



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

GEF ID:	5279		
Country/Region:	Togo		
Project Title:	Strengthening Climate Resilience of Infrastructure in Coastal areas in Togo		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCA-1; CCA-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$8,932,420
Co-financing:	\$90,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$99,132,420
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	

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. Togo 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 January 31, 2013, 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?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	YES. The proposed grant is available from the LDCF in accordance with the	

	<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 appears to be aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework and strategic objectives, but CCA-1 is mentioned twice in the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), with two different indicative grant and co-financing amounts.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide only one row per objective in Table A.</p> <p>05/20/2013 “ YES. The Focal Area Strategy Framework has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project is very closely aligned with Togo's NAPA priorities, as these relate to adaptation in the coastal zones. The project is also aligned with the findings of the country's initial national communication and a regional shoreline study and monitoring and management scheme for West Africa. The project is consistent with Togo's PRSP and National Investment Program for Environment and Natural Resources.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is associated with AfDB's ongoing efforts to support the development of transport infrastructure in Togo. The PIF cites AfDB's past investments in the rehabilitation and modernization of the road linking Lome Port and Avepozo, as</p>	

Project Design

the rehabilitation of the Lome-Ouagadougou corridor and the development of coastal roads and communities.

It is not fully clear, however, how these baseline investments relate to the indicative co-financing figures provided in Table C. In addition, p. 6 of the PIF states that the proposed civil works would "protect the coastal road, which has just been rehabilitated", yet it is not clear which road and which baseline investment this refers to. Finally, while perhaps not directly related to the baseline investments carried out by AfDB, the PIF could briefly describe the baseline scenario as it relates to land-use planning, coastal control and local livelihoods, as these relate to the proposed Component 2.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (i) how the baseline investments described relate to the indicative co-financing figures provided in Table C; (ii) what baseline investments would benefit from the additional public works proposed for LDCF financing; and (iii) the baseline scenario associated land-use planning, coastal control and local livelihoods.

05/20/2013 – NOT CLEAR. The re-submission clarifies the relationship between the baseline investments and indicative co-financing, and the way in which the LDCF grant would contribute towards the resilience of relevant baseline investments. With respect to land-use planning, coastal control and local

		<p>relevant information is provided in the Agency's response matrix, the PIF does not adequately describe the baseline scenario.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please describe, in Section A.1 of the PIF, the baseline scenario associated with land-use planning, coastal control and local livelihoods.</p> <p>06/03/2013 -- YES. Section A.1 of the PIF has been revised as recommended.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The project framework (Table B) lacks an objective. It also cites that support be provided towards "reinforcing the regulatory framework" under Component 1, but no such activities are mentioned as the component is described on p. 6. Finally, given that it seeks only 10 per cent of the overall project grant, Component 2 could potentially be streamlined with fewer outputs.</p> <p>Please refer also to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please (i) revise the project framework accordingly. Specifically, (ii) include an objective; (iii) ensure that the components are consistently described between Table B and p. 6 of the PIF; and (iv) consider streamlining Component 2.</p> <p>05/20/2013 -- YES. The Project Framework has been revised as recommended.</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. The proposed project seeks to protect key transport infrastructure in the face of climate change, and to address the exploitation of sand and gravel, which exacerbate coastal erosion. While the project addresses one of Togo's foremost adaptation priorities, the additional cost reasoning could be further strengthened.</p> <p>Specifically, the additional reasoning does not adequately consider the current and expected effects of climate change on coastal erosion. Useful references are provided on pp. 7-8 and these could be presented in Section A.1 of the PIF.</p> <p>In addition, it is not entirely clear how the targeted sites and communities have been prioritized for the proposed project.</p> <p>As for Component 1, the PIF could further clarify the choice of technology, and how this choice will be finalized during project preparation. In particular, the merits of soft adaptation measures could be considered.</p> <p>Finally, with respect to Component 2, the proposed project would support a wide array of activities, including coastal management planning and capacity building, fishing, gardening, the establishment of an early-warning system, and promoting tourism. Given the relatively limited grant request for Component 2, and the absence of a clear baseline initiative, the PIF could further clarify how the project would achieve meaningful and sustainable results across the many activities proposed.</p>	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6 above, please (i) strengthen the additional reasoning accordingly. In particular, (ii) describe the current and expected effects of climate change on coastal erosion; (iii) clarify the basis on which the targeted sites and communities have been prioritized; (iv) clarify how the appropriate technologies for Component will be determined, and consider the merits of soft adaptation measures; and (v) clarify how the project would achieve meaningful and sustainable results across Component 2.</p> <p>05/20/2013 “ YES. While one recommendation under Section 6 has yet to be addressed, the additional reasoning has been adequately strengthened for this stage for project development.</p>	
	<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>By CEO Endorsement, please clarify how public participation will be ensured during implementation, beyond the consultations contributing to project design.</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>NOT CLEAR. The PIF identifies relevant risks associated with institutional and policy environment, stakeholder participation, and limited institutional and technical capacity. Still, given that more than 80 per cent of the proposed LDCF grant would be invested in coastal protection infrastructure, the PIF could consider the risks associated with the design of such infrastructure given uncertainties over future climate change, the associated uncertainties over accurate and realistic cost estimates, the risk of delays in deployment of the infrastructure, and the risk of inadequate management and maintenance beyond the duration of the project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider explicitly the risks associated with the proposed, significant investments in coastal protection infrastructure.</p> <p>05/20/2013 “ YES. The re-submission discusses the risks associated with the proposed, significant investments in coastal protection infrastructure, as well as appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The PIF notes that there are several other initiatives in the transport sector that are relevant to the proposed project, but it does not name or describe these initiatives. In particular, in absence of a clear baseline project, the PIF should indicate any initiatives related to the planning and livelihood diversification activities proposed under Component 2.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please list</p>	

		<p>coordination will be sought.</p> <p>05/20/2013 – NOT CLEAR. While the re-submission provides a clearer description of relevant baseline investments, the PIF should also identify other relevant initiatives with which coordination and coherence will be sought.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: In addition to the AfDB baseline investments, please identify other relevant initiatives with which coordination will be sought.</p> <p>06/03/2013 -- YES. The re-submission clarifies adequately how the proposed project would be coordinated with other relevant initiatives in the transport sector.</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 scaling up the project’s intervention. 	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project is well placed to catalyze policy change and further investments in climate-resilient coastal development. The PIF notes that the project would provide efficient and tangible adaptation solutions for replication elsewhere, and enable decision-makers to review and revise existing policies and practices from a climate change perspective.</p> <p>The project could potentially provide innovative decision-support services for coastal planners, the private sector, and local communities, but this aspect is not clearly reflected in Component 2 of the PIF, which would contribute more generally towards an enabling environment for coastal-zone management.</p> <p>Given the relatively limited investments</p>	

		<p>behavioral change under Component 2, the PIF should consider more explicitly how such activities are sustained and scaled up beyond the duration of the project.</p> <p>Please refer also to sections 8 and 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 8 and 11, please (i) clarify what innovations the project could bring in terms of decision-support services for climate-resilient coastal development; and (ii) describe how the livelihood diversification activities under Component 2 would be sustained and scaled up.</p> <p>05/20/2013 – YES. The innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up have been adequately described in the re-submission.</p>	
	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 under sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant</p>	

		necessary. 05/20/2013 “ YES. The proposed grant and co-financing amounts per component are appropriate and adequate.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? 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?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the Agency co-financing amounts accordingly, if necessary. 05/20/2013 “ YES. In line with its role, AfDB would bring \$90 million in indicative co-financing. The indicative co-financing figures have also been consistently provided across the document.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	YES. The proposed grant request for project management is appropriate, at \$415,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components.	
	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?	A PPG of \$200,000 has been requested and will be recommended once the PIF is ready for clearance.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant		

	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• 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, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 17.</p> <p>05/20/2012 – NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6 and 12.</p> <p>06/03/2013 – YES. The project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.</p> <p>08/19/2013: YES.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to Section 10.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	February 20, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	May 20, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 03, 2013	

* 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.