



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	9476		
Country/Region:	Chad		
Project Title:	Chad child project: Integrated management of natural resources in the Chadian part of the Lake Chad basin		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-1; LD-2; CCM-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$2,557,942
Co-financing:	\$8,292,500	Total Project Cost:	\$10,850,442
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	DIOP BAMBA

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?		April 25, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?		April 25, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		April 25, 2016 n/a AC

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?		April 25, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		April 25, 2016 n/a AC
	• the focal area allocation?		April 25, 2016 Yes. The agency fee is 7.99% of the grant amount, and funds were approved under GEF 5 and are still available. Cleared. AC
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		April 25, 2016 n/a AC
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		April 25, 2016 n/a AC
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		April 25, 2016 n/a AC
	• focal area set-aside?		April 25, 2016 n/a AC
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		April 26, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?		April 26, 2016 While the project is aligned with the LD results framework, it is strongly suggested here that component 2 be changed to eg "promotion of renewable energy (RE)"

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>technologies/practices.' It can easily be argued that components 1 and 2 are essentially the same because rehabilitation of degraded lands/habitats (component 1) will have positive impacts, lead to improved flow of ecosystem services (ES) (component 2). That is, they can be merged to yield the similar impacts/results.</p> <p>In addition, most outputs and outcomes under ES component 2 as it is, will fit better under a component about renewable energy. They simply need to be phrased accordingly. Even the description of component 2 on p17 is all about RE, and hardly much about ES. Consider revising.</p> <p>Secondly, component 3 needs to be dedicated to institutional capacity building/development in line with LD-1 and 2, BD-2, CCM-3 and SFM/Redd+-1 that all have an explicit support for capacity building for improved policy and institutional environment. In addition, this will also strengthen the link with the regional umbrella project component 1. Consider 'knowledge, data and monitoring improved' as one of the outcomes of the component about 'Institutional capacity building/development.' You will add associated outputs of this outcome, taking into account the elements the most relevant to the project.</p> <p>Finally, there are 4 medium to high risks on p24 that are linked to capacity levels.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>This reinforces the reason to have a component in this project that is dedicated to capacity building.</p> <p>AC</p> <p>14 October 2016 Addressed</p>
	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?		<p>April 26, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC</p>
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?		<p>April 26, 2016</p> <p>With reference to the comments in cell 8 above, there is need for a better alignment of the component (component 3) to the focal area project support activities. That alignment will give a better articulation of how developed capacities will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes, as requested here. Once the requested modifications are done, please articulate accordingly the capacities developed with the sustainability of the project outcomes AC, PM.</p> <p>14 October 2016 Addressed</p>
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and		<p>April 30, 2016 Partially: it will be helpful to maintain a language that is not open to misunderstanding regarding whether</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	based on sound data and assumptions?		<p>PRODEBALT and PRESIBALT are either both baseline projects or simply PRESIBALT. Notably, the allusion to PRODEBALT on p13 (the table), p14 (paragraph 2) suggest PRODEBALT is a baseline project for this project.</p> <p>In addition, clarify why you will use PRODEBALT as co-finance for this project (p9 last line). AC, PM</p> <p>14 October 2016 Addressed</p>
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		<p>April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC</p>
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?		<p>April 30, 2016 The incremental/additional reasoning is conceivable in the generalities of activity description (pp 20-21). To allow for a better understanding of the incremental/additional reasoning, please give additional information about the specifics of envisaged activities, i.e what exact activities, measures, technologies/practices, renewable energy technologies that the project will focus on? Besides RE technologies mentioned on p17, specifics will be helpful. Eg What trees will be used for re-vegetation (p16); indigenous or exotic, horticultural? Please clarify.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			AC, PM 14 October 2016 Addressed
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	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?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	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)		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	20. Is the project implementation/execution arrangement adequate?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		April 30, 2016 The baseline project has been changed from PRODEBLT to PRESIBALT. However, consider suggestions and comments in cells 8, 11 and 13 above. AC 14 October 2016 Addressed
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		April 30, 2016 n/a AC
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		April 30, 2016. The suggested changes in cell 8 above will necessitate a revision of the funding levels for the components and their expected outcomes and outputs AC 14 October 2016 There is a mistake in table A: the total project costs do not correspond to the sum of the items above (for GEF Grant Amount and for Cofinancing). According to the umbrella program, the total GEF grant for LD is \$200,981 and not the double as stated in table A. Please correct accordingly. 29 November 2016 Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;		April 30, 2016 No letter to confirm cofinancing is

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.		attached to this project submission. Please provide the cofinancing letters. AC, PM 14 October 2016 Addressed
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		April 30, 2016 Yes. Cleared. AC
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		April 30, 2016 The Tracking Tools (TTs) have been submitted, however, there is insufficient information in some of the sections: -LD TT: Project context and impact 4.c-f are all empty. From the project description, these need information. Regarding GHG emissions reduction and sequestration. It was expected that this be included in the "Measurable global environmental benefits in the project target area" section of the TT. There is no data at all in Part II (outcomes and learning) of the LD TT. Numbers of rural people, where did 250,000 male and 250,000 female come from? In P28 there are 40,000 and in p31 40,000 and 50,000 people. - The CCM TT needs to be completed (energy efficiency - GHG emission avoided and LULUCF sections). - The BD TT needs also to be completed (sections II and III). -SFM/Redd+ TT: Socio-economic benefit and the outcomes (current

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>situation) sections need to be filled in. Please also explain the coherence in the number of hectares of forests between the TT, the Ex-Act tool and the project document. The numbers in the ex-Act tool do not correspond to those in the other documents.</p> <p>AC, PM</p> <p>14 October 2016</p> <p>CCM TT: The CCM TT doesn't correspond to the project document and to the Ex-act tool neither: GEF grant, co-financing, avoided deforestation vs afforestation, where does the 700 ha of Conservation and enhancement of carbon in forests, including agroforestry come from, where in the project document are reported the CO2 benefits of 263,954 tons and where these benefits are in the Ex-act tool? Please align the 3 documents and use the version of Ex-act tool on line in the FAO website.</p> <p>BD TT: it is not clear where the 18,200 ha of landscape/seascape area directly covered by the project and the 1,700 ha of sustainable management land come from. The same applies with the 40,000 ha of water provision for the PES. These areas are not clearly reflected in the project document. Please align the BD TT with the project document.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>SFM TT: It is unclear to which figure the surface of 4,000 ha of conservation & enhancement of carbon in forests correspond in the project document (3,000 and 5,000 appear in the document...). The 1,195,323 tCO2 do not correspond to the project document and do not appear in the ex-act tool. Please align the SFM TT with the project document.</p> <p>Generally speaking, please revise the TTs and ensure a clear alignment with the CEO endorsement request and use a clear calculation method for GHG, such as ex-act tool, that shows clearly the results which are reflected in the project document and in the TTs.</p> <p>2 December 2016: Addressed</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>April 30, 2016 The proposal includes an M&E description, however the proposed M&E activities need a clear and substantiated budget and costing. In addition, the proposed indicators appear too many (p38), and therefore will need to be streamlined to capture the most relevant measurable elements of the proposed project. AC</p> <p>14 October 2016 Thank you for the explanation and for budgeting the M&E plan. Addressed.</p>
	29. Has the Agency responded		
Agency Responses			

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAP? 		May 4, 2016. As STAP requests major revisions, please contact the STAP and address its comments before resubmission. PM 14 October 2016 Addressed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention Secretariat? 		N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council comments? 		May 4, 2016. The reality described by Germany and France may have changed since 2011. Please update the response to council comments. PM 14 October 2016 Addressed
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		N/A
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		April 30, 2016 Yes, annex C. Cleared AC
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		April 30, 2016 Not yet. Please, consider revisions as per suggestions above. To facilitate the review, please also indicate in your response to this review where the changes have been made and show it clearly in the documents highlighting

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the modifications. AC, PM</p> <p>14 October 2016 Not yet. Please consider the comments above in box 24 and 27.</p> <p>2 December 2016 Yes, the project can now be recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*		April 30, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

*** This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

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

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.