chad is home to a growing population that has urgent needs to address the impacts of climate change on the water resources and the ecosystem of the basin. It provides for millions of people living in Cameroon, the CAR, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria a diverse range of environmental services, mainly provisioning (food and water), supporting (land and nutrient cycling), regulatory (ground water replenishment, carbon sequestration, air purification), and cultural (recreation, spirituality, education) services.

Environmental resources are critical to the survival of the Lake Chad population, both for subsistence and for economic mainstay. The escalating degradation of water resources and ecosystems is exacerbated by the current security challenge and the subsequent migration of livestock and people in search of a better life. In 2008 a previous UNDP/GEF project assisted the countries and LCBC in preparing a regional transboundary diagnostic analysis leading to a regionally endorsed Strategic Action Programme (SAP).

This UNDP-GEF project has a focus to initiate the implementation of the SAP with the overall **objective to achieve climate resilient, integrated ecosystem-based management of Lake Chad Basin through implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity, and sustain livelihoods**. Meeting this objective will address concerns linked to the management capacity of the LCBC and its member countries to develop and implement sustainable management policies and to address unsustainable land/water practices responding to the SAP and the regionally agreed Water Charter. The project will progress towards this objective through the achievement of six **outcomes**:

1. A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance **with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin**
2. Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwater
3. Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels
4. LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management
5. LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and **upscaling** validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods
6. Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation

Agreed by LCBC (Implementing Partner):

---

Name (print) and Title

Signature

Date/Month/Year

Agreed by UNDP:

---

Name (print) and Title

Signature

Date/Month/Year

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>ACRONYMS</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>1 SITUATION ANALYSIS</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1 Environmental context	6
1.2 Socio-economic context	7
1.3 Problems to be addressed	9
1.4 Threats and root causes	10
1.5 Long-term solution and barriers to achieving the solution	11
1.6 Stakeholder analysis	12
1.7 Baseline Analysis	13
<b>2 STRATEGY</b>	<b>17</b>
2.1 Project rationale and policy conformity	17
2.2 Country ownership: Country eligibility and country drivenness	18
2.3 Design principles and strategic considerations	20
2.4 Project Outputs and activities	23
2.5 Project indicators, risks and assumptions	46
2.6 Cost-effectiveness	47
2.7 Sustainability and replication	48
2.8 Compliance with UNDP Safeguards Policies	49
<b>3 PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>4 PROJECT BUDGET</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>5 PROJECT WORKPLAN</b>	<b>65</b>
<b>6 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>7 MONITORING FRAMEWORK AND EVALUATION</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>8 LEGAL CONTEXT</b>	<b>73</b>



## ACRONYMS

AfDB	African Development Bank
BGR	German Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources
BMZ	German Federal Ministry for Economic Co-operation and Development (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung)
BRIDGE	Building River Dialogue and Governance (an IUCN Project) <a href="http://iucn.org/about/work/programmes/water/wp_our_work/wp_our_work_bridge/">http://iucn.org/about/work/programmes/water/wp_our_work/wp_our_work_bridge/</a>
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CoP	Conference of the Parties
DRR	Disaster Risks Reduction
EU	European Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
IRAD	Institute for Agricultural Research for Development
IRD	French Research Institute
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IW	GEF International Waters focal area
IW:LEARN	GEF International Waters Learning Exchange And Resource Network
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
LCB	Lake Chad Basin
LCBC	Lake Chad Basin Commission
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
NAP	National Action Programme
NAPA	National Adaption Programme of Action
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NTFP	Non-Timber Forest Products
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PRESIBALT	Programme to rehabilitate and strengthen the resilience of lake chad basin systems (AfDB)
PRODEBALT	Lake Chad Sustainable Development Support Program (AfDB Project)
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
SAP	Strategic Action Programme
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
TDA	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNESCO	United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
USD	United States Dollar

## 1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

### 1.1 Environmental context

Lake Chad is the fourth largest African lake (in terms of area) after Lakes Victoria, Tanganyika and Nyasa. Located in the eastern Sahel region on the southern edge of the Sahara Desert, Lake Chad and its basin is a vast resource of freshwater shared by Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Niger, Nigeria, and Libya. It is a shallow lake with an average depth of only 1.5 m, and consequently the volume of water is relatively low. The lake area has been undergoing considerable change, varying between 25,000 and 2,500 km<sup>2</sup>. The lake is also subject to considerable evaporation, but, surprisingly, is not very saline. The Lake is mainly supplied by the Chari (about 85% of total inputs), rain (between 7 and 14%) and other tributaries, including El Beid and Komadugu Yobe (2 and 1.5%, respectively). The water balance of the Lake Chad in its Medium and Small state is given in Table 1 below.

For thousands of years, Lake Chad has been a centre for development, trade and cultural exchanges between established populations in the north and south of the Sahara. More than 22 million people depend for their livelihoods from the lake and the associated basin, with an area of 966,955 km<sup>2</sup>. The entire basin includes an estimated 47 million people that depends on the lake and its associated resources.

Lake Chad basin consists of two basins, the north and the south basins, that are separated by a shallow mid-section, the “Great Barrier”. The Chari River is the primary inflow of the southern basin. The rest of the Lake’s water comes from direct rainfall and small tributaries, including the Komadugu Yobe in the northwest and the El Beïd River to the south. During the wet periods, the Lake’s water level is high enough for the Great Barrier to be submerged. During the dry periods, the Lake’s water level is low and the Great Barrier emerges, separating the two basins, whose levels vary independently. When the northern basin is no longer fed by water overflow from the southern basin, it can completely dry out. The Lake’s landscape transforms from almost an inland sea to a huge area of marshland. The most distinctive feature of Lake Chad is its variability. The Lake has experienced a long history of wet and dry periods covering several timescales, ranging from the geological to the annual and seasonal.

The Lake Chad Basin (LCB) hosts significant biological diversity with 120 species of fish and 372 bird species, and some antelope species such as the Sitatunga. The protected areas Dougia, Zakouma and Mandelia, the Grand Yaeres and the Waza National Park are home to several important wild animal species. It is also an important grazing area for livestock. The international strategic Hadejia Nguru Wetlands, home to Nigeria’s premier Ramsar site, is in this sub basin. The Kouri breed of cattle, which is unique to the Lake Chad Basin, is also found here. The Sambisa Game Reserve (important for elephant conservation), the Chingurimi Duguma and the Lake Chad Game Sanctuary Sectors of the Chad Basin National Park are situated in the *Borno Drainages* sub basin.

The lower Chari is the most important collecting area for waters that feed the lake, having the largest permanent river. This basin spans the Sahelo-Sudanien zone and the Sudano-Sahelian zone-. The flood plains occupy about 25,000 km<sup>2</sup>, with the most significant plain being the Grand Yaeres, (8,000 km<sup>2</sup>).

The Chari-Logone basin constitutes critical source of water to the Lake Chad basin. Its vast inundated plains notably the large Yaere covering about 800,000ha is international recognised for its ecological and economic importance especially livelihood activities of surrounding local communities. The presence of protected areas such as Zakouma in Chad, Waza and Kalamaloue (Cameroon), several important rivers such as the Chari and Logone, and numerous streams with fertile soils within inundated plains have led to high pressure on natural resources in the region by local communities and other key stakeholders. Since 2014, wildlife and other natural resources in this region are illegally exploited by refugees from neighbouring Nigeria and other displaced communities as result of current insurgencies perpetuated by the Islamic sect Boko Haram. Current illegal exploitation activities are rather unsustainable and must be controlled to avoid possible ecological disaster in the region.

The Komadugu Yobe river system drains 148,000 km<sup>2</sup>, and is a classic example of a tapering stream, losing a large part of its total annual flow by infiltration and evapotranspiration. With the largest number of dams and population of all the sub basins, poor management of the river system and dam operations have altered its overall water regime.

The *Northern Diagnostic Basin*, known for its Oasis, is the largest diagnostic basin (807,360 km<sup>2</sup>). It supplies no inflow for the lake. Major resource use concerns here include the mobilisation of dunes by livestock and the over harvesting of increasingly scarce trees. It is also home to the largest, failed irrigation scheme as lake levels have dropped.

The *Lake Fitri* is a rich source of pastures in a zone of water scarcity. There is an intensive competition for the resources of this sub-basin amongst the populations, resulting in increased risk of conflict over resource. The Sambisa Game Reserve (important for elephant conservation), the Chingurimi Duguma and the Lake Chad Game Sanctuary Sectors of the Chad Basin National Park are situated in the *Borno Drainages* sub basin.




Figure 1: Drainage map of the Lake Chad Basin

## 1.2 Socio-economic context

Lake Chad is home to a cosmopolitan population that has developed solutions for adapting to the variability of the environment that are based on a range of sectoral livelihood generating activities (fishing, agriculture, and livestock farming). It provides for its 47 million people living in the basin environmental services including, provisioning (food and water), supporting (land and nutrient cycling), regulatory (ground water replenishment, carbon sequestration, air purification), and cultural (recreation, spirituality, education) services. Provisioning and supporting services are provided through economic diversification (including, cultivation of hydrophilic sorghums and millet, seasonal hunting and fishing, intensive livestock rearing).

The Lake contributes significantly to the food security of the region that extends over a radius of approximately 300 km from the lake. The average fisheries is about 50,000 tonnes annually which significantly contributes to the GDP of the countries. However, there are concerns that these fisheries, an important source of protein and revenue for the local population, is under threat. The land area immediately around the lake serves as an important grazing area for livestock. The flood plains support large numbers of seasonally grazed livestock, as well as major fisheries and fish spawning habitat. The lake fishery, an important source of protein for local populations, is under threat.

The countries of the Lake Chad Basin are among the poorest in the world. According to the UNDP Human Development Index 2015<sup>1</sup> the countries are ranked: Niger (188); Central African Republic (187), Chad (185); Cameroon (153) and Nigeria (152). Civil war, HIV/AIDS, malaria, climate change and associated natural disasters (drought, floods, and inundations) have hindered efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), especially the MDG1 and MDG7 respectively on eradicating poverty and hunger, and on environmental sustainability. Similar challenges will exist to meet the expectations of the current Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). The HIV AIDS pandemic has directly impaired economic growth because it mainly affects the economically active population.

As a result of its shallow waters the Lake Chad is always very downsized depending on the seasons, but its water surface has shrunk over the past four decades from 25,000 km<sup>2</sup> to only 2,500 km<sup>2</sup> (more than 90 percent) heavily impacting the economic activities and food security in the Lake Basin, threatening the life of more than 47 million inhabitants who live in its Basin and who draw the essence of their livelihood through activities including fishing, agriculture and animal husbandry. As at 2013, the Lake Chad is showing signs of recovery due to above average seasonal precipitation in 2010 and 2012 with an open water area of 4,698 km<sup>2</sup> and an intra-annual swamp of up to 8,000 km<sup>2</sup>. The input of the River Chari into the Lake determines its surface area. Rain falling on the Chari catchment is thus the primary factor of the lake size. It was found that, when the rainfall in the basin varies by 10%, the Chari's discharge varies by approximately 30%. As a result, Lake Chad is an amplifier of rainfall variations, hence its fragility.

**Table1: Components of the Water Balance in Medium Chad and Small Chad Stage, (km<sup>3</sup>/year)**

<b>Inputs km3/year</b>	<b>Medium Chad 1954-1969</b>	<b>Small Chad 1988-2010</b>
<b>Chari</b>	42,0	21,1
<b>El Beïd</b>	1,5	0,3
<b>Komadougou Yobé</b>	0,7	0,5
<b>Direct Rainfall</b>	7,4	1,9
<b>Losses km3/year</b>		
<b>Evaporation</b>	48,8	22,6
<b>Net infiltration</b>	2,3	1,0
<b>Overflow</b>	0,2	0

Sources: Vuillaume, 1981; Bader *et al.*, 2011.

<sup>1</sup> <http://hdr.undp.org/en/2015-report/download>

The shrinkage of the Lake is thought to be driven by both global and local causes. However, recent evidence has downplayed the role of local water abstraction for the shrinkage of the Lake. There are currently no net water abstractions from the lake for irrigation, as the great Nigerian irrigated schemes have not been functional since 1987. In the whole basin, surface water abstractions for various uses have been estimated at less than 3 km<sup>3</sup> /year (Water Charter, 2012). The effects on the Lake of the Nigerian dams in the Yobe River basin are probably limited across the entire lake but could be significant in the estuary of the river and the north basin of the lake. Climate change seems to have accelerated the lake shrinkage over the past years; a situation that is still possible to worsen with significant impact on the local economy, the Lake and its tributaries (Chari and Logone). The Lake's wildlife and populations incessantly migrate in search of areas with water around the Lake and their survival is seriously affected. The vulnerable populations are forced onto rural exodus and compelled to migrate across the borders to live as climatic refugees.

### 1.3 Problems to be addressed

At the UNFCCC CoP 21 in Paris (December 2015), the high-profile problem of the significant loss of volume (90%) and surface area (90%) of Lake Chad over the last 45 years has been highlighted. The basin has suffered multiple years of declining rainfall. In addition to the climate change threats, the Lake Chad Basin Strategic Action Programme (SAP) (based on a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis - TDA) developed and endorsed by the riparian countries in 2008, identified the following interlinked transboundary issues that need to be addressed within the Lake Chad Basin:

- **Variability of the hydrological regime and fresh water availability:** the drastic decrease in fresh water availability in the LCB is a major concern. This is a result of variability in the hydrological regimes of the rivers and rainfall regimes in the region. Some of the root causes contributing to the overall degradation of the lake and its ecosystems include the absence of sustainable development in the political programs of the Member States to handle the population pressure, and the insufficient awareness of stakeholders. The ecosystems degradation has led to continuing decline in local access to water, crop failures, livestock deaths, collapsed fisheries and wetlands services, etc. As identified in the SAP, the socioeconomic consequences of these impacts include food insecurity and declining health status of the populace. Variability of the hydrological regime and fresh water availability is considered to be the most significant problem, not only due to the above impacts, but also because it drives or contributes to the other six transboundary problems.
- **Water pollution:** it is one of the immediate causes of biodiversity loss in the wetlands. The use of agrochemicals for commercial cotton and rice production, and the increasing oil exploitation in Chad with a lack of working regulations and environmental standards will increase inorganic chemical pollution and eutrophication of the Lake in the near future. Moreover, the increasing urbanization resulting from the oil exploitation in Chad risks giving rise to domestic waste and increases pollution from oil spills. If these trends are maintained, the likelihood for drastic fisheries depletion and wider ecological damage is high.
- **Decreased viability of biological resources:** the stress created by the overexploitation of the natural resources of Lake Chad are undermining the ability of the plant and animal populations to maintain their normal regenerative rate. There is an absence of appropriate and harmonized policies and plans between the Member States to regulate basin activities coupled by the insufficient awareness of the local population in the Member States on environmental issues. It also contributes to biodiversity loss and increasing variability of hydrological regime and fresh water availability.
- **Loss of biodiversity:** concerns the loss of plant and animal species, as well as damages to ecosystem health. It is rooted in population growth, absence of sustainable development in

political programs, and low environmental awareness. This reduces ecosystem productivity and thus resources availability, resulting in deepening poverty. It also contributes to the decreasing viability of biological resources.

- **Loss and modification of ecosystems:** The TDA has identified extensive habitat and community modification that has been experienced in the lake and the river environment. The lake, for example, has changed from open water to a marshy environment, and about 50% of wetlands have been destroyed. This has been due predominantly to reduced flows resulting from the lack of sustainable development in the Member States, as well as a low level of environmental awareness. The impact of the loss/modification of ecosystems has most impact on the decline of some fisheries and rice cultivation, as well as on biodiversity loss and the decreased viability of biological resources.
- **Sedimentation in rivers and water bodies:** this has led to changes in channel flow patterns, a reduction in the inflows to the lake through channel diversion, and the colonisation of the silted sites by invasive species. It is driven mainly by unsustainable farming practices on marginal lands and is rooted in low environmental awareness, population pressure, and absence of sustainable development on the political agenda of the Member States.
- **Invasive species:** The Lake is being invaded by typha grass and water hyacinth. Typha is also a major problem in the Komadugu Yobe Basin, and quelea birds are the major pest prevalent all over the basin. Invasive species, to a large extent, are a function of poor water resources management, poor enforcement of environmental regulations and standards, etc. The typha grass blocks river channels and diverts flows, while the quelea destroys crops, both contributing to poverty through the loss of livelihoods.

Recognising that the development of the TDA was over a decade ago and there have been significant additions to the knowledge-base in the region, including on climate variability and change, and groundwater resources, the TDA is currently being updated (by GIZ) and this UNDP-GEF project will update the SAP. It is not expected that there will be significant changes to the above identified transboundary problems however the new and emerging regional issues (e.g. climate impacts and conjunctive use aspects of groundwater) will be incorporated to enhance the overall planning and decision making.

#### 1.4 Threats and root causes

The TDA and the SAP identified key root causes responsible for the transboundary problems that require attention. They are briefly discussed below:

- **Absence of sustainable development and wise use of natural resources on political agenda:** in all the Member States, there is clear evidence that the governments make minimal investments in the biological resources management and environmental protection sector. The region's economy is dependent on the exploitation of natural resources, whether through agricultural production or direct harvesting of resources. The lack of political interest is assumed to be driven mainly by a low level of environmental awareness and education and there are currently no pressures on the governments for investments that can underpin sustainable development.
- **Population Pressure:** this phenomenon would not necessarily be a serious problem in isolation. However, given the generally low levels of technical knowledge for sustainable natural resources exploitation that characterizes the region, coupled with the pressures of short term survival concerns (low standards of living), as well as the laissez-faire attitudes of governments towards natural resources exploitation, there is a correlation between growing populations and more natural resources exploitation. Within the Yaere plains for example the local populations have developed more sophisticated and unsustainable fishing practices with construction of water channels to facilitate water drainage and fish harvesting. The current

practices pose serious biological threats to fish populations in terms of regeneration but also impact hydrological regime of the area with long term consequences on water availability, soil fertility, agricultural productivity and livestock management.

- **Legal and regulatory challenges:** the signing of the Lake Chad Basin Convention in 1964 was an indication of the willingness of the countries in the region to address issues related to the sustainable management of the lake and its catchment area. Individually the Member States have also acceded to many other international agreements and conventions that pertain to joint international action for addressing resource-use issues. However, the LCBC has not been sufficiently backed by the relevant national legislations required for effective implementation of regional and global agreements. The regulations are poorly enforced, often with a lack of clarity on responsibilities among different administrative agencies. There is a multiplicity of agencies at all tiers of government pursuing different uncoordinated water agendas.
- **Institutional challenges:** The planning system has so far demonstrated the ability for joint fact finding, consultation and planning at the regional (e.g. LCBC), national and local levels but has yet to develop measures to integrate implementation and management of networks and partnerships with actors. The major challenge is the lack of capacity to coordinate implementation with network and partners.

The LCBC, in association with partners including BMZ (through GIZ and BGR), the EU, etc., has been reforming their internal structures and operations and ensuring that all departments and staff have detailed specifications and terms of references. In addition, support has been provided to assist with the process of planning, financial, administrative and technical management, and implementation and monitoring of programmes/projects etc.

**Economic and financial challenges:** the member states of the Lake Chad Basin Commission are among the poorest in the world. Civil war, HIV/AIDS, malaria, climate change and associated natural disasters (drought, floods, and inundations) are hindering all efforts to achieve the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), especially the MDG1 and MDG7 on eradicating poverty and hunger, and environmental sustainability, respectively. The financial resources of the LCBC are from the annual payment of statutory contributions by member countries. Unfortunately, these payments are not made regularly, impacting the effective functioning of the organization.

### 1.5 Long-term solution and barriers to achieving the solution

The relationship between environmental (natural) resources, livelihood and conflicts has long been established in literature. Environmental resources are critical to the survival of the Lake Chad population, both for subsistence and for economic growth. The basin's population live mostly in rural areas and are strongly dependent on their natural resources. Desertification and the effects of climate change exacerbate the overexploitation of these natural resources.

The escalating degradation of water resources and ecosystems is further exacerbated by the current security challenge and the subsequent migration of livestock and people in search of more secure lives and livelihoods.

In the long term, it is crucial to secure the environmental conditions for prosperity, stability and equity, through long-term and co-ordinated management responses to the scale of the environmental challenges. In its vision 2015, the LCBC has expressed the responsibility of the LCB Member States on the *"common heritage-and other wetlands maintained at sustainable levels to ensure the economic security of the freshwater ecosystem resources, sustainable biodiversity and aquatic resources of the basin, the use of which should be equitable to serve the needs of the population of the basin, thereby reducing the poverty level"*). Achieving this vision is still facing many difficulties in the Lake Chad Basin. There is a crucial need to *harmonise* policies, legislation, enforcements, incentives etc. between Member States and on a regional basis to address environmental, socio-economic and mitigate



disaster risks. A further challenge remains the absence of suitable mechanisms and instruments for mobilising internal and external financial resources, aimed at progressively achieving self-sufficiency for the sustainable management of resources in the Lake Chad Basin. Lastly, failing to integrate the risks of climate change and to build the resilience of the population will undermine all efforts to sustain the water resources, ecosystems and socio-economic development of the Lake Chad Basin and its inhabitants.

This UNDP-GEF project *“Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the SAP”* will address concerns linked to the management capacity of the LCBC and member countries to develop and implement sustainable management policies to rectify unsustainable land/water practices and respond to climate change threats in accordance with the agreed SAP (and any updates).

## 1.6 Stakeholder analysis

The **central governments of the Member States** of the Lake Chad Basin are the primary stakeholders who fully participate and derive benefits in participation in the activities of the LCBC. They are motivated by the need to protect and preserve the Lake Chad as a common heritage that supports the livelihood for a large proportion of the basin’s population. The central governments play an important role in defining policies, guide principles and providing funding.

The **local governments in the Member States** play an important role in the Regions, Municipalities and Provinces, where responsibilities have been transferred to sub-national entities which now play key roles in the conservation and protection of Lake Chad Basin. In some instances, provincial Governors in some Member States have more power than do the central governments. Likewise, some Municipalities are becoming more powerful and getting more involved in decision making over the management of the LCB. In some countries such as Cameroon, the youth and women are being more and more involved in decision-making instances in the Municipalities.

**Parliamentarians** are increasingly concerned about the subsistence needs of their constituencies and can exert control over central governments’ actions. Specifically, for the LCB management there is a commission of parliamentarians who have their say in the matter when it comes to make decisions over the conservation and protection of the LCB.

**Riparian communities** are among the greatest potential beneficiaries from improved environmental management activities within the Lake Chad Basin. These are mainly cattle breeders, farmers, fishermen, associations of wholesale fish merchants, women associations involved in market gardening and craft, traditional hunters and loggers, users of non-wood forest products, and more recently sand miners derive directly their subsistence and incomes from the LCB. The number of beneficiaries has drastically increased over the last decade, and particularly during the last years with the food crisis, the natural disasters and the security challenges resulting from terrorist attacks and civil war. For example, approximately 70,000 refugees from Nigeria have increased the number of the existing 80, 000 victims of food crisis with their livestock in the Niger portion of the LCB (OCHA, 2014), and the trend is still continuing.

Other stakeholders include national environmental NGOs, development and environmental programs and projects, universities, religious organisations, customary authorities, and other civil society organizations that play an important role in raising the awareness of the local communities on the importance of the conservation and protection of the LCB to their sustainable livelihoods.

Several **international organizations**, including IUCN, UNDP, UNEP, and UNESCO, have contributed to improved knowledge on the resources of the LCB, strengthening the institutional capacity of the LCBC as well as to support regional cooperation and governance.

**Specialized agencies of Inter-governmental institutions** such as AGRHYMET (a drought monitoring and capacity development centre, a specialised institute of the Permanent Interstates Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel - CILSS – created in 1974) have contributed to agro-meteorological and



hydrological monitoring at the regional level. Other scientific and academic communities, such as IRAD and IRD have participated in both regional and national processes to improving promote knowledge and experience sharing in the LCB. Other universities are becoming active in contributing to address the adverse effects of climate change on the Lake Chad Basin and in contributing to the emergence of new young engineers capable of addressing the main challenges faced in the LCB.

Following the institutional reforms undertaken currently by the LCBC, some **bi- and multi-lateral organizations** are supporting the sustainable management of the LCB. These include the European Union, which is supporting a program to assist the people encountering insecurity and to strengthen the culture of peace among local communities in the LCB. AfDB is supporting the regional project PRODEBAL, as well as the AfDB-GEF project currently in the process of development. Other support is the German cooperation agency (BMZ), through GIZ and BGR projects are enhancing the institutional capacity of the LCBC as well as measures to address climate change, groundwater and the TDA update.

A stakeholder's involvement plan for project execution is presented in Annex 2.

## 1.7 Baseline Analysis

### Regional Agreements

Riparian countries of the Lake Chad Basin established the **Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC)** in May 1964 when Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria signed the Convention of Fort Lamy (now N'Djamena). The role of the LCBC has been to ensure the most efficient use of the basin's waters, to co-ordinate regional (as opposed to national) development, and to assist in the settlement of disputes that might arise between and among the basin states. The original four signatory countries have now been joined by the Central African Republic 1994 and Libya 2008. In the period 1990 – 2012, the LCBC with the support of external donors has been undergoing a process of reformation to make sure that Member States national policies are re-aligned to regional policy. This process started by working with the riparian countries to define a common vision (Lake Chad Vision 2025), developing a regional strategy (Lake Chad Basin Strategic Action Programme) and adopting common water management principles (Lake Chad Basin Water Charter).

The LCBC **Strategic Action Programme (SAP)** is a regional policy framework document with the appropriate support from international partners. The programme is designed for the Member States to opt into it and its content is complemented by the National Action plans (NAPs). Such voluntary adoption of the programme is a guarantee of consistent, joint action to safeguard the environment in the Lake Chad Basin and of progress in the sustainable, equitable use of the basin's resources. The LCBC SAP adopted by the Summit of the Head of States of the LCBC in 2008, commits the countries to a programme for strengthened regional environmental cooperation among the Member States. In pursuance of the SAP implementation, an LCBC Five-Year Investment Plan 2013 -2018 based on agreed priority investment was launched in Bologna, Italy in 2014.

The **Lake Chad Water Charter**, a vehicle for sub-regional integration and security, was formally approved or adopted at the 14th Summit of the LCBC Heads of State and Government held on the 30th April 2012 in N'Djamena, Chad. Four out of the six Presidents (Niger, Nigeria, Chad and CAR) of the LCBC states personally assented to the document, while the two others (Cameroon and Libya<sup>2</sup>) endorsed through their authorized representatives. The Water Charter was the first legal instrument after the 1964 Fort Lamy Convention to be collectively assented by the highest political authorities as a binding document to cover the entire Lake Chad Basin.

The Lake Chad Water Charter is a document setting out the rights, obligations, duties, restrictions, processes and procedures pertaining to proper management of the Lake Chad resources. Once again, another preamble of the charter gives further insight as to its nature and goal by stating that the

---

<sup>2</sup> Libya is not part of the current UNDP-GEF project

document is determined to promote sustainable development in the Basin through integrated, equitable coordinated management of natural resources, and water resources. Under Articles 3, the general objective of the charter maintained the same focus and elaborated that the framework *“advocates good governance, sub-regional cooperation and solidarity based on the common interest of the Member States...”*.

Article 4 sets out the specific objectives the charter aims to provide. These are covered under various items and spheres such as quality and quantity management for surface water and wetlands; groundwater management; ecosystem and biodiversity; processes of approving new projects; facilities of common interest; national and regional responsibilities; data sharing and exchange; conflict prevention and resolutions; and socio-economic development of riparian populace.

At the 14<sup>th</sup> Summit of the LCBC’s Heads of State and Government held on 30<sup>th</sup> April 2012 in N’Djamena, a **5-year Investment Plan** (2013-2017) for the Lake Chad Basin was adopted. This plan aims at improving and preserving the entire ecosystem of the Lake Chad Basin through: (i) the execution of the Inter-basin Water Transfer Project from Ubangi River to Lake Chad<sup>3</sup>; (ii) the sustainable use of natural resources; (iii) the preservation of the Lake Chad basin ecosystems; (iv) building up stakeholders participation and capacity; (v) the implementation of the Lake Chad Basin Water Charter; (vi) the implementation of the National Action Plan for the integrated water resources management (IWRM) in the member countries ; and (vii) the restoration of sustainable peace and security in the region<sup>4</sup>. (Of relevance to this UNDP-GEF project are the environmental aspects of the plan, points ii to vi)

In 2015 a Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Plan was developed by LCBC with support from the World Bank and presented to the UNFCCC CoP 21 in Paris. This builds on the NAPs developed by the countries identifying priority investments needed to address and strengthen responses to climate change in the Lake Chad Basin.

The annual budget of the LCBC consisting of recurrent and development expenditures depends almost entirely on Member State. Since the adoption of the SAP, increasingly, a large part of the development budget is contributed by donor partners. On average, between 2005 to 2009 the actual annual expenditure of the LCBC changes little from CFAF 700 million in 2005 to CFAF 840 million in 2009. Each individual Member State contribution is based on a formula adopted in 2009 that assigns 40% to Nigeria, Cameroon 20%, Libya 18%, Chad 11%, Niger 7% and RCA 4%. National, sectoral and environmental plans exist in each country. National institutions are officially in charge of co-ordinating the implementation of LCBC regional actions.

At national level, the following are the relevant institutions involved in policies and strategies concerning the environment and water sectors;

- **Cameroon:** Cameroon's institutional framework for managing the environment rests with the Inter-Ministerial Committee on the Environment (ICE) which comprises 17 representatives from ministries concerned with environmental management and is chaired by the Minister in charge of Environment. In the water sector, the National Water Committee is to prevent and regulate the inevitably conflicting demands for water resources, in terms of domestic use, irrigation, environmental protection and hydroelectricity, as well as other problems such as pollution or changes in water flow.
- **Central African Republic:** High Commission for the Environment, presided by the Prime Minister, and including the various technical Ministries, NGOs, and Civil Society.

---

<sup>3</sup> Not supported by the UNDP-GEF project.

<sup>4</sup> Not directly supported by the UNDP-GEF project

- **Chad:** The National High Committee on the Environment, which includes the Prime Minister and various ministers. (HCNE - 1995). The HCNE ensures environmental sustainability for all development challenges, including those relating to the water sector.
- **Niger:** The National Council for the Environment and Sustainable Development (CNEDD - 1997), which includes the Cabinet Director, ministers, civil society, university and NGOs), coordinates the environment sector activities. In the water sector, the National Water and Sanitation Commission (CNEA) is a consultative and cooperative body to be consulted on: (1) the strategy for improving knowledge of water resources; (2) water resources development and management schemes; (3) the arbitration of disputes regarding internal and shared water resources management; (4) guidelines and measures proposed by public authorities within the fields of health, environmental protection and forestry; (5) any activity that might impact on water and sanitation.
- **Nigeria:** The Federal Environmental Protection Agency (co-ordination of ministers) backed by the National Advisory Council (governmental organisations, private sector, NGOs, community organisations, university) and by the National Council on the Environment (States). In the water sector, the National Council on Water Resources made up of the Federal Minister and State Commissioners of Water Resources coordinates water policies at the Federal level but in the Lake Chad basin, the Hadejia Jama'are Komagugu Yobe Basin Coordinating Committee (HJKYBCC) is listed to "generally consider and determine major policy issues of common interest to the Basin states concerning effective planning and management for the equitable, efficient and sustainable use of the water, land and other environmental resources of the Hadejia-Jama'are - Komadugu-Yobe Basin".

## Regional Projects

The proposed GEF funded project builds on a set of baseline projects (including the previous UNDP-GEF project that led to the development of the SAP), which aim to support the countries and the LCBC to achieve The Lake Chad Basin vision 2025.

- **German Cooperation BMZ (GIZ): Sustainable Water Resources Management in the Lake Chad Basin (GIZ) - Module: "Organizational advisory services for the Lake Chad Basin Commission"** The objectives of the project are to support LCBC in its organisational development and to strengthen the planning, cooperation, and communication capacities for a better performance of its tasks and to achieve sustainable results. Two overarching areas of responsibility have been defined (i) Increasing the performance and effectiveness of the organisation and its contact partners in the member states; and (ii) Expanding and adapting the existing information system to the requirements contained in a two-year report (ecological condition of Lake Chad). A 'State of the Basin' report has also been prepared that will serve as a basis for updating the TDA and informing the SAP. A second phase of the project has just been initiated and will focus on: information exchanges between countries, strategic planning of LCBC, organisational development and internal and external communication. This work will also include an update of the 2008 TDA.
- **German Cooperation BMZ (BGR): "Advice on groundwater resources for the Lake Chad Basin Commission"**. The total duration of the program is from July 2011 to June 2017. The budget for this program is 4 million Euros. The project intends to strengthen the LCBC so that it is able to coordinate the exchange of groundwater data between the member states, integrate them in a management system and elaborate water resources strategies of sustainable character. Following results are achieved: (i) training of LCBC experts in hydrogeological methods on collection and analysis of groundwater data; (ii) collecting of groundwater and surface water data in the Basin and Pilot Zones; (iii) Developing a groundwater database and integrating it

into a water information system; (iv) Installing and implementing a groundwater monitoring system; (v) Compiling a hydrogeological map for the Chad Basin area; (vi) Establishing a water coordination group within the LCBC responsible for a continuous exchange of groundwater data.

- **African Development Bank-“Programme to rehabilitate and strengthen the resilience of Lake Chad basin systems (PRESIBALT)”**. The Bank proposes to rehabilitate and strengthen the resilience of socio-economic and ecological systems of the Lake Chad Basin consistent with the Five-Year Investment Plan (2013-2017) of the LCBC and geared towards enhancing the resilience of vulnerable populations of Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, CAR and Chad, who depend on the Lake basin’s natural resources. It will comprise three components: (i) Preservation and development of water resources; (ii) Development of ecological services and value chains; and (iii) Institution building and programme management.
- **The African Union secretariat** transboundary project in collaboration with IUCN on Livestock for Livelihoods: Strengthening Climate Change Adaptation Strategies through Improved Management at the Livestock-Wildlife-Environment Interface. This project covered all lake Chad basin countries with following objectives: i) Climate-Proof’ livestock production systems and alternative means of livelihood provided to pastoral and agro-pastoral production systems in ASALs; ii) Identification of policy entry points for supporting the implementation of priority adaptation options in pastoral and agro-pastoral systems; iii) Community rehabilitation of degraded land; iv) Development of Zonation including Grazing management plans and establishment of grazing committee; v) Training and support to alternative and climate-proof livelihoods and livestock production interventions (feed resources, breeding, etc.); vi) Strengthening women groups to develop basic entrepreneurial capacities; vii) Identification of the target groups and facilitation of exchange visits for the dissemination of success stories and lessons learnt; and viii) Documentation of the success stories and lessons learnt and sharing of information
- **Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation**, SADC funded project on building river dialogue and governance mechanisms in management of water resources within Lake Chad basin. The objectives of this project include i) facilitating trans boundary stakeholders dialogue on water governance at national and local levels involving surrounding local communities; ii) developing tools to assist decision makers (criteria for sites selection etc.) in planning and management of water resources; iii) capacity building of local resource persons and establishment of and identified champions on water governance related issues; and iv) production of thematic maps to facilitate dialogue and reduce conflicts in water resource management between stakeholders. The second phase of this project, to be implemented in collaboration with LCBC, is expected to begin in 2016 for another 3 years with primary objective of assisting LCBC implement the water charter.
- **World Bank supported ‘Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan’** has been prepared by the countries and LCBC and presented at the UNFCCC CoP in Paris in December 2015.

## National projects

Since the adoption of the SAP, the following national initiatives have been undertaken or are completed, are contributing to the SAP implementation

### Cameroon

- Improve water management in the Maga dam and allow downstream flows for agricultural activities and for the conservation of biodiversity (AfDB, 850 k USD)
- Improved food security for the most vulnerable households (AfDB, 400 k USD)
- Chari – Logone Project (AfDB)

## **Chad**

- Reduce post-harvest fishing losses with a view to improve community review and quality of fishery products made available to consumers (AfDB, 365 k USD)
- Improved livestock production and reduced farmers' conflicts (AfDB, 420 k USD)

## **Central African Republic**

- Reduce post-harvest fishing losses with a view to improve community review and quality of fishery products made available to consumers (AfDB, 460 k USD)
- Reduce the risks of malaria in pregnant women and children from 0 to 5 years (AfDB, 55 k USD)

## **Niger**

- Conservation of biodiversity with the safeguard of the endangered Kouri cattle breed (AfDB, 190 k USD)
- Improved food security for the most vulnerable households (AfDB, 400 k USD)

## **Nigeria**

- Reduce post-harvest fishing losses with a view to improve community review and quality of fishery products made available to consumers (AfDB, 650 k USD).
- Improved livestock production and reduce farmers' conflicts (AfDB, 165 k USD)
- Channel flow/water management improvement in the Komadugu -Yobe Basin (National Budget).

## **Conclusions**

The UNDP-GEF project will take advantage of key achievements of the previous (and ongoing) projects and regional policy agreements that have been strengthening LCBC capability for effective transboundary lake management. LCBC has acquired knowledge of Lake Chad's potential resources and produced an inventory regarding the hydrology, geology, pedology and climatology with the support of international institutions. However, at the national level, the harmonization of sectoral policies for integrated management of land and water resources and ecosystems, and the capacity of the countries to address these issues remains a major challenge. This was highlighted in a recent study<sup>5</sup> in the four countries bordering the Lake Chad, which indicated that the roles and responsibilities of the ministries and organizations involved in water resources management of Lake Chad are not always clearly defined or divided

## **2 STRATEGY**

### **2.1 Project rationale and policy conformity**

The project responds to the need for additional regional and national support to initiate the implementation of actions identified in the 2008 SAP, support both LCBC and, more significantly the Member States, strengthen aspects of their environmental management and enhance harmonisation of approaches between countries. Through SAP related pilot actions in communities the project will be both assisting with reducing stress and enhancing livelihoods in the region.

This project, *"Improving Lake Chad management through building climate change resilience and reducing ecosystem stress through implementation of the SAP"*, fits within, and complements, the GEF IW portfolio building upon a country-driven regional Strategic Action Programme (endorsed at the highest level by the countries in 2008) and developed with GEF support. This project is expected to

---

<sup>5</sup> Joint Environmental Audit on the Drying up of Lake Chad, Joint Audit Report, May 2015.

generate useful lessons and will serve as a model for other transboundary initiatives in GEF's worldwide portfolio and made available through the GEF IW:LEARN.

The project design incorporates lessons from other regionally relevant GEF IW projects, including the Niger, Volta and Senegal basins. The GEF funding will: enable regionally coordinated implementation of the SAP through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission; and foster the removal of sectorial barriers to the integrated management at the national level of the Lake Chad Basin to ensure the sustainable use of water resources and the ecosystems.

This project is consistent with GEF's International Waters strategy, including: **Objective 1 to Catalyse multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in trans-boundary surface and groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change (GEF FA Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4).**

## **2.2 Country ownership: Country eligibility and country drivenness**

The Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC) and its Convention were established in 1964 to regulate and control the use of water and other natural resources in the basin, and to initiate, promote, and coordinate natural resources development projects and research. The commission also promotes mechanisms for settling disputes and enhancing regional cooperation between Lake Chad Convention members. Individually the Member States have acceded to several international agreements and conventions (e.g. CBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD, Ramsar, etc.) that pertain to joint international action for addressing natural resource use issues.

This project will build upon the 2008 SAP endorsed by all countries that provides the framework for regional strengthening of LCBC and led to the development of corresponding National Action Plans (NAPs) in all Member States. The African Water Facility assisted LCBC to create a regulatory and legal framework (the Water Charter) that is both appropriate and flexible. The Water Charter has been finalised and adopted at the 14<sup>th</sup> Summit of the LCBC Heads of State and Government held on the 30<sup>th</sup> April 2012 in N'Djamena, Chad, and to-date three of the five LCBC countries have ratified the Charter. The SAP and the NAPs were influential in the development of the LCBC's 5-year investment plan.

### **Alignment with national water resources strategies**

The project is supportive of elements of the National Adaptation Programmes of Actions (NAPAs) under the UNFCCC for CAR, Chad and Niger and the recent (2015) Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Plan (the project assistance will provide strengthen data and information management to aid the DRR plans for floods and droughts). The project is also consistent with, and supportive of, the World Bank's Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) for all the Lake Chad Basin Countries.

All Member States have developed NAPA as a response to climate change. The LCBC under this project will review each country's NAPA and coordinate the implementation of aspects that falls within the transboundary mandate of the LCBC and the objectives of the Lake Chad Basin Water Charter.

Cameroon, Niger and Nigeria have each developed and adopted a national biodiversity strategy and action plans aligned with Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In each of the biodiversity strategy, attention is paid to the role of biodiversity in poverty reduction and sustainable development. This project shall work within the goals of each country's NBSAP and identify opportunities to coordinate transboundary implementation within Lake Chad Basin.

### **Cameroon**

Cameroon's NBSAP II was completed in 2012 and is a revision and update of the 2000 NBSAP. The NBSAP II will be implemented through to 2020 and contains 4 strategic goals, 20 national-level targets and 10 ecosystem-specific targets, priority actions, timeframes for action, performance indicators and actors/organizations responsible for implementation.

## Niger

The preparation of the second edition of Niger's *Stratégie Nationale et Plan d'Actions sur la Diversité Biologique*, adopted in 2014, was guided by the objectives of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity (2011-2020) and the National Plan for Social and Economic Development (2012-2015). The revision contains 5 strategic objectives, eighty actions, along with associated responsible actors and indicators.

## Nigeria

The Nigeria Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan was launched in 2006. A revised NBSAP (2016 – 2020) was adopted by the government as a policy instrument in 2015 and includes plan for capacity development and technical capacity needs assessment, a communication and outreach strategy and a plan for resource mobilization. A Water Resources Strategy document which is aligned with the goal of the Lake Chad Basin Water Charter has also been adopted by the Federal Executive Council of Nigeria in 2016.

The need and country demand for additional strengthening of technical and administrative functions at the regional (LCBC) and the country level has been clearly indicated in the 2015 report *'Joint Environmental Audit on the Drying up of Lake Chad'* prepared jointly by government auditing offices in the four countries bordering Lake Chad (Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria).

The overall conclusions of this joint audit report are:

***'On the one hand, with regard to the definition and effective implementation of policies, strategies, actions and instruments for the control of water users, the development of water resources monitoring and surveillance mechanisms, and the enforcement of protective legislation on these resources, it appears that the management and the future of Lake Chad have not been sufficiently taken into account to fall under the national priorities of the LCBC Member States.'***

*The low level of consideration given to this body of water and the issues relating to its reduction, or even disappearance, have led to the shortcomings and gaps pointed out by the joint environmental audit, namely:*

- *the lack of institutional coordination of actions related to water resources management in the Lake Chad basin;*
- *the lack of formal strategies for directing actions and interventions of ministries and other organizations regarding the resources management in the Lake Chad basin;*
- *insufficient control measures of water users in the Lake Chad basin;*
- *the inadequacy of the water resources monitoring and surveillance framework of the Lake Chad basin;*
- *the insufficient application of the legal and regulatory framework for water resources management in the Lake Chad basin;*
- *the non-operationalization of structures and technical means of water resources management that could contribute to the safeguarding of Lake Chad water resources in the riparian states;*
- *the failure to comply with financial commitments by the Member States of the LCBC to this organization, reflected by the general observation of significant arrears in contributions for the financing of its activities.*

***On the other hand, the LCBC has for a long time been orientated in its mandate, structures, strategies and actions towards various transboundary activities which may be important to the riparian countries of Lake Chad, but which do not give due consideration to the primary objective of its vocation as true transboundary basin organization, namely: the sustainable management of Lake***

***Chad, a transboundary water resource. Consequently, the legal instruments guiding its actions, as well its financial and human resources have not sufficiently helped to achieve the primary objective, which is the lasting and sustainable management of this body of water, nourishing more than thirty million people.***

*All the findings of the audit at regional level result from this fundamental flaw. They are recalled here as a matter of importance:*

- *the strategic development planning of the Lake Chad basin does not sufficiently link the actions and water needs of the riparian countries as local, national and regional level with the objectives set by the basin organization – the LCBC;*
- *the LCBC does not entirely fulfil its purpose as transboundary basin organization, in particular with regard to the equitable management of water, the development of the basin and the enforcement of rules for the protection of water resources;*
- *despite the adoption of a Water Charter, the mechanisms and tools for regulating the withdrawal of water resources of the Lake Chad basin in each state are not functional;*
- *the LCBC does not ensure the collection, processing, distribution and archiving of data relating to the evolution and use of water resources in the Lake Chad basin, for lack of the appropriate procedures and logistics and sufficient commitment from the states to contribute to this;*
- *the LCBC has not put in place a sustainable funding model, since the current one relies on financing sources that are limited, temporary and difficult to mobilize;*
- *the LCBC does not sufficiently direct the few financial, human and logistical resources that it has available towards effective actions of sustainable management and protection of water resources of the Lake Chad basin.*

*It is therefore the responsibility of the governments, parliaments, and administrations of the member countries of the LCBC and all other stakeholders in the management of the Lake Chad basin and its natural resources, to take ownership of the issues related to Lake Chad. The LCBC is also encouraged to refocus its activities and operation on the conservation and development of this freshwater body, so as to become a vehicle of development and prosperity in this area on the border of the desert.’*

Further demonstrating the need, and recognition of by the countries, for on-going assistance to strengthen the technical, administrative and management functions of the countries and LCBC to ensure the lake and its inhabitants has a viable and sustainable future.

## **2.3 Design principles and strategic considerations**

The five-year UNDP-GEF project<sup>6</sup> will address concerns linked to the co-ordination and management capacity of the LCBC and its Member States to develop and implement management policies to address unsustainable land/water practices and respond to climate change threats. To-date, the LCB Convention, the SAP and the Water Charter have not been sufficiently backed by relevant national policies and legislation required for its effective implementation.

The project will support implementation of harmonised institutional, policy and legal reforms, identified in the SAP, by promoting national and regional policy tools for better management of Lake Chad surface and groundwater, and biodiversity, while supporting sustainable development of the region. In addition, the project will establish conditions for adaptive ecosystem based management through strengthened national inter-ministerial committees. The project will also support the institutional sustainability to ensure the SAP and the LCBC will be more effective in the long-term and capable in providing appropriate reports on progress of the SAP and other programmes to the Council

---

<sup>6</sup> The project duration has been extended from the four years approved at PIF to ensure this can be executed in parallel to the AfDB-GEF project and a recognition of the challenges that will exist in establishing and implementing this regional project.



of Ministers. Based on priorities identified in the NAPs and the SAP, the project will implement innovative transboundary actions to improve water use efficiency and promote IWRM, including through local, community-based actions.

The project will support countries to ratify, and to implement the agreements, of the Lake Chad Water Charter and updated SAP, expected to address conjunctive management of surface and groundwaters and to integrate climate vulnerability and change issues. Linkages with poverty reduction strategies are also expected through pilots demonstrating sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihood approaches.

Involvement of all Member states in the management of the Lake Chad basin will enhance transboundary water resources and ecosystems management, and regional peace and stability. The project is expected to assist countries with their reporting against relevant SDGs, including: SDGs 1 (poverty), 2 (hunger), 6 (water and sanitation), 8 (decent work), 13 (climate change) and 15 (sustainable terrestrial ecosystems).

The UNDP-GEF project has a focus on *targeted* strengthening of the LCBC (for example, to enhance donor co-ordination and reporting the progress of the SAP / Water Charter implementation to the Council of Ministers), and national actions and capacity building, to complement training that has been provided at the regional (LCBC) level to ensure that there are adequate qualified resources at multiple levels in each country.

LCBC has developed a five-year work plan and budget linked to the SAP that are supported by the countries and will be further enhanced by the activities of this project. Local communities will be contributing to the management of the lake ecosystem through community-based projects. The LCBC and national focal points will contribute to the project through its operating budget to administer and monitor all activities related to the management of Lake Chad natural resources management.

Socio-economic benefits for the target communities in the riparian countries will be realized from interventions proposed in the project. Through innovative actions on water management, the project will increase opportunities for improving livelihoods and provide concrete benefits to smallholder farmers and pastoralists, both men and women. By enhancing access to water and using it in a sustainable manner, local communities will benefit from increased food production, enhancing food security and restoring productive natural resources.

LCBC will be the implementing Partner, building on the experiences and roles of these organisations. IUCN and World Bank are pre-selected as Responsible Parties to support LCBC in the implementation of the Components 5 and 6, respectively. IUCN will provide small grants to local community projects building on their regional experiences (presented in the baseline) implementing a range of climate change adaptation strategies to enhance livelihoods.

The project will promote gender mainstreaming at all stages of the project cycle. Specifically, the implementing partner and communities will mainstream gender concerns when identifying ecosystem-based income-generating activities and developing key risk management tools. Training packages under component 3 will be designed and disseminated to ensure that women and girls – especially those who are poor or have been denied the right to an education – can easily have access to and absorb the necessary information. It is planned to document the contribution of women to project activities in key areas where women already figure prominently (e.g., biodiversity management, in situ conservation of agro-biodiversity, conservation of medicinal plants, management of household water needs, etc.).

The socio-economic benefits of gender mainstreaming will serve to strengthen the impacts of the interventions on the management of the Lake Chad basin. It is expected that there will be a mutually reinforcing effect between and among the objectives of improving the environment, optimizing economic benefits and improving the role of women in project formulation and implementation.

### UNDP comparative advantage

UNDP's Strategic Plan for 2014-2017 includes as one of its core areas of work "Sustainable development pathways" through the effective maintenance and protection of natural capital. Support for integrated water resources management and efficient use of water is specifically mentioned in this context. UNDP has recently updated its 2007 Water Governance Strategy through the development of UNDP Water and Ocean Governance Programme's "Contribution towards realizing the UNDP Strategic Plan 2014–2017". This serves as a global framework for action and will guide implementation of UNDP's Strategic Plan in water and ocean governance. The programme contribution document identifies the Strategic Outcome and output within the Integrated Results and Resources Framework to which the Water and Ocean Governance Programme will contribute, namely Outcome 2: Citizen expectations for voice, development, the rule of law and accountability are met by stronger systems of democratic governance; Output 2.5: Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation. The programme contribution document also outlines the UNDP vision on water and ocean governance.

The proposed project will support achievement of one of UNDP's thematic priority areas in water and ocean resources and services, as identified in the programme contribution document: Protection of transboundary surface and groundwater in a changing climate

UNDP's work on improving governance of shared water resources incorporates the important linkages between upstream water and land management and the health and integrity of downstream ecosystems. Of the GEF agencies, UNDP has the largest portfolio and associated experience in the development and implementation of TDAs and SAPs in a wide range of river, groundwater, lake and marine water bodies. UNDP supported the development of the SAP under the GEF IW project "*Reversal of Land and Water Degradation Trends in the Lake Chad Basin Ecosystem*".

UNDP's strong track record in facilitating improved transboundary water governance has been further strengthened by the integration of UNDP's 'core' Water and Ocean Governance Programme (WOGP) with its GEF International Waters cluster, and the similar full integration of the UNDP Water Governance Facility at the Stockholm International Water Institute with UNDP's corporate water and ocean governance activities.

In terms of international advocacy, UNDP has championed the global water crisis and stressed the importance of water for life and water for livelihoods in its 2006 Human Development Report titled "Beyond scarcity: Power, poverty and the global water crisis". UNDP's priorities within this area include:

- Improving national and local water resources management for poverty reduction and sustainable development
- Increasing access to adequate and safe water supply and sustainable sanitation for the poor
- Promoting cooperation on shared water resources and global water challenges
- Gender mainstreaming in water governance
- Capacity development for Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM)

Finally, UNDP builds on its field presence in the five countries participating in this project and support technical staff based in the Regional Center in Addis Ababa. UNDP initiatives will be supported by the Offices in Chad, Niger, Cameroon, Central African Republic and Nigeria that have the necessary expertise to technical and human support under its unit in charge of Environment. Additionally, UNDP has close links with governments, as well as a high level of experience managing other projects in the region, for example, with Disaster Risks Reduction, governance, gender, poverty reduction.

## 2.4 Project Outputs and activities

In February 2011, the GEF Secretariat expressed its willingness to continue supporting the countries of the Lake Chad Basin in safeguarding this important ecosystem, supporting the implementation of the Lake Chad Strategic Action Programme (SAP), endorsed at the Ministerial Conference of the Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC) in 2008. Subsequently, two agencies of GEF, African Development Bank (AfDB) and UNDP, submitted complementary initiatives on behalf of the LCBC member states for funding under GEF 5.

The AfDB initiative is a programmatic approach targeting various investments to conserve the water and agro-forestry ecosystems of Lake Chad Basin through (i) knowledge mobilization for IWRM and WUE in the Lake Chad basin; (ii) transboundary water governance within the Lake Chad basin for improved water conservation, use and governance; (iii) Ecosystems goods and services with improved food security; (iv) Renewable Energy and (v) Ecosystem (forest & wetland) restoration and maintenance. Chad basin countries committed to part of their STAR allocations for the Biodiversity, Climate Change and Land Degradation focal areas to this programmatic approach. Additional funds were requested from the Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) resources. As Lake Chad is one of the priority transboundary water bodies funds were also requested from the International Waters focal area.

The UNDP-implemented initiative will be driven by the Lake Chad basin SAP approved in 2008. In addition, the Lake Chad Basin has since developed a range of other investment plans and strategies (including the Water Charter of 2012, the LCBC's 5-year investment plan 2013-2018, and the Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan presented in December 2015 at CoP 21 of the UNFCCC). The 2008 SAP (and the associated National Action Plans) presented a wide range of priorities that require commitment and actions from National Governments, local communities and support from international partners. UNDP support will focus on specific issues identified in the SAP and NAPs (and take account of the updated TDA/SAP, to be produced in 2016-2017) to assist with regional and national governance of the Lake Chad Basin; sustainable management of the natural resources in the Lake basin, with emphasis on improved water resources assessment/management by introducing conjunctive management approach to the surface and groundwater resources; policy and institutional reforms; monitoring and data management; community-based demonstration projects (to illustrate stress reduction practices) and pre-feasibility investment activities. These include:

- **Component 1:** Strengthening of Lake Chad Basin management, linked to EQWRO I of the SAP, Targets 1&2; EQWRO III, Target 1. This will be achieved through the updating of the SAP, based on an updated TDA (to be supported by GIZ), and the strengthening of the planning bodies within LCBC to address strategic issues of the region. Actions to help identify investment needs for LCBC (and the region) will be undertaken through Component 6 which will link closely to this component and utilise experiences and recommendations from the whole project;
- **Components 2 & 3:** Enabling environment for SAP implementation enhancing national/regional governance, harmonising policies and practices, strengthening capacity of institutions and other stakeholders and increasing the public involvement to address the identified problems of the Lake Chad Basin (Linked to the SAP implementation and EQWRO V);
- **Component 4:** Improving availability and accessibility of data and information on the Lake Chad water resources and ecosystems (Linked to EQRO III, Target 1);

- **Component 5:** Community-based demonstration activities to assist with uptake of the SAP recommended actions (Linked to SAP implementation), focusing on invasive species control and promotion of alternative income generating activities that support the Lake Chad basin ecosystem conservation;
- **Component 6:** Pre-feasibility assessments of priority investments to catalyse Lake Chad stress reduction (Linked to SAP implementation and the strengthening actions in Components 1 -5).

All components will be closely co-ordinated with the ongoing and forthcoming activities supported by GIZ and BGR, the recently launched AfDB PRESIBALT and the expected AfDB-GEF project. The project will also link closely with LCBCs policies and programmes on gender mainstreaming and training to ensure a common message is conveyed.

LCBC has finalised the Water Charter. Ratification of the Charter by the countries is on-going. The challenge now is to put the Water Charter's pioneering provisions into effect, building on the recommendations of the SAP. GEF resources will be used to operationalize and facilitate effective application of the Charter's provisions, including: facilitating the development and adoption of the LCBC's Biodiversity Protocol.

The project **objective** is to enhance Lake Chad Basin Commission and basin riparian countries to achieve climate resilient, integrated ecosystem-based management of Lake Chad Basin through implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms, the development of management approaches, investments and pilot actions that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity, and sustain livelihoods. In supporting the LCBC and the member states the UNDP-GEF project will also contribute to the countries responses to SDGs reporting requirements, for example, SDGs 1,2, 5, 6, 13 & 15.

Following the ecosystem-based approach designed in the regional SAP and discussions with the Lake Chad basin stakeholders (including regional and national technical and financial partners) six inter-linked components are planned to achieve this objective. **Component 1** will include the update of the 2008 SAP, development of key tools for the effective lake-basin management within the LCBC (e.g. the development of a biodiversity protocol, disaster risk reduction plans, improving the LCBC and subsidiary bodies implementation and planning capacities, etc.) and countries will be supported to reinforce effective governance (**Component 2**). Capacity of key stakeholders (ministries, parliamentarians, academics and basin resources users) will be strengthened to support the development /harmonization of policy leading to better water resources and ecosystem management, with a focus on improving the conjunctive management of the surface and groundwater resources (**Component 3**). **Component 4** will enhance the joint monitoring strategies and information sharing. **Component 5** will engage local communities through pilot demonstrations into the shared management of the natural resources of the region, and **Component 6** will assist with the prioritisation of investment opportunities (particularly building on the actions implemented at the community level through Component 5 and taking account of recent plans and strategies) that will reduce stress to the ecosystem and strengthen livelihoods of the basin population.

At least 1% of the GEF grant will be dedicated to contribute to IW-LEARN activities, such as writing up IW experience notes, participating in regional IW meetings as well as the GEF biennial International Waters Conferences during the project's lifetime.

The work of the UNDP-GEF project will collaborate and co-ordinate closely with the on-going actions of the GIZ programme for Lake Chad (for example the strengthening of capacity at LCBC, updating the TDA), BGR (for example the groundwater and surface water mapping and conjunctive use

management), with the AfDB PRESIBALT programme (for example, the rehabilitation of monitoring equipment). PCUs for all projects are/will be based in the LCBC Secretariat, which will facilitate the close cooperation and collaboration throughout the project implementation period. The AfDB-GEF project and the UNDP-GEF Lake Chad projects will work closely together and invite each other to its respective Project Steering Committee meetings.

During the preparatory phase, a mapping exercise was initiated among the partners and LCBC to show how different initiatives will strengthen the joint monitoring and management capacity of the LCBC and its member states to sustainably manage the Lake basin resources (Annex 3). During the inception phase of the UNDP-GEF project, an integrated work plan (Gantt chart) will be developed to show how different initiatives will collaborate on various activities under each SAP priority over time to maximize synergies and operational effectiveness and avoid duplication. Both mapping and the integrated workplan will be periodically updated together with the LCBC throughout the project implementation period as part of efforts to build coordination capacity and operational effectiveness of LCBC. These efforts will contribute to the strengthening of LCBC's Donor Advisory Committee attached to the Executive Secretary's office (supported under output 1.4).

### **Component 1: Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission**

The challenge for the LCBC is in supporting countries to implement the SAP, including improving basin-wide monitoring, towards an integrated ecosystem-based lake basin management approach (closely linked with Components 3 and 4). With GEF resources, priority interventions will focus on the update of the SAP, development and adoption of the Biodiversity Protocol; the development of the disaster risks management plans (one of the key measures of the Water Charter); and strengthening the LCBC's capacity to identify projects and coordinate the implementation of projects.

#### **Component 1 Summary:**

The expected **Outcomes** for this Component are: *A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhanced basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad basin.*

To be achieved through five key outputs: **Output 1.1:** *The 2008 SAP updated on the basis of the revised TDA<sup>7</sup>; **Output 1.2:** LCBC Biodiversity Protocol developed and adopted by all parties; **Output 1.3** Disaster risk reduction response plans developed to ensure the protection of people, the environment and water resources; **Output 1.4:** LCBC's coordination and monitoring capacity strengthened with effective reporting of performance to the Council of Ministers; and, **Output 1.5:** Strengthening LCBC's capacity to develop and manage programmes and projects*

#### **Output 1.1: The 2008 SAP updated on the basis of the revised TDA**

The SAP, and the TDA that informed the SAP, are key documents for the overall planning and management of the Lake Chad basin and have helped direct financing key priorities (including the AfDB and UNDP GEF projects) of the LCBC. It has been recognised by LCBC that there are key recent observations and new understanding that need to be embedded in the SAP to ensure that this remains a key document for driving the sustainable management of the Lake Chad Basin environment whilst

<sup>7</sup> TDA will be updated in 2016-2017 by LCBC and the member states with support from GIZ.

supporting the livelihoods of the population. The importance and relevance of the SAP as a key tool to guide the LCBC can be seen in the ‘mapping’ exercise conducted in the PPG phase showing the links to the SAP from the major initiatives supporting the LCBC and the other important strategies and plans of the LCBC (Annex 3).

Since the adoption of the SAP in 2008, LCBC and their partners have conducted many significant studies that has added to the wealth of knowledge on Lake Chad Basin’s environment, water resources, pressures and socio-economic issues. It has been agreed during the preparatory phase that the LCBC and the member states will update the TDA, with support from GIZ, based on previous studies (undertaken by the EU, BMZ, UNESCO, WB, AfDB, etc.) and the GIZ supported LCBC study to deliver a ‘State of the Basin’ report to be finalized in 2016. This update will take account of the information that was generated after the production of the previous TDA including the impacts of climate variability and change, groundwater interactions with surface water (and associated ecosystems), etc. It is anticipated that the TDA will be updated prior to the initiation of the SAP updating exercise, to be supported by this UNDP-GEF project.

The recent GEF IW:LEARN manuals and training activities for TDA/SAP will be utilised.

The UNDP-GEF project will utilise the results of the updated TDA to prepare a more detailed and up-to-date SAP reflecting emerging and recent issues of transboundary concern. The updated SAP is also expected to be accompanied with a detailed implementation plan, a robust M&E framework that assist LCBC to track the SAP implementation progress and to report the progress, and a prefeasibility study to inform its investment plan.

Based on the updated TDA, the GEF resources will be used to undertake the following activities to update the SAP:

- Reviewing and updating transboundary priorities and actions for investments, capacity development, awareness raising, following the causal chain analysis conducted during the TDA update process;
- Updating the vision, goals and environmental / socio-economic objectives as appropriate;
- Developing regional implementation plans linked to related strategies and action plans;
- Developing realistic and effective M&E programme to assess the implementation of the SAP as a sustainable tool for LCBC;
- Recommending updates required to national action plans (NAPs);

The updated SAP will be presented to the LCBC Council of Ministers for approval.

***Output 1.2: LCBC Biodiversity Protocol developed and adopted by all parties***

The UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) specifies the following goals for its signatories: (1) conservation of biodiversity; (2) sustainable use of its components; and (3) fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from genetic resources. The LCBC Member States are all signatories and the convention covers all ecosystems, species, and genetic resources and links traditional conservation efforts to the economic goal of using biological resources sustainably. The Convention requires countries to prepare a national biodiversity strategy (or equivalent instrument) and to ensure that this strategy is mainstreamed into the planning and activities of all those sectors whose activities can have an impact on biodiversity<sup>8</sup>. The unique location of the Lake Chad in the Sahelian zone, its basin, rivers,

---

<sup>8</sup> Amongst the Member States of the LCBC, Cameroon, Niger and Nigeria are the only countries (2016) that have developed

wetlands and the numerous species its harbours and the livelihood it supports requires a special attention to safeguard its biodiversity in the face of continuing climate change. The member states of the LCBC therefore need to develop a Regional Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (RBSAP), in addition to their commitments and obligations at the national level, comprising of agreement on regional targets, as a means of complementing and supporting national actions and of contributing to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The UN has declared the period from 2011 to 2020 as the Decade on Biodiversity. The LCBC Biodiversity Protocol shall be the main instrument for Member States to coordinate their implementation of the CBD in the Lake Chad Basin and work towards the goals of the UN Decade on Biodiversity.

The LCBC Biodiversity Protocol will serve as a legal instrument for developing, harmonizing and enforcing necessary environmental policies, strategies and measures at the national level for preserving, protecting and sustainably managing natural resources, and the historical, cultural and aesthetic resources of the Lake Chad Basin. GEF resources will assist LCBC and its expert groups to develop a regional biodiversity protocol for subsequent approval by the Council of Ministers.

The following activities are envisaged to deliver Output 1.2:

- To develop the LCBC RBSAP, Sub-national Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (SBSAPs), articulated at local government or provincial levels in line with each country's national NBSAP's are necessary. Local actors shall be mobilised to develop and agree on common vision, statement of principles, clearly identified priorities, defined short, medium, and long term goals, and a set of targets to help guide local implementation;
- The various SBSAP's are integrated within the LCBC RBSAP and validated at the regional level.
- The validated LCBC RBSAP will be the basis for developing the LCBC Biodiversity Protocol for subsequent approval by the Council of Ministers.

### **Output 1.3: Disaster risk reduction response plans developed to ensure the protection of people, the environment and water resources**

The Water Charter, in its Article 38, stipulates that: *"In order to prevent and control emergency situations, the State Parties shall, in cooperation with the Commission, jointly develop and enforce emergency plans and disaster response plans to attenuate, eliminate or reduce the damage likely to be caused to the population, the environment and the water resources in the Basin by such emergency situations"*. The need for such disaster risk reduction plans has been identified by LCBC and its member states as an emerging transboundary priority since the adoption of the 2008 SAP. GEF resources will support the LCBC to develop disaster risk reduction (DRR) plans to strengthen the preparedness and mitigate the effects of natural disasters, specifically drought and flood, on the multiple wetlands and floodplains that support the region's economy and the livelihoods of the basin population.

The LCBC will principally work with the focal point in each national ministry to establish an appropriate institution (sub-basin office) to work with the LCBC in delivering outputs related to component 1 and 4. The present system is based on national agencies that have a wider focus with little incentive to correct the weaknesses observed in the Lake Chad Basin. Chapter 14 of the Lake Chad Basin Water Charter makes it obligatory for all state parties to make necessary internal arrangements to ensure effective enforcement of the charter including judicial, institutional, operational and financial arrangements. The AfDB project support to the operationalising the monitoring system shall include

---

National Biodiversity Strategic Action Plans (NBSAP).

training and capacity building of new institutions that will be agreed for the implementation of the Water Charter. The GWP central African has funded an LCBC study aimed at establishing an Early Warning System that will eventually transition into a basin-wide DRR. The EWS identified actors, institutions and method of dissemination of alerts and actions to be taken in case of unfavourable forecast.

The UNDP-GEF project responsibility in component 1 is largely geared towards having a harmonised coordinated policies exist within sectors in each member states and between member states of the LCBC at the regional level. One key intervention of the UNDP-GEF project that differentiate it from the AfDB-GEF intervention is ensuring that the information archive in the regional database goes into the continuous process of joint-fact finding and the design of policies and the choice of future development alternative within the Lake Chad Basin region.

This output will be delivered through the following activities:

- Conducting preliminary assessments of potential significant flood and drought risk areas in the basin, in collaboration with GIZ, BGR, AfDB, and data/information on floods and droughts collected through output 4.1 (monitoring). This will include a delimitation of the catchments and sub-basins, a description of flood and drought events in the past and the probability of future floods/drought, as well as an estimation of the potential negative consequences, considering climate change predictions and long-term socio-economic development;
- Identification of structural and non-structural measures suitable in the basin, with indications of their effectiveness (e.g.: types of flood-proofing constructions, drought and flood forecasting, drought and flood preparedness, emergency planning, etc.);
- Based on this information, DRR plans will be established. Appropriate measures will be identified and planned with broad stakeholder participation of the riparian countries.

***Output 1.4: LCBC's coordination and monitoring capacity strengthened with effective reporting of performance to the Council of Ministers***

As the body designated to oversee the regional management of the Lake Chad Basin, LCBC needs to be highly effective at co-ordinating and monitoring the support from multiple donors and prioritising future target areas for interventions. In addition, the LCBC will need to enhance their capacity to develop and manage projects and programmes to meet the recommended policies adopted by the Council of Ministers and to implement the Lake Chad Basin Water Charter. GEF resources will assist LCBC to improve the operational effectiveness and financial sustainability for the future equitable and effective management of the Lake Chad Basin.

It is expected that the proposed 'Donor Advisory Committee', foreseen in the recently approved new structure of LCBC, will work closely with donor representatives, national representatives and other relevant stakeholders to advise the LCBC Council of Ministers. The secretariat of the committee proposed by LCBC is the head of the Project Implementation Division and the meeting would be chaired by the Executive Secretary of the LCBC.

The two Lake Chad GEF projects (AfDB and UNDP) will closely collaborate and deliver complementary activities, focusing on the comparative advantages of the two GEF Agencies. The UNDP-GEF project will support LCBC Secretariat to develop coordination and monitoring tools such as the mapping and the integrated work plan, while the AfDB, as the current main partner to the LCBC, will support LCBC in convening the coordination meetings, anticipated to be held quarterly. A key output from this



meeting will be further elaboration and update to the 'mapping' process initiated in the PPG phase (see Annex 3).

The UNDP-GEF project will support the LCBC Secretariat to develop tools and procedures to allow the Council of Ministers to systematically and effectively monitor and assess progress on SAP implementation by linking M&E results with the planning procedures of the Council meetings. This monitoring exercise is expected to capture SAP implementation progress made by all initiatives coordinated by LCBC supported by various partners; therefore, it will enable LCBC Secretariat to provide an integrated progress report on the SAP implementation, instead of multiple progress reports provided by donors. In the meantime, the project will also assist LCBC Sec to develop a guidance note on national reporting on SAP implementation progress in each basin state, to be made by each member state. Such national reporting will help capture SAP implementation progress made by initiatives that are not coordinated by LCBC. Put together, LCBC's capacity to provide more comprehensive reporting on the SAP implementation progress by all initiatives, including donor-supported and nationally-funded, will be strengthened significantly. This will in turn lead to the strengthened coordination and monitoring capacity of LCBC.

UNDP-GEF project will support LCBC in coordinating donor supports on capacity strengthening activities through the development of a comprehensive Capacity Building and Training (CBT) Programme for the Lake Chad basin, which will guide the LCBC Secretariat to coordinate donor support on capacity building. Its M&E framework will help LCBC periodically and systematically monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of CBT Programme implementation over time and cumulative impacts of donor support on capacity building. All capacity building support planned by UNDP-GEF, AfDB, GIZ and BGR are expected to be coordinated by this LCB Programme..

The GEF resources will support:

- Assisting with the operationalisation of LCBC's Donor Advisory Committee (attached to the Executive Secretary's office) including the updating of the LCBC 'donor mapping' (see Annex 3) against the SAP priorities, the Lake Chad Climate Resilience Strategy and the LCBC 5-year investment plan. This will facilitate directing future investments from donors and assist with the prioritisation of the needs as presented in the various strategy documents for Lake Chad.
- Linking with Component 3, provide specific training on relevant issues for the Donor Advisory Committee (both LCBC staff and national representatives) including: M&E, mapping of donors, interactions with donors, understanding donor financing cycles, information needs for bankable projects, etc. The training would be delivered 'on the job' to ensure that the committee delivers required and relevant information to the LCBC. This will also assist with sustainability and ensuring that the Project Implementation Division has a cadre of well qualified staff that will deliver the projects expected.
- During the inception phase of the project, detailed terms of reference for the committee will be drafted for adoption by LCBC that will include the expected outputs to be prepared by the committee;
- Ensuring that LCBC Council of Ministers receives adequate and informative reports on projects and programmes for the Council to effectively monitor the SAP implementation progress.

### ***Output 1.5: Strengthening LCBC's capacity to develop and manage programmes and projects***

The UNDP-GEF project will build on the capacity development actions undertaken to-date by GIZ to strengthen LCBC management of projects and programmes through strengthening the financial management (including facilitating the development of a financial management manual), project management/implementation, procurement, resourcing, M&E, etc. The project will undertake the following actions:

- Guidance for the LCBC's in developing and implementing operational programmes based on the recommendations made by LCBC Council consistent with the restructuring being implemented (2016) of LCBC's organisational structure;
- To strengthen the capacity (and complement the actions of GIZ, AfDB, etc.) of LCBC and national partners on administrative and project management in support of the existing SAP, action plans and investment plans.
- To develop a Capacity Building and Training Programme (linked with LCBC's Human Resources Department) to ensure that LCBC has future technical and administrative capacity to manage projects.

### **Component 2: Establishment of effective, sustainable national governance structures to support the SAP and Water Charter**

The development of the Lake Chad Water Charter of 2012 is a clear indication of the willingness of countries in the region to address issues related to the sustainable management of the lake and its catchment area. Individually the Member States have also acceded to many other international agreements and conventions that pertain to joint international action for addressing resource-use issues. The Water Charter is presently not sufficiently backed by the relevant national legislations required for effective implementation. In addition to limited coordination among line ministries, a disconnect between the line ministries implementing LCBC decisions and key stakeholders who should be part of the process of mainstreaming exists.

On the premises that stronger institutional capacity and policies at the national level is required to effectively implement the Water Charter at the regional level, GEF resources will support the member states, through LCBC, to harmonize national level legal and policy and financial<sup>9</sup> instruments across countries for greater water availability and effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwater resources and related ecosystems. The project will also identify policy gaps and develop recommendations to establish required policies at the national level to strengthen institutional, legal and financial capacity at the national level.

---

<sup>9</sup> Linking to the efforts to promote the Payment for Ecosystem Services scheme at the national level in the Lake Chad basin supported by AfDB.

### Component 2 Summary:

The expected **Outcome** for this Component is: *Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwaters.*

To be achieved through two key outputs: **Output 2.1:** *Harmonising the national legal and policy frameworks for effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwaters to reflect the relevant provisions of the Water Charter;* and, **Output 2.2:** *Operationalize national inter-ministerial committees to improve coordination and support the policy mainstreaming process at the national level*

### ***Output 2.1: Harmonising the national legal and policy frameworks for effective conjunctive management of surface and groundwaters to reflect the relevant provisions of the Water Charter***

LCB member's states are the centre of the regional integration and their full commitment to implementing Decisions and Agreements is decisive for progress towards achieving Water Charter Dispositions. National implementation of agreements is not a simple task and requires a strong political commitment and coordinated efforts by all stakeholders and relevant tools. With internal resources, LCBC is working towards the full ratification of the Lake Chad Water Charter by all member states<sup>10</sup>.

In addition, key stakeholders which include the communities living around the lake, private sector exploiting basin resources, CSOs, academia, etc. need to be informed about decisions on LCBC policy instruments, the Lake Chad Water Charter, especially since they have a major role to play in making operational decisions and implementation on the ground. A popular model to achieve this goal is the use of multi-stakeholder participation and consultation mechanisms (developed under Output 3.3).

The Lake Chad Basin Water Charter is awaiting the ratification of one other member of the LCBC (Nigeria or RCA) to come into effects. The deficiencies in water management and national policies that led to the initial GEF Intervention is captured by the previous project UNDP/GEF "Reversal of Land and Water Degradation Trends in the Lake Chad Basin Ecosystem" through the TDA/SAP process and summarised in sections 1.3 and 1.4 (problems to be addressed and treats and root causes respectively).

The following activities are anticipated that will result in the strengthening of conjunctive management of surface and groundwaters:

- Review of relevant national Policies, Legal and Regulatory Frameworks to identify gaps and recommendations to harmonise approaches to surface/groundwater management and make them consistent with the Water Charter;
- Organise national consultation meetings (at least 10) with relevant policy makers to discuss how to undertake regulations and policies harmonisation and reforms to enhance conjunctive management approaches;
- Develop a roadmap for harmonising approaches on implementing the Water Charter across the Lake Chad Basin with respect to surface/groundwater management. It will include policy process for institutional and operational framework for national implementation, and monitoring and evaluation processes. This step involves also bringing together potential public

<sup>10</sup> As of February 2016, the ratification from Nigeria and CAR are still outstanding.

and private partners, supported by relevant technical and financial experts, to jointly assess and develop the roadmap.

- National policies on groundwater monitoring strengthened and harmonized at the basin level to ensure the groundwater monitoring capacity being strengthened by donor support (e.g. BGR, AfDB-GEF) will be institutionalized
- A pilot in one country to demonstrate how the groundwater monitoring efforts can be effectively integrated into the hydrological monitoring and planning; lessons learned captured and shared with the other basin states.
- Mentor at least 2 countries in advocating and implementing the roadmap of national policy harmonization and reform process and timeline.

***Output 2.2: Operationalize national inter-ministerial committees to improve coordination and support the policy mainstreaming process at the national level***

The reviving of the Inter-ministerial committees (IMC), established during the first phase of the UNDP-GEF project, will be desired to facilitate the mainstreaming and implementation of new policy frameworks. The implementation of the Lake Chad Basin Water Charter and its annexes requires a new level of commitment from the Member States as well as the improved level of inter-sectoral coordination at the national level to realize the ecosystem-based approach embraced by the Water Charter. The GEF project will aim to assist LCBC and the member states secure funding for the IMC arrangements at the national and local levels to sustain operational requirements of the monitoring and management of the Lake Chad Basin. The strengthening of the IMC arrangements are essential to support the timely preparation and national adoption of the updated SAP. The aim is to provide structures for co-ordination between different ministries involved in water resource management. (e.g. ministries for environment, agriculture, hydraulic, irrigation, energy, transport, finance, decentralisation, etc.) whose activities might not be coordinated to date. The operationalization of such bodies will be done through the following process:

- Redefinition of mandate and establishment of management mechanisms;
- Raise awareness and train staff from member states to enhance the capacities of national authorities to monitor efficiently compliance with regulations and standards that support the sustainable management of the natural resources within the Lake Chad Basin.
- Sustainable financial strategies will be identified in at least 3 countries and recommendations to assist the budgeting of related measures identified in the Water Charter. Improving allocation of financial resources will make a significant difference in the mainstreaming process at national level. The following steps are proposed: (i) developing multi-annual programmatic and budgeting approaches and (ii) developing a coherent vision for external and national climate investments.
- Organise regular meetings of the IMC to discuss policy issues; resolve policy differences and inconsistencies and financing options/opportunities for SAP (and Water Charter) implementation at the national level; and provide policy recommendations for consideration by the relevant ministries/decision makers.
- Develop strategies for sustainable financing for the IMC as an agreed mechanism that support the Lake Chad Water Charter and the SAP implementation (including monitoring and management arrangements).

**Component 3: Capacity of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to support the harmonisation of policies and improved monitoring and management of the Lake Chad basin ecosystem**

The UNDP-GEF project will have as a priority focus the training of national experts enabling close co-operation with their counterparts within LCBC and to assist with harmonisation of approaches to monitoring and management across the Lake Chad Basin. The AfDB-GEF project is focusing training at the regional (LCBC) level. The budget for this component has significantly increased from the PIF submission, reflecting on the need to deliver multiple national and specific training courses across the region. This additional effort will support national efforts to implement the SAP and provide strengthening to respond to the needs of the Water Charter, better ensuring that the objective of the project is met and enhancing the national capacity to sustain the project's actions. The training will build on existing programmes (of the LCBC and other partners) and be supportive of new actions expected by the LCBC (for example the recently launched Climate Resilience Action Plan). The capacity building component will target major stakeholders including: resource managers, users, NGOs, CSOs, academics and policy makers.

UNDP will utilize its CapNet Programme's considerable experience, training materials, tutorials and tools in a wide range of IWRM related topics. This will be used to strengthen both government institutes and ministries and to assist with strengthening the role and capability of civil society organisations to effectively support the sustainable management of the natural resources within the Lake Chad Basin consistent with the SAP and the Water Charter.

**Component 3 Summary:**

The expected **Outcome** for this Component is: *Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels.*

To be achieved through three key outputs: **Output 3.1:** *Training national authorities on technical and environmental management;* **Output 3.2:** *Increase capacity in national research and academic institutions in the basin to conduct assessments on emerging issues in the Lake Chad basin and produce policy and management recommendations;* and, **Output 3.3:** *Develop participation capacities and provide environmental awareness training of basin users*

All stakeholders in the Member States require additional training as the further development of environmental protection and livelihood enhancements necessitates that more actors need to be aware of their regional, national and local obligations and know how to fulfil these obligations. LCBC Human Resources department have determined the training needs at the regional level, but more work is needed at the national /local levels to assess needs in relation to the Water Charter's requirements. This national/local training needs assessment, addressing training demand for all three outputs, will be undertaken during the inception phase by a consultant that will provide quantified indicators/targets for inclusion in the Project Results Framework after confirmation by the PSC/Inception Meeting.

### ***Output 3.1: Training national authorities on technical and environmental management***

Based on needs identified during the project inception phase, training sessions will be organised and relevant monitoring tools established to ensure the application of training. The training will focus on the needs of all stakeholders to support the implementation of the Lake Chad Water Charter and the (updated) SAP. The training programme development will be undertaken in close co-operation and co-ordination with partners working with LCBC.

The emphasis on national capacity building by the UNDP-GEF project is essential to enable the member states to effectively undertake the functions expected of them by the LCBC related to sustain the implementation of the SAP and Water Charter actions.

The aims of this output are to:

- (i) Support national managers with the skills and tools necessary for better decision making for water cooperation and integrated management (e.g. assessing the governance of basin resources, key economics assets including infrastructure, economic gains, in the short- and long-term; promoting integrity and accountability in the management of water; using Environmental Impact Assessments when proposing infrastructure developments, integrating, budgeting and implementing Legal and Regulatory Frameworks governing the management of the Lake Chad);
- (ii) Assist with national negotiations of solutions to water management issues in multilateral contexts within and across national boundaries; and to provide technical training (e.g. quantity and quality of water, conjunctive use, climate impacts and adaptation, etc.) to enable effective guidance and recommendations to be presented to national authorities /policy makers that will encourage harmonisation of approaches to water/environment management and assist with the national implementation of the SAP/NAPs and the Water Charter.

Output 3.1 is expected to directly support at least 10 national authority technical experts, with the benefits of the training to be disseminated to at least an additional 30 experts per country

### ***Output 3.2: Increase capacity in national research and academic institutions in the basin to conduct assessments on emerging issues in the Lake Chad basin and produce policy and management recommendations.***

Countries across the Lake Chad Basin have already established relevant training centres in support to the management of natural resources. These include, the Ngala Regional Agricultural Training School (in Nigeria), established in March 1977 by the LCBC, to train mid-level staff from Member States. The training aims to provide rural development agencies and farmers in the sub-region with competent extension agents, that will implement agroforestry and pastoral programmes, and techniques to improve farm yields and preserve natural resources. The Fishery Centre of Djimtilo (Chad) was established to train fishing communities on the improvement of their methods. There are also other national agriculture centres established in Diffa (Niger), Ndou (Cameroon), Koundoul (Chad), that undertake activities on irrigation techniques. The GEF resources will support key research institutes and universities to undertake research and training on emerging needs for Lake Chad management (e.g. conjunctive management of surface and groundwater, climate risk, etc.) linked to the SAP/NAPs and the Water Charter. Researchers, teachers and students will benefit from scholarships to improve their knowledge, undertake research, and specific training modules will be developed and integrated into the curricula. An annual regional scientific forum will be organised to share results of targeted

research. Finally, policy briefs will be generated from the research findings, and shared with policy makers through different platforms.

Output 3.2 is expected to directly support at least 20 national research and academic institutions, with the benefits of the training to be disseminated to at least an additional 100 experts per country

**Output 3.3: Develop participation capacities and provide environmental awareness training of basin users**

Riparian communities are stakeholders (including civil society groups, local leaders, mayors, parliamentarians, communities, etc.) that are among the greatest beneficiaries from the activities of the LCBC to enhance the environment and their livelihoods. These are mainly cattle breeders, farmers, fishermen, associations of wholesale fish merchants, women associations involved in market gardening and craft, traditional hunters and loggers, users of non-wood forest products, and more recently sand miners who directly derive their subsistence and incomes from the LCB. With GEF resources, communities will increase Public Participation as a means of improving water management through better planning and more informed decision-making. Following activities are planned:

- Develop a Public participation strategy and plan, and a roadmap for the implementation of the public participation plan (including sustainable financial strategy);
- Establish the network of basin resources users and support their participation to statutory meetings of the LCBC;
- Organise training and information forums to increase the understanding of Lake Chad environmental challenges and emerging issues and to access relevant tools and knowledge regarding the management of Lake Chad basin. Stakeholder knowledge gaps which will be identified especially the riverside communities and appropriate materials will be developed to stimulate imaginative engagement and learning. This will help reinforce the importance of the Lake Chad basin with regards to food and water security, and assist with livelihood development to reduce threats from underemployment leading to security issues;
- Develop regionally appropriate communication tools highlighting the contribution of the network to the management of Lake Chad. The promotion of traditional knowledge and documentation of best practices will be promoted, using engagement approaches that put locals and experts on an equal footing to help a two-way flow of information.
- Embed evaluation in participatory activities, using a range of evaluation methods to bring out the range of impacts that active engagement to LCBC management delivers.
- Translation of the Water Charter into 11 local languages (Kanuri, Mobber, Buduma, Hausa, Kanembu, Kotoko, Shewa Arabs, Haddad, Kuri, Fulani and Manga) and production of a booklet on key Water Charter obligations and key water management tools adapted to the need of communities;
- Awareness campaigns through local meetings and through national media and community radios;
- establish mechanisms for these stakeholders to monitor and evaluate the impact of the implementation of the Water Charter and conjunctive management of surface and ground waters.

Output 3.3 is expected to directly support at least 40 national water users, with the benefits of the training to be disseminated to at least an additional 30 water users per country

#### **Component 4: Monitoring, Modelling and Data/Information for Integrated Management of Basin Water, Land and Biodiversity Resources**

Regular ecosystem monitoring is a key function to ensure appropriate basin management responses and reporting of status. The need for strengthening and implementing a basin-wide lake monitoring system is specified in the SAP and expected under the Lake Chad Water Charter. At present, there is a relatively low level of monitoring in the basin and an even lower level of data sharing undertaken within and between countries. In addition, the capacity of staff to undertake monitoring and interpretation of data is limited (this project will address issues of national capacity through Component 3). Multiple partners of LCBC (e.g. GIZ, BGR and AfDB) are supporting the development and implementation of monitoring networks for surface and groundwater and this project will co-ordinate with these actions and with the LCBC Observatory Division to provide additional data and guidance.

The UNDP-GEF project will work with all partners to encourage the collection and sharing of monitoring information across the basin and will support effective utilisation of basin-wide data and databases within LCBC. The project will focus on supplementing data collected via the AfDB-GEF, PRODEBALT projects and the activities undertaken by BGR (on conjunctive use management and surface/groundwater quantity and quality monitoring) with community generated information on water and environment status, consistent with the needs of the Water Charter.

This work will also have direct relevance to national reporting requirements against relevant SDGs by providing additional data related to water, biodiversity, etc.

##### **Component 4 Summary:**

The expected **Outcome** for this Component is: *LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management*

To be achieved through two key outputs: **Output 4.1** *Transboundary lake basin monitoring system designed and agreed by all member states; and, Output 4.2: Contribution to GEF IW:LEARN related activities for information sharing and knowledge management*

##### **Output 4.1 Transboundary lake basin monitoring system designed and agreed by all member states.**

The LCBC in providing management oversight of the Lake Chad Basin needs to have a comprehensive information system to enable data processing and management, and for communicating to basin and global stakeholders on the state of the environment with the support of multiple partners.

Responding to the SAP (EQ 1 and 3), and consistent with the management needs of LCBC in providing status reports and assessing the impacts of the Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan, the 5-year investment plan and the SAP, the UNDP-GEF Project will support LCBC design a Lake Basin monitoring system (together with the actions of LCBC's partners). It is expected that this system will address surface and groundwater, land use, biodiversity, inputs from climate models and hydro-metrological stations, etc.



The UNDP-GEF project will assist the LCBC monitoring programme through the development and implementation of a multi-level participatory approach to water monitoring with a focus at the national/local level of the basin (collaborating with other partners at the regional level). This will provide a mechanism for regional coordination and collaborative actions, that will enable riparian partners to harness resources and expertise from a wide range of stakeholders and interest groups towards solving interlinked environment and water resources problems. Following activities are planned:

Specific activities to include (conducted in partnerships between LCBC, GIZ, BGR and AfDB, with the UNDP-GEF project focusing on national actions):

- Inventory and analysis of existing national/regional data and information, including institutional analysis and training gaps, the implementation of agreed mechanisms for the sharing of data and information at the local, national and regional levels (consistent with the Water Charter).
- Develop a clear specification of the intended purpose for a transboundary (basin-wide) monitoring system (who, what and why the data is required) consistent with the Water Charter;
- Assess the community's understanding of water resources. It investigates current water usage, observations on water condition, community confidence in water quality/supply and the possibility of increasing community-monitoring programs that will feed-in to national and regional data sets
- Support the establishment and operation of a Regional Working Group for Data management (under LCBC) including both scientists and community representatives. This will ensure that data and information interpretation is provided to multiple stakeholders in appropriate formats and details;
- Further develop data sharing to meet Water Charter agreed exchange protocols (in conjunction other partners);
- Obtain member state agreement to monitoring system and guidelines consistent with the Water Charter.

***Output 4.2: Contribution to GEF IW:LEARN related activities for information sharing and knowledge management***

With GIZ support, LCBC has: established a communication mechanism to raise awareness of the basin's resources and problems; inform on actions undertaken and their outcomes; explain the role of the LCBC and establish a continuous link with all the partners. Under the UNDP-GEF project the LCBC will further improve global communications of its achievements through GEF IW:LEARN and will contribute at least 1% of GEF funds to IW:LEARN information sharing activities.

- Ensuring that relevant information generated or available through the GEF IW:LEARN project(s) is shared with stakeholders in Lake Chad Basin (including, conjunctive use management, gender mainstreaming approaches, the TDA/SAP methodology, etc.)
- Participation in various GEF IW:LEARN exchange platforms and face-to-face knowledge-sharing events: Project teams and relevant partners at national & regional level will be supported to participate to regional/international forum held under the GEF IW:LEARN, especially the GEF Biennial International Waters Conference(s), to give their valuable inputs

on themes and activities. The project will also support the participation in the learning exchanges for potential replicating of successful practices and contribution to portfolio wide learning, and share the benefits of the exchange with other projects. Finally, contribution to relevant Communication of Practices will be facilitated to communicate with fellow community members via blogs, webinars, forums, and wikis in order to share experiences, pose questions, exchange information, etc.

- Development of a strategy to share information and experiences with the GEF IW LEARN from all activities of the UNDP-GEF Lake Chad project;
- Conducting studies, publications and reporting to inform the GEF IW-LEARN consistent with the GEF IW: LEARN Website Guidelines.
- Participation in various GEF IW:LEARN exchange platforms and face-to-face knowledge-sharing events.
- Through close co-operation with AfDB-GEF project, the two GEF projects will ensure to bring representatives from complementary organisations / ministries in each country to relevant GEF IW:LEARN events that will further encourage national involvement and sustainability of GEF project actions.

#### **Component 5. Implementing targeted community-based pilot projects to demonstrate local / national / regional stress reduction benefits in support of SAP implementation**

Despite their importance, the water resources and associated ecosystems in most basins are increasingly threatened by escalating and unsustainable pressures from fast-growing populations and cities as well as expanding agricultural and industrial activities. This is particularly true since the 1970s with the general climate context of chronic variability and deficits in rainfall and surface water resources. In the push for accelerated economic growth, many basin and national water and environment policies show clear limitations in their ability to promote equitable and sustainable resource use. The Lake Chad basin is no exception and this calls for an urgent intervention. In support to the LCBC and its member states, the AfDB PRODEBALT Project is setting up local development Funds to finance basic community infrastructures and micro projects of diversification and promotion of profitable sectors. The new AfDB PRESIBALT Project will support the enhancement of employment and revenue-generation through labour-intensive works in off-farming periods and the financing of income-generating activities (including development of productions using green technologies).

UNDP's implementing partner for this component will be IUCN.

IUCN in collaboration with surrounding local populations has initiated livelihood projects within peripheral zones of Zakouma national park (Chad) and Waza NP in Cameroon situated within underwater basin area of Chari Logone. The purpose of these projects is to support income generating and livelihood activities to boost household economies of local populations but also to foster support by surrounding local communities to conservation programs with the national parks. Results and lessons learnt from the projects are being replicated to other critical transboundary areas within Lake Chad basin and surrounding local communities of priority landscapes.

IUCN during implementation of the second phase of water governance project (BRIDGE) will address issues capacity building of local community leaders and transboundary collaboration in water resource management. This work will primarily focus on reinforcing existing stakeholders' consultative platforms on water dialogue, capacity building with particular attention on trained water champions, enhancing enabling institutional environment on water and conflicts management etc.

UNDP-GEF financed project will complement these activities undertaken by countries in the basin to support LCBC, national governments and local communities to gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods. IUCN has demonstrated experience in the Congo basin specifically landscapes such as tri national de la Sangha, TNS trans boundary program involving protected areas in Cameroon, Congo and CAR, lake Chad basin with Waza and Zakouma national parks, BSB Yamoussa Chad-Cameroon trans boundary program, working with local communities on community driven livelihood projects. In all these projects identification of community needs and priority activities follow broad base consultative process with beneficiary communities. The consultative process also takes into account expertise and knowledge of local NGOs, CBOs and local administration in project identification. Participatory M&E schemes are developed and implemented using simple progress indicators with participation of all key stakeholders. Another important aspect is information gathering and sharing with lessons learnt that are produced and disseminated to all stakeholders. IUCN as part of knowledge generations always produces knowledge products from field projects highlighting key successes, successful models and challenges that are shared with local partners but also the wider network. Establishing multi stakeholders' platforms to facilitate dialogue and collaboration among the different stakeholders is critical for successful engagement of different players in community driven projects.

The pilot interventions are planned (subject to security review following project start-up) in Waza, (Cameroon) working with pastoralists, agro-pastoralists, agriculturalists, fishermen, NTFP collectors (e.g. honey, Arabic gum etc.), and Zakouma (Chad) working with, pastoralists, agro pastoralists and NTFP collectors.

Key projects results and best practices will be shared through the GEF IW:LEARN. It is expected that all member states of LCBC will participate in either the regional project to control invasive plant species impacting Lake Chad (Output 5.1) and/or community financed activities linked to strengthening livelihoods (Output 5.2). Preliminary identification of the pilot topics and community level interventions has been undertaken in the PPG and PIF stages, but the final selection of the sites and communities will be determined after project start-up (as an exception) taking account of the evolving security issues in the region and the need for easy and frequent access to the locations. The development of national replication strategies (Output 5.3) will also develop operational guidelines for the project's public participation (including CSO engagement and gender strategies). It is anticipated that most of the project resources will be directed towards the on-the-ground interventions and upscaling actions with up to 20% directed towards basin-wide exchange of information. This Component will assist in reinforcing understanding and an appreciation of the benefits of ecosystem based management offering sustainable livelihoods that will be promoted through replication strategies for regional upscaling.

Potential criteria for the final site-selection (Outputs 5.1 and 5.2) will include: entrepreneurial skills, dynamic and proactive communities with ability to learn and adapt to context, structuration of selected local communities and organisational set up of proposed beneficiary communities. The final selection will be presented to the PSC for final approval. A preliminary cost-benefit assessment will be undertaken during year 1 to validate the final selection of the site/communities. This information will be used to refine the Project Results Framework through the inclusion of specific metrics likely to include:

- Revenues of beneficiary communities especially from income generating activities supported by the project
- Improvement in living standards of local households
- Number of stakeholders' resource-use conflicts
- Functionality of multi stakeholders' platforms

- Specific socio-economic indicators and targets to be identified following project start-up and detailed identifications of the sites/projects to provide a clear baseline against which progress will be monitored.

Pilot project intervention will be through a participatory process as described above involving local communities and other interested parties. A project committee will be put in place with representatives of the local communities to oversee project implementation, monitoring and reporting on progress.

#### **Component 5 Summary:**

The expected **Outcome** for this Component is: *LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods*

To be achieved through three key outputs: **Output 5.1:** *Regional/National pilot projects to control invasive plant species*; **Output 5.2:** *Promote ecosystem-based income-generating activities through sustainable financing schemes established at the national/local levels*; and, **Output 5.3:** *Development of National Replication sustainability strategies for community-based actions*

#### **Output 5.1: Regional/National pilot projects to control invasive plant species**

In the Lake Chad Basin, prevalence of invasive species was identified as one of the seven priority regional environmental concerns in the basin Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA). The problem is mostly seen in the Komadugu-Yobe sub basin, Chari Logone sub system and the lake itself. In the KYB sub-system, there are two prominent invasive species, typha grass and quelea birds. In the Chari-Logone system it is water Hyacinth while Typha and water Hyacinth have invaded the lake itself. The major environmental impact of weed infestation is the blockage, and in some instances even diversion of channels leading to channel desiccation and inundation; and loss of livelihoods, poverty and resources use conflicts. In Cameroon, the project will make use of data and results from research studies carried out by ministry of environment in collaboration with university of Dschang on management invasive plants in extreme northern savannah regions of Cameroon. The LCBC has the control of invasive plant as priority investment under the 2013-2017 Investment Plan.

With GEF resources following activities will be undertaken:

- Mapping of invasive plants and assessment of technologies for eradication/control and utilisation by communities;
- Undertaking at least 10 community projects ((based on the potential selection criteria above) for controlling invasive species, including training communities on marketing products. Project activities will focus on an integrated approach coupled with close participation of the local communities in the control process. Members of the local communities will be trained in management of natural resources and provided with inputs to support their horticultural farming, using composted fertilizer from harvested weeds. Approach will be developing to convert typha grass and other agricultural wastes as biomass for energy generation. This will contribute to ensuring project sustainability by demonstrating to local farmers the potential increase in production and income resulting from utilizing harvested aquatic weeds. The project is built on the premise of a beneficiary demand-driven approach, at national level as well as at community level, with full

participation of local farmers and fisher-folk in the activities and adoption of recommended methods.

- The aquatic plants of Yaere plains are exploited for commercial purposes mostly by local women. The project will support this activity as part of income generation opportunities for local women. Most of the water points in Waza national park contain various invasive species which potentially can be exploited by local communities. The project will work out mechanisms to facilitate access and exploitation of the invasive plants by notably organised women groups.
- Monitoring and assessment of the environmental and socio-economic impacts of control activities.

***Output 5.2: Promote ecosystem-based income-generating activities through sustainable financing schemes established at the national/local levels***

This output responds to expectations of SAP EQ 5. The UNDP-GEF project will assist the countries with developing, practicing and promoting environmentally sustainable and financially viable income generating activities to enhance livelihoods. The LCBC has over a decade experience in stakeholder engagement in financing community-based projects and investments for protecting or rehabilitation of Lake Chad basin habitats with the support of earlier projects executed by UNDP, WB, IUCN and the AfDB. The UNDP-GEF project will leverage this experience when promoting ecosystem-based income-generating activities through Output 5.2.

The project will benefit from IUCN experience in financing livelihood and income generating activities identified in collaboration with surrounding local communities of Zakouma and Waza national parks. More than 200 micro projects worth USD\$ 0.5million have been funded through mechanism involving micro financing establishments (MFEs) and joint local committees with representatives from local communities for approval of projects. Direct project subventions either financial or material to support identified livelihood and income generating activities. The beneficiary communities through legalised and recognised community based natural resources management committees (CBNRMs) benefit from technical assistance in financial management during project implementation phase. The CBNRMs also receive training in financial management and reporting to ensure accountability and transparency in the various initiatives financed by the project. In the case of Waza, the project facilitated partnership between CBNRMs and MFEs, MFE with experience and expertise in managing community micro subventions to finance livelihood and income generating activities. The CBNRMs formalized partnership arrangements with MFE to facilitate management and disbursements of funds to finance identified and approved field activities. The MFE also accorded small loans besides project subventions to reinforce activities of CBNRMs. This is part of building small scale local business enterprises in the various localities with CBNRMs as beneficiary structures. The MFE had the responsibility of supervising funded projects financed through their small credit schemes. As an example of the scaling benefits that can be achieved in this UNDP-GEF project, in Waza it is estimated that the livelihood projects directly benefitted 1500 individuals through financing of 150 CBNRM groups and indirectly the 200,000 local population of the area. In Zakouma about 1000 people directly benefitted from project subventions and indirectly an estimated 150,000 of surrounding local communities.

The focus will be at the local community level and the UNDP-GEF project will assist through the following support:

- Identification of at least 10 communities and appropriate financing mechanisms to develop actions for environmental and livelihood sustainable actions (based on the potential selection criteria above).
- Development of the Gender Assessment and Action Plan and a stakeholder engagement plan as soon as beneficiary communities were chosen. Gender Assessment and the development of the Gender Action Plan will be guided by experiences and guidelines developed by UNDP as well as IUCN's experience and knowledge in the field<sup>11</sup>. Gender is not an optional "add on" that can be considered at the last minute as a box checked, or seen as a "nice to have" element in conservation. Recognizing the important contribution women and men can make within conservation efforts to the global fight against issues such as climate change, loss of biodiversity, food insecurity, and poverty, for example, can significantly enhance environmental sustainability, and at the same time reduce the hardship of the most vulnerable peoples and save lives. Gender Assessment and Action Plan will also guide a broader stakeholder engagement plan that ensures the public participation in the project activities and engagement of CSOs/NGOs in general.
- Identification and agreement within communities/countries to sustain actions and financing approaches;
- Identification and partnering with appropriate local micro-financing organisations to address community projects that aim at restoring, maintaining and enhancing ecosystem-based income-generating actions to improve living conditions of communities. Income generating activities will include but not limited to exploitation trade in *Azadirachta indica* or neemier, *Balanites egyptiaca*, *Acacia* species, various fruit trees (mango, pear, orange etc.), apiculture with beekeeping etc.
- The UNDP-GEF project will provide support for sub-project development, which will include: (i) technical support for sub-project development. Feasibility studies will identify and assess costs and benefits for new income-generating opportunities as well as to provide guidance based on marketing and management study results; (ii) implementation support for subprojects consist of sub-project in-built technical assistance for training and mentoring to further strengthen capacity of local stakeholders, and to ensure desired quality and standards of sub-projects; (iii) follow-up support for sub-project management including management support and advice, knowledge management, and replication activities; and
- The sharing of experiences. Communication tools will be developed (such as reports, DVDs, films and documentaries, radio shows and brochures). The information will be translated into the appropriate formats and languages to allow dissemination through the community radios or television channels in the national languages. All material will be posted into LCBC, IW:LEARN, GEF and UNDP websites to ensure that the lessons learned affect a broader audience, including the international agencies. Depending on the target groups involved,

<sup>11</sup> IUCN has demonstrated experience ensuring gender mainstreaming and engagement in field activities. For example, the Pro Poor REDD project implemented in Cameroon which has one of the main activities CSO participation in REDD+ process has helped integrate women in ongoing national consultations for developing REDD+ national strategy in Cameroon. IUCN supported establishment of CSO platform on REDD chaired by a woman. On the ground the Pro Poor REDD project also identified and trained local champions who include women for grass root advocacy to combat climate change and REDD+ initiatives. Several women groups at landscape level have benefitted from direct subventions for livelihood and income generating projects. These groups also received training in various management aspects of natural resource management, organisational and leadership skills.

suitable mode of communication will be developed (e.g. local knowledge forum, product exhibition during weekly markets, etc.). Stakeholder's forum will be organized to communicate the technologies and gender approaches promoted, share lessons learned and experiences, in order to replicate them in other communities that are not covered. The project will benefit from services of Radio Environment with its network of members under Central Africa Rural Communities Radio Network with wide experience in design and communications in local dialects to targeted local communities.

***Output 5.3: Development of National Replication sustainability strategies for community-based actions***

Through the Output 5.3 the project will facilitate the development of national strategies to support the replication of the lessons and experiences from the community based actions validated through Output 5.2 above.

It is imperative that gender be entrenched in all national replication strategies, reflecting not only the theory but actual lessons learned and knowledge from the implementation of activities under Output 5.2.

The results of the pilot projects and the community-based actions (Outputs 5.1 and 5.2 respectively) will also inform Component 6 leading to pre-feasibility studies on potentially bankable actions that will be undertaken through the World Bank in partnership with LCBC. In addition, information will be also made available to a global community through both the GEF IW:LEARN website via the LCBC's Observatory Division's information system and the website of IUCN.

Specific activities towards the development of LCBC National Replication sustainability strategies for community-based actions shall include the following;

- (Economic) valuation and analysis of the environmental and socio-economic gains (and losses) realized through community-based activities implemented under Outputs 5.1 and 5.2. Potential/expected economic values realized in the near future to be provided by ecosystem services provided through restored ecosystem should also be estimated to the extent possible with the best available knowledge.
- Compilation of best practices, lessons learned and any other useful knowledge obtained through the implementation of community-based activities under Outputs 5.1 and 5.2, through the implementation of Gender Action and a stakeholder engagement strategy.
- Compilation of best practices, lessons learned and other useful knowledge obtained from the implementation of similar activities elsewhere in the world.
- Present the findings from the above at the existing national inter-ministerial committees (IMCs, supported under Output 2.2), which ensure the participation of government agencies, traditional leaders, community representatives, civil society, and the private sector in the discussions related to national water strategies and IWRM plan implementation.
- Discussion on replicability and scalability, based on the information provided, by the IMCs, which will inform the development of national replication strategies.

- The development of the gender-sensitive, national replication strategies with consideration on gender mainstreaming and on financial sustainability for review and adoption by the national IMCs.
- National and regional workshops to share and exchange approaches, results and recommendations for sustainability.
- Advocacy activities to secure national budget for the implementation of the national replication strategy.
- Agreement and preparation of a costed action plan for regional replication.
- Document experiences so far and develop LCBC Replication and Scaling-up Toolkit and other communication tools to promote the importance of replication and scaling-up plans in the LCBC member states.

### **Component 6: Pre-feasibility studies to identify Lake Chad SAP investment opportunities**

Recognizing the significant investments that are required to fully implement commitments under the SAP, this project will support LCBC to undertake a pre-feasibility assessment to identify specific investment opportunities that improve livelihoods of basin populations while restoring and protecting the ecosystem integrity of Lake Chad basin. Pre-feasibility studies will better articulate concrete investment options required to progress on the SAP implementation and guide future investments by the basin states as well as partners. During the 14th Summit of the LCBC's Heads of State and Government held on 30th April 2012 in N'Djamena, Republic of Chad, the Five-Year Investment Plan (2013-2017) was adopted. More recently the Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan was launched at the December 2015 UNFCCC CoP 21 in Paris.

This component links closely with Components 1 and 5, will be executed through the World Bank in close co-operation with the LCBC and will contribute to revisions and updates to the LCBC's 5-year investment plan by increasing the availability of bankable projects linked to potential donors and including all sectors of the Lake Chad society (e.g. civil society, private sector, government agencies) in the discussions and prioritisation. Through this component, the project aims to identify at least two potential investment opportunities per country, supported by the preliminary feasibility studies, with a strong hope to further identify investors/donors for each identified opportunity.

Potential contribution of each identified investment opportunity to the achievement of SDGs, in particular, SDGs 1 (poverty), 2 (hunger), 5 (gender), 6 (water and sanitation), 8 (decent work), 13 (climate change) and 15 (sustainable terrestrial ecosystems) and to the achievement of gender equality and women empowerment in the respective countries will be also articulated in the pre-feasibility studies.



### **Component 6 Summary:**

The expected **Outcome** for this Component is: *Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation*

To be achieved through two key outputs: **Output 6.1:** *Assessment of potential investments based on the SAP recommendations; and, Output 6.2:* *Pre-feasibility studies on potential bankable investments with outline budgets, scope of work and timescales*

### **Output 6.1: -Assessment of potential investments based on the SAP recommendations**

The UNDP-GEF project will coincide with the 5-year Investment Plan, the recent adoption of the Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan, etc., and with the update of the Lake Chad Basin TDA and SAP, the UNDP-GEF resources will focus on supporting LCBC to:

- Assist with the assessment and evaluation of the 2013-2017 investment plan and identify the major development, investment priorities and watershed ecosystem management challenges based on relevant socio-economic, financial, and environment studies (linkages with the TDA and SAP updating process ensured). It will contribute to the update of the mapping of interventions in the basin (projects, programs, partners) (see output 1.4 and developed through the AfDB and UNDP GEF PPG phases presented in Annex 3);
- Analyse a set of development scenarios for growth-oriented investments in water resources management. The analyse of the economic perspective will help to better integrate the implications of the development investment in the conjunctive management of water resources into the broad economic development and growth objectives of the riparian countries and the Lake Chad Basin.

### **Output 6.2: Pre-feasibility studies on potential bankable investments with outline budgets, scope of work and timescales**

Linking with the upgrading of the mapping process of potential donors' support and investments (undertaken in Output 1.4), the UNDP-GEF project will work closely with institutions geared to making mid- to long-term investments to support the Lake Chad basin population through the implementation of the (updated) SAP, Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan, etc. to identify priority investments through a range of pre-feasibility assessments. The work of this output will also build upon lessons learned, achievements, replication potentials and recommendations distilled through Outputs 5.2 and 5.3.

- Realise a detailed study of the benefits of cooperation and joint investment, and of how those benefits might be shared. The riparian countries could achieve short- and long-term benefits through coordinated operation of existing and planned cooperative flood management, and cooperative irrigation development. Engagement in the basin will depend on opportunities to build confidence in cooperation at these different levels, and will depend on political and socioeconomic conditions.
- Study and assess existing moribund water resources infrastructure investment with a view to determining the suitability of injecting new investment for their reactivation and determine the feasibility of conversion into common facilities for sustainable management of the basin in accordance with the provisions of the Lake Chad Basin Water Charter.

- Conduct specific studies on select topics. Future detailed planning of water resources development and management would benefit from studies such as: benefit- and cost-sharing approaches applied to specific cases; determination of e-flows, particularly for tributaries; and other studies deemed essential for project preparation and decision making.
- Build capacity of national decision makers and LCBC subsidiary bodies to identify and develop bankable investment projects;
- Support LCBC in preparing and developing the upcoming investment Plan (2018-2022) and in organising forums investments, involving the private sector, to finance the investment plan

## 2.5 Project indicators, risks and assumptions

Objective level indicators and outcome level indicators are specified in section 3 of this Project Document, including some tentative output indicators related to the planned work. The project design further foresees the development of more specific M&E tools, especially at the local implementation level. Participatory local level M&E can be a powerful management and communication tool, especially for tracking and demonstrating project results in demonstration sites. A more detailed M&E project framework will be developed during the project inception phase for management purposes. A GEF IW Tracking Tool has been completed and is presented in Annex 8 of this Project Document.

An outline project M&E plan has been developed and is included in section 6 of the project document below. It is expected that this will be further defined, and linked with the detailed indicator specification, during the inception phase of the project.

Assumptions underlying the project design include:

- Regional security is sufficient to enable the implementation of community based actions in the vicinity of Lake Chad;
- Involvement interest of communities in developing and implementing relevant actions;
- LCBC's reorganisation is implemented and functions as planned;
- Countries willingness to participate in the project and address issues highlighted in the TDA/SAP.

A complete Risk Log is included in Annex 1 of the project document. In summary, the main risks include:

Risk	Level	Mitigation
Political instability could affect the implementation of actions at country level	M	UNDP and LCBC Secretariat will work closely with national representatives to LCBC to identify potential issues and recommend specific interventions to reduce the potentially negative impacts. The participation of all countries in the Project Board, and reports by LCBC to the Council of Ministers will also be a conduit for addressing any potential issues at the national level.
The multiplicity of interventions for SAP implementation without effective coordination by the	L	UNDP and other partners (GIZ, AfDB) have started working together to establish a platform of partners under LCBC (Project output 1.4) for better coordination of interventions and donors. The expectation is that this donor co-ordination

Risk	Level	Mitigation
LCBC could limit the expected results and duplicate efforts.		function (together with related monitoring, evaluation and reporting of, for example SAP implementation) will be mainstreamed into LCBCs regular function and progress on donor actions will be reported annually to the Council of Ministers.
Environmental variability and climate change could alter ecosystem functions and reduce ecosystem services.	M	Key actions will be undertaken through the project (Component 5) and other partners' interventions (e.g. GIZ and AfDB) to improve management and resilience of basin ecosystems. This work will co-ordinate with the recent Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Plan (presented to the CoP 21 of the UNFCCC)
Insecurity in the area – terrorist attacks or regular banditry – may jeopardize the implementation and follow-up of the programme	H	Security and Intelligence Services of the LCBC member States have agreed to pool their efforts to bring a common and coordinated response to the current security challenges related to the threats posed by terrorism. The situation will also be advised by the UN's security assessments and briefings.
Limited technical capacities of staff from line ministries to support implementation of activities	M	Relevant trainings are planned by the project, specifically in Component 3. The UNDP/GEF project has a focus on assisting countries capacities to meet the expected demands for data/information and policy harmonisation of LCBC's 'basin management') to support basin managers and user in supporting key activities.

## 2.6 Cost-effectiveness

The project will strengthen the governance of the Lake Chad basin (at the regional and national/local levels), enhance stakeholders' capacity to monitor, plan and manage basin water resources and associated ecosystems, sustain and enhance inhabitants' livelihoods. The project will develop upscaling and replication plans further enhance the outputs and outcomes achieved.

The project addresses priority transboundary problems that have been nationally and regionally agreed during the TDA/SAP process. The endorsement of the Lake Chad SAP demonstrates the participating countries' commitment to long term environmental objectives and their willingness to begin the process of SAP implementation that has been reinforced through the development of NAPs in all countries.

Implementing policy, legal and institutional reforms agreed under the Lake Chad Basin SAP, and providing to the countries and LCBC relevant, information (including information on the progress towards overall SAP implementation), capacity and management tools would facilitate the governance of the basin and environmental status improvements. Through the implementation of the

project, it is anticipated that national budgets will increase to allow LCBC to fulfil its mandate and, implement restoration and management actions already planned. This will help countries to meet relevant commitments under the relevant components of the SAP/NAPs.

The project is also closely aligned with the LCBC's 5-year investment plan and the recent Lake Chad Development and Climate Resilience Action Plan. These plans have (and continue to) attracted considerable international and national attention, and together with other donor actions (e.g. AfDB, World Bank, bilateral donors, etc.) will reinforce the actions and cost effectiveness of the UNDP-GEF project.

The main focus of the UNDP-GEF project is in support of national and local capacity building and strengthening local communities' abilities to sustain livelihoods whilst enhancing the environment. Whilst the current security issues in the region render it impossible to be precise on the communities and actions to be undertaken, it is planned that during the inception phase this will be resolved and indicators and targets on the actions strengthened. The focus on local and national actions (including assisting the countries identify sustainable mechanisms to support, for example, IMC meetings) will aid the ability of countries to respond to LCBC's requests and lake management recommendations in the longer-term.

Cost-effectiveness of this project is also conveyed through the close co-operation and co-ordination planned with other regional initiatives (including: GIZ, BGR AfDB PRESIBALT, BRIDGE, etc.). The project will operate closely with the planned AfDB-GEF project sharing information and attending each project's 'steering committee' meetings. During the PPG phase the two GEF projects on Lake Chad confirmed their intention to share planning information and ensure that training programmes are implemented co-operatively, ensuring that the beneficiaries from both projects attend relevant events. In addition, assistance provided by the two GEF projects to LCBC to support donor co-ordination, and building on the initial work of GIZ, (with AfDB-GEF project supporting the meetings and UNDP-GEF project supporting the capacity strengthening for planning and reporting) further enhances the cost effectiveness of this project. An additional strength of these two parallel projects will be the ability to fund additional representatives from countries and LCBC to attend global events (such as IW Conference and twinning events organised by GEF IW:LEARN). This will be especially of value when more than one ministry is involved in the management of LCB.

The proposed project has the potential to provide experiences and lessons for application to other regions of the world. The project will document the lessons from demonstration projects, data sharing approaches, harmonisation of policies, basin management tools to facilitates their replication and will actively participate in GEF and other activities that seek to promote replication and sharing of experiences, such as IW: LEARN and the GEF IW Conferences.

## **2.7 Sustainability and replication**

At least 20% of the project resources are dedicated for community groups, especially women's groups and activities, to develop sustainable, ecosystem-based income-generating activities. The beneficiaries will explore new opportunities to generate the capital required to (i) restoring, maintaining and enhancing ecosystem services while improving living conditions of communities, (ii) ensure their bankable potential with lending institutions, and (iii) contribute to the family's daily expenses (children's health, education and food).

The project will build operational and financial capacity of target households for a sustainable, long-term solution that can ensure access to credit and thereby continuous support to durable solutions after the exit of the project. Professionals will conduct the training and partnerships will be developed with the private sector (e.g. micro-finance institutions) to support women during and after trainings. They will accompany women groups to design flexible products that meet the demand and capacity of people and take into consideration a development flow, i.e. that people move from e.g. 'grantable' to 'loanable', from small to larger loans or to saving-and-loan or from group to individual lending. Finally, they will support women organisations in developing business plans that may include turnover

and profits, the need for re-investments, production cycles, etc. Approach will be developing to convert typha grass and other agricultural wastes as biomass for energy generation. This will contribute to ensuring project sustainability by demonstrating to local farmers the potential increase in production and income resulting from utilizing harvested aquatic weeds.

Critical factors for project institutional sustainability will be also addressed through a full collaboration with institutions at national and local levels and adequate M&E procedures carried out by different national agencies. The project will provide support to the entities to strengthen their capacities in line with their role in the project. The technical sustainability is realised through the support from national institutions. The project will allocate significant resources to increasing the capacity of multiple stakeholder groups to encourage sustainability of project actions including: regional level (LCBC) and national level (national authorities and institutes, parliamentarian, academics and community organisations, etc.).

The proposed project has a strong potential to provide experiences and lessons that can be adapted to other sites, particularly those aiming to adopt ecosystem-based management approaches to transboundary river basins and lakes management. The project will document the lessons from demonstration projects, data sharing systems, development and implementation of policy, legal and institutional frameworks as well as basin management tools in a form that facilitates their replication, and will actively participate in GEF and other activities that seek to promote replication and sharing of experiences, such as IW:LEARN and the Biennial GEF IW Conferences.

## **2.8 Compliance with UNDP Safeguards Policies**

The project is rated as a 'Category Low' from an environmental and social safeguard perspective, with small scale, site-specific and manageable environmental and social impacts. No adverse long-term impacts are anticipated. Socially positive impacts are expected with the implantation of profitable ecosystem-based income-generating activities. Any negative environmental and social impacts of the project would result mainly from activities (component 5) associated with the rehabilitation of sites infested by invasive species and the development of vegetable garden & cash crops activities. During the project inception phase, the LCBC will develop an Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) that will provide guidance and measures with clear roles and responsibilities, along with capacity strengthening measures for effective implementation and monitoring. The document will provide key steps for screening all project components, outline procedures for preparing, reviewing, clearing, disclosing and monitoring sub-project-specific Environmental and Social Impact Assessments (ESIAs)/Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMPs). A full UNDP Social and Environmental Screening assessment is included in Annex 4.

### 3 PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

<b>This project will contribute to achieving the following Country Programme Outcome as defined in CPAP or CPD: N/A</b>
<b>Country Programme Outcome Indicators: N/A</b>
<b>UNDP Strategic Plan 2014-2017 Outputs&amp; Indicator:</b> <b>Output 2.5:</b> Legal and regulatory frameworks, policies and institutions enabled to ensure the conservation, sustainable use, and access and benefit sharing of natural resources, biodiversity and ecosystems, in line with international conventions and national legislation. <b>Output Indicator 2.5.2:</b> Number of countries implementing national and local plans for integrated Water Resource Management.
<b>Applicable GEF IW Strategic Objective and Program:</b> IW-1: Catalyse multi-state cooperation to balance conflicting water uses in trans-boundary surface and groundwater basins while considering climatic variability and change
<b>Applicable GEF IW Expected Outcomes:</b> Outcome 1.1: Implementation of agreed Strategic Action Programmes (SAPs) incorporates transboundary IWRM principles (including environment and groundwater) and policy/ legal/institutional reforms into national/local plans Outcome 1.2: Transboundary institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management demonstrate sustainability Outcome 1.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency, sustainable fisheries with rights-based management, IWRM, water supply protection in SIDS, and aquifer and catchment protection Outcome 1.4: Climatic variability and change as well as groundwater capacity incorporated into updated SAP to reflect adaptive management
<b>Applicable GEF Outcome Indicators:</b> Indicator 1.1: Implementation of national/local reforms; functioning of national inter-ministry committees Indicator 1.2: Cooperation frameworks adopted and states contribute to financial sustainability Indicator 1.3: Measurable water-related results from local demonstrations Indicator 1.4: Updated SAP and capacity development surveys

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Project Objective<sup>12</sup></b> To achieve climate resilient, integrated ecosystem-based management of Lake Chad Basin through implementation of agreed policy, legal and institutional reforms and investments that improve water quality and quantity, protect biodiversity, and sustain livelihoods	Number of countries implementing SAP actions Total number of SAP actions implemented across basin Ratification progress of Water Charter Gender mainstreaming in the SAP (and NAP) implementation	LCBC and countries have developed a number of strategies (SAP, NAPs) and investment plans (LCBC 5-year plan, Climate Resilience Plan) but significant implementation has yet to begin. 3 countries have ratified the Water Charter (Feb16). LCBC has a strategy on gender, but no Gender assessment or Gender Action Plan exists.	All countries implementing SAP (and NAPs) actions Average of 10 actions per country by year 5 All countries ratified Water Charter SAP/NAP implementation activities guided by Gender Action Plan, which is developed based on the Gender Assessment and in line with and in support of the LCBC strategy on gender.	Reports to and from LCBC Council of Ministers Project Board meetings SAP implementation tracking reports, which includes tracking progress on gender mainstreaming.	Council of Ministers discuss the SAP and project implementation in detail National authorities approve national actions proposed by the project Security situation is resolved to allow ease of access by project staff and communities to move freely within Lake Chad Basin. Donors continue interest in supporting the Lake Chad Basin countries. Commitment of LCBC and countries on gender mainstreaming
<b>Outcome 1<sup>13</sup></b> A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhance basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake	Council of Ministers approve SAP update Council of Ministers adopt BD protocol DRR protocol accepted by Council of Minister Donor Advisory Committee meetings Donor mapping	2008 SAP exists and needs updating. No BD protocol No DRR protocol agreed approach. LCBC has been given assistance on aspects of administration and technical elements. To-	Updated SAP, incorporating gender mainstreaming and women empowerment considerations, accepted by all countries by year 3 BD protocol adopted by year 4 DRR protocol adopted by Year 4 Donor Advisory Committee meeting meets annually. Donor mapping updated each year	Updated SAP Project Board meetings PIRs Project outputs/reports Reports presented to Council of Minister	Willingness to update the SAP from all countries Acceptance of BD protocol Tracking of SAP/Water Charter (etc.) implementation acknowledged as beneficial by Council of Ministers

<sup>12</sup> Objective (Atlas output) monitored quarterly ERBM and annually in APR/PIR

<sup>13</sup> All outcomes monitored annually in the APR/PIR. It is highly recommended not to have more than 4 outcomes.

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin	<p>LCBC provides reports on donors, projects co-ordination and SAP/Water Charter implementation progress to Council of Ministers</p> <p>LCBC staff trained in project management and reporting</p> <p>National staff trained in project management and reporting</p>	date training and assistance on donor mapping and tracking SAP implementation is lacking.	<p>LCBC develops reporting indicators for SAP /Water Charter tracking (Yr1)</p> <p>LCBC provides effective reporting to LCBC in Yr2 -5 Council of Ministers</p> <p>3 staff by year 2 Additional 5 staff by year 5</p> <p>3 staff per country/year (total 75, ensuring gender equality by encouraging the participation of women trainees as much as possible) (sex disaggregation of participant numbers recorded)</p>		
<b>Outcome 2</b> Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwater	<p>Number of countries with harmonised policies with respect to water management</p> <p>Number of countries with operating IMCs IMCs facilitating approval of update SAP at national level</p> <p>Financial and operational sustainability plans of IMCs agreed</p>	Baseline on harmonisation to be established in year 1.	<p>3 countries by year 3 5 countries by year 5</p> <p>Active IMCs in all countries by year 4.</p> <p>All IMCs demonstrate active support to SAP updating/approval process in their respective countries.</p> <p>3 countries by year 4 5 countries by year 5</p>	<p>Project Board meetings</p> <p>PIRs</p> <p>Project outputs/reports</p> <p>Reports presented to Council of Minister/LCBC</p>	<p>Willingness of countries to 'harmonise' approaches</p> <p>Benefits of IMC accepted at the national level</p> <p>Importance of conjunctive management accepted by all countries.</p>



	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	Number of countries with conjunctive use policies established		3 countries by year 4		
<b>Outcome 3</b> Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels.	National/local training programmes Number of water management trained national staff  Number of meeting/workshops for researchers/academics  Number of new collaborative projects from basin institutions  Environmental awareness meetings/workshops in each country  Level of community awareness of water, environment, climate change increased	LCBC has received significant training at the regional level.  Baseline to be fully established in year 1 for national capacity development	5 training programmes defining the scope of capacity building activities developed and approved by first PSC  National authority experts: 10 directly and 30 indirectly per country by year 5; Academics/research: 20 (directly) 100 (indirectly) by country by year 5 Water users: 40 (directly) and 100 (indirectly) by year 5  4 meetings by year 5 (sex disaggregation of participant numbers recorded)  3 by year 5 per country  3 per year (years 2 -5) per country  Survey results show increase of 100% by year 5  ALL data above will be sex-disaggregated. Qualified female participants are strongly encouraged to	Project Board meetings  PIRs  Reports from capacity building events with responses from participants  Surveys conducted at mid point and end of project demonstrate change in awareness at the community level	

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			participate in the training organized by the project.		
<b>Outcome 4</b> LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management	Multi-level participatory monitoring approach designed & implemented Agreements on data exchange protocols Member state agreement to programme  Strengthened national capacity to data/information management  IW:LEARN support	Monitoring is defined in the Water Charter but implementation and data sharing is limited.	Draft programme agreed Year 2, tested and finalised by year 4  Data exchange protocols (consistent with Water Charter) agreed by year 3  Approved by all countries by year 5  3 national experts per country trained to interact with LCBC's data management system  IW:LEARN website established within 6 months of project start 2 IWC conferences with 2 delegates supported from the LCB to each. 1 experience note produced by yr3 and 3 by year 5 Project shares (exchange, twinnings) with 2 other basins by year 5  (Sex disaggregation of participant numbers recorded. Qualified female participants are strongly encouraged to participate in the training organized by the project.)	Project Board meetings  PIRs  Reports prepared by LCBC's Observatory Division  National ministries reporting data transferred to LCBC  Operational website  Attendance list from GEF IW:LEARN exchanges and IWCs	Countries agree to monitoring programmes  Willingness to share data and information with LCBC
<b>Outcome 5</b> LCBC, national governments and local	Number of active pilot projects established	No projects	10 projects from all countries completed by year 5	Project Board meetings	Security situation is sufficiently resolved to allow movement of project staff and communities to pilot areas

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods	Number of national/local community financing projects	135 and 34 respectively in Waza and Zakouma field sites	Specific SR/SE indicators/targets (kg/year, ha of weeds removed, community individuals supported, household incomes increased, etc.) developed by Year 1  Guidance and information sheets developed for each pilot and community-level intervention site by year 5.  10 projects within the basin completed by year 5.	PIRs  Reports to Council of Ministers on national actions in support of SAP/NAPs/Water Charter  National reports	Ownership of project results by key stakeholders
	Gender mainstreaming and women empowerment through the active implementation of Gender Action Plan	LCBC strategy on gender exists, but no Gender Assessment or Action Plans developed specific to local/community-based investments.	Gender Assessment and Gender Action Plan developed that guide the implementation of community-based activities, as soon as the target communities are identified.		
	Number of replication strategies.	No replication strategies	National Replication Strategy developed for each country and approved by IMC.		
	Financial commitment for replication	No financial commitment for replication	Funding identified for replication activities  Direct project beneficiaries from pilot interventions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>200 persons (40% women) in Wazi</li> </ul>		

	Indicator	Baseline	Targets End of Project	Source of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>150 persons (50% women) in Zakouma</li> </ul> <p>(To be revised during implementation when sites/communities confirmed. As a guide, previous activities supported by IUCN benefited 1500 people directly and 200,000 indirectly in Wazi, and 1000 people directly and 150,000 indirectly in Zakouma)</p>		
<b>Outcome 6</b> Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation	Number of potential investment opportunities identified  Number of feasibility studies completed  Potential investments identified with possible sources	No pre-feasibility studies or investment opportunity assessments exist that support LCBC to attract resources required for the SAP implementation.	At least two viable investment opportunities (average) identified per country  A pre-feasibility assessment conducted at the basin level.  100 M\$ pipeline established linked to potential SAP actions with financial sources tentatively identified.	Project Board meetings  PIRs  Reports to Council of Ministers  Reports from the LCBC Donor Advisory Committee	Security situation and/or security clearance required to access to certain location of the basin to collect required data/information to conduct pre-feasibility studies.  Interest from countries in identifying actions for investments and assisting with pre-feasibility studies  Potential donor interest in funding actions within Lake Chad Basin

#### 4 PROJECT BUDGET

##### Component 1: Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission

GEF Outcome/ Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	Atlas Budget Description	Amount year 1 (k USD)	Amount year 2 (k USD)	Amount year 3 (k USD)	Amount year 4 (k USD)	Amount year 5 (k USD)	Total (k USD)	Budget Note
	Implementing Agent											
<b>Outcome 1:</b> A strengthened LCBC capable of: (i) Developing and implementing policies, investments and improved integrated ecosystem-based lake management through enhance basin-wide monitoring; and (ii): Developing and managing regional projects in accordance with the basin's priorities expressed in the Lake Chad SAP and other relevant strategic documents for the Lake Chad Basin	LCBC	62000	GEF/TF	71200	International Consultants	10	20	20	5	5	60	i.
				71300	Local Consultants	50	50	50	20	20	190	ii.
				71400	Contractual Services - Individuals	60	60	60	60	60	300	iii.
				71600	Travel	50	50	50	25	25	200	iv.
				72100	Contractual Services - Companies	10	30	20	5	0	65	v.
				72200	Equipment and Furniture	15	5	5	0	0	25	vi.
				72600	Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	vii.
				74200	Audio visual and Print Costs	5	10	5	10	5	35	viii.
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses	2	2	2	2	2	10	ix.
				75700	Training, Workshops and conferences	10	10	0	0	0	20	x.
	Total GEF Budget Component 1						212	237	212	127	117	905

**Component 2: Establishment of effective, sustainable national governance structures to support the SAP and Water Charter**

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	Atlas Budget Description	Amount year 1 (k USD)	Amount year 2 (k USD)	Amount year 3 (k USD)	Amount year 4 (k USD)	Amount year 5 (k USD)	Total (k USD)	Budget Note
	Implementing Agent											
Outcome 2: Strengthened and harmonised approaches to implementing sustainable legal and policy instruments across the Lake Chad Basin countries leading to greater water availability through effective conjunctive use management of surface and groundwater	LCBC	62000	GEF/TF	71200	International Consultants	10	5	5	5	5	30	i.
				71300	Local Consultants	30	30	10	5	5	80	ii.
				71400	Contractual Services - Individuals	57	57	57	57	57	285	iii.
				71600	Travel	10	30	30	20	10	100	iv.
				72100	Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	v.
				72200	Equipment and Furniture	15	5	5	0	0	25	vi.
				72600	Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	vii.
				74200	Audio visual and Print Costs	0	0	0	0	0	0	viii.
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses	2	2.381	3	3	2	12.381	ix.
				75700	Training, Workshops and conferences	0	20	0	0	0	20	x.
	Total GEF Budget Component 2						124	149.381	110	90	79	552.381

**Component 3: Capacity of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to support the harmonisation of policies and improved monitoring and management of the Lake Chad basin ecosystem**

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	Atlas Budget Description	Amount year 1 (k USD)	Amount year 2 (k USD)	Amount year 3 (k USD)	Amount year 4 (k USD)	Amount year 5 (k USD)	Total (k USD)	Budget Note
	Implementing Agent											
<b>Outcome 3:</b> <i>Technical capacity and awareness of national ministries, institutions and other stakeholders (e.g. academia, civil society) strengthened to contribute to the sustainable management practices of the natural resources in the Lake Chad basin at both national and basin levels</i>	LCBC	62000	GEF/TF	71200	International Consultants	10	5	5	5	5	30	i.
				71300	Local Consultants	15	20	15	5	5	60	ii.
				71400	Contractual Services - Individuals	57	57	57	57	57	285	iii.
				71600	Travel	80	125	150	80	60	495	iv.
				72100	Contractual Services - Companies	30	60	60	30	20	200	v.
				72200	Equipment and Furniture	5	5	5	5	0	20	vi.
				72600	Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	vii.
				74200	Audio visual and Print Costs	5	10	5	5	5	30	viii.
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses	2	2	2	2	2	10	ix.
				75700	Training, Workshops and conferences	2	6	6	4	2	20	x.
	Total GEF Budget Component 3						206	290	305	193	156	1150

**Component 4: Monitoring, Modelling and Data/Information for Integrated Management of Basin Water, Land and Biodiversity Resources**

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	Atlas Budget Description	Amount year 1 (k USD)	Amount year 2 (k USD)	Amount year 3 (k USD)	Amount year 4 (k USD)	Amount year 5 (k USD)	Total (k USD)	Budget Note
	Implementing Agent											
Outcome 4: LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information System for effective and sustainable Land, Water, and Biodiversity Resources management	LCBC	62000	GEF/TF	71200	International Consultants	4	4	4	4	4	20	i.
				71300	Local Consultants	15	30	30	15	10	100	ii.
				71400	Contractual Services - Individuals	57	57	57	57	57	285	iii.
				71600	Travel	20	40	50	40	10	160	iv.
				72100	Contractual Services - Companies	0	0	0	0	0	0	v.
				72200	Equipment and Furniture	10	5	5	5	0	25	vi.
				72600	Grants	0	0	0	0	0	0	vii.
				74200	Audio visual and Print Costs	1	2	2	2	3	10	viii.
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses	2	2	2	2	2	10	ix.
				75700	Training, Workshops and conferences	0	0	0	0	0	0	x.
	Total GEF Budget Component 4						109	140	150	125	86	610



**Component 5: Implementing targeted community-based pilot projects to demonstrate local / national / regional stress reduction benefits in support of SAP implementation**

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	Atlas Budget Description	Amount year 1 (k USD)	Amount year 2 (k USD)	Amount year 3 (k USD)	Amount year 4 (k USD)	Amount year 5 (k USD)	Total (k USD)	Budget Note
	Implementing Agent											
Outcome 5: LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods	LCBC(IP) & IUCN (RP)	62000	GEF/TF	71200	International Consultants	0	0	0	0	0	0	i.
				71300	Local Consultants	15	20	15	5	5	60	ii.
				71400	Contractual Services - Individuals	57	57	57	57	57	285	iii.
				71600	Travel	20	40	50	30	10	150	iv.
				72100	Contractual Services - Companies	20	80	80	50	20	250	v.
				72200	Equipment and Furniture	10	5	5	5	0	25	vi.
				72600	Grants	50	300	300	250	100	1000	vii.
				74200	Audio visual and Print Costs	0	5	0	5	5	15	viii.
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses	2	2	2	2	2	10	ix.
				75700	Training, Workshops and conferences	10	10	5	5	10	40	x.
	Total GEF Budget Component 5						184	519	514	409	209	1835

**Component 6: Pre-feasibility studies to identify Lake Chad SAP investment opportunities**

GEF Outcome/Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/	Fund ID	Donor Name	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	Atlas Budget Description	Amount year 1 (k USD)	Amount year 2 (k USD)	Amount year 3 (k USD)	Amount year 4 (k USD)	Amount year 5 (k USD)	Total (k USD)	Budget Note
	Implementing Agent											
Outcome 6: Assessment of stress reduction and livelihood strengthening activities identified in the SAP leads to a broad investment programme to further assist SAP implementation	LCBC (IP) & World Bank (RP)	62000	GEF/TF	71200	International Consultants	5	5	10	10	10	40	i.
				71300	Local Consultants	10	10	20	20	20	80	ii.
				71400	Contractual Services - Individuals	57	57	57	57	57	285	iii.
				71600	Travel		5	15	15	15	50	iv.
				72100	Contractual Services - Companies				15	5	20	v.
				72200	Equipment and Furniture	5	5	5			15	vi.
				72600	Grants						0	vii.
				74200	Audio visual and Print Costs						0	viii.
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses						0	ix.
				75700	Training, Workshops and conferences		2	3	3	2	10	x.
	Total GEF Budget Component 6						77	84	110	120	109	500

## Project Management

GEF Outcome/ Atlas Activity	Responsible Party/	Fund ID	Donor	Atlas Budgetary Account Code	Atlas Budget Description	Amount year 1	Amount year 2	Amount year 3	Amount year 4	Amount year 5	Total	Budget Note
	Impl. Agent					(k USD)	(k USD)	(k USD)	(k USD)	(k USD)	(k USD)	
Project Management	LCBC	62000	GEF/TF	71200	International Consultants			20		30	50	xi
				71300	Local Consultants	6	6	6	6	6	30	ii
				71400	Contractual Services - Individuals	32	34	34	33	34	167	iii
				71600	Travel	6	6	6	6	6	30	xii
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses			0.619			0.619	lx
	Sub-total GEF Budget Project Management					44	46	66.619	45	76	277.619	
	LCBC	4000	UNDP	71600	Travel	10	10	10	10	10	50	xiii
				71200	International Consultants	0	20	20	20	20	80	xiv
				72200	Equipment and Furniture	25	0	0	0	0	25	xv
				73400	Rental & Maint. of Other Equipment	5	10	10	10	10	45	xvi
				74500	Miscellaneous Expenses	10	10	10	10	10	50	xvii
	Sub-total UNDP Budget Project Management					50	50	50	50	50	250	
	Total Project Management					94	96	116.619	95	126	527.619	

PROJECT TOTAL GEF	956	1,465.38	1,467.62	1,109	832	5,830
PROJECT TOTAL UNDP	50	50	50	50	50	250
PROJECT GRAND TOTAL	1,006	1,515.68	1,517.62	1,159	882	6,080

## Summary of Funds:

Funding Sources	Amount Year 1	Amount Year 2	Amount Year 3	Amount Year 4	Amount Year 5	Total
GEF	956,000.00	1,465,381.00	1,467,619.00	1,109,000.00	832,000.00	5,830,000.00
UNDP	436,658.00	436,658.00	436,658.00	436,658.00	436,658.00	2,183,290.00
Participating Governments	43,247,746	43,247,747	43,247,747	43,247,747	43,247,746	216,238,733.00
LCBC	1,176,850.00	1,176,850.00	1,176,850.00	1,176,850.00	1,176,850.00	5,884,250.00
GIZ	1,895,207.00	1,895,206.00	1,895,206.00	1,895,206.00	1,895,206.00	9,476,031.00
IUCN	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	500,000.00	2,500,000.00
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>48,212,461.00</b>	<b>48,721,842.00</b>	<b>48,724,080.00</b>	<b>48,365,461.00</b>	<b>48,088,460.00</b>	<b>242,112,304.00</b>

## Budget Notes:

- i. International experts working on technical components
- ii. National/regional experts working on technical components and supporting the PIU activities
- iii. Long-term PIU staff working on technical components of the project
- iv. Travel and expenses for regional participants and for PIU staff attending meetings, workshops, etc. related to technical components
- v. Organisations/companies undertaking technical activities and supporting workshops on components
- vi. Office equipment for PIU and sub-regional staff
- vii. Grants allocated to local /national pilots and community projects under Component 5
- viii. Costs associated with printing material for training, workshops, regional/national/local awareness raising and other publicity activities
- ix. Contingency for unplanned needs of component activities
- x. Cost associated with workshops and meetings (meeting rooms, translation, etc.)
- xi. International consultants for mid-term and terminal evaluations
- xii. PIU travel for supervision and management purposes.
- xiii. Travel costs for UNDP staff for supervision
- xiv. International experts to support the LCBC Secretariat
- xv. Project car to be based in LCBC Secretariat
- xvi. Maintenance of the project car
- xvii. Miscellaneous expenses, including the Direct Project Support Cost

## 5 PROJECT WORKPLAN

	Outputs	Year 1				Year 2				Year 3				Year 4				Year 5			
		Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
	<b>Inception Phase</b>																				
	<b>Component 1</b>																				
1.1	Updated SAP																				
1.2	BD Protocol																				
1.3	DRR plans																				
1.4	LCBC monitoring & reporting																				
1.5	LCBC management																				
	<b>Component 2</b>																				
2.1	Harmonisation policies																				
2.2	IMC strengthening																				
	<b>Component 3</b>																				
3.1	National authorities training																				
3.2	Academics training																				
3.3	Participation capacity																				
	<b>Component 4</b>																				
4.1	Participatory monitoring																				
4.2	Information sharing/IWL																				
	<b>Component 5</b>																				
5.1	Pilots																				
5.2	Community livelihoods																				
5.3	National replication plans																				
	<b>Component 6</b>																				
6.1	Potential investments																				
6.2	Pre-feasibility studies																				

## 6 MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The **implementing partner** will be the Lake Chad Basin Commission (LCBC), who will closely coordinate project implementation with National focal points and Responsible Parties to deliver the project outputs in time, in scope and in budget.


For Components 5 and 6, IUCN and World Bank have been chosen as a Responsible Party, respectively, to support the LCBC to deliver the respective components.

The **Project Board** (PB), or Project Steering Committee (PSC), will be the highest decision making body for the project and responsible for management decisions and oversight for the project. Figure 2 presents the structure of the project management.

The Project Board plays a critical role in project monitoring and evaluation by quality assuring these processes and products, and using evaluations for performance improvement, accountability and learning. It ensures that required resources are committed, arbitrates on any conflicts within the project, negotiates a solution to any problems with external bodies and ensure the full ownership of the project by the countries. In addition, it approves the appointment and responsibilities of the Project Manager and any delegation of its Project Assurance responsibilities to appropriate entities. The PB approves Annual Work Plan and Budget, and also approve any essential deviations from the original plans (consistent with the approved project objective and outcomes). The Project Board decisions will be made in accordance with standards to ensure management best practices, value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency and effective international competition. In case consensus cannot be reached within the Board, the final decision shall rest with UNDP.

The Project Board will consist of (at least): country representatives, UNDP, LCBC, IUCN, and World Bank, with the PIU providing the secretariat support.

The AfDB-GEF and UNDP-GEF funded Lake Chad Basin projects (, including project staff, consultants, etc. as appropriate) will participate in both project's 'steering committee' meetings and work together to coordinate their activities (including planning of regional and national events) to enhance both the cost effectiveness of project delivery and ensure that LCBC (and Member States) has a clear perspective of the ongoing work of both projects. Other key partners of LCBC (e.g. GIZ, BGR, World Bank) will be invited to attend Project Board meetings. In addition, joint supervision missions will be organised by AfDB and UNDP to coincide with Project Board meetings.



**Figure 2: Project management arrangement**

The **Project Implementation Unit (PIU)**, based in N'Djamena at LCBC's offices, will assure day-to-day implementation and management of project activities as well as close collaboration with LCBC, IUCN, LCBC's partners, intervention, municipalities and communities. Members for the PIU will be recruited by UNDP in support of LCBC in its role as an Implementing Partner (Direct Project Support services requested by LCBC). The PIU will consist of a Regional Project Manager (PM), technical expert, Finance and Administration Manager, Administrative Assistant and a communication officer (on a contracted as-needed basis). IUCN, as an Implementing Partner responsible for the implementation of Component 5 of the project, will appoint a Project Manager who will be held accountable for the delivery of the Component 5. Comp 5 Project Manager will report to the Regional Project Manager for the overall project and report to the Project Board through the PIU on the progress made on Component 5. Both Implementing Partners are responsible to submit to UNDP financial reports quarterly for the funds they manage.

The project will develop MoU with LCBC National Focal Points based to support implementation of activities at national/local levels. The Regional Project Manager will be delegated the authority to run the project on a day-to-day basis on behalf of the Implementing Partner and the GEF Agency within the constraints laid down by the Project Board. The Regional Project Manager's prime responsibility is to ensure that the project produces the results specified in the project document, to the required standard of quality and within the specified constraints of time and cost. The detailed TOR for each PIU member will be prepared prior to the Inception Workshop (based on the outline terms of references in Annex 5), and approved by the Project Board and by UNDP-GEF.

## 7 MONITORING FRAMEWORK AND EVALUATION

The project will be monitored through the following M&E activities. The M&E budget is provided in the table below.

### Project start:

A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months after the Regional Project Manager post is filled, involving UNDP, LCBC and its member states, IUCN and other stakeholders in the basin. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first-year annual work plan.

The Inception Workshop will address key issues including:

- Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of all stakeholders, vis à vis the project team will be discussed, together with the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
- Based on the project results framework and the GEF IW Tracking Tool, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
- Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
- Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
- Plan and schedule Project Board (PB) meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first PB meeting will be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

An Inception Workshop report is a key reference document and will be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

The first Project Board meeting will usually follow right after the inception workshop to approve the annual work plan and the updated logframe, if applicable, which are reviewed at the inception workshop.

### Quarterly:

Progress made will be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform. Project progress will be recorded in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform, based on the progress and financial reports submitted quarterly by the Implementing Partners (IPs). UNDP will require a separate financial report from each IP quarterly; however, the narrative progress report, which report technical progress against the approved annual work plan may be submitted as a joint report by the PIU that shows progress of all Components.

Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log will be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Updating of the risk log will be done by UNDP Chad, based on the updated risk description included in the quarterly progress reports.



Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) will be generated in the Executive Snapshot.

Other ATLAS logs will be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc. The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

#### **Annually:**

Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared to monitor progress made since project start and for the previous reporting period (1 July to 30 June). The APR/PIR combines UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

- The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:
- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF IW Focal Area tracking tools) used by the IW Focal Areas on an annual basis.

#### **Mid-term of project cycle:**

The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organisation, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared based on guidance from UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, including the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre \(ERC\)](#).

#### **End of Project:**

An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the project closure and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by UNDP-GEF.

The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a

management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the [UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Centre \(ERC\)](#).

During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

#### **Learning and knowledge sharing:**

Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums.

The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation through lessons learned. The project will identify, analyse, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

#### **Communications and visibility requirements:**

Full compliance is required with UNDP's Branding Guidelines. These can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>, and specific guidelines on UNDP logo use can be accessed at: <http://intra.undp.org/branding/useOfLogo.html>. Amongst other things, these guidelines describe when and how the UNDP logo needs to be used, as well as how the logos of donors to UNDP projects need to be used. For the avoidance of any doubt, when logo use is required, the UNDP logo needs to be used alongside the GEF logo. The [GEF logo](#) can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF\\_logo](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEF_logo). The [UNDP logo](#) can be accessed at <http://intra.undp.org/coa/branding.shtml>.

Full compliance is also required with the GEF's Communication and Visibility Guidelines (the "GEF Guidelines"). The GEF Guidelines can be accessed at: [http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08\\_Branding\\_the\\_GEF%20final\\_0.pdf](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/C.40.08_Branding_the_GEF%20final_0.pdf). Amongst other things, the GEF Guidelines describe when and how the GEF logo needs to be used in project publications, vehicles, supplies and other project equipment. The GEF Guidelines also describe other GEF promotional requirements regarding press releases, press conferences, press visits, visits by Government officials, productions and other promotional items.

Where other agencies and project partners have provided support through co-financing, their branding policies and requirements should be similarly applied.

#### **M&E workplan and budget**

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Section 3 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome and will be refined and further elaborated prior to the Inception Workshop. The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators are summarized in below.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities. Indicators and their means of verification will be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the PCU but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators.

**Table: M& E work plan and budget**

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Inception Workshop and Report	Project Manager LCBC and IUCN UNDP CO, UNDP W&O RTA	Indicative cost: 20,000	Within first two months of the regional project manager on board.
Measurement of Means of Verification of project results.	UNDP RTA/Project Manager will oversee the hiring of specific studies and institutions, and delegate responsibilities to relevant team members.	50,000	Start, mid and end of project (during evaluation cycle) and annually when required.
Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation	Oversight by Project Manager Project team UNDP-CO UNDP-RTA LCBC and IUCN	50,000	Annually prior to ARR/PIR and to the definition of annual work plans
APR/PIR	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RTA LCBC & IUCN	None	Annually
Periodic status/ progress reports	Project manager and team	None	Quarterly
Mid-term Evaluation	Project manager and team UNDP CO UNDP RCU LCBC & IUCN External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost: 40,000	At the mid-point of project implementation.
Final Evaluation	Project manager and team, UNDP CO UNDP RCU LCBC & IUCN External Consultants (i.e. evaluation team)	Indicative cost : 40,000	At least three months before the end of project implementation
Project Terminal Report	Project manager and team UNDP CO Local consultant	0	At least three months before the end of the project
Audit	UNDP CO Project manager and team External support	Indicative cost per year: 10,000	Yearly

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget US\$ <i>Excluding project team staff time</i>	Time frame
Visits to field sites	UNDP CO UNDP RCU (as appropriate) LCBC & IUCN Government representatives	For GEF supported projects, paid from IA fees and operational budget	Yearly
<b>TOTAL indicative COST</b> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff and travel expenses		US\$ 250,000 (+/- 5% of total budget)	

**Audit:** Project will be audited in accordance with UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies.

## 8 LEGAL CONTEXT

This project forms a part of an overall programmatic framework under which several separate associated country level activities will be implemented. When assistance and support services are provided from this Project to the associated country level activities, this document shall be the “Project Document” instrument referred to in: (i) the respective signed SBAA for the specific countries; or (ii) in the [Supplemental Provisions](#) to be included in the Project Document in cases where the recipient country has not signed an SBAA with UNDP, and forming an integral part hereof.

This project will be implemented by LCBC in accordance with its financial regulations, rules, practices and procedures only to the extent that they do not contravene the principles of the Financial Regulations and Rules of UNDP. Where the financial governance of an Implementing Partner does not provide the required guidance to ensure best value for money, fairness, integrity, transparency, and effective international competition, the financial governance of UNDP shall apply. The responsibility for the safety and security of the Implementing Partner and its personnel and property, and of UNDP’s property in the Implementing Partner’s custody, rests with the Implementing Partner. The implementing partner shall:

- a. Put in place an appropriate security plan and maintain the security plan, taking into account the security situation in the country where the project is being carried;
- b. Assume all risks and liabilities related to the implementing partner’s security, and the full implementation of the security plan.

UNDP reserves the right to verify whether such a plan is in place, and to suggest modifications to the plan when necessary. Failure to maintain and implement an appropriate security plan as required hereunder shall be deemed a breach of this agreement.

The implementing partner agrees to undertake all reasonable efforts to ensure that none of the UNDP funds received pursuant to the Project Document are used to provide support to individuals or entities associated with terrorism and that the recipients of any amounts provided by UNDP hereunder do not appear on the list maintained by the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1267 (1999). The list can be accessed via <http://www.un.org/Docs/sc/committees/1267/1267ListEng.htm>. This provision must be included in all sub-contracts or sub-agreements entered into under this Project Document.