# GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
# THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| GEF ID: | **9364** | | |
| Country/Region: | **Sao Tome and Principe** | | |
| Project Title: | **São Tomé and Príncipe Additional Financing - West Africa Coastal Area Resilience Investment Project** | | |
| GEF Agency: | **World Bank** | GEF Agency Project ID: | **158330 (World Bank)** |
| Type of Trust Fund: | **Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)** | GEF Focal Area (s): | **Climate Change** |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | | **CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;** | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | | Project Grant: | **$6,000,000** |
| Co-financing: | **$8,400,000** | Total Project Cost: | **$14,400,000** |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | **June 01, 2016** |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | **Fareeha Iqbal** | Agency Contact Person: | |

## PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Project Consistency** | 1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1] | RS, Jan. 18, 2016:<br>YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1, 2 and 3.<br><br>Before CEO Endorsement, please complete the GEF tracking tool for climate change adaptation projects with baselines and targets corresponding to the strategic objectives and outcomes selected. | Jan 19, 2016:<br>Thank you. We will ensure completion of the GEF tracking tool prior to CEO endorsement. |

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | FI, April 11, 2018:<br>Yes. The project title and PDO have been changed. The revised title is 'São Tomé and Príncipe Additional Financing - West Africa Coastal Area Resilience Investment Project' and the revised PDO is 'To strengthen the resilience of targeted communities and areas in coastal Western Africa'. Both the revised title and PDO remain aligned with the LDCF strategic objectives and results framework, as the submitted documents specify that the focus will be on building and/or enhancing climate resilience. The proposed PIF remains aligned with the baseline project, 'West Africa Coastal Areas Management Program (WACA)'. | |
| | 2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? | RS, Jan. 18, 2016:<br>NOT CLEAR. While the proposed grant is sought to scale up the outcomes achieved under the project 'Sao Tome and Principe: Adaptation to Climate Change' (GEF ID: 4019), and therefore remains consistent with the priorities identified in the country's 2006 NAPA, it would be important to recognize other relevant policies, plans and strategies that may have been developed and adopted since, including the adaptation component of Sao Tome and | Jan 19, 2016:<br>Thank you for this comment.<br>The project is indeed fully consistent with recent national policies, plans and strategies. The Sao Tome and Principe Nationally Determined Contribution, or NDC (September 2015) identifies the 'protection of coastal communities and artisanal fishermen' as one of its two top adaptation priorities (amongst 27 identified). The NDC further states 5 short-to-medium term adaptation actions, of which action (II) 'Reduce the number of people living in vulnerable areas at |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | Principe's intended nationally determined contribution (INDC).<br><br>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe briefly how the proposed project is aligned with relevant national policies, plans and strategies.<br><br>FI, Mar. 1, 2016:<br>Cleared.<br><br>FI, April 11, 2018:<br>Yes, the proposed project continues to be aligned with country priorities. It integrates adaptation considerations in a larger baseline project on coastal management in STP. | risk, by providing housing in safer areas' drive the design of Component 2; and actions (IV) Introduce radar reflectors on board all fishing vessels by 2025, reducing the number of accidents at sea and (V) Train and equip fishermen with means to enable safe fishing and train them in the proper use of fishing gear, are reflected in the design of Component 1.<br><br>The project is also consistent fully consistent with STPs Second Poverty with the Second Poverty Reduction Strategy (2012-16), which emphasizes mainstreaming of climate change issues in the countries' policies as a key strategic action. The parent project further helped inform STP's Second National Communication (2012).<br><br>The NDC document is attached to the matrix of responses, and the project's alignment is further described in the project information document (PID), paragraph 'Consistency with National Strategies and Plans'. |
| **Project Design** | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation? | RS, Jan. 18, 2016:<br>NOT CLEAR. The proposed additional financing is sought to scale up, consolidate and sustain the outcomes of a previously approved | Jan 19, 2016:<br>Thank you for this comment.<br><br>A substantial part of the co-financing (estimated at US$200,000 per district, or a |

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | LDCF grant. Moving forward, however, it would seem important to seek alternative and diversified sources of financing to ensure sustainability. Specifically, what measures will be taken to ensure that systems, community structures, and practices/behaviors will be sustained after project completion?<br><br>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please outline how the outcomes of the proposed project could be sustained and scaled up further in absence of LDCF financing.<br><br>These aspects of the project design should also be revisited and described in further detail prior to CEO Endorsement.<br><br>FI, Mar. 1, 2016:<br>Cleared for PIF stage.<br><br>By CEO Endorsement:<br>Please update the information on prospects for long-term sustainability on the basis of findings from the preparation mission.<br><br>FI, April 11, 2018:<br>Yes, no change. | total of US$1.4 million) is the expected financial and in-kind contribution from the participating districts, to fund maintenance activities in the target communities and social infrastructure in the expansion areas. Evidence from the parent project indicates that this is already happening – in Malanza, for example, the Government installed electricity in the expansion area and is planning the construction of a new school and in Santa Catarina, the district government is providing regular maintenance of the adaptation works at their cost. In addition, Sao Tome and Principe has established community based risk management committees in the targeted villages, whose role is to organize maintenance activities, as well as encourage adaptation and risk reduction.<br>The expected end result is that all districts in Sao Tome and Principe will have gained experience from incorporation of adaptation and risk-based management into participatory local development plans, and that the model can then mainstreamed nationwide.<br><br>Under the Early Warning and Safety at Sea Component, the last mile communication protocols designed under the parent project (radar detection, community radio, and FrontlineSMS), involve minimum costs, or have operation |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | | and maintenance already funded by national agencies (e.g. ICT companies, Coast Guard, Port Authority).<br><br>The regular use of basic safety at sea equipment is being sustained by a mandatory decree, and by registration and marking of artisanal canoes (making it easier to identify unsafe practices). Furthermore, the project is aiming to train future trainers inside the communities, so that safety at sea education can continue to be done locally. After 10 years of implementation, and already visible results (in terms of lives saved), sustained changes of behavior are expected, allowing for the permanency of the safety at sea practices.<br><br>The alternatives and sustainability of the financing have been described in chapter VII of the PID, and would be further detailed in the project paper, following the conclusions of the preparation mission. |
| | 4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning? | RS, Jan. 18, 2016:<br><br>NOT CLEAR. The Concept Memorandum could provide further information of how climate change is affecting the disaster risks facing the targeted areas, communities and livelihoods, and how the project is designed to address the increased risk. | Jan 19, 2016:<br>Thank you for these comments. The expected impacts of climate change on the coastal communities, and their background studies, are now described in the PID and will be further detailed in the Project Paper. The team notes that additional sources of co-financing are expected to be identified during the February 2016 mission. |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | The Concept provides a useful description of the ways in which the proposed additional financing would build on and scale up the project 'Sao Tome and Principe: Adaptation to Climate Change' (GEF ID: 4019); and how it would complement the LDCF-financed project 'Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Western and Central Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change' (GEF ID: 5004).<br><br>In addition, it would be important to understand how the indicative sources of co-financing, and the associated baseline initiatives, would contribute towards progress across the proposed components: (i) coastal early warning and safety at sea, and (ii) coastal protection, and how the proposed additional financing would build on and enhance these initiatives.<br><br>Moreover, it is not clear how the proposed project would be coordinated with and complementary to the following, LDCF-financed projects that are currently under implementation or that have been recommended for approval: (i) 'Strengthening the adaptive capacity of most vulnerable Sao Tomean's | The first two LDCF projects are concentrated in inland communities. In May 2009, a joint World Bank and UNDP mission agreed with the Government on a programmatic framework for adaptation assistance to Sao Tome and Principe , which involved a component of participatory adaptation to vulnerable coastal communities (implemented through the World Bank) and a component of adaptation in vulnerable inland areas and national capacity building (implemented through UNDP). Hence, the approaches are complementary but implemented in geographically different areas. AfDB came in a few years later, concentrating on livestock and fisheries development, two sectors where their program were particularly active. The last AfDB project (GEF ID: 9113) focuses on fisheries infrastructure development, and is thus complementary to the proposed project. This has been further clarified in the project documents.<br><br>The number of incremental fishermen trained under the Additional Financing project will be verified during the February 2016 mission and reflected in the revised project document.<br><br>The proposed use of LDCF resources would be restricted to targeted assistance |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | livestock-keeping households' (GEF ID: 4274); (ii) 'Enhancing capacities of rural communities to pursue climate resilient livelihood options in the Sao Tome and Principe districts of Caue, Me-Zochi, Principe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata (CMPLCL)' (GEF ID: 5184); and (iii) 'Strengthening Resilience and Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in Sao Tome and Principe's Agricultural and Fisheries Sectors' (GEF ID: 9113).<br><br>With respect to the proposed, additional measures, it is not clear how many people would be trained under Sub-component 1.1, and how the enhanced capacities would be retained. As for Component 2, the additional reasoning for using LDCF resources to invest in social infrastructure as a 'pull factor' is not clear and such activities may be best supported through other sources.<br><br>RECOMMENDED ACTION: In addition to the outcomes of the project 'Sao Tome and Principe: Adaptation to Climate Change' (GEF ID: 4019), please (i) provide a description of the baseline scenario relative to the proposed project components, taking into consideration | to the most vulnerable households – those who may not have the resources to voluntary retreat to safer areas. For some of the most vulnerable (elderly and widows) there may be merit in establishing a common social house in the expansion area, so they can be together and serviced by health and social workers. Other social infrastructure, such as schools or health centers, are expected to be funded by other sources. This has been integrated in the PID, and will be further detailed in the Project paper. |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing, and the associated baseline projects and programs, as well as other relevant initiatives that are underway or planned. Upon clarifying the baseline scenario, please (ii) revisit the activities proposed for LDCF financing with a view to avoiding duplication and ensuring cost-effectiveness; (iii) clarify the scope of the training proposed under sub-component 1.1 and how the enhanced capacities would be retained; and (iv) seek alternative sources of financing for the proposed investments in social infrastructure under Component 2.<br><br>These aspects of the project design should also be revisited and described in further detail prior to CEO Endorsement.<br><br>FI, Mar. 1, 2016:<br>Yes, information provided is sufficient for PIF stage.<br><br>By CEO Endorsement:<br>Please provide fuller discussion on items in the "Recommended action" para dated Jan. 18 for this section. (Please ensure that LDCF-supported activities are covering the cost of additional actions necessary to | |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | enhance community resilience to climate change, and not for community development investment measures.)<br><br>FI, April 11, 2018:<br>Yes. The adaptation reasoning remains sound. | |
| | 5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs? | RS, Jan. 18, 2016:<br><br>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 4 above.<br><br>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 4, please revise Table B accordingly, as needed.<br><br>FI, Mar. 1, 2016:<br>Yes for PIF stage (for CEO Endorsement stage, please address comment for section 4).<br><br>FI, April 19, 2018:<br>The components are sound. However, agency is requested to ensure PMC are within 5% or to provide explanation for the requested (above 5%) amount.<br><br>FI, May 23, 2018:<br>Cleared. PMC are now revised to 4.3%. | Jan 19, 2016:<br>Thank you. Table B might be revised, as needed, following the conclusions of the preparation missions. |
| | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, | RS, Jan. 18, 2016: | Jan 19, 2016: |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered? | NOT CLEAR. The Concept Memorandum could provide further information on the gender dimensions of the proposed project, including based on lessons learned from the project 'Sao Tome and Principe: Adaptation to Climate Change' (GEF ID: 4019).<br><br>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide further information on the gender dimensions of the proposed project.<br><br>FI, Mar. 1, 2016:<br>Cleared; information is sufficient for PIF stage.<br><br>By CEO Endorsement:<br>Please discuss gender dimensions of the project more fully. Please also discuss engagement with civil society organizations and NGOs.<br><br>FI, April 19, 2018:<br>Cleared; no change. | Thank you for this comment. The PID now highlights the fact that 65 percent of direct beneficiaries are expected to be women; that by reducing loss of lives at sea, the project will help prevent a high proportion of widows, who are commonly left destitute; and that adaptation interventions will be formulated with particular attention to benefits accruing to women (based on the experience of the parent project, which indicates that structural interventions have tended to favor men).<br><br>[please see gender issue session in the PID] |
| **Availability of Resources** | 7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • The STAR allocation? | | |
| | • The focal area allocation? | | |
| | • The LDCF under the principle of | YES. The proposed grant is available | |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | equitable access | from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access. | |
| | • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | | |
| | • Focal area set-aside? | | |
| **Recommendations** | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified? | RS, Jan. 18, 2016:<br>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 above.<br><br>FI, Mar. 1, 2016:<br>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.<br><br>By CEO Endorsement:<br>Please ensure that comments for sections 3, 4 and 6 are addressed.<br><br>FI, April 19, 2018:<br>Resources for this project have become available under the LDCF, and the agency has submitted an updated PIF that demonstrates continued relevance of the project for the country, and with the baseline project. However, agency is requested to revise the PMC to be within 5%.<br><br>FI, May 23, 2018:<br>Yes. | Jan 19, 2016:<br>The comments have been incorporated in a concept-stage Project Information Document (PID), which is being shared with the GEF Secretariat. Further details will be reflected in the Project Paper once the preparation mission of February 2016 is completed. |

| PIF Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| **Review Date** | Review | January 18, 2016 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | March 01, 2016 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | April 19, 2018 | |

| CEO endorsement Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
| **Project Design and Financing** | 1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided? | | |
| | 2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | | |
| | 3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective? | | |
| | 4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | | |

| CEO endorsement Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
| | 5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided? | | |
| | 6. Are relevant tracking tools completed? | | |
| | 7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented? | | |
| | 8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region? | | |
| | 9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | |
| | 10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan? | | |
| **Agency Responses** | 11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from: | | |
| | • GEFSEC | | |
| | • STAP | | |
| | • GEF Council | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat | | |
| **Recommendation** | 12. Is CEO endorsement recommended? | | |
| **Review Date** | Review | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

| CEO endorsement Review | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |