



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

GEF ID:	9417		
Country/Region:	Chad		
Project Title:	Restoring Ecological Corridors in Western Chad for Multiple Land and Forests Benefits - RECONNECT		
GEF Agency:	IUCN	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):	CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$137,615	Project Grant:	\$5,366,972
Co-financing:	\$19,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,366,972
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Jacques Somda

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>	Yes	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. The project is consistent with the second communication to UNFCCC and the recent LDN report, as Chad was a pilot country. The project also fits with the National Development Plan.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental	The direct drivers of environmental degradation are identified, as well as	

<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)?

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>the indirect causes.</p> <p>The project is innovative in its way to develop a "landscape and ecological continuity" out of protected areas with CC mitigation objectives and the empowerment of local stakeholders in regional planning. Chad was a pilot country for LDN and this project is aligned with strategy proposed for the Mayo-Kebbi Ouest region. The approach is potentially replicable with a high potential for scaling up. The development of local governance mechanisms will help for sustainable approaches.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>- The project is building on significant NRM and Decentralization initiatives supported by the government of Chad and various agreement notably with the German Cooperation. Many other investments also exist in parallel (WB, AfDB, GIZ, BMZ, JICA, IUCN, WWF, USFWS, for instance). The project is designed with a sound incremental reasoning.</p> <p>- However, the restoration of forest and savanna corridors can provide multiple environmental, social, and economic benefits. We understand the focus on reduction of GHG and the sequestration of carbon (to justify the CCM resources). But, the justification of the SFM resources makes sense</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>because of these multiple benefits. Please complete the section 4 (p18) on the Global Environment Benefits, and develop the multiple benefits for the environment and the communities.</p> <p>- We would also like to see the project title better reflect these multiple benefits and not only CC mitigation.</p> <p>March 14, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	The result framework is acceptable at PIF level. The explanations in the document are very helpful. Please use the PPG to confirm and detail the strategies, outputs, and activities, especially of the second and third components. Confirm the values in carbon (baseline and targets).	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>During the PPG, please extend the notion of gender issues to inequality issues.</p> <p>Develop a comprehensive risk analysis.</p>	
<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>	The OFP has endorsed \$3,000,000 from CCM and \$1,000,000 fro LD (and potentially leveraging \$2,000,000 from SFM). The proposed grant is available within the STAR	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		resources (\$4,374,824 are available), with the application of a marginal adjustment (\$2,781,000 are available from CCM, \$1,214,100 from LD, and \$379,724 from BD).	
	<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>	SFM: \$2 million are requested from the SFM programme (\$1,776,484 for the project grant + \$50,000 for the PPG + \$173,516 for the agency fees).	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>The PIF is not yet recommended for clearance. Please address the two points in the cell 4.</p> <p>March 14, 2016 The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 07, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 14, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<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.