



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

GEF ID:	10007		
Country/Region:	Sao Tome and Principe		
Project Title:	Enhancing Capacity for Biodiversity Conservation and Protected Area Management		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5881 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,262,559
Co-financing:	\$11,757,908	Total Project Cost:	\$16,020,467
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Saskia Marijnissen

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	<p>The project can potentially be aligned under the BD1 Program 1 and the LD2 Program 3, but several adjustments are requested (cf. cell 5). Please, confirm.</p> <p>5/4/2018:</p> <p>Cleared. Also note that the Obo National Park is a very important</p>	<p>5/4/2018</p> <p>We have made adjustments to ensure better alignment with BD1 Program 1 on Improving Financial Sustainability and Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure and LD2 Program 3 on Landscape Management and Restoration, conform recommendations made by the reviewer (ref. response to comments 5).</p>

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
		KBA.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, NBSAP II (2015-2020) and Strategy on Desertification and Land Degradation (2005), but also the second National Poverty Reduction Strategy.	Noted.
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>- The main threats of environmental degradation are identified, but should be classified and prioritized. Based on the information provided in the document, we understand that the main drivers of environmental degradation are unsustainable exploitation of land and marine resources (expansion of agriculture, felling, BD extraction) aggravated by demographic changes, prevailing poverty, climate change, and invasive species. Other problems that are mentioned are consequences of these threats (deforestation, coastal area degradation and loss).</p> <p>- The barriers should be defined in the context of protecting a globally important biodiversity, improving the current network of protected areas, and the management of surrounding buffer zones. The logics between the table p9 and the result framework (table B) is not clear.</p>	<p>5/4/2018:</p> <p>3.1 The Threats section (p 7) has been revised to follow a causal chain approach, distinguishing between the root causes, underlying causes and immediate drivers of environmental threats. The key threats that the project will aim to reduce by addressing their immediate drivers are classified and prioritized.</p> <p>3.2 The narrative of the table describing the barriers (p 9) has been revised to emphasize more clearly the linkages that exist with the proposed interventions as described in the Indicative Project Description Summary (Table B).</p> <p>3.3 References have been included in the Project Strategy (see footnotes).</p> <p>3.4 As described in the background section (p5-6), the present global vulnerability status (following the IUCN Red List criteria) of several of the species</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- Scientific references would be welcome to reinforce the demonstration.</p> <p>- Is the status of Global Important Biodiversity available for the sites that are considered (Obo Sao tome, Obo Principe, coastal and marine area of the Principe Biosphere reserve)?</p> <p>5/4/2018 Cleared.</p>	<p>that inhabit the Obo Natural Parks on São Tomé and Príncipe and STP's coastal waters is known. However, as described in the baseline and barriers sections, limited investments have been made thus far in monitoring biodiversity trends and making this information widely available. We have strengthened the narrative in the barriers sections to place more emphasis on this problem.</p>
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>- The project is embracing too many aspects, due to some weaknesses in the reasoning. It is difficult to see the approach that is unifying the outcomes, outputs, and activities of the project.</p> <p>- What is the baseline in terms of existing related policy framework? Additional information would help to better shape the result framework. What is the overarching policy framework (if any) that will integrated the PA management with SLM interventions? What is the approach that is unifying the activities of the project?</p> <p>- The role of cofinancing should be better developed to demonstrate the added value of GEF activities.</p>	<p>5/4/2017:</p> <p>4.1 We recognize this issue, which is related to the fact that multiple aspects require interventions simultaneously in order to enhance overall capacities for both terrestrial and marine biodiversity conservation in STP. We have revised the Result Framework (ref. response to comments 5) and the narrative of the Project Strategy to better explain the underlying theory of change that unifies the different components. As furthermore described in the Coordination section (p. 17), the project will ensure synergies with ongoing/planned interventions, including the EU-funded ECOFAC VI Programme, in order to maximize the impacts of the GEF investment.</p> <p>4.2 One of the challenges for biodiversity conservation in STP is the</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- We suggest to well check the nature of investments financed under the BD1 Program 1 (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF-6%20Programming%20Directions.pdf), and reconsider the project design to reinforce the network of protected areas.</p> <p>- The table, p12, should be revised, highlighting the role of cofinancing, and showing the additionality of GEF investments.</p> <p>- In the PPG, include a comprehensive risk analysis.</p> <p>5/4/2018 We take note of the improvement and can consider the items above addressed at PIF level. However, during the PPG, please address the following points:</p> <p>- Please ensure additional details on the role of the co-financing and what specific activities will be covered by co-financing are included at the endorsement stage.</p> <p>- Include a comprehensive risk analysis.</p>	<p>lack of an overarching policy framework, and the fact that there is no mechanism to ensure coordination (see Barriers p. 9), and as a result PA management and SLM interventions are not adequately linked. The project aims to facilitate strengthened legal frameworks and better coordination as well as integration of information across components (also see Component 4).</p> <p>4.3 This has been addressed by strengthening the narrative of the Coordination section (p. 17), and through a revision of the table on incremental reasoning (p. 14).</p> <p>4.4 We have revised both the Results Framework and the Project description to ensure better alignment with the type of investments financed under BD1 Program 1 (also see responses under comments 5).</p> <p>4.5 The narrative and table (p. 14) on Incremental Reasoning and Global Environmental Benefits were revised to show additionality of GEF investments (also see response 4.3).</p> <p>4.1 As mentioned (see Risks, p 4) a comprehensive risk analysis will be conducted during the PPG phase.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate	- Project objective: the formulation is not enough specific. How would you	5/4/2018:

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>evaluate the "reduction of threats"? Please, revise and provide a more specific objective.</p> <p>- Project description: the text under each component should help to understand the logics and the nature of outputs. Please, revise.</p> <p>- Result framework: the result framework should be revised, simplified, and focused on outputs aligned with the BD1 Program 1 and the LD2 Program 3.</p> <p>- Formulation of outputs: The formulation of outputs should reflect the products, capital goods and services resulting from project activities; they should be quantified, as far as possible, specific, measurable, and reflect the value the money. The formulation of outcomes should express the short-term/medium-term effects, or consequences, achieved by a set of outputs. Several outputs are expressed as outcomes, are not quantified, or are too vague to reflect a value for money:</p> <p>- Please, revise the formulation of the following outputs: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.3,</p> <p>- Please, quantify (provide a number) for the following outputs: 1.1, 3.1,</p>	<p>5.1 Project objective is reformulated as: "Systemic, institutional and operational capacity at national and site levels strengthened for protected area management and sustainable land management, to safeguard globally significant terrestrial and marine flora and fauna and ensure environmentally sustainable livelihoods."</p> <p>5.2 The narrative of the project strategy section (p 11-14) has been revised to help better understand the logics and nature of the outputs (see responses to comments 5.9-5.16)</p> <p>5.3 The results framework has been revised to highlight alignment with BD1 Program 1 and LD2 Program 3.</p> <p>5.4 Outputs have been simplified and quantified to the extent possible, taking into account the comments below.</p> <p>5.5 Outputs under Component 1 have been adapted to reflect the comments of the reviewer. Output National capital accounting (TSA) was removed, and instead</p> <p>Outputs under Component 3 were revised, and their order was changed according to their expected timeframes (also see response 5.14 and 5.15).</p> <p>5.6 Outputs have been quantified to the extent possible. Kindly note that the number of communities targeted for</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>3.2, - Please, remove the list of activities in the formulation of outputs: 1.3, 2.1.</p> <p>Components Component 1: there are too many outputs in too many directions, often over-promising, unrealistic (1.1, 1.4), or out of the scope of the project (1.2, please note that national capital accounting is a different GEF BD objective). However, a strategic capacity development plan, based on an identification of needs, complementary to cofinancing, is welcome (fusion and reformulation of 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, and 1.4).</p> <p>Component 2: OK for a component focusing on effectiveness of BD conservation and PA management planning. However, the text p11 does not help to figure out the logics and the nature of outputs and activities. Please, revise. - Output 2.4: "Gazettement" should be better included in the component 1. - Output 2.2: "Training" seems a duplication of training activities under the component 1. - What is the difference between action plans in 2.1 and action plans in 2.5? - Output 2.1: If management plans</p>	<p>strengthening of development plans is tentative, and will be based on further assessments during the PPG phase. The project will prioritize support for the strengthening of development plans with those communities where the piloting of sustainable land management and IGA practices is expected to have the most impact (as explained in footnote and Project Strategy narrative). 5.7 The list of detailed activities in outputs 1.3, and 2.1 was removed and is explained in the narrative of the Project Strategy.</p> <p>Component 1 5.8 This has been addressed taking into account the comments of the reviewer (see responses 5.3-5.7).</p> <p>Component 2 5.9 We revised the narrative of this component to better explain the logics of the outputs and activities, including reference to the existing management plans (comment 5.13). 5.10 Gazettement of STP's first MPA is now included in the component 1. 5.11 The type of training to be provided under Component 2 (Output 2.2) differs from the type of training intended under Component 1, as it will focus on enhancing capacities for active PA management on site.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>(2015-2020) exist, the project financed management planning activities are not clear: we do not understand the added value of "Result based management and Action Plans".</p> <p>Component 3: - Output 3.1: How will the support to these activities by local communities be sustained? - Output 3.3: The formulation is more an outcome. In the text, we would like to see the logics of SLM investments (plan? capacity development strategies? pilot farms? demonstration plots? role of farmer organizations and agriculture extension officers...).</p> <p>Component 4 - Output 4.4: the description of the component 4 is silent on this output which includes the design of an upscaling strategy and its implementation. Please, explain. We are not seeing evidence of potential for upscaling.</p> <p>5/4/2018 Addressed. At CEO endorsement, again, develop the reasoning to show that the GEF is completing other efforts, and there are options/solutions for sustainability. Without this information (baseline,</p>	<p>5.12 At present, the only existing PAs are the Ôbo Nature Parks and no marine/coastal PAs exist (e.g. see Table 1), hence a distinction was made between plans to manage the forested PAs and marine biodiversity. The Output on marine biodiversity action plans has now been merged.</p> <p>5.13 Although PA Management Plans, already exist for the 2015-2020 period, the Government acknowledges that these are already outdated, not sufficiently participatory, and do not adequately incorporate results-based approaches or strategies aimed at increasing the financial sustainability of PA management. In addition, the existing Action Plans only cover 1-year periods. We have revised the description of this component to highlight these facts, and better explain the added value of GEF-financed support.</p> <p>Component 3 5.14 We have revised this component to emphasize the importance of market analyses, as well as assessment and support of capacities of targeted groups to ensure sustainability of the investments (p 13).</p> <p>5.15 Formulation of Output 3.3 (Table B) and narrative (p 13) were revised. The logics of the SLM, SFM and CBM interventions are explained, including actions to ensure sustainability.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		co-financing), it will be difficult for the GEF to finance alone infrastructures, like the Old Obo Natural Park building (output 2.3).	Component 4 5.16 The description of Output 4.4: the description of component 4 was revised to include reference to the design of an upscaling strategy and its implementation. In addition, the section on Innovation and Potential for Scaling-up (p. 14 was revised). 6. Stakeholder analysis will be included in the PPG as per standard procedure, and the role of key stakeholders in all stages of the project (design, implementation, M&E processes) will be facilitated.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	A list of stakeholders has been identified. In the PPG, please include a stakeholder analysis and ensure a role of local communities, CSO (farmer organizations, cooperatives, NGOs) in the design and the implementation of the project. 5/4/2018 Cleared.	Stakeholder analysis will be included in the PPG as per standard procedure, and the role of key stakeholders in all stages of the project (design, implementation, M&E processes) will be facilitated.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	The proposed grant should be within the STAR resources of Sao Tome y Principe (total: \$4,831,752; \$3,776,014 from BD and \$1,055,738 from LD).	Noted.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>However, some red alerts are popping up in the PMIS, with potential over-programming of STAR resources. This project will be considered with other GEF6 projects still pending for Sao Tome y Principe.</p> <p>Please, also understand that approval of PIFs at the end of the replenishment period depends on the overall availability of the trust fund and cannot be guaranteed.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>See above.</p> <p>Approval of PIFs at the end of the replenishment period depends on the overall availability of the trust fund and cannot be guaranteed.</p>	Noted.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>- Table A and Table C: Please, revise the cofinancing, and round up the numbers: Providing the cents in the tables A and C is making then a discrepancy with the table B.</p> <p>- Some comments above should be included in the PPG (risk analysis,</p>	<p>5/4/2018:</p> <p>The comments provided by the reviewer are appreciated and have been addressed in the revised PIF.</p> <p>Tables A and C have been revised to round up the numbers and address discrepancies with table B.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>stakeholder analysis,...).</p> <p>5/7/2018 The comments have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance. The points below should be addressed or improved at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>During, the PPG, please address the following points summarized below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please ensure additional details on the role of the co-financing and what specific activities will be covered by co-financing are included at the endorsement stage. - The need to improve the GEF reasoning (baseline, cofinancing) will be particularly important for infrastructures, like the Old Obo Natural Park building. Options/Solutions for sustainability should also be proposed. - Include a comprehensive risk analysis. - Include a stakeholder analysis and ensure a role of local communities, CSO (farmer organizations, cooperatives, NGOs) in the design and the implementation of the project. - About the Monitoring & Evaluation (not only related to the project administration, but also the scientific 	<p>PPG-related comments are noted and will be taken into account accordingly.</p>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		monitoring, if any): please provide baseline data and quantified indicators at CEO endorsement, and do not plan to make the assessment the first year of the project.	
Review Date	Review	March 15, 2018	May 04, 2018
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 07, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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		

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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		