



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

GEF ID:	5184		
Country/Region:	Sao Tome and Principe		
Project Title:	Enhancing Capacities of Rural Communities in the Districts to Pursue Climate Resilient Livelihood Options in the Sao Tome and Principe Districts of CauÃ©, Me-Zochi, Principe, Lemba, Cantagalo, and Lobata (CMPLCL)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4645 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		CCA-2; CCA-1; Project Mana;	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$16,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$20,200,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Junu Shrestha	Agency Contact Person:	Henry Rene Diouf

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 Oct 10, 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 and considerable experience in projects/programs on community livelihood strengthening and development of national/regional capacities. UNDP has been working on ground in STP since 2000.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	NA	

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. The project would build on UNDP's already existing projects in STP: (1) Integrated and Comprehensive Approaches to Climate Change Adaptation in Africa (AAP); (2) the Project for rehabilitation of the infrastructures supporting food security (PRIASA); and (3) SATOCAO Villagers Project.	
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 from 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 well aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The project is expected to contribute to the objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards STP's NAPA priorities in the areas of Reinforcement and diversification of agricultural production; Sustainable management of forest resources; and Construction of Infrastructure for protection of	

	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 11 and 13 below.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clearly describe how the measures discussed in component 1 are expected to ensure sustainability of the project, and explain the shortcomings of the capacity development components in the identified baseline projects, on which the proposed project is expected to build on. Explain new (or improved) measures that will ensure sustainability.</p> <p>Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please ensure that the capacities developed contribute to the sustainability of the expected outcomes of the project.</p> <p>1/30/2013 Yes.</p>	
Project Design	<p>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?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project will build on the existing baseline projects aimed at strengthening adaptive capacities and increasing resilience of communities and infrastructures related to fisheries and cocoa production industries in STP.</p> <p>PRIASA project has been identified as a baseline for the proposed project. However it is also a baseline for an already approved LDCF project ("Strengthening climate information and early warning systems in Western and Central Africa for climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change - STP" ID 5804).</p> <p>Baseline projects that already include</p>	

		<p>used as a baseline for a LDCF project. Also baseline projects that are already a part of previously approved LDCF projects cannot be used again as baseline projects for new LDCF proposals.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please find suitable baseline projects that can clearly demonstrate the added value of LDCF grants or kindly provide clear rationale for choosing baseline projects that already include climate resilient measures.</p> <p>3/18/2013 Requested changes have been made and SATOCAO has been added as a new baseline project.</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>NOT CLEAR. The added value of the LDCF funding towards the three baseline projects for component 1 is not clear. These projects already include elements of climate change resilience in their capacity building activities. Also additional cost reasoning for LDCF funding for the baseline project (PRIASA) which is already a part of an approved LDCF project is not clear.</p> <p>Finally, one component cannot have different grant types.</p>	

		<p>demonstrate the relevance of the LDCF supported activities in context of the baseline projects that already consider climate change resilience, and that are already a part of approved LDCF project.</p> <p>Please split investments and technical assistance under different project components.</p> <p>3/18/2013</p> <p>Yes. The proposed project will support capacity building activities related to climate change risks that could be of concern to the baseline projects.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please revise the project framework (Table B) accordingly.</p> <p>3/18/2013</p> <p>The project framework has been suitably revised.</p>	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 13 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 13, please ensure that the expected adaptation benefits are described based on sound methodology and assumptions.</p> <p>3/18/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>	

	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 expected socio-economic benefits and gender dimensions are adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. The information provided is sufficient at this stage. The project identifies CSOs and CBOs as main beneficiaries to be targeted	
	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 information provided is sufficient at this stage	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	YES. Coordination with other related initiatives is adequately described for this stage of project development.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	
	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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. At \$200,000, or 5.3% of the sub-total of proposed LDCF grant. Project management cost appears to be somewhat high.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the LDCF funding level for project management does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components</p>	

		3/18/2013 The project management cost has been reduced to \$190,000 (4.9% of the requested grant).	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 11, 13, 14 and 23 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 11, 13, 14 and 23, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly. 3/18/2013 Yes. The funding and co-financing per objective has been adjusted.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The level of indicative co-financing of \$17,000,000 is adequate and appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	YES. UNDP is bringing \$700,000 in indicative, grant and in-kind cofinancing.	
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?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 10,	

PIF Stage		3/18/2013 Yes. All the concerns have been adequately addressed.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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*	November 09, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 18, 2013	
	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
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Not yet. PPG approval is contingent upon PIF approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.