

Resilient Futures: Safeguarding Guinea- Bissau's Coastlines and Urban Areas from Climate Risks

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
11890
Countries
Guinea-Bissau
Project Name
Resilient Futures: Safeguarding Guinea-Bissau's Coastlines and Urban Areas from Climate Risks
Agencies
UNDP
Date received by PM
3/5/2025
Review completed by PM
4/17/2025
Program Manager
Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji
Focal Area
Climate Change
Project Type
FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Not yet. Please revise the Summary clearly articulating the climate problem and rationale the project aims to address. The narrative should go beyond stating that Guinea Bissau is both an LDC and SIDS. Given the project is designed as an multi-trust fund, we would appreciate fleshing out both the GEBs and adaptation benefits.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

The additional input and revision of the project design excluding the use of GEFT is noted however, the climate challenge/ problem (with reference to the local context relevant to the project, reference to vulnerable population, livelihoods) needs to be briefly expressed in the summary before introducing the project objectives. Its not necessary to list the project components.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

The project will no longer be accessing GEF Trust Fund resources. Then, an expanded narrative for a project designed to deliver both GEBs and adaptation benefits is not needed. While it is obvious that Guinea-Bissau is an LDC (Least Developed Country), the fact that it also is a SIDS (Small Island Developing State) may not be known to most. Recognizing the word limitations to the project summary section, UNDP mentioned also the complex development challenges faced by Guinea-Bissau.

UNDP 17/4/2025: The project summary has now been revised to include reference to the local context that is relevant to the project, and reference to vulnerable population, livelihoods. The components are no longer listed in the summary.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) Yes

b) In general, yes. Consider simplifying Outcome 2; it is currently overly wordy. We also note that Component 2 is repeated twice, differentiating the LDCF and GET financing. However, there is no clear distinction which activities are solely LDCF financed or GET financed. As you should know, the GET fund can only finance non-climate adaptation related activities. From the Financing Table, it appears the GET/Star Allocation is being sourced from Biodiversity, Land Degradation and Climate Mitigation focal areas, kindly ensure clear alignment with financing criteria of these focal areas.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

b) There is no more funding from GEF TF going to the project. A new LOE has been uploaded in the portal and necessary edits made to the financing tables. There is no more duplication of Outcome 2.

As for the requested simplification on the language of Outcome 2, this has been performed directly in the revised PIF, including in the TOC diagram.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Gender dimensions: Gender considerations are embedded in the components, particularly through gender-responsive spatial planning in Component 1, a small grant-making scheme targeting women-led initiatives in Component 2, and active participation of women in disaster risk management committees under Component 3. Additionally, Component 4 ensures gender inclusion in policy development and private sector engagement through Blue Economy Incubators. However, the budget allocation for gender-specific activities is not explicitly outlined. A gender analysis and action plan should be developed at PPG with outlined and budgeted activities and gender disaggregated indicators.

Knowledge Management: Provision for KM is embedded in Component 4, which includes establishing a National Climate Adaptation Repository to centralize climate-related information, share best practices, and support decision-making. The project also emphasizes learning through workshops, knowledge-sharing platforms, and regional collaboration. It would be useful if the project could further clarify how knowledge generated would be disseminated, accessible and used by all stakeholders (local communities) including how it

would foster scalability of lessons. A project of this scale should consider the development of a KM and communication plan

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Comment cleared condition that gender, communication/KM dimensions are elaborated and budgeted during PPG.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

A gender analysis and action plan will be developed during the PPG phase. This is part of the requirements and a standard approach by UNDP. We agree that the project will benefit from the development of a KM and communication plan and this is now explicitly mentioned under Output 4.4, where it is now indicated: "During the PPG a KM and Communication Plan will be developed."

UNDP 17/4/2025: UNDP confirms that the gender, communication/KM dimensions will be elaborated and budgeted during the PPG.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) Please note that the use of GET funds (implementation of adaptation measures) is not eligible in the GET as proposed. While some of the activities mentioned for support under 2.2, e.g. mangrove restoration, may be eligible for BD funding within a larger integrated landscape/seascape approach and with a clear justification of the benefits for biodiversity of global significance, this is not what is currently proposed. Most of the interventions mentioned under component 2 are pure adaptation interventions that are not eligible for BD funding (climate-proofing of coastal rice fields by restoring and improving dikes, canals, and flow control structures, drip irrigation, and anti-erosion measures such as terraces and bunds, water supply infrastructure, drainage systems and retention basins for better stormwater management and flood control, development of greens spaces, protection dikes, etc.).

b) Yes

c) Yes

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

b) Additional comment from OP: On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$63,800,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$3,190,000 instead of \$2,200,000 (which is 3.4%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the

GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC needs to be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

a) In consultation with the GEF OFP, the GEF TF allocation has been removed from the project and the intervention will remain purely focused on adaptation using LDCF resources. Necessary revisions in that sense were made in the PIF.

UNDP 17/4/2025: The co-financing contribution to the PMC was adjusted at 5% of the revised component co-financing (62,857,142 USD), or 3,142,858 USD.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) The project provides a fairly good characterization of the climate problem including referencing the increasing climate hazards and impacts on ecosystems and vulnerable population. To strengthen the rationale, it would be helpful to provide additional projections especially as it relates to sea level rise and socio-economic vulnerabilities (livelihoods) in the target population. It would particularly be helpful to further elaborate the connection between the different drivers of climate vulnerability and their cumulative impacts (described from a systems perspective)

b) We note the description of the barriers. A brief articulation of "enablers" will also be useful.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Thank you for the additional information to strengthen the climate rationale. We also note the revised barriers, suggest including a sentence or two at the end of each barrier, stating how it would be addressed through the project.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

a) Additional information drawn from the recently published Guinea-Bissau Country Climate and Development Report (World Bank, 2024) has been added to section A. Project Rationale (The Climate Problem). Solid existing information are limited when it comes to ?projections especially as it relates to sea level rise and socio-economic vulnerabilities (livelihoods) in the target population?. While additional high-level assessment will be conducted during the PPG stage, in the preparation of this PIF, primary data was collected in project sites and through a proactive dialogue with the target populations.

b) TOC diagram and narrative were updated.

Elements considered Enablers of the Solution(s) are now also part of the TOC and have been thoroughly described / mentioned in the baseline section. They include:

- ? The fact that large swaths of Guinea-Bissau?s coastal zone enjoys environmental protection (protected areas)
- ? There is a significant presence of mangrove along the coast, and this can function as a natural coastal protection factor, although there are threats to mangroves. Mangroves can also be restored as part natural solutions to climate change problems and this is proposed as part of the strategy.
- ? Favorable policies, plans and baseline strategies, including Guinea-Bissau?s Blue Economy Strategy (2024), The Bissau 2030 Plan for the city, plus other key documents that underpin adaptation action, among them the NCD Adaptation Component (undergoing review) and the NAP (under preparation).

UNDP 17/4/2025: Under each of the five barriers, additional text was added explaining how the barriers are overcome / addressed through the project strategy, drawing on the linkages presented in the Theory of Change.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) The project suggests an integrated approach that combines risk-informed spatial planning, climate proofing infrastructure, community based DRM and finance solutions. The justification for the selected approach is however not clearly articulated. Consider a brief discussion of alternative approaches, the trade-offs and the long term benefits of the selected approach.

b) Yes. Suggest including mechanisms to ensure local governments and/or communities have the financial and technical capacity for long term maintenance of the public infrastructure

c) We note reference a new and ongoing UNDP GEF LDCF projects that the proposed project will build on. Please clearly write out the title of these projects.

d) Not yet. Briefly describe the relevant stakeholders and their roles. A clear stakeholder coordination framework and more defined participation mechanisms for vulnerable groups would be useful

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

a) We note your comments below on justification of selected project design, please incorporate into the PIF (not visible in the document)

b-d) Comments cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 Apr 2025:

a)

Justification of an integrated approach

The approach is proposed in response to various needs that have been identified to adequately address challenges sound in the coastal zone of Guinea Bissau and the urban areas in particular. A risk-informed spatial planning approach strengthens the efficiency of adaptation options to be implemented and avoid mal-adaptation. Climate proofing of existing public infrastructures such as schools and health facilities is widely considered as a non-regret's measure which can be implemented successfully based on currently available information, whereas other measures such as the improvement of drainage infrastructure and flood protection measures need more detailed assessments and studies. The approach of combining these different types of measures allows spreading in time and optimizing the project implementation strategy.

Climate proofing and improving infrastructure to limit the impact of floods, coastal erosion and other climate induced hazards is mainly aimed at reducing climate risks (by reducing exposure and vulnerability), disaster risks however, cannot be reduced to zero. As such also other components of the disaster risk management cycle need to be considered, the project therefore also addresses preparedness. Finally, the long-term benefits of the selected approach are safeguarded by including finance solutions, including strengthening of private sector. The synergy between infrastructure resilience, community engagement, and financial mechanisms allows for a more comprehensive solution to urban climate challenges.

The long-term benefits of the integrated approach are clear: it not only addresses immediate vulnerabilities but also builds capacity for future climate resilience. By combining risk-informed spatial planning with climate-proof infrastructure, the approach ensures that new development is adaptive to future climate conditions. The community-based DRM aspect fosters local ownership, ensuring that residents are equipped to manage risks independently. The integration of finance solutions, meanwhile, ensures that the project's outcomes are sustainable, with mechanisms for continued funding and investment in resilience initiatives.

System transformation and scalability

The integrated approach that combines risk-informed spatial planning, climate-proofing infrastructure, community-based disaster risk management (DRM), and finance solutions aims to achieve system transformation by addressing multiple interrelated challenges in a holistic way. This approach goes beyond isolated interventions, recognizing that climate resilience requires systemic change across various sectors such as urban planning, infrastructure development, and community engagement. By incorporating climate adaptation measures into

spatial planning and infrastructure design, the project ensures that urban and coastal communities are better prepared for future climate risks. At the systems level, the project will act by fostering coordination among local governments, community groups, and the private sector, enabling them to work together in identifying vulnerabilities, prioritizing investments, and implementing scalable, long-term solutions. Furthermore, the integration of financial mechanisms ensures that resources are efficiently mobilized to support ongoing resilience efforts, making the approach not only sustainable but also adaptable to changing conditions and expanding to other regions or sectors. The combined effect of these interventions will create a robust, interconnected framework that transforms how communities plan for and respond to climate risks, driving systemic change in urban resilience.

Alternative approaches

While alternative approaches, such as focusing solely on engineering solutions (e.g., flood barriers, sea walls) or purely community-based approaches (e.g., participatory DRM planning), are valid, they tend to address only specific aspects of the climate risk equation. Engineering solutions alone may not be sustainable in the long term, particularly when they fail to incorporate socio-economic factors, while community-based approaches may lack the necessary infrastructure and financial resources for scalability. The integrated approach selected provides a more holistic strategy that balances technical, social, and financial dimensions, ensuring a more adaptable and sustainable solution.

b) Mechanisms to ensure local governments and/or communities have the financial and technical capacity for long-term maintenance of the public infrastructure and various considerations have been added to the PIF:

- starting with the design of the spatial planning framework and the procedure for selection and design of adaptation measures (see Output 1.2)
- Training and capacity building (see output 1.3)
- Enhanced access to climate finance (see output 4.3)
- This will also be considered through the national and regional disaster preparedness plans (output 3.2) and local plans (output 3.3) which can include provisions to monitor the state and adequacy of public infrastructure.

c) Refer to slight revisions to this paragraph and footnote 1, where the project title and references are included in full.

?An ongoing UNDP GEF LDCF coastal adaptation project for Guinea-Bissau (GEF ID 6988, known as the ?Coastal Project?) [footnote 1] that is set to conclude in 2025 has been dedicated to addressing climate change adaptation needs in the rural areas of Guinea-Bissau. The presently proposed intervention (proposed short title ?Resilient Futures?) aims to complement the mentioned Coastal Project by focusing on unmet needs within the coastal adaptation sector. [?]?

Footnote 1)

Title: GEF ID 6988: Strengthen the adaptive capacity and climate resilience of Guinea-Bissau vulnerable coastal communities to climate risks.

d) This is now addressed in Section A. For a complete reference to stakeholder, refer to PIF Section D.

UNDP 17/4/2025: Content from the GEF response to point ?a? further up is now included in the PIF under a new sub-section titled ?SUSTAINABILITY: CONSIDERATIONS ON THE TRADE-OFFS AND THE LONG-TERM BENEFITS OF THE SELECTED APPROACH?, placed in the PIF's Section B > ?Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.?

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

dGEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) The ToC could be further improved with a more concise summary briefly outlining the core problem, interventions, expected outcomes, and impact in a clear cause-effect sequence.

b) Output 1.1 Please clarify the target of the vulnerability and risk assessments. The project suggests coverage of urban and peri-urban areas, however this output focuses on urban. It would also be useful to elaborate how the risk assessments will be institutionalized? Will they be embedded in national/local policy frameworks? Also indicate the selection process for the adaptation measures proposed in this output. What criteria would inform the selection and design process. Finally, a master plan is proposed as a deliverable, could provide more clarity on this plan and the existing urban plan for Bissau?

Output 1.2 Provide more clarity on the difference between the adaptation options identification/selection in Output 1.1 and 1.2

Output 2.1 From its description, the project design is premised on an evidence based (and context-specific) risk and vulnerability to inform adaptation measures and spatial planning. The rationale for implementing "climate proofing" measures is therefore unclear. Suggesting expounding more on this and how it feeds into component 1. How were the proposed infrastructure systems selected?

Output 2.2 Important to clarify the selection criteria for the grant-funded projects.

Output 2.3 Confirm if activities are at the city level or region, if there is a difference. The description mentions it will focus on larger-scale **regional** interventions or strategic actions in priority areas for enhancing resilience. What region?

Consider merging outputs 2.2, 2.4, 4.2 and 4.3 (or consolidating under one component) given similar theme of enhancing finance, private finance and unlocking innovative instruments including de-risking instruments and risk sharing facilities.

Output 4.2 the business case and rationale for the blue economy incubator within the larger scope of the project to enhance urban and peri-urban resilience as well as support coastal protection is not clear. There needs to be a cohesive flow of ideas and linkages of the proposed adaptation solutions to the climate challenges.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Thank you for the additional information and elaboration on the outputs. Ensure this is well reflected in the PIF and elaborated during the PPG. Cleared

Agency's Comments
UNDP, 4 Apr 2025:

a) Refer to the TOC diagram included in the PIF and the narrative that explains it. The description of barriers is now included in Section A and not as part of the TOC narrative. The narrative has been simplified.

b)

Output 1.1

Focus on urban / peri-urban areas. While the output is said to focus on urban areas, the exact delimitation in Guinea Bissau is not clear. The project sites are included because they have either been formally identified as urban or they have urban characteristics (based on population density, population growth, presence of certain infrastructures and functions commonly found in urban areas). Because the boundary is not always clear the project interventions areas are sometimes also identified as 'urban and peri-urban'.

Institutionalizing of vulnerability and risk assessment.

The target of the vulnerability and risk assessments will be defined more specifically at PPG stages. The PPG stages should include a more thorough review of the existing studies. To this extend access should be given to all data, models and reports available. Based on this review gaps can be identified, and additional or complementary studies can be designed. Additional studies should be implemented in function of specific project outcomes (selection of adaptation measures, guiding disaster risk management plans) and should indeed be institutionalized. They should be integrated in (local) adaptation planning frameworks and DRM planning. It is therefore also important that local capacity is being built with regard to the interpretation and use climate risk information (data, maps, ..) and that this information is made available through a National Climate Adaptation Repository (climate portal).

Selection process for adaptation measures

Many methodologies or frameworks exist to select adaptation options. The PIF does not go into this detail. The approach to be used for this project should be customized to the local context but can be based on commonly used frameworks or guidelines such as Regional Adaptation Support Tool (step 4 assessing and selecting adaptation options). We suggest using a semi-quantitative approach and multi-criteria analysis. Parameters to include in the analysis should be defined together with stakeholders. Ideally these include social, economic, technical, environmental, .. parameters. Also durability, complexity and cost of maintenance should ideally be included (also see response to b in the section above).

Masterplan

The master plan to be developed will take the existing plan Bissau 2030 as a basis. The existing plan contains a decent structural analysis of the current situation and sets out 10 urban development objectives. One of these objectives is 'A resilient and green city?'. The proposed action to be implemented in the project is aiming to contribute to this goal by drawing up a master plan for storm water management and flood (coastal and fluvial). This should include both green and grey infrastructure, e.g. integrating green spaces (recreational) and mangroves, agriculture production areas, ... A high-level strategy to implement this objective is included in the Bissau 2030 plan and will be further developed into the drainage and flood protection master plan.

Selection of adaptation options in Output 1.1 and Output 1.2

Adaptation options identified/selected in Output 1.1 will be larger interventions, mainly to be implemented by authorities. They will include flood control and erosion control measures (green and grey). The selection will be guided by the risk-informed spatial planning process.

Adaptation options identified/selected in Output 1.2 can also include certain flood control and erosion control measures but will go beyond this and have stronger community focus. These measures do not specifically aim at flood or erosion control but are making communities more resilient. This can include access to drinking water, and other actions improving livelihoods

such as actions aligned with the blue economy strategy. The selection process will follow the same principles, but need to be customized.

Output 2.1

The rationale for implementing "climate proofing" measures is to be able to accelerate implementation. The selection of the infrastructure will be done at PPG stage, by site visits analysis of existing exposure maps and rapid rural appraisal techniques. While Guinea Bissau does not have specific guidelines for climate proofing of public infrastructure, guidelines developed by UN Habitat in other countries facing similar conditions can be applied, with minimal adjustments to take into consideration local material and design considerations. Thus, the project can start implementation on the ground already in the first year and thus also avoid fatigue of communities which do not need to wait until the end of the project to see results.

These interventions focus on schools and health facilities, and possibly also other public infrastructure (markets, sanitation facilities, ...). And are therefore of another nature of the interventions in component 1.

Output 2.2

Selection criteria will be defined in a participatory way. However they should take into account certain considerations such as;

- Strategic alignment with the project outcomes, with national and local policies, including Guinea-Bissau's NDC, Integrated Coastal Zone Management Plan, and Blue Economy Strategy. Project should contribute to the objectives of climate resilience, disaster risk reduction, and sustainable livelihoods.
- Design elements: Projects should be designed to deliver tangible adaptation benefits, prioritize 'low-hanging fruit' and community-level interventions, and ensure gender responsiveness. Simplicity, replicability, and scalability should be considered in the mini-projects' design, in line with best practices.
- Impact and sustainability. Project should demonstrate measurable long-term benefits in climate adaptation, infrastructure resilience, or community-based disaster management.
- Feasibility and readiness. Projects should have a clear implementation plan, with a realistic timeline and achievable milestones. Proposals should demonstrate the technical and operational capacity of the implementing entity to deliver results.
- Inclusivity and social equity. Project must prioritize not just gender equality (a gender responsive approach, as stressed further up), but social inclusion more broadly, and the empowerment of marginalized groups (e.g., women, youth, indigenous communities). Community participation in project design and implementation must be demonstrated.

Also, as part of the gender-responsive and social inclusion approach mentioned above, the work under this output of the project will specifically target CBOs that are able to reach out to the most vulnerable groups, e.g. their ability to ensure that to households headed by women, the poorest households within a community, household with a higher number of children, elderly, people living with disabilities, etc.

Output 2.3

The title and description of Output 2.3 has been changed with adequate explanations provided. It now reads as follows 'Output 2.3: Implementation of identified adaptation measures from the spatial planning process (component 1), focusing on the most urgent infrastructural/hard adaptation interventions or strategic actions in priority areas for enhancing resilience to climate impacts.'

Revised explanations mention now that activities under output 2.3 focuses on implementing 'a few limited infrastructural (or 'hard') adaptation interventions that are urgent, high priority and enhance climate resilience.'

The following is also now part of the descriptions of this output: 'As it will be important to maximize the number of beneficiaries for such interventions, the works to be prioritized will

most likely be in urban or urbanized areas within project sites, and targeting the protection of the highest number people and assets per funding amount allocated through the recuperation or development of vital infrastructures.?

Considering the geographies of Guinea-Bissau, the capital city of Bissau is the only one among the project's coastal sites that a sizable population and a population density above 2000 inhabitants per sq km. All of the other sites can be considered rural, but some of them include urbanized settlements that also require coastal protection, albeit small (e.g. Bolama, Bubaque) . Nevertheless infrastructural work

Consider merging outputs 2.2, 2.4, 4.2 and 4.3?

We suggest to keep Output 2.2 as it is, under component 2. The focus of this output is on implementation of adaptation measures.

The other outputs are indeed more geared towards setting up new strategies and tools to improve access to finance and could therefore be regrouped into one outcome. Output 2.2 is removed, and merged with 4.3.

Output 4.2 is proposed maintained under Component 4, as it is since it is fully aligned with the National Blue Economy Strategy.

Output 4.2

The National Blue Economy Strategy (NBES) of Guinea-Bissau is closely linked with Guinea-Bissau's adaptation strategy and priorities (NDC), as both address climate resilience, sustainable development, and ecosystem protection in coastal and marine areas. Both make specific considerations with regard to the protection and use of marine and coastal resources promoting nature-based solutions (e.g., mangrove restoration, sustainable land use) to enhance climate adaptation as well as economic development and livelihood improvement. It is widely recognized that the role of private sector in mitigating climate risks needs to be strengthened. The National Blue Economy Strategy has mapped several pathways to achieve this. The actions included under this output will not consider all the action areas defined in the NBES but will particularly aim to strengthen these actions in the NBES that are aligned with the project outcomes.

UNDP 17/4/2025: UNDP confirms that the "additional information and elaboration on the outputs" referred to in the GEF Secretariat's comments is currently reflected in the PIF and will be elaborated during the PPG. More specifically:

- ? For Output 1.1, the clarification regarding "urban" vs "peri-urban" areas has been addressed through footnote 14 of the PIF.
- ? Regarding the "Institutionalizing of vulnerability and risk assessment" under Output 1.1, content that was previously in response to the comment is now reflected in the final paragraph describing Output 1.1.
- ? The topic "Selection process for adaptation measures" was addressed under Output 1.1 through references to the use of a semi-quantitative approach and a multi-criteria analysis. This has now been made more explicit in the revised PIF, which includes mention of the range of methodologies and frameworks available to guide the selection of adaptation options.
- ? The relationship between the study/plan Bissau2030 and the proposed drainage and flood protection master plan is presented under Output 1.1. The PIF notes that the master plan will address stormwater and flood management (both coastal and fluvial floods), and that "[a] high-level strategy to implement this objective is included in the Bissau 2030 plan and will be further

developed into the drainage and flood protection master plan." Additionally, the "10 urban development objectives" are mentioned in the PIF's baseline section.

- ? Explanations previously provided regarding the "Selection of adaptation options under Output 1.1 and Output 1.2" have now been incorporated directly into the description of Component 1.
- ? A paragraph articulating the rationale for implementing climate proofing measures has been added under the description of Output 2.1.
- ? For Output 2.2, the necessary clarifications had already been included in the PIF. No further action were required.

Concerning Output 2.3, the content of the response to the GEF Secretariat had already been incorporated in the output description. The only addition made was a clarifying footnote on the "geographies", or the geographic distinctions in Guinea-Bissau?specifically, what may or may not be considered urban within the coastal zone.

- ? Lastly, the explanation regarding the National Blue Economy Strategy (NBES) under Output 4.2 had already been incorporated into a footnote.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

No.

"Through the ongoing UNDP GEF LDCF project for the coastal zone (PIMS4978) and the ongoing WB WACA II national project (funded by the World Bank and implemented through IBAP), a few studies have mapped vulnerability along the coast covering localities that will be encompassed by the project. Also, policy development consultancies are producing some results through the mentioned on-going project"

Please describe the additionality of the project if ongoing projects are already undertaking vulnerability mapping in the intervention areas that the proposed project is targeting.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Thank you for the clarification. Please ensure additional information is incorporated in the PIF

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

The proposed studies will be building further on the studies conducted in the ongoing UNDP GEF LDCF project for the coastal zone (PIMS4978 / GEF ID 6988) and the ongoing WB WACA II national project (funded by the World Bank and implemented through IBAP).

The existing studies are primarily focused on coastal erosion and coastal flooding, which are largely confined to the immediate coastal areas. Pluvial and fluvial floods have not been studied, or only at low resolution (on regional or global scale). Exposure mapping and vulnerability assessments have only been conducted for selected pilot areas. Certain aspects

such as socio-economic vulnerability and vulnerability of the health sector were not or only marginally included. Particularly for the urban area of Bissau, more data and knowledge is needed to be able to conduct a thorough risk assessment, and to define adequate and realistic protection levels and measures. Bissau is located on the banks of the Geba estuary and is also influenced by the Rio Mansoa to the North, thus being influenced by coastal dynamics and two river systems.

To ensure a comprehensive risk assessment, the following additional aspects require further investigation:

1. **Detailed urban flood modeling for Bissau** ? There's a clear need for a hydrological and hydraulic assessment focusing specifically on pluvial and fluvial flood risks within Bissau, considering the combined influence of the Geba estuary [direct impact] and Rio Mansoa [indirect impact]. This should include floodplain mapping under current and future climate scenarios.
2. **Socio-economic and health sector vulnerability assessment** ? The existing studies appear to be infrastructure-focused. A broader assessment covering vulnerable populations, critical services (like health facilities), and livelihoods would provide valuable insights.
3. **Drainage system assessment and rehabilitation strategy** ? A full inventory and performance assessment of Bissau's urban drainage network is crucial, including an evaluation of the system's functionality under extreme rainfall events and climate change impacts.
4. **Integrated coastal-inland flood risk assessment** ? Given Bissau's estuarine location, it would be useful to study the interaction between coastal flooding (e.g., storm surges) and riverine/pluvial floods under compound event scenarios.
5. **Climate downscaling and impact projections** ? Downscaled climate data for the region is essential to anticipate future risk trends, especially for precipitation extremes and sea-level rise impacts.

UNDP 17/4/2025: The additional element mentioned in the response above are included in Box 1: ?Guiding elements for a comprehensive urban vulnerability and risk assessment foreseen under Output 1.1?.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) GEF Agency is being proposed as an executing agency.

- b) Please submit evidence of government's request for Agency's execution role.
- c) No. We note the table listing the ongoing initiatives and projects that will contribute to the proposed project. However provide more information on how the project will coordinate with these projects
- d) Fairly yes. Component 4 includes an output focused on knowledge management. The KM is crucial for the scale of this project, and would suggest building up on how the knowledge will be developed, captured, disseminated, accessed and managed on a long term basis. There needs to be a clearer strategy for knowledge capture, more defined dissemination mechanisms, and a stronger strategic communication framework to ensure project knowledge outputs are actively used, replicated, and scaled beyond the project duration. KM and communication plan needs to be developed during PPG.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

a-b) Thanks for sharing the government's request for execution. However kindly note that this role would be fully determined and justified during PPG following sufficient progress in project preparation. If it is anticipated that Agency execution is indeed needed, a full information and justification for a request for policy exception should be submitted.

c-d Thanks for additional information and edits. Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

b) The government's request for Agency's execution role has been uploaded in the portal.

c) The Project will build up on the previous operations such as: i) Strengthening the resilience of coastal areas and communities vulnerable to climate change in Guinea-Bissau?, ii) Early Warning System; iii) Energy Mini-grids; for lessons learned and strengthening their coordination mechanisms in concertation with similar projects funded by the World Bank and European Union. This concertation mechanism will be deepened during the PPG stage.

Table 2. (Relevant initiative, their alignment with the project and contributions to baseline and/or co-financing), the column before last was updated to now cover ?Relevance to the proposed project (keywords) and how coordination will be ensured?, with new content in the relevant rows.

d) The communication framework to ensure project knowledge outputs are actively used, replicated, and scaled beyond the project duration will be developed at the PPG through the assessment of ongoing projects to enable developing a solid framework.

UNDP 17/4/2025: a-b) On the basis of capacity assessment and further discussions with the government, UNDP will determine the relevance of the request, and provide the necessary information and justifications for the Secretariat to consider the request for execution support.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) Yes

b) GEB: The only GET core indicator target included is related to improved Management effectiveness of an existing 8,000 ha Terrestrial Protected Area, with no clear explanation how the project would improve management effectiveness of any protected area. Moreover, this target is not commensurate with the GET funding request.

Adaptation benefits : LDCF core indicators provided. Meta Information table for LDCF needs to be filled properly. For example, this project isn't a challenge program,

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Thank you for the revision. Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

b) The project will no longer be accessing GEF Trust Fund resources. Then, the comment on 8,000 ha Terrestrial Protected Area no longer applies and has been removed.

c) The Meta Information table for LDCF has been revised, the project was marked as a ?challenge program? [by mistake](#).

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) Yes

c) Yes

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Comments from OP: Under the Institutional and Policy, Technological, and Financial and Business Model risk categories that fall under the broader Innovation risk dimension, please ensure that the assessment and mitigation measures relate specifically to innovative approaches in the project design.

Please also provide an Overall risk rating and describe how it was identified.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 17/4/2025: Edits were made to the table 'Risks to Achieving Outcomes' for the Innovation risk dimension, enhancing the assessment and mitigation measures for risks classified as: 'Institutional and Policy'; 'Technological', and 'Financial and Business Model'.

The overall risk rating is 'substantial' and this information is now added to the mentioned risk table with justification for the rating.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

a) Consider improving the narrative on how project is transformative. There's a reference to nature based solutions, howe this could be further strengthened to ensure adaption efforts leverage resilience building mechanisms alongside hard infrastructure. Also consider elaborating on how project will support long-term technical and financial sustainability at both local level (output 2.2) and the city level (resilient infrastructure). We appreciate the project's efforts to inform resilient spatial planning and develop a Master Plan for Bissau, it would be helpful to see stronger policy linkages with current city of Bissau urban plans.

b) A brief description on explicit innovative and scaling up opportunities would be useful in the project description section.

c) The project aims to integrate climate risk informed planning into existing local and national structures. Some clarity on how the project's initiatives would be adopted and/or institutionalized would be useful.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Thank you for additional clarity and elaboration.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

a) In Section A, a sub-section called 'Climate Action: Towards a transformative approach', improving the narrative that explains how project is be transformative.

In the TOC narrative, the 'Long-Term Solution' and the 'Long-term Impact (or outcome) expected' are respectively referred to and stated. This is followed by the following:

'Guided by this long-term vision, the project is designed to be transformative by operationalizing a robust TOC that integrates both community-based resilience-building and infrastructure-based adaptation. The approach strategically combines nature-based solutions (NbS) with targeted investments in climate-resilient infrastructure, ensuring that adaptation efforts are rooted in local contexts, while supporting long-term technical and financial sustainability. This integrated design strengthens local ownership and institutional capacity, while fostering scalable models of climate action across vulnerable coastal and rural areas.'

Additionally, the TOC narrative also mentions: 'There is a significant presence of mangrove along the coast, and this can function as a natural coastal protection factor, although there are threats to mangroves. Mangroves can and will be restored as part nature-based solutions to climate change problems and this is proposed as part of the strategy.'

On the question on whether the project's efforts should support the development of a Master Plan for Bissau, the current institutional context points more towards the ensuring the climate mainstreaming of existing plans, in particular the Bissau 2030 strategy/plan developed by UN Habitat in 2019, and most importantly, provide means for implementing climate action under the existing plan. A new Master Plan may not be needed. There is new language in the PIF that provides more context and explains what is foreseen in the Bissau 2030 strategy/plan. In fact, this approach has been retrofitted into the LDCF core indicators worksheet (see Excel file uploaded in the portal), which now [mentions this in the notes](#) for 'Core Indicator 3: Total number of policies, plans, and frameworks that will mainstream climate resilience':

'Updated on 26-Mar-2025: Initially proposed: Improvement of spatial planning framework (meaning: mainstreaming climate change adaptation into the Bissau 2030 strategy/plan); Local community-based adaptation planning framework; Local DRM framework. To be confirmed during PPG.'

Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that there have also been recent advances supported by UN Habitat to promote spatial planning methodologies in Guinea-Bissau (e.g. an international conference held in Feb/Mar-2025). However, the greatest challenge is to ensure that plans are enforceable, and above all, implemented. These institutionalization aspect is not only identified in the barrier analysis, but also reflected through the TOC in the project strategy, not least also through Output 4.1.

To further address the GEF's concern, during the PPG a more thorough consultation process with key stakeholder engagement will be conducted, including by specifically engaging not just the government of the Autonomous Sector of Bissau (SAB) but also with local government authorities in the neighboring communes. This is important given that at least 1 third of the urbanized area of Greater Bissau goes beyond the administrative boundaries of the SAB.

b) Concerning a brief description regarding explicit innovative and scaling up opportunities that would be useful in the project description section, this is already included in the following elements of project design:

In Section A:

>> There is specific mention of the following at the end of the sub-section titled 'Climate Action: Towards a transformative approach', where it is indicated that a scaling-up strategy will be developed during the PPG:

'To ensure that adaptation solutions extend beyond the project sites, a scaling-up strategy will be developed during the PPG, focusing on government adoption, financing pathways, and policy mainstreaming. This strategy will identify mechanisms to integrate successful interventions into national and regional policies, ensuring long-term sustainability. Key elements will include aligning project findings with Guinea-Bissau's climate adaptation frameworks, fostering partnerships with ministries and local governments for institutional uptake, and leveraging both public and private financing sources—including climate funds, blended finance models, and risk insurance mechanisms—to support expansion (see Outputs 4.1, Output 2.4, Output 4.2). Replication efforts will be guided by best practices and lessons learned (Output 4.4), with a focus on adaptable and scalable models suited to different geographic and socio-economic contexts. This approach will be further explored during the PPG phase to refine implementation pathways and ensure a structured transition from pilot initiatives to national-scale interventions.'

In Section B:

Under 'APPROACH TO KNOWLEDGE MANAGEMENT', it is mentioned that 'The KM system will support the documentation of project data, success stories, and challenges, enabling stakeholders to adapt and refine their approaches in real-time. Additionally, the project will promote strategic communication initiatives to share knowledge products, fostering broader awareness and encouraging replication and scaling of successful interventions both within Guinea-Bissau and in similar coastal contexts globally.'

The above narrative mentions that '[?] The project will also leverage partnerships with academic institutions and research organizations to co-develop robust data sets and knowledge resources. In terms of South-South cooperation, a partnership will be sought with BlueInvest Africa for the incubators and innovators under Output 2.4 and with African Risk Capacity (ARC) under Output 4.2 — both to be fully developed during the PPG. Other potential partnerships with relevant entities in countries such as Brazil, Senegal, Cuba, Poland, Denmark, Belgium and Mozambique will also be sought during the PPG.'

In the description of the four outputs under Component 4, all the enabling elements that are considered necessary to overcome the identified TOC barriers for the project and to realize innovative solutions that are scalable through opportunities. Here are some of the concrete examples already proposed, and some elements enhanced in response to the comment:

- ? Output 4.2 includes training and technical support, but it is explicitly mentioned that these will have a key focus on innovation and upscaling, for e.g. through Training of Trainers, through technology transfer geared training and exchanges, all in line with the KM strategy to be developed during the PPG.
- ? Output 4.2 talks about the establishment of 'Blue Economy Incubators' and 'Innovation Labs' which are actions that can potentially have a strong multiplier effect, especially when targeting young and tech savvy people with a purpose.
- ? Output 4.3 refers to finance mechanisms, which have through leverage the strongest potential to bring scale and innovation to the adaptation agenda in a country like Guinea-Bissau.
- ? Finally, Output 4.4 is about the KM systems and the supporting strategy, to be developed during the PPG along with a 'Communication Plan'. Together, they will underpin the other activities geared towards innovation and upscaling.

c) Challenges with ?institutionalization? have been identified as project risks and robust mitigation measures were designed to address these. The following are worth mentioning:

- ? Establish formal agreements and collaborations to reduce the impact of political changes on project continuity.
- ? Engage political leaders and policymakers early in the project to secure buy-in and emphasize alignment with national priorities and international commitments (Outputs 4.1, 4.4).
- ? Advocate for policy integration and legal reforms by showcasing successful adaptation interventions as models for replication, including for leveraging partnerships, financial resources and encouraging the emergence of an adaptation-minded (and climate conscious) private sector in Guinea-Bissau (Outputs 4.3, 4.4).
- ? Strengthen existing coordination mechanisms by clarifying roles and responsibilities across sectors and levels of governance (Output 4.1).
- ? Facilitate regular inter-sectoral meetings and joint planning sessions to ensure alignment (Outputs 1.3, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4).
- ? Provide training to key stakeholders in coordination and integrated planning approaches (Output 4.1).
- ? Creation of a Project Management Central Unit within the Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity and Climate Action (Output 4.4).
- ? Creation of a Project Management Central Unit within the Ministry of Environment, Biodiversity and Climate Action (Output 4.3), with this aspect of specifically supported by the co-financing from UNDP and government.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Not yet. Please elaborate how project aligns with the LDCF focal areas (scaling up finance, whole of society of approach, etc). Please refer to the GEF-8 Adaptation Strategy (2022-2026)

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

We note the additional text on the project's alignment with the GEF-8 Adaptation priority areas - (I)Scaling up Finance,(ii) Strengthening Innovation and Private Sector Engagement, and (iii) Fostering Partnership for Inclusion and Whole-of-Society Approach. However, we suggest elaboration of this section further with a sentence or two, beyond just referencing the output numbers.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

New content was added to Section C, repeated here for the ease of reference:

?This project aligns with the GEF-8 Programming Strategy for the LDCF by directly contributing to the two relevant Indicative Focal Area Elements, CCA-1.1, CCA-1.2 and CCA-1.3:

? Under CCA-1.1 (Supporting implementation of Climate Change adaptation solutions in priority themes), the project will invest in vulnerability and risk assessments and adaptation measures (Output 1.1), build community resilience to climate change (Output 1.2), implement no-regret adaptation measures and climate proofing (Output 2.1), as well as adaptation measures from spatial planning process (Output 2.3)

? Under CCA-1.2 (Scaling up finance for adaptation), the project will implement a low-value grant making scheme (Output 2.2) and enhance climate finance through public-private partnerships (Output 4.3)

? Under CCA-1.3 (Strengthening innovation and private sector engagement) will establish Blue Economy Incubators to foster private sector engagement (Output 4.2), implement institutional coordination mechanisms (Output 4.1)

The project further aligns with the three strategic priorities of the LDCF/SCCF by:

? Scaling up finance through public-private partnerships, climate finance readiness (Output 4.3), and Blue Economy entrepreneurship (Output 4.2), among other outputs;

? Promoting inclusive, innovative solutions via gender-responsive grant-making (Output 2.2) and community-led adaptation;

•? Advancing a whole-of-society approach by empowering women, youth, and marginalized groups to participate in decision-making structures (Outputs 3.3, 4.2) and benefit directly from adaptation investments.

This integrated approach ensures the project delivers long-term, transformative resilience outcomes for vulnerable communities and ecosystems in Guinea-Bissau's coastal and urban areas.?

UNDP 17/4/2025: Alignment with the three LDCF priority areas has been revised accordingly.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Information provided at this stage is fine.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Projects claims to generate biodiversity benefits, however this element is missing in this purely adaptation project.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Comment closed.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

The GEF TF allocation has been removed and this comment is no longer relevant.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Suggest sharing documentation of these consultations, such as minutes of meeting

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

The consultation report detailing consultations has been uploaded to the portal. For your ease, the link to the document is also shared

here: https://gefportal.worldbank.org/api/spapi/LoadDocument?fileName=https%3A%2F%2Fworldbankgroup.sharepoint.com%2Fsites%2Fgefportal%2FGEFDocuments%2F2c951da3-13f8-ef11-be1f-000d3a3b1487%2FRoadmap%2FOthers_0262DEL2and3Main%20Report04Mar2025.pdf

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

STAR allocation ineligible for LDCF adaptation project

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

Project design revised. Comment closed

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

The GEF TF allocation has been removed and this comment is no longer relevant.

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Evidence of proposed co-financing (investment mobilized) should be submitted.

Agency's Comments

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

More detail is provided in the PIF and details included in the co financing letters to be obtained during the PPG.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 3/5/2025

No. As designed, the project is not eligible for MFT programming. Global Environmental component and benefits need to be further refined. The project outputs and activities also need to be closely interlinked and aligned with the overall climate adaptation objectives.

STAR allocation can only be used for activities eligible under the GEF Trust Fund (GET) programming direction. This project is currently formulated as a pure adaptation project, which is not eligible for GET funding. While the GET is encouraging adaptation co-benefits. If interested in pursuing use of STAR allocation, suggest reviewing the GEF Trust Fund Programming directions, significantly revising, the proposal to ensure eligibility of the GET-funded part of the project and create coherent Multi-Trust Fund project.

GEFSEC 4/4/2025

The proposed urban project has been revised to access only GEF adaptation resources via the LDCF. Project recommended on condition that OP comments and additional clarifications are provided.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 22/4/2026: Based on suggestions and discussions with the GEF Task Manager and consultations with the GEF OFP, the project budget has been reduced to 10 million USD (inclusive of PPF and agency fees) and the PIF has been revised accordingly. The project scope has been reduced, with the urban site of Bissau remaining along with the rural/coastal areas of Bubaque and Varela. The project targets and expected co-financing reflect the reduced scope, but remain ambitious against the resources available. The number of target beneficiaries expected as a result of this LDCF investment is 120,000 (originally 200,000) and the coastal or marine area managed for climate resilience is 32,400 hectares (originally 73,400 hectares). Expected co-financing was reduced from 66 million USD to 42 million USD. The project's structure remains the same, except for the removal of the first output under Outcome 3 on national DRM strategies that the government will be in a position to deliver through other resources.

UNDP, 4 April 2025:

Thank you for your review, please see the responses above to your comments.

UNDP 17/4/2025: Thank you, please see our responses to additional comments above.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 4/9/2025

1) Please ensure to include relevant gender-specific indicators in the RF, based on the gender analysis and the Gender Action Plan to be developed. Under M&E, please reflect that reports submitted (MTR and TE) include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments

UNDP 17/4/2025: UNDP takes good note of the pertinent comment. In order to reflect the required content in the PIF, at the end of the description of outputs, and under a section that describes the linkages among the outcomes, content referring to the M&E component was added, as follows:

?Component 5 of the project caters for its M&E needs. This project follows both UNDP and GEF procedures for M&E. When fully developed, the project will include standard M&E outputs and activities, among them gender-specific activities and gender-responsive indicators in the Results Framework. During the PPG a thorough Stakeholder Engagement Plan and a Gender Action Plan will be developed. As part of the relevant M&E framework, a mid-term review (MTR) and a terminal evaluation (TE) reports will be prepared. These will include an assessment of gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.?

Review Dates

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Review

3/12/2025

4/4/2025

Agency Response