GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**6968**		
Country/Region:	**Chad**		
Project Title:	**Chad National Adaptation Plan**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5431 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,775,000**
Co-financing:	**$18,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$23,925,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Knut Sundstrom**	Agency Contact Person:	

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**?	YES. Chad is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the operational focal point and dated August 14, 2014, is attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The proposed grant is available	

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access	from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	NOT CLEAR. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) cites CCA outcomes associated with the previous programming strategy (2010-14). RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide, in Table A, the CCA objectives towards which the proposed project is expected to contribute, consistent with the 2014-18 Programming Strategy on Adaptation, along with the associated grant and co-financing amounts. 11/08/2014 -- YES. Table A has been revised as recommended. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-2 and CCA-3.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	YES. The proposed project addresses Chad's NAPA priorities associated with information, education and communication; climate information services; and policy development. The project is also anchored in Chad's National Development Plan (2013-2015). Importantly, however, the proposed project aims to strengthen national development planning and budgeting processes by integrating climate change risks and adaptation.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	6. 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?	NOT CLEAR. Overall the PIF provides a clear overview of the baseline scenario associated with each component, along with the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing. For Component 2, however, it remains unclear to what extent climate change risks and adaptation are incorporated into relevant national development plans, and what gaps and needs the proposed project would fill in this respect. Specifically, it seems climate change adaptation is already a priority in the National Development Plan (2013-2015). RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify the baseline scenario associated with Component 2 and, specifically, the extent to which climate change risks and adaptation are incorporated into relevant national development plans. 11/08/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies the baseline scenario associated with Component 2 as recommended.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8. Moreover, the objective -- to develop the national adaptation plan -- seems like an output rather than an objective, and is included among the outputs that contribute towards Outcome 2 on integration adaptation into policies and budgets in vulnerable sectors. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please (i) revise the project framework accordingly, as appropriate; and (ii) revise the objective with a view to developing a sound results hierarchy. 11/08/2014 -- YES. The project framework is sound and appropriately detailed.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. In absence of further clarity regarding the baseline scenario for Component 2, the additional reasoning and adaptation benefits cannot be adequately assessed at this time. Specifically, with reference to relevant gaps and needs related to the integration of adaptation into existing national development policies, plans and planning processes; and given Chad's relatively recent NAPA of 2010; the PIF could provide a clearer rationale for the proposed national adaptation plan and implementation strategy. In addition, the PIF could further specify to what extent the proposed project would "facilitate the integration of climate change vulnerability and risks into the formulation of policies". Which policies would be targeted and how would this integration relate to the proposed national adaptation plan? RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Section 6, please strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. Specifically, (i) clarify how the proposed national adaptation plan and implementation strategy would address relevant gaps and needs, and how these would add value to the 2010 NAPA, which remains in its early stages of implementation; (ii) clarify which policies would be targeted for the integration of climate change risks and adaptation; and (iii) how such integration would relate to the proposed national adaptation plan. 11/08/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The additional reasoning and expected adaptation benefits have been clarified. Still, it remains unclear how the "national plans " with adaptation priorities (second indicative output under Component 2) relate to the integration of adaptation into sub-national, national and sectoral policy-making and planning processes (third indicative output under Component 3). Will adaptation-specific plans be developed in parallel with development plans that incorporate adaptation options? RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify further how the "national plans" with adaptation priorities relate to the integration of adaptation into sub-national, national and sectoral policy-making and planning processes; and whether adaptation-specific plans would be developed in parallel with	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		development plans that incorporate adaptation options. 11/30/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies that the proposed project would integrate adaptation into sub-national, national and sectoral planning processes; while adaptation plans will be considered, in a country-driven manner, among the means of achieving such integration, and framing the country's adaptation priorities.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	YES. Public participation is adequately considered in the PIF.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	NOT CLEAR. The PIF could further assess risks and mitigation measures associated with the sustainability of the proposed investments in hydro-meteorological observation under Component 1. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe risks and mitigation measures associated with the sustainability of the proposed investments in hydro-meteorological observation under Component 1.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		11/08/2014 -- YES. The initial risk assessment has been strengthened as recommended.	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Relevant projects have been identified, with which coordination will be sought.	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 11 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 8 and 11, please revisit the description of the project's innovative aspects, sustainability strategy and potential for scaling up. 11/08/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. 11/30/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 8 above. The proposed project would adopt a comprehensive approach to advancing Chad's national adaptation plan process; addressing critical information and capacity needs across all climate-sensitive sectors, from the national to the sub-national levels. The project would enhance existing policy-making and planning processes, as well as the underlying climate information services, thereby seeking a sustained improvement in Chad's ability to address the adverse effects of climate change in the context of its national development priorities.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary. 11/08/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 8 above. 11/30/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 8 above.	
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	YES. At $18 million, the indicative co-financing amount is adequate, as is UNDP's share of the indicative co-financing at $1.5 million.	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	YES. At $275,000, or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. A PPG of $150,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects up to $6 million.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13 and 16. 11/08/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 13 and 16. 11/30/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*	September 11, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	November 08, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 30, 2014	

* **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.**