

Co-management of climate extremes for agriculture resilience via innovative technologies for irrigation in São Tomé and Príncipe

Basic Information

GEF ID

10883

Countries

Sao Tome and Principe

Project Title

Co-management of climate extremes for agriculture resilience via innovative technologies for irrigation in São Tomé and Príncipe

GEF Agency(ies)

AfDB

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Fareeha Iqbal

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/8/2021:

Cleared.

11/6/2021:

The requested change has not yet been made.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

Project duration: please explain why a six-year project implementation duration has been proposed. This is unusually long for an LDCF project. On-the-ground context/needs can change in six years.

Agency Response

This is well noted. The length of the project was on the basis of the proposed innovation approach of Underground Taming of Floods for Irrigation (UTFI). Innovation usually takes longer time to be properly tested on ground. Nevertheless, after discussion with the agriculture and water resources experts, it was clarified that the innovation part has to do with the combination of the different elements, it is considered that four years will be sufficient. Thus, this information will be corrected in the PIF.

11/7/2021:

The project duration has been changed to 48 months.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 11/8/2021:

Cleared. Thank you for these explanations.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

- (a) The investment measures proposed appear to be targeting current climate variability. Please discuss how the activities will deliver adaptation benefits into the future, as climate continues to change.
- (b) Please confirm that the hydrological models (groundwater, catchment hydrology and river hydraulic) discussed in the Component 2 description will use climate data that takes climate change into account.
- (c) The description for Component 1 mentions that the AfDB baseline project will be supporting dams. Please confirm that these will be small dams.
- (d) Please confirm that any climate risks that may be flagged in a climate risk screening of the baseline project will be managed independently of the LDCF funding.
- (e) We understand that the project will be focusing on resilient water management and irrigation to help farmers cope with droughts and floods. Will these measures be complemented by efforts to enhance farmer access to drought-tolerant or flood-tolerant crop varieties, as well as guidance on resilient farming practices? Will the project focus directly on other aspects of (climate-resilient) cropping besides irrigation?
- (f) Please explain what is encompassed in the term "Underground Taming of Floods for Irrigation (UTFI)".
- (g) Please discuss how the solar PV technologies and solar pumps will be supporting climate change adaptation.

Agency Response

a) The design and location of the interventions will be informed by hydrological modelling which will integrate climate change projections based on the most recent scientific publication from the IPCC. At present climate scenarios for Sao Tome and Principe show likely increased trend in the number of hot days during the "gravana" period and the continuous trend of rainfall variability with increase intensity. These climate projections have already been taken into consideration for the design of the project and will be further refined with comprehensive hydrological – climate modelling.

(b) Yes, correct. The hydrological models in Component 2 will use climate projections for RCP 4.5 for a timeframe between 2030 – 2070.

(c) Yes, correct. AfDB confirms that PRIASA III project will support small-scale dams.

d) Yes, correct. AfDB confirms that any climate risks identified for the baseline project PRIASA III will be managed with AfDB funds and **not** LDCF funding.

(e) Yes, the project design of the project is holistic and thus it considers in Component 1 to promote soil moisture storage promoting soil and water conservation practices. The project design however is not considering the introduction of drought-tolerant or flood-tolerant seeds.

f) The Underground Taming of Floods for Irrigation (UTFI) recharges depleted aquifers with wet-season high flows, adding to local groundwater storage and mitigating flooding in downstream areas. The stored recharge water may later be recovered via existing local wells for domestic supplies and irrigation. Capture and storage of high wet season flows that potentially pose a flood risk take place through groundwater recharge structures (interventions) installed in upstream areas for the protection of highly valued assets (urban, industrial, cultural, etc.) locally and in downstream areas. This would then enable the recovery of water stored underground for productive use and livelihood enhancement. Therefore, in a sense, the impacts that would be felt across one part of the system could be offset to create opportunities in another part. You may see more information in the following study:

Pavelic, P.; Brindha, K.; Amarnath, G.; Eriyagama, N.; Muthuwatta, L.; Smakhtin, V.; Gangopadhyay, P. K.; Malik, R. P. S.; Mishra, A.; Sharma, B. R.; Hanjra, M. A.; Reddy, R. V.; Mishra, V. K.; Verma, C. L.; Kant, L. 2015. *Controlling floods and droughts through underground storage: from concept to pilot implementation in the Ganges River Basin. Colombo, Sri Lanka: International Water Management Institute (IWMI). 33p. (IWMI Research Report 165). doi: 10.5337/2016.200*

(g) While adopting UTFI approach secures the access of water at community level, some individual farmers in more remote areas still require some technical support to deliver water to their farms. Solar PV pumps can provide a reliable source of energy in remote areas, contribute to rural access to water and reduce energy costs for irrigation. The key adaptation benefits include secure access to energy in order to use the available water in a cost-efficient manner. The saved time and money from the Solar PV pumps can be then invested in further building the resilience of the agriculture system via soil -water conservation practices or the availability of savings as a financial asset/safety nets in the face of potential impacts from extreme events

access, safety nets in the face of potential impacts from extreme events.

Co-financing

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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/21/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/21/2021:

Yes. STP has not yet accessed LDCF resources under the eligible per-country cap of \$10 million for GEF-7.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion n/a

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 9/21/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 11/9/2021:

Cleared. The agency has made the requested changes.

11/7/2021:

In the project meta-information section (above the Core Indicators, in the Portal), the agency has entered "False" for the statement "This Project involves at least one small island developing State (SIDS)". Please correct this, and enter appropriate comment in the review sheet.

9/21/2021:

Not yet. Adjustments are requested:

- (a) Core Indicator 2: This project has a strong agricultural and water management focus. For Core Indicator 2, please enter the number of hectares of land that will be managed in a more climate-resilient manner as a result of this project.
- (b) Core Indicator 1 (direct beneficiaries): As a \$10 million project that will use the entire STP LDCF amount for GEF-7, we would like to see this project provide impact, delivering adaptation benefits to a large number of direct beneficiaries in the country. The values for Core Indicator 1 appear very low relative to the grant request. Please consider how this project can provide direct adaptation benefits to a significantly larger number of direct beneficiaries, and adjust the Core Indicator 1 values accordingly.
- (c) Core Indicator 3: Please discuss (if known at this stage) which policies or plans will be targeted for adaptation mainstreaming.
- (d) In the project meta-information section (above Core Indicators, in the Portal), the agency has entered "False" for the statement "This Project involves at least one small island developing State (SIDS)". Please correct this.

(e) The Core Indicators table shows that some 60% of the direct beneficiaries will be women. The PIF states that 40% of the direct beneficiaries will be women. Please correct the discrepancy.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 11/7/2021:

Cleared.

9/21/2021:

Not yet.

Please also include tags for "climate change adaptation" and "climate resilience".

Agency Response Comment well noted and addressed in the PIF.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

Please specify the time period for the climate change projections discussed in the PIF. Are the projections to 2050, 2100 or another year?

Please try to use projections to 2030 or thereabouts as projections to 2100 may not provide a realistic picture for the nearer term.

Agency Response

The comment is well noted. The available and scientifically rigorous climate projections for Sao Tome and Principe are for the period 2041 – 2070. The following clarification was included in the PIF: “**Climate projections.** The climate projection dataset is a 4-km resolution down- scaling of the global climate model CanESM2^[1] with baseline 1971 and 2000, and climate projections for the period 2041 and 2070, under the RCP8.5 and the RCP4.5 greenhouse gas concentration scenarios.”

[1] Arora et al. 2011. Arora VK, Scinocca JF, Boer GJ, Christian JR, Denman KL et al (2011) Carbon emission limits required to satisfy future representative concentration pathways of greenhouse gases. Geophys Res Lett 38(5). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL046270>

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

Please include a theory of change for the project.

Agency Response Well noted. A Theory of Change diagram (Figure 1) and narrative are included in the PIF

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Yes.

9/21/2021:

Not yet. Please see comment for review item 6 of Part I of the review sheet.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

The PIF states that the water management technologies that will be supported by the project will be innovative, and that some have not been used in the country before. Please discuss which some of these potential technologies are, and why they are innovative.

Agency Response The technique called Underground Taming of Floods for Irrigation (UTFI) is innovative for Sao Tome and Principe. UTFI provides an opportunity to utilize floodwater harvesting and groundwater storage for agricultural development. It serves to overcome the

spatial and temporal mismatch in water availability that is characteristic of recurrent flood/drought cycles. This new technology involves diverting high water flows from rivers or canals when prone to flood risk and recharging the groundwater via village ponds or small dams that are modified for this purpose. By design the technology is gender neutral and is expected to benefit both men and women by offering them greater convenience, better health and enhanced socio-economic opportunities through improved water facilities. Whilst the technical components of UTFI are not necessarily new, the integrated approach and the proposed mode of operation is. The technology has been used in Asia, in particular Thailand, India, Sri Lanka

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

- (a) Please identify the Civil Society Organizations that were consulted.
- (b) Please discuss whether CSOs and/or local NGOs will be engaged in project design and implementation, and if so, how.
- (c) Please discuss how this project will aid in post-COVID-19 recovery and efforts to build back better.
- (d) Please provide further information on the planned consultations to be conducted with stakeholders at local and international level during the different stages of the project proposal preparation, including a list of stakeholders and their potential respective roles in the project.

Agency Response

- a) The civil society engaged in the initial consultation process include: (1) FONG - Federation of ONGs and (2) OIKOS.

- (b) CSOs and local NGOs (in particular women associations) will be engaged in the project design by (i) consulting about the specific needs and challenges of the farmers (including women farmers) with regards to access to water for irrigation, (ii) identification of key locations for the installation of water storage technologies and solutions (e.g. solar PV pumps, drip irrigation systems), (iii) assessment of capacity needs to better inform the capacity building activities at local level.

- (c) The following clarification is included in the PIF: "Project components are inherently aligned with the overall objective of stimulating a "green recovery" following the COVID-19 crisis. The project interventions will build resilience in the livelihoods of smallholder farmers and ecosystems via (1) promotion of ecosystem approach to water and soil resource management, thus increasing the productivity of farmlands and thus avoiding farmland expansions in areas of high natural and biodiversity value and (2) improving the quality and productivity of agricultural systems thus creating surplus of agricultural production which can be sold in markets and generate additional income to vulnerable farmers which can be used for long-term planning and anticipatory action. In combination, these results will enhance the resilience of farmers and their preparedness in the case of future socio-economic, climatic and health-related shocks. "

- d) At the project preparation stage, AfDB will engage the stakeholders at two stages (1) Consultation stage: consultation with local communities/CSOs and local government; national level government stakeholders to define needs and refine the project design (2) Validation stage: Validation workshop with representatives from different governance levels and local communities to ensure that the final project design is approved and supported from all stakeholders. An initial list with stakeholders and their roles is included in the PIF and as an Annex I to this Review Sheet.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

(a) The PIF states that the technologies and solutions for water storage and irrigation deployed by the project will be targeted specifically at women farmers. This is welcomed; please discuss how this is envisaged.

(b) Please submit a Gender Action Plan by CEO Endorsement. Please ensure the focus is on how the project activities can enhance women's climate resilience.

(c) It is unclear how this project will contribute to closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources. Please clarify further and/or revise the ticked box.

Agency Response

a) The preparation of the project design was informed by the gender analysis developed for PRIASA I and for PRIASA II. The project envisions the following to strengthen its gender components: improved access of women farmers to irrigation water and innovative technologies (solar PV pumps and drip irrigation); improved representation and participation of women in decision-making bodies; strengthened technical capacity for intervention and organisation of women in the activities supported by the project; and, appointment of a gender focal point. Project target to promote and enhance women place in decision making and will seek to strengthen women leadership in the Community Associations created / strengthened by the project.

b) This is well noted. A Gender Action Plan will be submitted by CEO Endorsement focusing on the expected impacts of the project interventions to enhance women's climate resilience and gender equality.

(c) The project will seek to engage with women farmers and enhance their access to water for irrigation. After a careful analysis it was defined that the project will not have such a prominent impact on closing the gender gap in access and control to water resources. Therefore, this box is revised.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

Cleared. Private sector engagement is not the focus of this project. However, it will support smallholder farmers with adaptation to climate change, and develop a business model for their uptake of water technologies.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested:

A climate risk screening of the project should be undertaken at PIF stage. Please submit the screening report, with any pertinent risks flagged, and, if flagged, proposed risk mitigation measures. (For any climate risks identified at PIF stage, a climate risk assessment is

needed by CEO Endorsement stage, with risk mitigation measures discussed.)

Agency Response

Hazard	Hazard level
Extreme heat	Medium
Coastal flood	Medium
Landslide	Low
River flood	Very low
Tsunami	Low

The climate risk screening for the project was performed using the World Bank's tool - ThinkHazard! (This is a web-based tool which supports the decision making for project design providing information on impacts of disasters on new development projects. The results are summarised in Table 1 below and a detailed description with proposed mitigation actions is included as a separate Annex 1. At CEO endorsement stage, a more detailed climate risk screening will be performed.

Table 1. Summary of climate risk screening (Source: ThinkHazard! <https://thinkhazard.org/en/report/214-sao-tome-and-principe>)

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared

SECRET.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

Please also discuss coordination with GEF LDCF ID 9364 (World Bank), as well as with any GEF Land Degradation projects in the country.

Please also discuss coordination with other relevant non-GEF initiatives (e.g., GCF/Adaptation Fund or bilateral donors).

Agency Response

The following clarification is included in the PIF: "Under the implementation arrangement, the project proposes to establish a Technical Advisory Group (TAG), which will consist of technical experts from the GEF LDCF ID 9364 (World Bank) and GEF ID 9517 (FAO) and other relevant non-GEF initiatives. The TAG will be responsible for the technical guidance, transfer of knowledge and best practices within different initiatives in Sao Tome and Principe. It will seek to ensure project's strategic approach, coordination among the partners."

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

Yes, it is aligned with the adaptation priorities laid out in STP's NDC 2021.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from

relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/9/2021:

Cleared. Thank you for this additional information.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

(a) Please include in the knowledge management plan (and in the PIF) that the project will capture lessons and best practice on the local adoption and use with the water technologies. What were successes and/or impediments to their uptake, use and durability? How were they innovative? Which ones proved more successful in times of drought or other climate stress? Which ones did women favor, and why? What ancillary measures could have made this even more successful?

(b) Please also specify the range of audiences for the various knowledge products, ensuring that the lessons can be fed back to extension workers and farming communities, among others.

(c) Please provide information on proposed tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning and collaboration; proposed knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders; and a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability, following the KM Approach.

Agency Response

a) A knowledge management (KM) plan has been considered as an integral part of Component 3 of the project. Therefore, at project preparation phase, a draft of KM plan will be prepared and submitted, which will then be revised and tailored during the implementation of Component 3.

In order to have a structured approach, the project considers adopting the following three KM steps, which will ensure the coherence of KM, including:

- Knowledge Management Registry (KMR): The KMR will define the areas of knowledge needed by the projects such as "key knowledge inputs" from ongoing projects and "knowledge outputs" from lessons learned.
 - KM Protocol: The KM will develop a process of creating the KM which defines the roles and accountabilities of each partner and details on how the knowledge shall be collected, stored, organized and distributed throughout the project lifetime.
 - Implementation Plan of the Project: The KM will make sure the KM protocol is ready to be applied throughout the implementation of the project.

b) Please see the responses for a) and c). In order to identify the audiences for the products, the project will first identify what are the knowledge gaps and needs for the different stakeholders and will then develop a KM plan to effectively address those knowledge and information gaps and share lessons learned.

c) The following clarification is included in the PIF: "Tools and methods for knowledge sharing: The project will generate various knowledge products (e.g. Farmer Field Schools curriculum on water infrastructure, solar energy equipment, climate smart agroecological approaches and techniques, sustainable practices on soil, water and biodiversity conservation), conduct studies (success stories, surveys, etc.), organize study visits/peer-learning events, different meetings/workshops/exhibitions for one to one communication with actual and potential beneficiaries, thereby establishing diligent internal and external information circulation now available for not only for project stakeholders but for also wider audience. The Project will package and disseminate information to the respective stakeholders including beneficiaries in the appropriate formats (e.g. brochures, studies, articles, newsletter, social media and web). This knowledge-sharing process will be supported by a well-focused series of workshops and joint learning events. A communication strategy will be established and implemented to disseminate in the project results within and beyond the project intervention zone through a number of existing information sharing networks and forums."

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent

with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/12/2021:

Cleared for PIF stage.

It is expected that prior to CEO Endorsement the project apply environmental and social standards and procedures to identify risks and potential impacts and submits for the GEF's review, in line with GEF Policy and Guidelines on Environmental and Social Safeguards (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_gef_policy_environmental_social_safeguards.pdf).

1. Screening/assessment report(s) such as any final screening reports and or Environmental and Social Risk and Impact Assessment report(s).
2. Environmental and Social Management Plans, if applicable, to address identified types and levels of risks.
3. Revise and update the overall project risk rating if needed.

11/9/2021:

Not yet cleared.

Further information is needed on the Environmental and Social Safeguards: The Agency response related to ESS is that "The risk matrix is reviewed and reflects the preliminary results of the environmental and social screening with identified mitigation measures." However, the information provided in the ESS section includes only climate risks. Please also discuss the broader environmental and social safeguard (ESS) context for the project, and/or provide any ESS screenings that may be have been undertaken.

9/21/2021:

Further information is requested.

(a) The project risk matrix does not include information on potential environmental and/or social risks that the project could pose. Please conduct an environmental and social safeguard screening, and submit the results or emerging findings to GEF Sec. If risks are identified, please discuss potential risk mitigation measures.

(b) Please provide, if available, the preliminary screening document following the AfDB Integrated Safeguards System (ISS). We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low. The PIF said that preliminary information on the types and levels of risks has been provided in the PIF, and a more in-depth analysis of risks is being undertaken as part of the development of the PRIASA III project and will help complement this section. However, there is no information about types of ESS risk related to this project.

Agency Response

- a) The risk matrix is reviewed and reflects the preliminary results of the environmental and social screening with identified mitigation measures

causes.

(b) The risk screening analysis will be presented at later stage as they it is still in a process of finalisation. Please refer to response a) for preliminary results.

11/12/2021

ESS risks will be more fully considered during project preparation phase.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/12/2021:

Yes.

11/9/2021:

Please address remaining items (response to 'Environmental and Social Risks' section).

11/6/2021:

Not yet. We are unable to see the Agency responses in the review sheet. Please correct this and resubmit.

9/22/2021:

Not yet.

Please address the comments in the review sheet. In addition to the agency responses in the review sheet, please make changes as appropriate/requested in the GEF Portal entry text. Please do not use highlighter or tracked changes, thank you.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/21/2021:

- (a) Please submit a Stakeholder Engagement Plan by CEO Endorsement that identifies stakeholders consulted and their envisioned roles, including CSOs and NGOs.
- (b) In addition to the social and gender analysis that will be conducted as part of project preparation, please submit a Gender Action Plan by CEO Endorsement. Please ensure the focus is on how the project activities can enhance women's climate resilience.
- (c) Please submit a Knowledge Management Plan. See PIF-stage comments on Knowledge Management for some aspects GEF Sec would like to see included.
- (d) It is expected that prior to CEO Endorsement the project apply environmental and social standards and procedures to identify risks and potential impacts and submits for the GEF's review, in line with GEF Policy and Guidelines on Environmental and Social Safeguards (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/guidelines_gef_policy_environmental_social_safeguards.pdf).
 1. Screening/assessment report(s) such as any final screening reports and or Environmental and Social Risk and Impact Assessment report(s).
 2. Environmental and Social Management Plans, if applicable, to address identified types and levels of risks.
 3. Revise and update the overall project risk rating if needed.
- (e) If significant climate risks were flagged in the PIF-stage climate risk screening, please submit a climate risk assessment by CEO Endorsement, with risk mitigation measures proposed for the identified risks.

Review Dates

PIF Review Agency Response

First Review	9/22/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/9/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/12/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval