



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

GEF ID:	9050		
Country/Region:	Chad		
Project Title:	Building Resilience For Food Security and Nutrition in Chad's Rural Communities		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	LD-1 Program 1; LD-3 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,329,452
Co-financing:	\$15,045,800	Total Project Cost:	\$20,525,252
PIF Approval:	April 28, 2015	Council Approval/Expected:	June 04, 2015
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Laokole Dedjoguere Antoinette

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	No. - The project sounds as a LDCF project (adaptation) or a LD project, but significant improvements are needed to make a MFA project using BD and SFM resources. - Please, refer to the Aichi targets that the project is contributing. - You have to include in the GEB the number of ha of production landscapes that will integrate biodiversity conservation and	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>sustainable use. The options of third-party certification system is preferred, but you can propose a different objective measure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- For SFM2, the number of ha under SFM, forest restoration, plantations, as well as the capacity building activities that are targeting the forest users are welcome. An estimation of carbon gains is expected at PIF level. There is a range of available simple tools for that. You can take inspiration from the WB and FAO who are using EXACT, but any other equivalent tool is welcome.</li> <li>- Most of the proposed activities under the outcome 4.1 are not eligible per se (targeted research, early warning system), or you have to make the demonstration that these proposed activities are completing baseline actions, they will help to produce GEB, and sustainability aspects are addressed. For the time being, we do not understand how these proposed activities are completing the baseline project.</li> <li>- 216 ha of SLM and 100 ha under pastoral management appears very poor outputs for a \$6 million GEF investment. Please, revise.</li> </ul> <p>March 26, 2015 Addressed.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>- Mainstreaming adaptation and resilience is certainly welcome in GEF MFA and SFM projects. However you cannot start the project reasoning by adaptation. First refer to NBSAP, NAP, and the national development programme, include the NAPA at the end (p11, p23).</p> <p>- Outputs and activities that mainstream resilience and adaptation are welcome when you can justify that these activities will be help for GEB (1.2.1, 1.2.2). Many outputs directly refer to adaptation activities out of any incremental reasoning (outcome 4.1, output 4.1.3).</p> <p>March 26, 2015 Addressed.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>No.</p> <p>- Please, reduce drastically the description sections: remove all the country general descriptions that are not relevant.</p> <p>- However, the information related to the project area is limited: Bahr el Ghazal and Kanae. You have focus on the drivers of environmental degradation in these areas.</p> <p>- Explain what the baseline project is financing in this area (the regional activities do not seem pertinent in the</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		baseline).  March 26, 2015 Addressed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>- Once the drivers will be well identified for the considered areas, you have to explain what the biodiversity of global importance is (are there protected areas in the area for instance?) and how the proposed measures will help to target the drivers. Land-use planning tools can potentially be part of the solution – but all training, awareness, etc., activities are not eligible in a BD program 9 project.</p> <p>- You have to demonstrate the added value of BD resources in your project in the context of the BD program 9. Mapped information is needed to figure out how the mainstreaming/integrated activities will serve for conservation of international importance. You have to describe the reasoning, the assumptions, and the proposed mechanisms. In the case of mainstreaming activities on the ground, please insert a verification/certification mechanism. Please refer to the GEF6 BD strategy and the program 9 for further details. It is very difficult to figure out the eligibility under the BD program 9</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>without a map of the area, with a minimum of information (protected areas, classified forests, buffer zones, community area, etc).</p> <p>- You have to be more concrete and accurate on the kind of incentive you will develop to protect/enhance biodiversity of global importance.</p> <p>March 26, 2015 Thanks for the responses. The last point is not addressed in the text. There is a new output 2.3.3 on certification aspects in the result framework. However, in the text, only planning, capacity building, and outreach activities are proposed. Please, develop the intention and the expected results in terms of certification and incentives, and explain how it would benefit to a biodiversity of international importance.</p> <p>March 27, 2015 Thanks for the clarification. We understand that various financing and incentive mechanisms will be designed during the PPG to materialize a certification system. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the</p>	<p>No. - It is recommended to limit PIF document at 10 pages. 26 pages is</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>GEBS?</p>	<p>definitely too much. Please reduce.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The result framework is 6 pages long, including 5 components, 6 outcomes, and 27 outputs. It is too much and reflects a certain dispersion. Please revise the reasoning and focus on outcomes and outputs that reflect the use of GEF BD, LD, and SFM resources for global environment benefits in complement of the baseline situation and the cofinancing.</li> <li>- Some outputs seem out the scope. Does that make sense to separate all training and capacity building outputs because of the beneficiaries (1.1.2, 2.1.2, 2.1.3, 3.1.2, 3.1.3); same comment for demonstration and income generating activities (1.2.2, 1.2.3, 2.1.1, 2.2.2, 2.3.1); same comment for KM (3.1.4, 4.1.2, 4.1.3, 4.2.1); same comment for monitoring related outputs (2.3.3, 4.1.2, 4.2.2, 4.2.3); same comment for mainstreaming/integration activities (3.2.2, 3.2.3).</li> <li>- Please revise the formulation of outputs, some of them are indicators and should be reformulated or removed (2.1.2, 2.3.3); other are not enough accurate (3.2.3).</li> </ul> <p>March 26, 2015 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects,</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Please develop these aspects during the PPG and include gender, indigenous, and CSO aspects in the result framework, the indicators, and the implementation arrangements.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>- Some amounts have been rounding up or down. At the end, the total project costs in the table B does not match with the sum of the components (\$5,329,452 vs. 5,329,454). Please revise.</p> <p>March 26, 2015 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>- \$2 million (PPG and Fees included) are requested from the GEF6 SFM incentive program.</p> <p>- This is the maximum possible, as the project is using \$4 million from STAR allocations.</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	No. The PIF cannot be recommended for clearance. The GEF Secretariat is available for discussion to make this proposal eligible under the GEF6	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		<p>strategies.</p> <p>March 26, 2015 Thanks for the revised the document and the response. Please address the last comment in the cell 4.</p> <p>March 27, 2015 All points have been addressed. Some will be further developed during the PPG. The PIF is technically cleared.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 19, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 26, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 27, 2015	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	At PIF level, we made the following recommendations. Please, include them in the table of responses from GEFSEC comments (c. cell 11).	



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>"During the PPG, please pay a particular attention to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop the incentive and certification mechanisms to mainstream BD into productive landscapes.</li> <li>- Develop a comprehensive risk assessment, including mitigation and monitoring measures.</li> <li>- Include a stakeholder analysis and adjust implementation arrangements.</li> <li>- Include a Monitoring and Environment/assessment plan, that includes the analysis of land degradation trends and associated socio-economic and biodiversity impacts.</li> <li>- Include gender analysis in the M&amp;E.</li> <li>- Develop in the project document the way you will assess biodiversity and conservation needs in the regions of Kanem and Bahr el Ghazal and the possible response mechanisms".</li> </ul>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The project structure is based on what was agreed at PIF level, with details and quantified targets.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>- We do not see the additional role of the GEF and the role of cofinancing in the baseline activities. Please provide this demonstration (a table</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>will be useful with the baseline activities financed by cofinancing and the incremental activities financed by the GEF). The memorandum provided for the PR2S is not enough detailed to figure out the activities in Chad.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A project document is needed for the Chad Component. Some technical reports by country are mentioned, but not available in the package. Those for Chad are needed to understand the whole AfDB/GEF operation.</li> <li>- Mapped information will be very useful.</li> <li>- Cost-effectiveness: Please explain why the proposed options of implementation are cost effective to meet the project objective in comparison with other possible options.</li> </ul> <p>March 28, 2017 Not addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- We thank the agency for the P2RS document. However, it is difficult to use this document as a baseline for the Chad project. Some technical annexes (in French) are mentioned, we would like to receive these documents to better understand the whole AfDB/GEF operation.</li> <li>- For further submissions, we recommend the Agency to include in</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the table of responses the page number and the sections that are modified. We also recommend to AfDB to send documents with tracked changes, or highlighted sections.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Is it the only map you have for the project? Could you provide the geographical coordinates of the intervention sites?</li> <li>- The right acronym is RAPTA.</li> </ul> <p>August 30, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Addressed.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>The relevant TT are available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- However, please complete the information under the SFM2 objective (# of ha).</li> <li>- For the LD PMAT, the mention "To Be Determined" is included in many cells. Is it planned to gather this information during project implementation? There is no mention of such activities in the result framework. Please, clarify.</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- Section C on M&amp;E: the LD Tracking Tools are referred as "climate change resilience (LD1) tracking tool. It is not correct. However, including a measure of resilience would have been useful, as recommended by the STAP. Please see if it is still possible to define and include such measure.</p> <p>March 28, 2017</p> <p>- The right BD tracking tools for the Objective 4 Program 9 are missing.</p> <p>- SFM tracking tracking tools: We take note of the 15,000 ha under low GHG management practices and the target of 1,313,400 tCO2 for the direct GHG emissions avoided. However, in the CEO endorsement request, under the Corporate Result 4, the value of 15,000 metric tons sounds as a error. Please, confirm, or correct.</p> <p>- The additional excel sheet on the carbon estimation is welcome, but an explanation will be welcome to understand the reasoning and the calculation applied to the intervention sites in the regions of Kanem and Bahr el Ghazal.</p> <p>August 30, 2017</p> <p>- In the SFM tracking tools, the mention of 15,000 ha under the indicators 1 and 3 does not seem correct. Later in the table, it is</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		mentioned that the project will work on 15,000 ha of lands, including 7,000 ha of degraded croplands, 3,000 ha of pastoral lands and 5,000 of woodlots and agroforestry parklands. Please, correct. Also, date the table (Section A).	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes, notably the PR2S and the Great Green Wall Initiative.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	There is M&E. cf. Component 3. - However, in the Monitoring and Evaluation tables (annex A), no baseline is available for each proposed indicator. The lack of quantified and mapped information is a concern and potentially a problem. Please, clarify.  March 28, 2017 Addressed.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Addressed. cf. Component 3.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	At PIF level (cf. review above), we	

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

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>raised a number of issues to address during the PPG. Please, insert a table a response in the annex B. For your convenience, the list of points is repeated below:</p> <p>During the PPG, please pay a particular attention to the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop the incentive and certification mechanisms to mainstream BD into productive landscapes.</li> <li>- Develop a comprehensive risk assessment, including mitigation and monitoring measures.</li> <li>- Include a stakeholder analysis and adjust implementation arrangements.</li> <li>- Include a Monitoring and Environment/assessment plan, that includes the analysis of land degradation trends and associated socio-economic and biodiversity impacts.</li> <li>- Include gender analysis in the M&amp;E.</li> <li>- Develop in the project document the way you will assess biodiversity and conservation needs in the regions of Kanem and Bahr el Ghazal and the possible response mechanisms.</li> </ul> <p>March 28, 2017 The responses are far too generic and</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>vague at CEO endorsement. We would like to receive copies of the studies developed during the PPG to figure out 1) the incentive and certification mechanisms to mainstream BD into productive landscapes, 2) the stakeholder analysis and the implementation arrangements, 3) the gender elements, and 4) the way you will assess biodiversity and conservation needs in the regions of Kanem and Bahr el Ghazal and the possible response mechanisms.</p> <p>August 30, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	<p>- It is mentioned in the annex B that the RAPTA framework has been used. However, the RAPTA framework is not mentioned in the request for CEO endorsement. Please clarify, and if possible include an annex with the RAPTA information.</p> <p>March 28, 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide the # of the paras/chapters that have been modified.</li> <li>- Provide a revised document in tracked changes.</li> <li>- We are not seeing how the RAPTA framework has been used. Please, provide the study.</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		August 30, 2017 Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	Responses are available for comments made by Germany and the US.  Addressed.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>The project cannot be recommended yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>March 28, 2017 Very few comments have been addressed since the first review. The project cannot be recommended.</p> <p>August 30, 2017 The project is recommended for CEO endorsement. However, please check the comments related to the Tracking Tools on SFM.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 06, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 28, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 30, 2017	