



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit 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: ¹	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 FRAMEWORK²

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>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</p> <p>Outcome 1.2: Transboundary institutions for joint ecosystem-based and adaptive management demonstrate sustainability</p> <p>Outcome 1.3: Innovative solutions implemented for reduced pollution, improved water use efficiency,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National and local policy and legal reforms adopted Co-operation frameworks agreed with sustainable financing identified Types of technologies and measures implemented in local demonstrations and investments Enhanced capacity for issues of climatic variability and change and groundwater management 	GEFTF	5,830,000	236,282,304

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² 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				
	Outcome 1.4: Climatic variability and change as well as groundwater capacity incorporated into updated SAP to reflect adaptive management				
Total project costs			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 (\$)
Component 1: Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission	TA	Outcome 1: 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	Output 1.1: <i>The 2008 SAP updated on the basis of the revised TDA</i> Output 1.2: <i>LCBC Biodiversity Protocol developed and adopted by all parties</i> Output 1.3: <i>Disaster risk reduction response plans developed to ensure the protection of people, the environment and water resources</i> Output 1.4: <i>LCBC's coordination and monitoring capacity strengthened with effective reporting of performance to the Council of Ministers.</i> Output 1.5: <i>Strengthening LCBC's capacity to develop and</i>	GEFTF	905,000	35,000,000

			<i>manage programmes and projects</i>			
Component 2: Establishment of effective, sustainable national governance structures to support the SAP and Water Charter	TA	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	<p>Output 2.1: <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></p> <p>Output 2.2: <i>Operationalize national inter-ministerial committees to improve coordination and support the policy mainstreaming process at the national level</i></p>	GEFTF	552,381	15,000,000
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	TA	Outcome 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.	<p>Output 3.1: <i>Training national authorities on technical and environmental management</i></p> <p>Output 3.2: <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></p> <p>Output 3.3: <i>Develop participation capacities and provide environmental awareness training of basin users</i></p>	GEFTF	1,150,000	18,000,000
Component 4: Monitoring, Modelling and Data/Information for	TA	Outcome 4: LCBC and member States operating and utilising data and information from Management Information	Output 4.1 <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> Output 4.2: <i>Contribution to GEF IW:LEARN related activities for information sharing and knowledge management</i>			
Component 5: Implementing targeted community-based pilot projects to demonstrate local / national / regional stress reduction benefits in support of SAP implementation	TA	Outcome 5: LCBC, national governments and local communities gain practical experience and upscaling validation on sustainable ecosystem management and alternative livelihoods	Output 5.1: <i>Regional/National pilot projects to control invasive plant species;</i> Output 5.2: <i>Promote ecosystem-based income-generating activities through sustainable financing schemes established at the national/local levels</i> Output 5.3: <i>Development of National Replication sustainability strategies for community-based actions</i>	GEFTF	1,835,000	80,000,000
Component 6: Pre-feasibility studies to identify Lake Chad SAP investment opportunities	TA	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	Output 6.1: <i>Assessment of potential investments based on the SAP recommendations</i> Output 6.2: <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) ³				GEF TF	277,619	33,282,304
Total project costs					5,830,000	236,282,304

³ 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
Total Co-financing			\$236,282,304

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b) ²	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
Total Grant Resources				\$5,830,000	\$553,850	\$6,383,850

¹ 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.

² 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 PIF⁴

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

⁴ 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
Component 1: Effective transboundary lake catchment management through a strengthened Lake Chad Basin Commission	LCBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Central government of the members' states: contribute to update the SAP, DRR plans, and Biodiversity Protocol; – Local government to involve communities necessary for the update of the SAP

Outputs	Responsible institution and role	Stakeholders and role
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – National institutes and academics involved with the SAP update – LCBC staff and management support the strengthening of their activities in programme management, donor co-ordination and reporting (to Council of Ministers).
Component 2: 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"> – 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. – Ministries of finance to assist with the development of sustainable financing for IMCs – Local government to involve communities.
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	Central governments of the Member States LCBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Target Ministries (water, agriculture, environment) involved in Lake Chad basin resources managements: identification of training needs and benefiting training activities; – Local government & parliamentarian: involved and assist with the identification of training needs; – Academicians: identification of needs, undertake key research, develop training modules and support sharing of research; – Basin users' associations: to assist with communities (CSOs/NGOs) and engaging private sector groups.
Component 4: 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>
Component 5: 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
Component 6: 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. 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.

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
TOTAL indicative COST 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.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
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 1st 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 17th October 2016)

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
Question 3: 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.
Question 7: 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).
Question 8: 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.
Question 9: 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>Question 10: 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
	<p>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.</p>
Question 11: Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	
<p>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>
Question 12: Has the cost effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	

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>Question 14: 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"> • Updating of the SAP (Output 1.1) • Harmonisation of policies (2.1) • Training of national authorities (3.1) • Training of academics (3.2) • Public awareness raising (3.3) • Monitoring and data management (4.1 and 4.2)
<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>Question 15: 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>Question 16: Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	
<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>Question 17: 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>Question 18: Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e. climate resilience)</p>	
<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>Question 19: 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>Question 20: 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 (2nd 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>Question 21: 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>Question 24: 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
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.	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.
Please note that the LCBC letter lists in-kind (staff time, office space etc.) as cash contributions. Please clarify.	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.
10/17/2016): Please see earlier comments on the LCBC letter of co-finance (see question 19.)	The co-financing letter from LCBC specifies 5,884,250 \$ in total (3,884,250 \$ in-kind and 2,000,000 \$ in cash).
Question 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	
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	Addressed

GEF Secretariat Comment at PIF	Response
needs to align with the current project for endorsement - and source of finance).	
Question 26: 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.
Question 27. 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
Question 29Other 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	Increase: 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	Slight increase: 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	Significant increase: 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	Significant decrease: 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	Slight increase (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 FUNDS⁵

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

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: \$300,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
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
Total	300,000	254,000	48,000

⁵ 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