



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

|  |   |                              |                       |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | <b>5004</b>   |                              |                       |
| Country/Region:                            | <b>Sao Tome and Principe</b>  |                              |                       |
| Project Title:                             | <b>Strengthening Climate Information and Early Warning Systems in Western and Central Africa for Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change - Sao Tome and Principe</b> |                              |                       |
| GEF Agency:                                | <b>UNDP</b>   | GEF Agency Project ID:       | <b>5103 (UNDP)</b>    |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | <b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>  | GEF Focal Area (s):          | <b>Climate Change</b> |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | <b>CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;</b>  |                              |                       |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | <b>\$0</b>  | Project Grant:               | <b>\$4,000,000</b>    |
| Co-financing:                              | <b>\$17,850,000</b>   | Total Project Cost:          | <b>\$21,850,000</b>   |
| PIF Approval:                              | <b>May 31, 2012</b>   | Council Approval/Expected:   |                       |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                       |
| Program Manager:                           | <b>Knut Sundstrom</b>   | Agency Contact Person:       | <b>Mark Tadross</b>   |

| Review Criteria                | Questions   | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion   | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Eligibility                    | 1. Is the participating country eligible?   | YES. Sao Tome and Principe 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 May 2, 2012, has been attached to the submission.                             |  |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?      | YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in institutional capacity building, as well as technical and policy support in the area of climate change adaptation. |  |
|                                | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | NA  |  |
|                                | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the                     | YES. UNDP has a considerable portfolio of relevant projects, as well as   |  |

|                       |   |  |  |
|-----------------------|---|--|--|
|                       |   | Principe. UNDP's programming in the areas of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management is well described in the PIF.  |  |
| Resource Availability | 6. 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 equitable access  | YES. The proposed grant (\$4.4 million, including Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.  |  |
|                       | • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?   |  |  |
|                       | • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund   |  |  |
|                       | • focal area set-aside?   |  |  |
| Project Consistency   | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?                                     | YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.   |  |
|                       | 8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?   | YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and CCA-3 and, specifically, CCA-2.2 on strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks of climate change-induced economic losses; and CCA-3.1 on the successful demonstration, deployment and transfer of relevant adaptation technology. More than 70 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant would support CCA-3.1. |  |
|                       | 9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant | YES. The proposed project is well aligned with Sao Tome and Principe's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper and it contributes towards the implementation  |  |

|                |   |  |  |
|----------------|---|--|--|
|                | NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?   | the establishment of early-warning systems. The project would also, in a cross-cutting manner, inform and contribute towards the implementation of NAPA priorities in the areas of water resources management, public health, infrastructure development, energy, and agriculture.   |  |
|                | 10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?                                   | <p>YES. The project combines physical investments in hydro-meteorological monitoring and early-warning infrastructure with capacity building for national hydro-meteorological services and other key stakeholders. The project includes a sub-component focusing on long-term public and private financing arrangements to ensure the sustainable management of the systems developed.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of the risks associated with the lack of sustainable financing, institutional support and political commitment, along with appropriate mitigation measures.</p> |  |
| Project Design | 11. 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? | YES. The proposed project would build on and contribute towards the following baseline initiatives: (i) the African Monitoring of the Environment for Sustainable Development (AMESD) project, financed by the EU; (ii) Supporting Integrated and Comprehensive Approaches to Adaptation in Africa, under the UNDP Africa Adaptation Programme; (iii) the IDRC project Building Capacity for Sustainable Responses to Climate Change in Cities of Portuguese-speaking Small-Island Developing States (KSIDS); (iv) the System for Climatic   |  |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
|  |   | <p>Support the Sustainable Development of Sao Tome and Principe (SICLIMAD) project; (v) coastal protection works under the EU Road Sector Support Project; the AfDB Support Project for the Development of Agriculture and Livestock Farming; (vi) the Project for the rehabilitation of infrastructure supporting food security (PRIASA); and (vii) the IFAD Participatory Smallholder Agriculture and Artisanal Fisheries Development Project.</p> <p>The baseline initiatives are all relevant and adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more detailed understanding of the specific activities to be carried out in the context of the proposed project, please discuss the gaps and needs associated with the baseline initiatives to allow for a complete and thorough assessment of the additional reasoning.</p> |  |
|  | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? |  |  |
|  | 13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?  | <p>YES. The additional cost reasoning is adequately described for this stage of project development.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, upon a more comprehensive assessment of baseline initiatives, as well as associated gaps and needs, please describe in greater detail the activities proposed for LDCF</p>   |  |

|  |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  |   | additional reasoning on which these activities are based.   |  |
|  | 14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?  | YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.   |  |
|  | 15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?   | YES. The adaptation benefits associated with the activities proposed for LDCF financing are clearly described, based on sound and appropriate assumptions and methodology.  |  |
|  | 16. 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? | YES. The socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are well described for this stage of project development.<br><br>By CEO Endorsement, please provide further information as to how the proposed project would reach the most vulnerable communities and groups, particularly women.                                   |  |
|  | 17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?  | YES. Public participation is adequately considered for this stage of project development.<br><br>By CEO Endorsement, kindly provide further information regarding the local-level stakeholders involved in the project.   |  |
|  | 18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)   | YES. The risk assessment is adequate for this stage of project development.<br><br>By CEO Endorsement, please provide a more detailed analysis of risks and relevant mitigation measures, considering in particular the sustainability of the systems established and the capacities developed (see also Section 10 above). |  |
|  | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related   | YES. The PIF identifies relevant initiatives and processes in Sao Tome  |  |

|                                   |  |   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|
|                                   | region?  | region.<br><br>BY CEO Endorsement, in addition to listing other relevant initiatives, please describe in greater detail how the proposed project will be coordinated with such initiatives. |  |
|                                   | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?   | YES. The project would primarily be executed by the National Institute of Meteorology and the National Council for preparation and response to disasters.                                   |  |
|                                   | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?     |   |  |
|                                   | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?               |   |  |
| Project Financing                 | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?  | YES. At \$190,000, the funding level for project management costs is below 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 and 2.  |  |
|                                   | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | YES. The LDCF funding and co-financing are appropriate and adequate.  |  |
|                                   | 25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;<br>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided. | The overall, indicative co-financing amounts to \$17.85 million, resulting in a co-financing ratio of 1:4.5.  |  |
|                                   | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?                         | YES. UNDP would bring \$2.75 million in indicative co-financing to the proposed project.  |  |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators as applicable?        |   |  |

|   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|--|
|   | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?           |   |  |
| Agency Responses                            | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:   |   |  |
|   | • STAP?   | NA  |  |
|   | • Convention Secretariat?   | NA  |  |
|   | • Council comments?   |   |  |
|   | • Other GEF Agencies?   | NA  |  |
| Secretariat Recommendation                  |   |   |  |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage                 | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?  | YES.  |  |
|   | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.  | Please refer to sections 11, 13, 16, 17, 18 and 19. |  |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? |   |  |
|   | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?  |   |  |
| Review Date (s)                             | First review*   | May 24, 2012  |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |   |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |   |  |
|   | Additional review (as necessary)  |   |  |
|   | 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.

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points   | Program Manager Comments                      |
|-----------------|---|---|
| PPG Budget      | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate. |

|                            |                                       |   |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended? | Yes, PPG approval is being recommended. |
|                            | 4. Other comments                     |   |
| Review Date (s)            | First review*                         | August 08, 2012                         |
|                            | 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.