



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

GEF ID:	9906		
Country/Region:	Regional (Benin, Sao Tome and Principe, Togo)		
Project Title:	WEST AFRICA COASTAL AREAS RESILIENCE INVESTMENT PROJECT		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	163945 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-1 Program 1; IW-3 Program 6; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$20,247,607
Co-financing:	\$185,825,000	Total Project Cost:	\$206,072,607
PIF Approval:	October 30, 2017	Council Approval/Expected:	November 30, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	Benoit Bosquest

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	(9/6/2017) Yes, the project is aligned with the IW, LD, and BD strategies in addressing the implementation of the GCLME SAP and NAPs, supporting sustainable land management practices and biodiversity protection and specifically mangrove restoration. The project is addressing specific AICHI strategic goals B,C,D and E.	

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
		<p>At ENDORSEMENT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PLEASE by endorsement be specific on the AICHI targets addressed in detail. 2. Please also be specific on the use of STAR resources. Please link country STAR allocations to output indicators. 3. Please submit updated endorsement letters for all countries to reflect the additional IW funds for Benin which were added during PIF development. 	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>(9/6/2017). The alignment with the GCLME SAP and NAPs as well as the WB country assistance strategies has been outlined.</p> <p>Comment: There is no/little reference to relevant country strategies and convention related assessments/strategies. Please include brief sections for such alignment for each country.</p> <p>(9/19/2017). The added information is noted. By endorsement, please enhance in more detail including related national strategies and information on STP.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	(9/6/2017). The drivers of coastal	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>degradation based on climate change, urbanization and population pressures are addressed. The project will be blended with the West Africa Coastal Resilience Investment program which will aim at transferring experiences across the coast of West-Africa.</p> <p>Comment: Please address and clarify the scope/scale of impacts of the GEF incremental finance which is substantial within the geographic scope targeted in the three countries and given ongoing GEF and other investments. The area of intervention/length of coastline currently is smaller given that Nigeria now is not part of this anymore. It would be useful to provide a better picture of the expected outcomes of the blended/combined operation (e.g. in the background or as an annex)..</p> <p>Furthermore, with regard to scale: at ENDORSEMENT, please update the numbers in table F. These appear conservative at present.</p> <p>(9/19/2017). The agency response and information in the PCN and PID/ISDS documents are noted. It is also understood that the blended PAD</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		for WACA will provide the larger, integrated interventions. Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	(9/6/2017). Yes, the project is designed to add innovation and green infrastructure measures to the larger IDA investments.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	(9/6/2017). The components are overall outlined in sufficient detail and upstream comments have to large degree been addressed. Please add more clarity on the following: (1) Comments: Previous comment regarding the difficulty to reduction invasive species and to restore mangroves. Need for more details to overcome these difficulties and for more warranty as regard to the sustainability of GEF investments; Not addressed: 1. Regarding the IAS, please refer to the Programming Directions that provide some guidance and limits which require more justification and details on the activities, in particular: "GEF will support the implementation of comprehensive prevention, early detection, control and management frameworks that emphasize a risk management approach by focusing on	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the highest risk invasion pathways. Targeted eradication will be supported in specific circumstances where proven, low-cost, and effective eradication would result in the extermination of the IAS and the survival of globally significant species and/or ecosystems".</p> <p>2. Regarding mangroves, we know that the restoration will be participatory. In addition, there is the need to know if possible hydrological changes caused by human activities have been considered as possible threat for the success of the restoration and if not, to include also this aspect to improve the chance of success.</p> <p>(9/20/2017) Comments on IAS and mangrove restoration addressed in the agency response. Please note that the respective agency/team response has been added under the points to be addressed by ENDORSEMENT BELOW. CLEARED.</p> <p>At/by ENDORSEMENT:</p> <p>- The PCN states that "the approach for IAS is based on local studies and lessons learned and experiences in the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>countries, that show that replantation using specified species have been largely successful." We would be happy to see the references and lessons that the design will build on as this kind of operations are not always successful.</p> <p>- Please add clarity on the cost effectiveness and scale of the supported interventions and investments. We understand that the PCN stage from WB side does not lend itself to providing more detail and we looking forward to have this discussion and more detail provided during the QER stage and reflected later in the PAD which will then also reflect the blend with the larger WACA investments.</p> <p>- Please modify language and be specific on the anticipated modes of intervention on supply chains including beneficiaries (by gender). We would also welcome to see relations to WARFP if indeed fisheries supply chains are among the areas to be strengthened.</p> <p>- During project design, please consider if it would make sense to include representation of the Abidjan Convention Secretariat As</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>OBESERVERs to the regional steering committee of WACA (at present and in lieu/during the formation of the Guinea Current Commission).</p> <p>- IAS: The point it is noted on the difficulty to reduce invasive species and restore native species. During project preparation, special attention will be given to scientific as well as local knowledge on introduction of exotic species in the countries and effective approaches towards their removal. The project will undertake a systematic approach towards management of invasive species that is based on understanding the biology of invasion including complex relationships between the intrinsic capabilities of species, physicochemical environment and human activities (food, medicinal, ornamental etc.) which will help with both early detection and control measures. The method of control will be assessed considering the history of the invasion, population flows, ecological, heritage interest, the use of the invaded area and management objectives.</p> <p>-Mangrove Restoration: Regarding mangrove restoration, the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>methodology and approach will consider all the important parameters for mangroves growth including and not limited to hydrology, salinity etc. Effects on these parameters due to ongoing and expected anthropogenic stressors will be considered as these are critical elements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please note the earlier comment on need for specific indicators that address convention commitments (BD/LD). - Please provide a clear gap analysis during project design with regard to complementarity and gaps that this project will address with regard to related national GEF investments, e.g. including with regard to the AFDB/GEF project in STP. - Please be more specific and consistent in allocating the GEF and co-finance either to component 5 or PMC. <p>As the PCN/PID mainly covers the GEF portion of the overall WACA investment, the presentation is not showing the entire impact of the blended project. We understand that by endorsement we will receive one PAD covering both the IBRD/IDA</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		and GEF finance.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>(9/6/2017). The PCN/PID states that the project design will make specific provisions to include gender aspects in the design of on the ground interventions and makes reference to inclusion of women in supporting supply chain approaches. We are looking forward to further development of these aspects during project design, including a gender analysis as part of the social assessment of the project.</p> <p>Comment: In the ISDS, please also give an overview of the social and environmental benefits and risks of the overall WACA program with which the GEF funds will be blended with (including any possible/expected resettlement)</p> <p>(9/19/2017). The agency response and the WACA ISDS plus information in the PCN/PID provide additional information at concept stage. Details on gender aspects in project component design and information on safeguards instruments will be available before/at endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	(9/6/2017). BD/LD: Yes, available at present time. (Benin and Togo)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	(9/6/2017). IW: Yes, available at present time.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>(9/6/2017). Please address comments above. Please also address errors in the GEF datasheet:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Please assure consistency of sum of finance/co-finance across tables A, B and D (note: the numbers in table C for GEF finance add up to 18,328,649 NOT 18,328,668 as given as sum in table D). Please adjust the agency fee to 9 % as per GEF Fee Policy. <p>We are happy to meet with the team to discuss question/comments as needed.</p> <p>(9/20/2017) Comments have been addressed adequately at PIF stage and the project is technically cleared and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>recommended for possible inclusion in a future work program.</p> <p>(10/30/2017) Text to describe additional activities to address potential pollution threats in Benin have been added and the updated LOE from Benin with additional IW resources has been submitted. The project is technically CLEARED and recommended for a future work program.</p> <p>Please take note of the items to be addressed by ENDORSEMENT (see review sheet).</p>	
Review Date	Review	September 08, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 20, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 30, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<p>Project Design and Financing</p>	<p>1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?</p>	<p>The project is overall consistent with what has been presented at PIF stage.</p> <p>With regard to GEF finance the main change are in the project target figures which are also inconsistent in across the agency response matrix and the GEF datasheet. Both information should be aligned.</p> <p>Further, depending on what the final numbers (in ha's) will be, these area targets for BD and LD investments seem comparatively low (compared to other GEF investments) which was pointed out at PIF stage.</p> <p>(1/2/2017) The areas/ha have been revised. The team will meet with the TTL to discuss the TT which need to be submitted to and reviewed by GEFSEC prior to Board. Comments addressed. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>Overall the WACA program is ambitious and its structure is set up to respond to local circumstances and needs. Given this, the exact locations of many of the interventions are not known yet.</p> <p>While this is understood, there are a few comments given at PIF stage that would benefit from further clarity especially with regard to</p> <p>- Mangrove restoration , PIF stage comment: how will the methodology</p>	

		<p>and approach to mangrove restoration consider factors such as possible changes caused by human activities including changes in hydrology and salinity. These factors may pose threats to the mangrove restoration. We cannot see reference in the PAD.</p> <p>- Invasive Alien Species: we understand that there are little specific lessons to build on and the project will engage in a study to define appropriate approaches. We would like to note the need to advance these as early as possible to still inform and enable implementation of the work within the timeframe of the project.</p> <p>(1/2/2017) References have been added in the PAD that for IAS a study will be conducted early during project implementation as previous experiences could not be identified. For mangroves: reference has been added in the PAD as well that possible anthropogenic factors for mangrove disappearance will be assessed prior to embarking on restoration. We offer and would welcome discussions and interaction between the team and GEFSEC staff to advise on such issue during project implementation. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?</p>	<p>Yes, the WACA program is set-up in a phased manner, combines substantial IDA and GEF resources and sets out the establishment of the WACA finance facility to leverage additional public and innovative</p>	

		private investment mechanisms.	
	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)	Yes, the project is designed to address coastal resilience and address risks from sea-level rise, increase in coastal storm surges and inland flooding - among other threats and risks which are described in the project's risk matrix.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	Yes, the co-finance is provided via IDA and country co-finance. The latter is an effectiveness condition for the project.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>We would like to seek dialogue with the team to improve the tracking tools.</p> <p>- please provide ONE consolidated tracking tools per GEF source of finance in addition to the country based TTs (for BD and LD). The IW TT has sections in itself to allow reporting on sub-activities/countries.</p> <p>- we stand ready for answer questions where tracking tools are not fully filled out. These would need to be completed.</p> <p>Below for illustration comments for just one GEF focal area while similar issues pertain to the BD and LD tracking tools.</p> <p>For example, for the LD focal area: The LD TTs are not clear: one has WACA in the title and the other one Benin. Is there another one missing for Togo? The LD TT are not fully filled (see in particular the LD TT for Benin</p>	

		<p>in project context tab). In addition, the numbers in the TTs doesn't appear clearly consistent with the targets in Table F. There is the need to show a clear consistency of the targets in the different documents provided.</p> <p>Furthermore and for more clarity, can we have a consolidated LD TT for the whole program, in addition to the 2 LD TTs for Togo and Benin?</p> <p>For BD: Please explain the indirect contribution for Benin. The TT mentions Ramsar site 1017 of Mono Delta as 142,497.74 ha and Chenal Gbaga/Bénin for 3,851.20 ha, but a total of 524.289,40 ha for indirect benefits and 11010 for direct benefits. These numbers do not seem to be consistent (and also differ from the table F/footnote).</p> <p>For IW: Please provide one consolidated and complete TT. Country based TT are useful to allow for greater granularity and detail, but are not required.</p> <p>(1/2/2017). We met with the WB team member and she offered to set up a meeting on the revision of the TTs early this January 2018. The revised TTs will NEED TO BE submitted to and reviewed by GEFSEC before Board date. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?</p>	<p>N/A</p>	

	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>While the PIF outline a number or related GEF and other non-GEF and non WB activities we cannot see reference to coordination with these in the PAD.</p> <p>On regional level, e.g. the GEF support to the GCLME SAP implementation lead by UNEP (with FAO, UNDP and UNESCO) is closely related and e.g. aims to establish a GCLME commission as a protocol under the Abidjan Convention. Cooperation between the WB team and UNEP had taken place during PIF development and it would be important to see reference of continued intent for such cooperation in the PAD.</p> <p>We had at PIF stage also pointed to some other relevant national GEF TF and LDCF coastal projects to coordinate with mainly with regard to component 3.</p> <p>(1/2/2017). References to some relevant GEF and/or LDCF national projects have been added. Please add some detail/information on such coordination and /or cooperation in PIRs and in MTR. Cleared.</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>Yes, the PAD is setting out monitoring and evaluation arrangements as well as an agency supervision plan. The project results framework forms the overall, high level monitoring framework including its targets.</p>	
	10. Does the project have	<p>While the GEF datasheet refers to</p>	

	<p>descriptions of a knowledge management plan?</p>	<p>knowledge management - including participation in IW -Learn - the PAD is not clear on who will be responsible for the development a KM plan. It would be useful to refer to who and when this will be developed (presumably by the RISU), budgeted and implemented.</p> <p>Please reassure that 1 % of the GEF IW grant is aimed for participation in IW-Learn activities (including results notes, establishment of a project website, and participation in the IW - learn regional and global meetings). This was indicated at PIF stage.</p> <p>(1/2/2017). This has been added in the PAD and GEF datasheet. Cleared.</p>	
<p>Agency Responses</p>	<p>11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF³ stage from:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	<p>The WACA program is clearly of key importance to aid in increasing coastal resilience in West Africa with large effects of climate change already increasingly impacting coastal zones. The GEF therefore is supporting this effort with substantial resources.</p> <p>There are a few comments provide at PIF stage that we would appreciate to be addressed in the PAD and/or implementation manual:</p> <p>1) Mangroves: See comments above and at PIF Stage on mangrove</p>	

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.

		<p>restoration.</p> <p>2) AICHI targets: the agency response describes how the project will address the AICHI targets which is good but we could not find the equivalent text in the PAD.</p> <p>Please also note, that it does not appear that the project strictly addresses AICHI target 8 which states " By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity." The measure to support early response systems for oil spills will not really lead to pollution reduction as referred to by Aichi target 8.</p> <p>3) Gender: There appears little attention to gender dimension in the design/description of the intervention (with special relevance to components 2 and 3).</p> <p>4) Private sector engagement : the PIF mentioned engagement in certain supply chains (eg. related to the development of alternative livelihoods, such as aquaculture etc.). The PAD at present mainly focuses on the role of the private sector in leveraging finance within the WACA finance facility. Could this be expanded and made more clear in the investments (component 3)?</p> <p>5) Social and environmental risks :</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>the requested additional detail at PIF stage was provided. The PAD and PID/ISDS now mention besides voluntary also 'planned resettlement' plans. Could the team provide more details on this , including the size/scope of such.</p> <p>6) please submit revised LOEs for the GEF finance - see request at PIF. At PIF stage only the letter for Benin was revised to indicate the additional IW finance. The two other letters (Togo and STP) need to be revised to provide consistent figures.</p> <p>(1/2/2017). Most comments above have been touched on in the agency response and references added in the PAD and/or GEF datasheet.</p> <p>- Please make note, to provide some information/update during project implementation in PIRs and MTR report(s) on how gender aspects are taken into account in project implementation, such as alternative livelihoods measures etc. and how women are provided with equal access to these opportunities.</p> <p>- PLEASE SUBMIT THE OUTSTANDING LOE asap. This will be needed for endorsement.</p> <p>(1/8/2017) Thank you for submitting the revised LOE for STP. Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	<p>STAP comments on the project have been overall very supportive of the</p>	

		<p>effort.</p> <p>It would be appreciated if the team could clarify how a couple of STAP comments are addressed in the project design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mangrove restoration: Aquaculture is not mentioned in Annex 2/component 3, making it impossible to assess if support to aquaculture may encroach in areas of mangroves. - IAS: STAP commented on the need for greater detail on how the project will address IAS and asked for an outline on risks, provision of expertise within the project, and on sustainability strategy for addressing IAS. Could the team please provide a mechanism for interaction/dialogue in the project start-up with GEFEC and STAP on the efforts to address IAS? <p>(1/2/2017). STAP and GEFSEC comments are consistent on these aspects and references have been added in the PAD regarding both - see earlier comments. Again, both STAP and GEFSEC would be available for technical discussions down the line and to share their expertise in this field. Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>Please note that not all Council comments have been registered yet (given that the Council meeting has just passed). GEFSEC will provide to the team any comments that may come in from Council members within the next week.</p>	

		(1/2/2017). NO comments have been received that require further work. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	None.	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>(12/12/2017) The GEF secretariat will participate at the ROC meeting on 12/15/2017 and is looking forward to the responses by the team.</p> <p>As stated above, the GEF teams are also happy to swiftly support the task team to resolve issues on the tracking tools.</p> <p>(1/2/2017). No. Please submit the one outstanding LOE (STP) before endorsement and please set up a meeting on the TTs - as discussed and agreed - and submit TT before Board submission.</p> <p>(1/8/2017). Thank you for submitting the revised LOE for STP. TTs are only due before Board submission.</p> <p>The project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 12, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 02, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 08, 2018	