



Strengthening climate information and early warning systems for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change in Guinea Bissau

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10105

Countries

Guinea-Bissau

Project Name

Strengthening climate information and early warning systems for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change in Guinea Bissau

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/20/2020

Review completed by PM

5/13/2024

Program Manager

Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

**PIF
CEO Endorsement**

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - Yes

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 5/3/2021 - Yes. The overall structure of the project makes sense and is well articulated in Table B as well as the description later in the submission.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - Clarifications requested:

- Co-financing letters from the Ministry of Environment and UNDP are listed as grant, but the co-financing letters say different - In-kind and cash, respectively. Please edit the entry on the portal.

- The other two letters do not specify that it is grant financing being provided, please amend.

GEFSEC 01/06/2022

Thanks. Comments cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

Updated letters of co-financing are attached to clarify the parallel and in-kind co-financing contribution from UNDP CO, the Ministry of Natural resources and energy (Hydraulic resources department) and from the Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity.

The UNDP CO co-financing letter indicates that the contribution is in cash. Copy of the letter is attached for reference.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - More information requested. is it possible to provide some additional information on the cost effectiveness of this project and how it is cost effective in comparison to viable alternatives?

GEFSEC 01/06/2022

Thanks for the additional information related to cost effectiveness. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

The funding shown in Table D is presents the project approach to achieve the objectives cost-effectively.

The approach focuses on the modernization and sustainability of different types of equipment needed by national partners (INM and Hydraulic Resources department). Cost-effectiveness of the approach also hinges upon long-term partnerships and coordination with other partners which are also part of the sustainability plan. Indeed, ongoing initiatives in the sub-region, such as Hydromet ECOWAS, of which Guinea-Bissau is part, D?SIRA EU project on network of tide gauges and the development of a marine and coastal observation system, GEF/LDC funded coastal community resilience project, World Bank WACA project on costal resilience are among the initiatives the EWS project will coordinate with to ensure complementarity mainly in terms of national early warning system, databases and equipment sustainability and cost effectiveness.

It should also be stressed that the LDCF project does not have a narrow focus on EWS, but a much broader one on raising the level of climate information and early warning systems involving the meteorological and hydrological services, and by considering the weak capacity of current services.

Descriptions in section 4 (Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects) have been revised to better explain what this means for both water and meteorology services and institutions.

In addition, the cost-effectiveness of using climate information systems relies on a combination of factors which are described in the PRODOC figure 'Functional components (pillars) of the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS)'.

Beyond climate information systems themselves, other components equally need to be developed, principally capacity development and observations and monitoring, which are at precariously low levels in Guinea-Bissau. Through the development of user interface platforms, alongside increased research, modelling and climate predictions, effective climate services can be developed, and in a harmonic and sustainable way e.g. according to what is described in PRODOC figure 'Hierarchy of national climate services'.

Currently, Guinea-Bissau does not meet the criteria for Category 1 level of climate services. For these reasons, it is difficult to conceive other alternatives to the project strategy that could be more cost effective outside of the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS). The existence of a minimal level of consistent climate observations is a pre-condition for any other climate service development activities.

Descriptions in PRODOC section 4 (Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects) have been revised to better describe the state of meteorological, hydrometric and maritime monitoring stations in Guinea-Bissau. The surface weather observation network system in Guinea-Bissau, as well as the hydrometric network and the few tide observation stations along the coast, are currently inadequate for the assessment, quantification and reliable prediction of weather, climate and their impacts, and consequently for the prevention of natural disasters and the management of climate-induced risks.

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - Yes this is included in Annex C.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - Clarification requested. At PIF stage an estimated 500 people were expected to be trained. Now, it's indicated that 50 will be trained. Is there a reason for this or is it a typo?

GEFSEC 01/06/2022

More clarification requested. The tracking tool doesn't have any target for core indicator 4. Also, the LDCF indicators and targets are not aligned with the results Framework Annex A. Please review and adjust the LDCF indicator targets accordingly. Also, the meta-information says the project is 100% NRM despite that the project has significant focus on climate information services.

GEFSEC, 5/23/2024

Thank you for clarification and inclusion of targets for the LDCF core indicator 4. Comment cleared

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

Hereby confirming that project is not 100% NRM..

In the CCA Tracking tool, tab ?0. Meta-information? states:

LDCF

100% Climate Information Services

Since the project fits under the LDCF climate change adaptation window, NRM Core indicator 4 in CEO Endorsement Request Part I, Table E covering NRM should not apply. A correction was made in the mentioned table.

As for CCA Core Indicator 4 in the CCA Tracking tool, it has been revised, so as to be aligned with indicators in the Results Framework. Reference to indicator numbering in the Results Framework is now included in notes in the CCA Tracking Tool. Results Framework indicators were also slightly updated for clarity. Some include notes that show their alignment with indicators in the CCA Tracking Tool. Those changes were made in direct response to the GEF Secretariat?s comment on Core Indicators.

We now have the following targets for CCA Core Indicator 4 from the CCA Tracking tool:

?Total no. of people trained: 50

Male 30

Female 20?

Targets for other CCA Tracking tool outputs have been corrected and aligned with the Results Framework indicators, with meta information added to the Tracking Tool. Details follow:

> Output 2.3.1: Number of people trained regarding climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses

[?]

of which total no. of hydromet and disaster risk management agency staff:

Male 30

Female 20

The above is linked to Results Framework Indicator 5.

Meta information added:

=====

?Aligned with Results Framework Indicator 5: Number of climate and hydrological local observers and maintenance staff trained and participating in Summer and senior climate and hydrological analysts in Master courses. The baseline is 0 and targets as follows: Up to 10 candidates selected for Master courses; 40 participants in summer courses and other climate related courses that may happen online in mass training & education platforms. The project will strive for a 50/50 gender ratio, but a ratio of 60% men, 40% women is considered viable, given the gender mainstreaming scenario in Guinea-Bissau.?

?The main target group will be climate and hydrological local observers and maintenance staff (slated to participate in Summer courses) and senior climate and hydrological analysts (slated to participate in Master courses).?

Other slight revisions to the CCA Tracking tool were made and changes are highlighted in yellow in Excel, tab ?1. Tracking Tool for CCA?.

Some Results Framework Indicators were slightly reformulated (#1, #2, #3, #5 and #11b) with changes marked in yellow. The most important changes, in view of clarity, are as follows:

> ?Results Framework Objective Indicator 1 | Aligned with Mandatory CCA Tracking Tool Core Indicator 1: # direct project beneficiaries disaggregated by gender (individual people)?

(no changes to targets or baseline for the above?)

> Indicator 5 with slight changes to formulations:

?Number of climate and hydrological local observers and maintenance staff trained and participating in Summer and senior climate and hydrological analysts in Master courses

[Aligned with: CCA Tracking Tool Core Indicator 4: Total no. of people trained, disaggregated by gender; linked to CCA Tracking Tool Indicator Output 2.3.1: Number of people trained regarding climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses (male and female)]?

> Indicator 5 Target, with slight changes to formulations:

?Up to 10 candidates selected for Master courses

40 participants in summer courses and other climate related courses that may happen online in mass training & education platforms

Total: 50 people from hydromet and disaster risk management agency staff trained at least, of which 30 are male, 20 female, but striving for a 50/50 gender ratio.?

Linkage to CCA Core Indicator 3 (as shown further up) is now adequately added to the Results Framework, as above.

> Indicator 11, now aligned with the CCA Tracking tool:

?Wider public awareness:

[?]

(b) number of people participating in the awareness-raising activities

[Aligned with CCA Tracking Tool Indicator Output 2.3.2: Number of people made aware of climate change impacts and appropriate adaptation responses (male and female)]?

R.P. 11/30/2021

The project currently specifies ?50 staff trained? as an indicator

At PIF stage, the indicator was generic. A note on it read as follows ?This number may include government staff, communities and households, private sector workers, etc.?

At CEO Endorsement stage, and with the project stakeholder engagement plan elaborated, there is more certainty about the numbers. It is therefore important to distinguish between different groups that have been lumped under the same in Core Indicator 4.

At PIF stage, the indicator also focused on the number of people with enhanced capacity to identify climate risk and/or engage in adaptation measures (gender-segregated, M/F).

In the PRODOC, GEF Core Indicator 4 is best reflected in Indicator 11b, which focuses on the number of people participating in the awareness-raising activities (implying training). The target is 4000, of which at least 40% are women.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 4/20/2021 - Some clarifications requested:

1) Does the project address the barrier regarding environmental databases?

2) Will the weather data collected by the new/improved weather stations will be relayed to the WMO's Global Basic Observation Network (GBON)? It is expected of all countries, but few are doing so, which is impacting the ability to generate regional forecasts with good lead time in Africa.

GEFSEC 01/06/2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

Response to Comment #1.

=====

As mentioned in the Section II, development challenges of the PRODOC, the project tackles inadequate or nonexistent climate data and information.

Descriptions in PRODOC section 4 (Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects) have been revised to better describe the state of meteorological, hydrometric and maritime monitoring stations in Guinea-Bissau. The surface weather observation network system in Guinea-Bissau, as well as the hydrometric network and the few tide observation stations along the coast, are currently inadequate for the assessment, quantification and reliable prediction of weather, climate and their impacts, and consequently for the prevention of natural disasters and the management of climate-induced risks. This seriously hamper decision-making at various levels and places the population in high risk. Through the revised descriptions, it becomes clear that the issue is less about "environmental databases", but rather the dysfunctionality of meteorological, hydrometric and maritime monitoring stations in Guinea-Bissau. Examples of existing databases and how they are given in Section 4 on the baseline scenario: e.g. the comprehensive and indexed dataset for hydrometric and meteorological stations in Guinea-Bissau has been maintained by the French research institution HydroSciences Montpellier under an initiative titled SIEREM (Environmental Information System on Water Resources and their Modeling / "Système d'informations Environnementales sur les Ressources en Eaux et leur Modélisation"). Another example is the "DGRH HYDROM vs 3.1 database", which is shared with neighboring countries and covers the transboundary freshwater resources in the Geba and Corubal rivers where newer hydrometric stations have been installed. However, a point is made in Section 4 that none of this is enough, but rather to address the capacity deficits more broadly in line with the guidance from the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS).

PRODOC Section 4 Baseline Scenario and barriers have been complemented to reflect the information above in response to comment #1. The CEO Endorsement Request, in Part I, Section 1a-2 was also updated.

It is stated in the Prodoc that the lack of a national environmental database reduces the potential for using meteorological and climate information for decision-making in the different economic sectors in Guneau-Bissau. These include planning and investment decisions related to urban and rural development, infrastructure, health, transport, agriculture, and mineral and water resources.

To ensure effective efforts to improve early warning systems, Guinea-Bissau must overcome all of the above obstacles related to environmental and climate database, while taking into account the adaptive capacity of the country's most vulnerable population.

Response to Comment #2.

=====

The data that will be collected by new / rehabilitated weather stations will be concentrated at the national level, transmitted to the regional and global observational level of WMO. This will improve Guinea-Bissau's contribution to the WMO's World Weather Watch (WWW) Program. The country is a member of the WMO and is expected to relay the data.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - Not clear, more information requested. The baseline scenario and the project context make sense, however, it is difficult to understand which group of projects contribute to the baseline situation in the country. Please provide a summary of which projects are providing co-financing and brief descriptions of these projects, including the timeline and main activities.

GEFSEC 01/06/2022

Thanks for listing the projects which form the baseline for this LDCF project. However, a number of projects listed do not seem to be relevant to this project i.e. the linkage is not intuitive. For example, the port project supported by Govt. of China doesn't seem to be linked and also the project period is 2018-2020 which has been crossed. Please review the list again and include only those projects which have clear links with this LDCF project.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks for the modifications. Cleared.



Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

UNDP has cross-checked the project's duration and amounts and made corrections to PRODOC Table 15. Baseline Finance and Co-Financing Table. The following project is still on-going:

Alto do Bandim Fishing Port Project ? Duration First phase: 2018-2021; Second phase 2022-2023/4?

This project is only a part of the baseline investments that supports fishery sector value chain development. It is not included as part of the co-financing, however the project will likely to benefit from the early warning and climate risk information that will be generated by the project.

Further information follows:

Alto do Bandim Fishing Port Project, funded by the Government of China in collaboration with the Ministry of Fisheries. Construction started in March 2019. The port will have facilities for storing and processing fish, which would add value to the output of the fisheries industry. The port's investment has been assessed at \$26M (possible much more, when figures for phase 2 are released), but the relevant baselines, in this in relation to Components 1 and 2, were considered at a more conservative figure of \$20M and for the baseline only, given that the project has been under implementation for a while and its linkages to improved climate information services are indirect.

R.P. 11/30/2021

The baseline scenario was developed based on records of the INM and the Ministry of Natural resources and energy/hydraulic resources department. It was elaborated during the PPG development stage and in addition to the IP records the baseline scenario was also confirmed on the ground with stakeholders and community consultations. More details are in Annex 15 of the PRODOC. A typo error mentioned Annex 19 in the sub-section 4 Baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects, while it should be Annex 15. This has been corrected in the updated version of the PRODOC. Table 15 on co-financing on page 68 of the PRODOC contains the details of the baseline projects and co-financing. It is noteworthy to mention that the baseline project does not include investments in the development of climate monitoring infrastructure because there have been none lately. Summary and brief descriptions of the projects providing co-financing is below for easy reference:

- **Project IFAD REDE with 14M\$ co-financing:** Agricultural Diversification, Integrated Markets, Nutrition and Climate Resilience Project (REDE). The project will promote crop diversification to reduce the country's dependence on a single crop production - rice or cashew. As the project areas have an arid Sahelian climate, climate change mitigation and adaptation measures will be introduced, particularly by reducing brush fires and forest

clearing, better lowland water management, by increasing organic content of cultivated soils and protecting and generating forests on plateau land.

- **Saltinho Hydroelectric Planning Project over Corubal River in Guinea-Bissau (OMVG project) with 10 M\$ of co-financing:** The project is part of a wider regional grid extension project, which will interlink electrical networks of The Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau and Senegal. This is an infrastructure development project. In Guinea Bissau the project aims among others to the rehabilitation of two hydropower stations initially cracked on the Corubal River course at Sintch? Canta (5.4 km upstream of the projected site for the saltinho dam) and Tche - Tche (located at 117 km upstream from the same town). Leading potential funders include the AfDB (Sustainable Energy Found for Africa), private sector including banks. The project is executed by the Gambia River Basin Organization (OMVG) in collaboration with the General Directorate for Water Resources under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy.

- **Scaling up climate-smart agriculture in East Guinea-Bissau with 8M\$ cofinancing:** aims at strengthening practices and capacities in climate-smart agriculture in the project region of dryland East Guinea-Bissau, and at institutional level. Key vulnerabilities in agriculture and water resources management are addressed; project will contribute to immediate and longer-term development and resilience needs of extremely vulnerable farmers. Food security and livelihoods are planned to be strengthened at household level while simultaneously increasing capacities in climate risk management and adaptation planning at all levels of governance. The project aims also at consolidating and upscaling the activities of the LDCF-UNDP project "Strengthening adaptive capacity and resilience to Climate Change in the Agrarian and Water Resources Sectors in Guinea-Bissau" (finished June 2016 in the 14 original tabancas in Gab? region? and 26 additional tabancas in the regions? of both Gab? and Bafat?; total beneficiary target population of approximately 37,000 people.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 5/3/2021 - Yes, the project structure makes sense and the outputs deliver against the respective outcomes.

Agency Response

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - Yes, this project is well aligned with LDCF/SCCF focal area objectives 1,2, & 3.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - No. The Section 1e/1(5) seems to be missing, and the way the proposal is currently structured makes it very difficult to determine the additional cost reasoning and the baseline / co-financing information. Is it possible to list each of the baseline investments in the baseline section, each with a brief description of the objective and main activities; as well as each of those interventions which are contributing co-financing to the proposed intervention? Currently it is difficult to determine the baseline projects which collectively make up the baseline scenario, and differentiate them from the projects which are contributing co-financing because there are no details provided on these projects. Therefore, understanding the additional cost basis and/or the LDCF contribution is also difficult.

GEFSEC 01/06/2022

Please add a summary of incremental reasoning in the portal submission section " Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing". The descriptions are spread across multiple sections which is difficult to comprehend. A clear summary of the incremental reasoning here will be useful for review.

Also- we noticed that a Theory of Change has been added in the CEO ER submission. However, it is simply a schematic depiction of project outcomes and outputs. The Agency is requested to revised the TOC to provide a more clear and simple illustration of the change process and also include assumptions. Please refer to the guidance from STAP on how to develop an effective theory of change.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks for the elaboration and the revised TOC. It's fine now.

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

The response to this comment is provided in two steps:

First, in the CEO Endorsement Request, a table titled "Additional Cost Reasoning Matrix" with three columns was added to the following section:

5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTE, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing

The table includes the summary of the baseline status, a summary of what the project will deliver under each component and the additionality. An approximate calculus of the additionality is also shown. The same table is included in PRODOC in an Annex titled "GEF focal area specific annexes (e.g. METT, GHG calculations, target landscape profile, feasibility study, other technical reports)?"

Second, the Theory of Change (TOC) has been revised accordingly. The linkages between different TOC elements are now shown.

Refer to the updated "PRODOC Figure 8. Theory of Change?"

The same figure and related content are now included in the CEO Endorsement Request, Part II, Section 1a-1 > "Theory of Change (TOC)?"

R.P. 11/30/2021

Table 15 related to co-financing at page 68 is explicit about the projects (description, agency, synergy) that are providing co financing and those which are not. Additionality of the EWS LDCF project is detailed on pages 36 and 37 for Component 1 (with and without LDCF) and page 48 for Component 2 (with and without LDCF).

All co-financing comes from the baseline, with the exception of that from UNDP which is leveraged. UNDP co-financing goes primarily to PMC and a small amount to C1. The breakdown is provided in the CEO Endorsement Request Part I, Table B.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - More information requested. Section 1f/1(6) seems to be missing -- This is the section where an articulation of the quantitative benefits provided in the results framework spreadsheet should be provided. A qualitative analysis detailing the project's expected contributions in terms of adaptation benefits would be appreciated.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Thanks for the description merging the sections 5 and 6. However, it is difficult to comprehend the overall contribution of the project to adaptation benefits. As commented in the previous question, please provide a short summary of all the adaptation benefits in addition to the existing details.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks for the details. It's fine now.

Agency Response

UNDP 06/09/2023

The following sections from the CEO Endorsement Request, Part II, are now separated:

5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing

and

6) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF);

Section 5 now includes the Additional Cost Reasoning Matrix.

Section 6 has new text that highlights the project's adaptation benefits.

R.P. 11/30/2021

Refer to CEO Endorsement Request, sections 1a > Sub-sections 5 and 6:

5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing

+

6) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF);

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - No - this section seems to be missing from the submission. There are references to sustainability and scaling up in the submission, but section 1g/1(7) is not articulated in the portal, please add.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Thanks for adding the details related to innovation and sustainability. Some good information related to innovation in the approach is provided. Please highlight if other aspects of the project such as technologies used for climate monitoring is also innovative in the country context. On sustainability, please elaborate how the weather stations installed through LDCF funding will be financially sustainable going forward for maintenance and operations.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks. No further comments.

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

In the CEO Endorsement Request, Part II, section ?1a-7) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up? has been expanded.

The same content is also included in the UNDP PRODOC, in section IV. Results and Partnerships,

under a sub-section with a similar title.

R.P 11/30/2021

Innovation was an important consideration during PPG project design. One of the outcomes was the implementation strategy which is divided in 3 phases, with two mid-term reviews and a close monitoring plan. This approach will contribute to reducing the risks identified during project design.

Moreover, project activities will help local institutions implement a demand-driven approach to the development of climate information services. This is a new perspective for the institutions in Guinea-Bissau and will promote a shift in the current strategy for developing

products in the country. With this approach, future climate information services and products produced by national institutions will be based on the needs of potential clients, making it tailored and facilitating commercialization. Additionally, project outputs and activities foresee the support for start-ups working with climate information services. Working with young, driven and entrepreneurial people will promote innovation and creative solutions for climate monitoring, information services and ultimately, climate change adaptation measures.

The project will ensure sustainability by investing in capacity building at all levels, with a special emphasis on gender, participation and replication of successful models and interventions, improving and strengthening knowledge and understanding of medium to long-term climate-related disaster risks to local communities. The project will then bring knowledge and experience to the climate change observation network and climate information services in Guinea-Bissau, helping to ensure its potential for scaling up through a strong community engagement.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation

phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - More information requested. In section 3.VI of Annex 4 the prodoc states that a comprehensive plan will be developed and implemented. However, at this stage of project development, it seems that a plan for engaging stakeholders throughout implementation should have already been formulated. Please clarify and include in the relevant section of the portal.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

ANNEX 4: STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN is now uploaded in the portal

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 5/3/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - More information requested. The submission refers to potential to include the private sector in non specific terms. At this stage of project development, some concrete examples of entities and engagement modalities would be appreciated, if relevant.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Thanks for the additional details. Some of the details in the responses are useful and we suggest to include them in the CEO ER section also.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

In the CEO endorsement, section: Private Sector Engagement, additional content was added to address the comment..

A new section titled "Private Sector Engagement" was added to the UNDP PRODOC, under Section IV-7.

R.P. 11/30/2021

There is indeed the potential to include the private sector in the project ? including to the extent that climate-based risk planning becomes a necessity in Guinea-Bissau.

The project will explore during implementation different types applications of hydro-climatic information, and related services and systems, including the potential for generating tailored climate information products, which may eventually have commercial applications and the potential to generate revenue.

Yet, it should be clear that the project's main focus is to develop, first and foremost, a public utility service targeting those who are most vulnerable in and therefore cannot afford paid climate information services.

In addition, the development of climate information services in Guinea-Bissau departs from a very low baseline. Before service provision can reach a certain level of capacity, services will need to be subsidized, and their development will need to be implemented in a step-wise manner.

Some climate information products (or services) may eventually be suited for private sector use and commercial, to the extent that they are able to generate revenue.

In section 3 (The Long-term solution and Barriers to achieving it), examples of sectors and segments in which climate services applications can be used are mentioned. Some of them lend themselves to private sector engagement.

Beyond support for food security and the management of climate-induced disasters, including Early Warning Systems (EWS) ? which are key segments on focus in the project -- the following income-earning sectors can also eventually benefit from climate information and have been considered: commercial agriculture; building and management of infrastructure; mining and oil & gas operations; land, air and maritime transport management; integrated water resources management; and certain aspects of coastal zone management and land use management.

Many of these sectors and segments are still under development in Guinea-Bissau. It will take a while before they can demand climate information services and pay for them. At the same time, we stress that this is the long-term perspective in the project strategy. Representatives from relevant sectors (commercial agriculture, transportation, construction, extractive industries, etc.) will be invited to the project launch, in which the project?s vision for climate information services will be presented.

In the section ?The state of climate information services?, we outline the typical pathway that countries pursue when developing national climate services. A figure is included to illustrate the hierarchy of levels of services according to categories. Given the poor state of the hydrology and meteorology observation and monitoring network in Guinea-Bissau, as well as the data processing capabilities at the hydrology and the meteorology institutes in Guinea-Bissau, we stress that the baseline scenario in the country is not yet sufficiently advanced to fully comply with CATEGORY 1, which corresponds to the ability to deliver a basic range of climate data and products, to participate in regional climate forums, and to engage in limited interactions with end-users. The level of service that includes specialized climate products that may be interesting to the private sector belong to CATEGORY 4.

The project has two mid-term reviews and a close monitoring plan. This approach will contribute to reducing the risks related to long term O&M of investments. A sufficient budget has been reserved for the purpose, including for addressing additional challenges linked to

the Covid-pandemic, whose impacts are now assessed in Annex X to the PRODOC, along with how the project will mainstream its covid response into outputs and activities. The knowledge management component will document the evidence base to support further upscaling and replication, including for instance for climate information for additional public and private sector actors.

Specific products from climate services will be identified in the framework of Result 2.4 and will be tackling specific vulnerable sectors and actors. It is not possible at this stage to identify specific private sector entities that could immediately enter into cost-sharing agreements. However, the mentioned sectors are currently experiencing fast growth in Guinea-Bissau.

Also, Activity 2.5.3 (on Development communication and outreach) mentions: "Within this activity, additional effort will need to be carried out for consulting other exposed sectors (industry, transport, agriculture, media, etc)."

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - Yes, the risk matrix is sufficiently developed. However, an additional section regarding COVID risk and opportunity would be appreciated. Please see the last comment box in this review sheet.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Many thanks for the Annex on COVID related risk. However, as per GEF policy guidance, please provide a summary of COVID-19 related risks, mitigation strategies and resilient recovery opportunities in the CEO ER submission. This summary is a key part of the final endorsement note to be sent to the GEF CEO for review.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks for the additional information. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

Information on COVID related risk has been added to the CEO Endorsement Request, at first in a box in Part II, Section '1a-5 Risks'. Refer to heading:

Summary Box from Annex X, which was updated on 23 March 2022.

(filename: PRODOC_Annex_X_Impacts_Covid_Recovery_230322.pdf)

The content of this box includes background information, figures on the spread of covid-19 in Guinea-Bissau, plus the level of vaccination and, most importantly, the project's Covid-response and risk mitigation measures. Updated graphs from Mar 2022 were now added.

Additionally, **Annex X, titled 'Impacts of Covid and Mainstreaming of Post-Covid Recovery'** is now fully integrated into the CEO Endorsement Request, in part III.

R.P. 11/30/2021

Risk #6 includes:

Climate or other (ie COVID) shocks occurring during the implementation phase of the project.

We have included a new and up-to-date Annex to the PRODOC:

PRODOC_Annex_X_Impacts_Covid_Recovery is uploaded

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 5/3/2021 - Additional information requested. Coordination with other LDCF initiatives is described throughout the project description, but there is not much of summary in the requisite section. A brief but detailed synopsis of the coordination mechanisms with all relevant LDCF-financed projects projects in Guinea Bisseau would be appreciated. Additionally, there are 9 projects in the GCF's pipeline in Guinea Bissau, some of which may

be relevant to this initiative. A summary of whether and how this project will coordinate with ongoing GCF projects in GB would be appreciated.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Thanks for the details. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

Refer to PRODOC Section VI. RESULTS AND PARTNERSHIPS > subsection
?Collaboration and synergies with other GEF-funded initiatives. Table 14. Synergies,
collaboration and partnerships

The EWS project has important complementarity with the ongoing LDCF funded project
?Strengthen the adaptive capacity and climate resilience of Guinea-Bissau vulnerable coastal
communities to climate risks?. The main synergy is related to:

Data and climate information. The LDCF funded project has important results on coastal data
gathering, coastal climate risk and vulnerability

- Working with local communities. The LDCF project has a component on coastal communities (farmers, fisher men, women, youth...) with grants to help livelihoods. The EWS project has results on a tailored package of EWS to local communities of farmers and fishermen.

Coordination is ensured as INM is a member of the Coastal project steering board.

Coordination will be strengthened through:

- Exchanges between project management units, which will follow continuously;
- M&E and communication will be cost shared by ongoing GEF projects, enhancing coordination.

Synergies have also been identified with two other GEF supported projects:

First: Intensify climate-smart agriculture in the coastal areas of Northwest Guinea-Bissau /
Scaling up climate-smart agriculture in Coastal Areas of Northwest Guinea Bissau

In this project, Component 1, developing the technical and institutional capacities of the government and civil society, aims to establish and operationalize a monitoring system for water and soil quality (Result 1.1) and to communicate and disseminate information on the water and soil quality monitoring system (Result 3.1). Synergy could be strengthened with EWS Project's components 1, 2 and 3 to contribute to the achievement of the results targeted by the intensification of climate-smart agriculture project.

Indeed, hydrometeorological and environmental data or information, if they are well collected (Project EWS Component 1), used in the early warning system (Project EWS Component 2) and disseminated in an appropriate manner (Project EWS Component 3), could inform farmers on the types of hazards, crops and resilient varieties suitable to plant based on environmental conditions and the adjustment of their agricultural calendar. This would lead to better decision-making which would improve the adaptability of farmers to climate-environmental shocks. Early warning systems followed by coordinated action are essential tools to prevent loss and damage of agri-food products and assets.

Second, Enhancing Livestock Resilience to Drought in Guinea-Bissau (ELRD)

While there is no direct synergy of the EWS Project with this project, the EWS project could indirectly contribute to the objectives of ELRD. The collection of climate and environmental data and the establishment of an Early Warning System (EWS) on risks and hazards could help identify:

- current water and forage accessibility conditions and alerting in the event of risk
- availability of fodder areas for livestock, relocation of areas and / or transhumance corridors in the event of a risk for livestock.
- potential sources of surface water availability to facilitate access to livestock.

Knowledge sharing and lessons learned by the EWS project can also be capitalized on (Component 3 in both projects).

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - Yes. This project is well aligned with Guinea Bissau's national priorities. However, more information is requested regarding Component 2 -- More details on the specific interface with the NAP process would be appreciated.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Thanks for the response below. However, as commented earlier, it will be useful if a short description can be added on how this project is contributing to the NAP process under this section of the CEO ER submission. Also, given that the project is linked with NAP process, please review the project indicators and consider adding some targets under relevant outcomes (e.g. 3.1 or 3.2 or 3.3) and outputs of Objective 3.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks for the modifications. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

Information on the NAP process has been updated and additional information added to the CEO Endorsement Request, in Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities?. Similar content is also included in the PRODOC.

The new content on the NAP process includes a new sub-section called "About the proposed Sectoral Frameworks for the 2021/22 Updated NDC's M&E, Adaptation Component".

Further to this, the CCA Tracking Tool was revised, so as to be aligned with indicators in the Results Framework. Reference to indicator numbering in the Results Framework is now included in notes in the CCA Tracking Tool. Results Framework indicators were also slightly updated for clarity. Some include notes that show their alignment with indicators in the CCA Tracking Tool.

Those changes were made in direct response to the GEF Secretariat's comment on Core Indicators.

Targets for other CCA Tracking tool outputs have been corrected and aligned with the Results Framework indicators, with meta information added to the Tracking Tool. Targets under CCA Output 2.3.1 had added.

As for CCA tracking outcomes 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3, it is important to note NAP process is ongoing and teams of consultants, supported by a national working group for adaptation, are currently in the process of developing and validating sectoral frameworks for adaptation within the Updated NDC. At this stage, it would be premature to establish targets. Sectoral frameworks for adaptation in the Updated NDC are still drafts, not yet nationally validated.

R.P. 11/30/2021

The project is consistent with national priorities. Indeed, in addition to the alignment with the 3-year development plan (2020-2023), the project will contribute to the elaboration of the upcoming development plan to strengthen risk informed development. In addition, the project will be implemented in parallel to the NAP projec. All the outputs from the EWS project (Component 1, 2 and 3) are responsive to the NAP in Guinea Bissau.

The EWS project aims among other things in component 2 to formally start the process of establishing the National Framework for Climate Services (NFCS). This framework will enhance climate change mainstreaming in NAP and development planning processes through synergy and coordination with the NAP project Outcome 1 Coordination mechanisms and processes for adaptation planning.

Finally, it is important to mention that the two projects EWS and NAP will contribute to the update of the main national climate goal in Guinea Bissau, the NDC, in 2024. Indeed, Guinea Bissau is currently updating its first NDC and one of the major issues is climate data, including to establish an MRV system for climate mitigation and adaptation.

The project is also mentioned in the updated 2021 NDC.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - More information requested. The information provided in the KM section is appreciated, but is it possible to provide some type of plan with a set of deliverables?

GEFSEC 01/07/2022- Still more details are needed. Please provide a more detailed knowledge management plan in this section with specific set of deliverables and timeline.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

CEO Endorsement Request, Part II, Section 8 (Knowledge Management) has been complemented with relevant and new content, in particular from the project's Component 3, which has a strong focus on knowledge management, in addition to M&E. Additional descriptive text under Component 3 was also added.

R.P. 11/30/2021

The UNDP and the GEF LDCF are supporting a set of NIM Climate Information and Early Warning System projects (12 at total) and a coordinating regional component (CIRDA) which aims to enhance coordination among the 12 NIM projects, increase cost effectiveness and, most importantly, provide the 12 country projects with a regional network of technologies, a cohort of technical advisors and efficient knowledge management mechanism for experience and lessons exchange. As described in Component 3, this project will be linked to CIRDA, and through the KM mechanism established by CIRDA, will benefit from lessons and experiences from the 12 Country projects which are at a very advanced state of implementation.

This KM mechanism will also allow this project to assess and document in a user-friendly form and share best and successful practices and lessons with relevant stakeholders and with other relevant initiatives in the region. Furthermore, the project will seek to establish effective feedback mechanisms and knowledge management structures to deliver the optimum messaging to reduce people's exposure to risk and threats. This will also help ensure that resources are used most-cost effectively and that inefficient vehicles are not promoted throughout the project term rather that the project activities can continually be re-adapted to serve the greatest number of people through the most effective messaging and delivery possible.

Moreover, project Component 3 focuses on developing knowledge management mechanisms and specific activities that will ensure the assessment, documentation and sharing of best and successful practices and lessons learned with key stakeholders and other relevant initiatives in the region.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/22/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 12/22/2020 - Yes.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - More information requested. There is no specific information regarding how the infrastructure and information generated by this project will benefit the end users in terms of everyday impacts on their lives and quality of living. Is it possible to elaborate slightly on exactly how this project will result in socioeconomic benefits for those 100,000 estimated direct beneficiaries of this project?

GEFSEC 01/07/2022- The response is fine but not comprehensive and also not integrated in the benefits section of the CEO ER submission. The section is expected to elaborate more on the social and economic benefits through the project in addition (and complementary) to specific adaptation benefits. e.g. creating new jobs, sustainable livelihoods, local economic growth, improved public infrastructure services, institutional capacity and governance, inclusion of the most vulnerable in decision making, etc.

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

CEO Endorsement Request, Part II, Section 10 (Benefits) has been expanded with new content. Other information that had previously provided is also complemented. Most of the content is from the description of specific activities in the PRODOC that relate to the topic of social and economic benefits. Reference to certain indicators, to the project's phases and to NAP process are also made in the updated Part II, Section 10.

R.P. 11/30/2021

Estimated beneficiaries are 100,000, supported by:

- Establishing EWS and tailored products for the local population in order to strengthen their resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters contributing to protecting their assets and saving lives:

- The EWS project results aim at strengthening climate information capacity to protect the natural capital and ecosystems that play important roles in disaster risk reduction and in socioeconomic development. Indeed, protecting the natural capital and ecosystems in Guinea Bissau will have an impact on the economic growth of the country that relies essentially on its natural resources (marine resources, agriculture, protected areas, ?);

By improving education and awareness-raising on climate change, the local population and leadership will make sure their voices heard. This is aligned with Output 1.9 *Strengthen community demand and develop participative community driven monitoring of Climate Information Services as well as EWS response capacities at local/site level*, that will support among others a community engagement strategy.

- The project will monitor the benefits for direct and indirect beneficiaries through the results expected under Outcome 3 which will aim to ensure sustainability of the achievements through strong ownership of national and local stakeholders, mainly direct beneficiaries: *Output 3.1*. Project activities and impacts on global, national and local adaptation benefits of climate information and EWS are assessed and monitored. *Output 3.2*. Project lessons and knowledge codified and disseminated nationally and internationally, *and Output 3.3*. Wider public awareness of climate services available and the benefits of their use achieved through comprehensive multimedia outreach and education campaigns

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - No. Annex B and Annex E need to be uploaded.

GEFSEC 01/07/2022: Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

Annex B and E are now uploaded in the CEO ER

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/30/2021 - In progress.

GEFSEC, 1/07/2022

Please provide responses to the below comments made previously:

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration.

Additional please consider the [below](#):

1) Please include a section elaborating further how this project will respond to challenges and risks posed by the COVID-19 pandemic to Guinea Bissau and the target area, as well as an opportunities analysis on how this project will contribute to the post-pandemic green recovery.

2) Please provide some more information regarding the amount of the budget that is allocated to international consultants -- the amount budgeted for international consultants is more than 5 times that of the local consultants. Considering this project is meant to build local capacity, some more information regarding how this is in line with that goal would be appreciated.

3) Please clarify what are the "Miscellaneous Expenses" under the budgeted expenses for the LDCF?

GEFSEC 07/18/2022

Thanks. Comment cleared for further review by PPO.

GEFSEC 08/25/2023

Please address the following comments:

1. Co-financing:

? All investment mobilized require a description on how it was identified. Please consider providing that at the bottom of co-financing section (c) .

? The letters of support are dated in 2020 and 2021. Please consider including an updated estimation of the actual amount that the Agency (with the help of the co-financier if possible) think will really go to the project considering the timeframe of both ?the co-finance and the GEF project?.

? Please consider including revising ?investment mobilized? to ?recurring expenditure? for \$14 mil co-financing amount as per letter of support.

2. Geographic location data:

? In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated data entry field in the portal.

3. KM: The project document includes a set of knowledge management and communications activities, especially as part of Component 3, including knowledge and communications products to share key messages and experiences and disseminate lessons learned as well as training, workshops, a knowledge management (KM) mechanism as well as multimedia outreach and education campaigns.

The project document includes a reference to a communication strategy as part of ?Activity 2.5.3 - Develop communication and outreach?; but no details have been provided. Also, the project?s results framework does not list key KM or communications deliverables. A clear timeline and budget for key KM and communications activities have not been provided, either. The agency is requested to include a brief description of the proposed communication strategy. It is also requested to provide a simple table with timelines and budget for key KM and communications activities. This information can be added to the KM section.

4. Gender: Please reflect gender considerations in Component 2, in particular, in Outputs 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5

5. Operations:

a. Expected implementation start date is not realistic, also project duration doesn?t correspond to start date and end date. Please amend accordingly:

b. PMC is not proportionate between GEF financing and co-financing, please adjust PMC budget allocation accordingly:

c. As UNDP is providing some execution support services, please provide a short justification and also add UNDP under the Other Executing Partner of the Project Information section.

GEFSEC, 5/23/2024

Thank you for addressing all comments. Cleared

Agency Response

UNDP. 06/09/2023

Concerning the three comments above:

Comment 1)

On how the project will respond to challenges and risks posed by the COVID-19 pandemic to Guinea-Bissau and the target area, as well as an analysis of opportunities on how the project will contribute to the post-pandemic green recovery:

In the CEO Endorsement Request, Part II, Section 5, a box on with the following title has been added:

[?Summary Box from PRODOC Annex X Impacts Covid Recovery 230322.pdf -- updated on 23 March 2022?](#)

Additionally, PRODOC Annex X (Impacts of Covid and Mainstreaming of Post-Covid Recovery) is now fully integrated into the CEO Endorsement Request as an annex, at the very end of the document in Part III.

Comment 2)

More information regarding the amount of the budget that is allocated to international consultants:

The GEF indicates that the amount that had been budgeted for international consultants is more than 5 times that of the local consultants. We conducted a budget analysis, considering the different modalities under which consultancies can be procured and contracted. We then correlated these modalities to different categories in the GEF's Budget Template. With respect to consultancies, four were identified:

? ?Contractual services-Company?, when consulting services are engaged through companies;

? ?Contractual services-Individual?, which are for longer-term individual consultancies, both national and international;

? ?Local Consultants?, which are for short-term individual consultancies; and

? ?International Consultants?, also for short-term individual consultancies

For the two latter categories, the break-down between national and international consultants is clear.

When we consider only those two latter categories, we agree with the GEF Secretariat that the gap between the amounts reserved for 'Local Consultants' and 'International Consultants' is indeed large. However, short-term consultancies represent only a small portion of the project's budget dedicated to consulting services. The two other modalities listed further up also need to be considered.

In order to correctly sort and classify amounts as either 'national' or 'international' consultants in relation to the four budgetary categories mentioned further up, an analysis of the 'Detailed Descriptions' that were as presented in the GEF Budget Template, was conducted. Results are presented in a pivot table below:

<i>Ref. LINE</i>	Analysis of GEF Budget Template: Consultancies	Sum of Amount (USD)	% of Total Amount (USD)
<i>A</i>	Blended national / international consultancies	1,872,000	58%
<i>B</i>	Contractual services-Company	1,872,000	58%
<i>C</i>	International consultancies	651,968	20%
<i>D</i>	(Short-term) International Consultants	248,000	8%
<i>E</i>	Contractual services-Individual	403,968	12%
<i>F</i>	National consultancies	728,666	22%
<i>G</i>	(Short-term) Local Consultants	25,000	1%
<i>H</i>	Contractual services-Company	298,000	9%
<i>I</i>	Contractual services-Individual	405,666	12%
	Grand Total	3,252,634	100%

The analysis above confirms that short-term consultancies represent only 9% of all consultancies (lines D + G).

The analysis also shows that 'Contractual services-Company' will be the preferred mode of engaging consultants. Under this category most of budget lines were tagged as 'blended national and international' (58% in line A).

Additionally, 9% of 'Contractual services-Company' are expected to be procured nationally (line H).

Also, when comparing the 'non-blended consultancies', we note a rather balanced relationship between 'National consultancies' (22% in line F) and 'International consultancies' (20% in line C).

Hence, it may be said that the gap between national and international consultants is not so large after all.

Above all, it is important to consider that this is a technology transfer project, and this is the main reason why an important portion of the GEF budget will be used to attract international expertise to Guinea-Bissau. This expertise is expected to assist national stakeholders with the things that are difficult. This is the expertise that cannot otherwise be found in-country and needs to be procured abroad. Amounts dedicated to both 'blended' (line A) and purely

International consultancies (line C) add up together to more than \$2.5M, or 42% of the total GEF Budget. This is significant, but it is also necessary and considered reasonable in a technology transfer project.

On the latter point, the UNDP Country Office offered the following explanation, which is highly relevant:

National capacities, as assessed by the UNDP Country office, are at an all-time low. This is a result of the long-standing political crisis that has greatly eroded the resident national capacities. It has been extremely difficult to recruit national consultants in the most diverse technical areas. Recruitment of international consultants is a necessity in order to keep the project moving at an acceptable speed.

Comment 3)

Concerning "Miscellaneous Expenses" under the budgeted expenses for the LDCF:

We verified the UNDP PRODOC Atlas Budget as it has been submitted to the GEF Secretariat on 03 December 2021.

The budget that had been included in the above referred iteration of the PRODOC can be found in PRODOC Section IX. On page 105 of the mentioned file, there is a budget line classified as "Miscellaneous Expenses". It is titled "74500 Miscellaneous Expenses (DPC)" and includes an amount of \$74,145.00 and a cross-reference to budget note 56.

However, it is important to note that this line is charged to the UNDP TRAC budget (the agency's core resources), and not to LDCF resources.

UNDP response, 13 May 2024:

Comment #1 on Co-financing

Considering the GEF co-financing policy, all co-financing identified is now marked as "investment mobilized". Explanations on the co-financing tagged as "investment mobilized" are now included in the CEO Endorsement Request, under Part I > Table C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE. Also, a slight correction to the table was made relating to the category of co-financing. With respect to the four rows in Table C, the following explanations are given:

1) Funds that represent investments in the agricultural sector (first row) and that were leveraged by the Government of Guinea-Bissau's Ministry of Agriculture through two IFAD projects. One of them (PADES) has already closed. To that effect, the General Directorate for Agriculture provided an updated letter of co-financing specifying and clarifying the nature of the co-financing. The project that currently provides co-financing to the GEF project is titled

?Agricultural Diversification, Integrated Markets, Nutrition and Climate Resilience Project (REDE)?. It aims to promote crop diversification to reduce the country's dependence on a single crop production - rice or cashew. As the project areas have an arid Sahelian climate, measures relating to climate change mitigation and adaptation measures will be introduced, particularly by reducing brush fires and forest clearing, better lowland water management, by increasing organic content of cultivated soils and protecting and generating forests on plateau land. The project constitutes a relevant intervention vis-?-vis the GEF's Early Warning System's Project because the agricultural sector is among those that will benefit the most from climate information in the form of early warning and seasonal forecasts. Other sub-sectors / segments that are implicated in the REDE Project, and for which EWS are also relevant include food production and distribution, landscape level management, rural development, infrastructure. Since the last submission, a correction was made to the category of co-financing not being in-kind, but rather ?Grant?.

2) Funds managed by Gambia River Basin Organization (OMVG) and leveraged by the General Directorate of Water Resources (DGA, under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy) (second row). OMVG is working together with the Government of Guinea-Bissau and the African Development Bank to ensure the successful implementation of ?Feasibility studies project for the construction of the Salinho dam, over the Corubal river in Guinea Bissau?. Studies are ongoing. A new letter from DGA (dated 19-Oct-2023) substitutes the previous one from 2020. It provides updated content on the period for this co-financing.

3) Funds that were leveraged by the Ministry of Environment (third row), as per their letter dated 17-May-2021, which reflect a commitment linked to an ongoing project funded by the Adaptation Fund and executed through the West African Development Bank (BOAD) titled ?Scaling up climate-smart agriculture in East Guinea Bissau?. The commitment remains valid and it represents investments mobilized for vulnerable rural livelihoods. The BOAD/AF Project is being implemented in the northern parts of Bafata and Gab? regions in the sectors of Sonaco, Pirada, Pitche, Gab?, Cuntoboel and Ganadu.

4) Funds from UNDP (last row) which will be managed together with GEF funds through the same project award. These funds were leveraged by UNDP to directly support the project throughout its duration.

UNDP is appending two (02) new letters of co-financing that update previous ones from 2020 and 2021, namely from: (1) the General Directorate for Water Resources under the Ministry Of Natural Resources and Energy, dated 19-Oct-2023; and (2) the General Directorate for under the Ministry of Agriculture, Forests and Rural Development, dated 21-Sep-2023.

Comment #2 on Geographic location data:

Besides the information contained in the CEO Endorsement Request Annex D, the PRODOC includes the required information in Tables 8, 9, 10, as well as to PRODOC Annex 1 (Project map and Geospatial Coordinates of project sites? for additional information).

Comment #3 on KM ? Knowledge Management:

UNDP added a description of the proposed communication strategy and a simple table with timelines and budget for key KM and communications activities. The updated content that responds to Comment #3 is included in the CEO Endorsement Request document in Part II, Section 8. Knowledge Management. Corresponding content is also included in the PRODOC under the descriptions of Component 3, which is titled ?Monitoring, evaluation and Knowledge management?.

Three outputs are foreseen under Component 3, of which the first one (3.1) is clearly dedicated to M&E. The second and third outputs under Component 3 (3.2 and 3.3) have stronger relevance for KM. At the same time, it is important to note that the entire project revolves around the concept of ?Climate Information Services?, which is of crucial importance to climate change adaptation and effective climate disaster response. Delivering improved Climate information Services, which the project aims to achieve, can be characterized almost in its entirety as a ?knowledge management service? which will be enhanced by several knowledge management products that the project will produce. These included e.g. results from consultancies, systems that will be built up as a result of project activities, training that will be provided in connection with it, among other types of related activities. It is therefore important to note that KM is included not restricted to Component 3, but also embedded in various activities under Components 1 and 2. Therefore more specific content was added to both the PRODOC and the CEO Endorsement Request document.

In the CEO Endorsement Request the relevant content that responds to Comment #3 includes three sub-sections:

? ?General KM Strategy?, which includes a brief introduction;

? ?Key KM Elements in the Project?s Strategy (matrix)?, which reproduces content from the corresponding PRODOC Table 14 with the same title; and

? ?Key KM and deliverables and timelines?, which reproduces content from PRODOC Box 1 titled ?About Knowledge Management Mechanism and related Activities? and a table below it, which contains the core KM deliverables, their timelines and associated budgets.

A table below Box 1 that is mentioned in the latter bullet point provides details at activity level.

Specifically regarding Activity 2.5.3 ?Develop communication and outreach? (which is mentioned in Comment #3), it should be noted that it is not a stand-alone communications and outreach activity for the entire project. It belong under Output 2.5 (Development of an efficient and sustainable mechanism for sharing climate products and early warning information). Details for Activity 2.5.3 are provided in the PRODOC. For the ease of reference the brief description of the activity is reproduced below:

A consultant will develop and implement communication and outreach activities relating to the EWS. This development will be carried out considering the outputs from Activity 2.5.1 and the in close interaction with activity 1.9.10.

Within this activity, additional effort will need to be carried out for consulting other exposed sectors (industry, transport, agriculture, media, etc.).

A local consultant with experience in EWS will be involved in the process to customize the communication and outreach components.

As a next step, drills will be organized and assessed. The results of the assessment will be used to improve the communication and dissemination protocol such that it can be rolled out in subsequent stages.

As for the description of the actual communication strategy, both under Activity 2.5.3 (and related activity 1.9.10) and for Output 3.3, they will be developed with FSP funds and by professional consultants of public communications and outreach, as suggested by the description further up.

Comment #4 on Gender:

In the PRODOC, the content that follows has been incorporated into Component 2 description:

A number of important **gender actions** will be incorporated into the development and implementation of activities under Outcome 2 -- the numbering refers to Actions under specific Gender Outcomes included in the project's **Gender Action Plan (GAP) in Annex 9**:

[GAP 2.1] Design and implementation of capacity building for gender and climate change / EWS /DRR focal points in line ministries and all other relevant technical staff and leadership.

[GAP 2.2] Implement Parity Law (2018), minimum quote of 36% women representation as limited number of women involved in decision making at national levels in lead ministries and institutions (Meteo, Hydro, Environment, Agriculture, Civil Protection Service) remains prevalent

[GAP 2.3] Technical support for mainstreaming gender in CC, DRR, EWS at lead institutions responsible for Climate Information Systems. Engage external experts to support strong gender approach: institutional gender audits; develop a comprehensive gender mainstreaming toolkit for projects.

[GAP 2.4] Undertake planning and support resource mobilization for the gender action plan.

[GAP 2.5] Evaluate performance, develop and implement an acknowledgement system for good performance on gender mainstreaming

[GAP 3.1] Ensure EW information is tailored to needs of women and communicated in a manner to maximize accessibility and action (e.g. must consider literacy rate of recipient area). Give strategic attention to gender equality and the empowerment of women in Guinea-Bissau.

ensuring that programmatic and operational activities of Climate Info and EWS System for resilient development are gender-responsive.

[GAP 3.2] Ensure that women's needs and particular challenges are represented in the design and implementation of on-the-ground interventions of the climate info, EWS and DRR; hold multi-stakeholder dialogues on EWS/DRR and gender at national and county level with inclusive and equal participation of both women and men.

Expected gendered results: (i) Enhanced capacities for gender mainstreaming in the overall climate change management and institutional framework; (ii) Women are specifically involved in all aspects of EWS and DRR and the challenges that they face are duly considered: Disaster management activities are gender sensitive at all stages of the climate info process and disaster cycle, by involving both women and men in the design, administration, and implementation of EWS.

The above-listed gender actions and results from the GAP are not exhaustive. Other elements from the GAP may apply. It is recommended that, during the project's inception activities, indicators and the project's planning are scrutinized for their effective contribution towards gender equality and women empowerment, with particular attention given to Outputs 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5.

The same principles of Gender Mainstreaming and Gender Targeting apply to other Outcomes as well. It is expected that the GAP in Annex 9 is actively used in the project's planning and implementation tools.

Additionally, under Output 2.1, the following edits were made to strengthen gender targeting in the project (what is marked in yellow is what is new):

The aim of the framework is to support climate-smart decision making by making sure to:

(a) know the user, including among them women, and understand what is needed: Understand the climatic elements that are relevant to the user; how the user wishes to receive information; how the user is likely to interpret the information; for what purpose the information will be used; the decision process of the user; and how the information might improve the decision-making processes.

(b) Make the information service simple, accessible and timely, including for women: Provide products that can be understood and readily applied by the user, along with easy access to follow-up professional advice. Where applicable, tailor communication products to women's needs, so that they can fully participate in the efforts towards enhancing climate information services in Guinea-Bissau and their applicability.

(c) Ensure quality and gender sensitivity: Provide products that have been developed with skill and with an understanding of possible applications and analytical techniques, complete with proper documentation and backed by thorough knowledge of up-to-date data availability and characteristics. They will also need to be sensitive to gender caveats, in addition to securing a balanced participation of women in training events and capacity development opportunities.

The proposed activities or steps for the establishment of the NFCS are based on Step-by-step Guidelines for Establishing a National Framework for Climate Services (WMO-No. 1206) as shown in PRODOC Figure 9 [Five steps for establishing a National Framework for Climate Services (Source: (WMO-No. 1206)] ? and with gender scrutiny of the details duly applied.?

Comment #5a on Operations > Expected implementation start date:

Updated Project Start Date: July 2024

Updated Project End Date: July 2030

Changes were made to the CEO Endorsement Request PART I and to the PRODOC's cover page.

Comment #5b on Operations > PMC for the co-financing: The distribution of co-financing per Component has changed in response to the comment. The proportion of PMC for GEF and co-financing is now proportional.

Comment #5c on Operations > UNDP's execution support services:

1. Justification for Execution Support to National Implementation Modality (NIM):

Request from Government: A formal request for execution support has been submitted by the Government of Guinea-Bissau. A letter signed by the GEF OFP/Secretary General of the Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity is attached as Annex 1, confirming the government's need for assistance.

Assessment of Government's Capacity for Execution: The executing body, MAB (Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity), underwent a HACT micro-assessment in 2022, resulting in an overall "Moderate" rating, with "high" rating in fixed assets and inventory, financial reporting and monitoring. The government's request for execution support is based on these challenges, consistent with experiences from previous projects.

Types of Support Needed: The government has identified specific areas where support was required. This includes the following execution support services:

(a) Identification and/or recruitment of project and programme personnel;

(b) Identification and facilitation of training activities;

(c) Procurement of goods and services;

(d) Transaction costs and other services as needed.

2. Justification of UNDP's Assistance to NIM:

Existence of 3rd Party Support: There is no identified third party, other than UNDP, capable of providing execution support to the MAB (Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity) in implementing a full-size GEF-financed projects. UNDP's preference is justified by its extensive presence across the country, proven technical skills, and successful track record in collaboration with state and non-state institutions.

Mapping for 3rd Parties: During the PPG phase, potential third parties were actively engaged, and past experiences with local NGOs were thoroughly reviewed. However, no candidate emerged as a viable option for the execution support needed. See below a list of potential third parties:

Third Party Entity	Pros	Cons
Conservation International (INGO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Expertise in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. ? Experience in working with local communities for natural resource management. ? Potential for leveraging private sector partnerships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Focus primarily on conservation might limit their expertise in early warning systems. ? Limited financial resources compared to larger organizations.
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) (INGO)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Globally recognized for biodiversity conservation efforts. ? Extensive network and partnerships with various stakeholders. ? Expertise in policy development related to environmental issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? May have a bureaucratic structure that could slow down project implementation. ? Limited focus on early warning systems specifically.

World Bank (Multilateral Development Bank)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Significant financial resources for large-scale projects. ? Experience in financing and implementing projects in various sectors. ? Access to a wide range of experts and consultants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Bureaucratic processes might lead to slower implementation. ? Potential emphasis on large infrastructure projects rather than specific environmental initiatives.
West African Development Bank (Multilateral Development Bank)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Regional focus may allow for a better understanding of local dynamics. ? Experience in financing projects in West Africa. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Limited resources compared to larger international institutions. ? May have a narrower mandate that doesn't fully align with the project's scope.

UNDP's Capacity Assessment: UNDP in Guinea-Bissau has been providing successful support to MAB (previously known as Secretary of State of Environment) since 2011, as confirmed by independent evaluations of GEF-financed projects. A terminal Evaluation report for the project "Strengthening Resilience and Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in Guinea-Bissau's Agrarian and Water Sectors Project" (see Annex 2) attest to UNDP's Moderately satisfactory performance and coordination with MAB.

UNDP's Willingness to Provide Execution Support: UNDP in Guinea-Bissau is fully committed to providing execution support, and such costs are included in the project budget. The estimated amount is presented in the OFP letter requesting execution support. The total amount is estimated at USD 74,145.

Capacity Building and Future Sustainability: UNDP's assistance aims not only to provide immediate execution support but also to build long-term capacity within MAB. Capacity-building trainings have been ongoing including in 2023, (report in annex 3) following the micro-assessment, and there will be another in 2024. Also, to support MAB in strengthening its institutional capacity and enhancing the technical skills of its personnel, UNDP intends to recruit a Capacity Development Specialist, who will be based at the Ministry of Environment and Biodiversity (MAB).

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - No. Please include responses to comments from Council members in Annex B on the portal

https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/LDCF_SCCF%20Council%20Comments%20Compilation_Dec.2018.pdf

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Thanks. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

Annex B is now uploaded in the CEO ER

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - Not clear. Why does it say NA? Please include responses to STAP comments in Annex B on the portal: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/work-program-documents/Final%20STAP%20Screen%20PIF10105_Strengthening%20climate%20info%20%20early%20warning%20Guinea%20BissauCW_1.pdf

GEFSEC 01/07/2022- Thanks. Cleared.

Agency Response

R.P. 11/30/2021

Annex B is now uploaded in the CEO ER

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestGEFSEC, 4/23/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestGEFSEC, 5/3/2021 - Yes.

Agency Response
Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA
Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response
Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement RequestNA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSEC, 1/5/2021 - Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project.

GEFSEC, 4/23/201- Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit for consideration. Additional please consider the [below](#):

1) Please include a section elaborating further how this project will respond to challenges and risks posed by the COVID-19 pandemic to Guinea Bissau and the target area, as well as an opportunities analysis on how this project will contribute to the post-pandemic green recovery.

2) Please upload the full budget template onto the portal, as per the GEF guidelines

3) Please provide some more information regarding the amount of the budget that is allocated to international consultants -- the amount budgeted for international consultants is more than 5 times that of the local consultants. Considering this project is meant to build local capacity, some more information regarding how this is in line with that goal would be appreciated.

4) Please clarify what are the "Miscellaneous Expenses" under the budgeted expenses for the LDCF?

5) Where is the Theory of Change diagram?

GEFSEC 01/07/2022

Not yet. The Agency is requested to address additional comments made in the review sheet and also respond to some of the comments above, which are pasted under the GEF Secretariat Comments section.

GEFSEC 07/18/2023

YEs, the project is recommended for endorsement.

GEFSEC 08/25/2023

The agency is requested to address additional comments as received from PPO. These comments are pasted in the "GEF Secretariat Comments" box above.

GEFSEC, 5/23/2024

Agency has addressed comments from PPO. Project is recommended for endorsement

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/3/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/7/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/24/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/25/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project has addressed the comments provided during the review and now presents a strong adaptation rationale for effective use of LDCF funding. Please refer to the recommendation note for detailed reasoning.