



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

GEF ID:	6988		
Country/Region:	Guinea-Bissau		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas and Communities to Climate Change in Guinea Bissau		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4978 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$12,000,000
Co-financing:	\$26,150,000	Total Project Cost:	\$38,450,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Rawleston Moore	Agency Contact Person:	Henry Rene Diouf

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	YES. Guinea Bissau is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the operational focal point and dated September 27, 2014, has been attached to the submission.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	YES. The proposed grant (\$13.407 million) is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3. It is not clear however, how nearly half of the proposed LDCF grant (\$5.7 million) could be associated with CCA-3 on integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please review the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) against the latest results framework of the GEF Adaptation Program and ensure that the indicative breakdown of grant and co-financing per strategic objective is in line with the scope and focus of the proposed project.</p> <p>12/04/2014 -- YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A) has been revised as recommended, and the breakdown of grant and co-financing by strategic objective seems in line with the outcomes of the proposed project.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant</p>	YES. The proposed project is consistent with Guinea-Bissau's NAPA priorities in the areas of coastal-zone management and food security, as well as the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	identified, associated need for capacity building. In addition, the project is in line with the country's principal development strategies and plans, notably the Second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper.	
Project Design	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF (pp. 4-5) lists several baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build and the resilience of which it would enhance. It is not entirely clear, however, how these initiatives and their associated financing relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing listed in Table C. In particular, Table C includes co-financing only from the national government and UNDP, whereas the baseline initiatives are mostly financed by the World Bank and AfDB.</p> <p>With respect to Component 1, the description of the additional reasoning mentions several plans and frameworks that the proposed project would contribute towards, including the Tourism Areas Master Plan, the Bissau City Master Plan, the National Coastal Areas Zoning Regulation, the National Plan for Environmental Management, as well as local development plans in targeted areas. It is not at all clear from the description of the baseline situation to what extent these plans and frameworks already consider climate change risks.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) specify the indicative co-financing amounts associated with each relevant baseline initiative; and (ii) ensure that all</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>sources, amounts and types of co-financing are reflected accordingly in Table C. In addition, please (iii) clarify to what extent relevant, existing plans and frameworks already consider climate change risks.</p> <p>12/04/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies how the baseline initiatives relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing listed in Table C; and to what extent climate change risks and adaptation strategies are considered in relevant, existing plans and frameworks.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>Please include an objective in Table B.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the project framework accordingly.</p> <p>12/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8. The project framework is sound and appropriately detailed.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Given some outstanding questions regarding the baseline scenario and initiatives, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed.</p> <p>Specifically, the added value of the proposed Component 1 should be clarified with respect to the actual extent to which climate change risks are</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>considered in existing plans and frameworks.</p> <p>In addition, the PIF could clarify the difference between the proposed Output 2.2 on water control in low-land rice-growing areas; and Output 3.1 on resilient management and production practices. The two seem partly duplicative.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please strengthen the description of the additional reasoning and indicative adaptation benefits accordingly. Specifically, (ii) clarify the added value of the proposed Component 1 with respect to the extent to which climate change risks are considered in existing plans and frameworks; and (iii) explain the difference between the proposed Output 2.2 on water control in low-land rice-growing areas; and Output 3.1 on resilient management and production practices.</p> <p>12/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 6 above. The re-submission clarifies how the proposed project would build on and strengthen existing plans and frameworks, and it further specifies the indicative outputs 2.2 and 3.1, of which the former would focus on hard coastal protection measures, while the latter would include complementary, soft measures.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks and appropriate, associated mitigation measures are adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives is adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for 	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please describe in Section A.1 of the PIF the project's innovative aspects along with an indicative strategy to ensure sustainability and promote scaling up.</p> <p>12/04/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would take a comprehensive approach to reducing the vulnerability of Guinea-</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	scaling up the project's intervention.	Bissau's coastal populations, livelihoods and productive assets to the adverse effects of climate change. By addressing the information and capacity gaps among key stakeholder groups, by exploring policy measures to incentivize private sector investment, and by addressing shortcomings in existing coastal planning frameworks; the project presents a credible strategy for achieving sustainable adaptation benefits with potential for scaling up nationally and in the wider region.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8 above, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>12/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p>	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate?	NOT CLEAR. Please address the recommendations in Section 6 above.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement:</u> Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>12/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to section 6 above.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>YES. At \$550,000 or less than five per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the proposed LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?</p>	<p>YES. \$300,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects above \$10 million.</p>	
	<p>20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>	<p>NA</p>	
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		
	<p>22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?</p>		
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council? 		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 4, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16 and 17.</p> <p>12/04/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	October 31, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	December 04, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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