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

GEF ID:	**9113**		
Country/Region:	**Sao Tome and Principe**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening Resilience and Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change in São Tomé and Príncipe's Agricultural and Fisheries Sectors**		
GEF Agency:	**AfDB**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$150,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,502,968**
Co-financing:	**$17,021,480**	Total Project Cost:	**$20,524,448**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Fareeha Iqbal**	Agency Contact Person:	**xavier Boulenger**

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]	Yes, it is aligned with LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability), CCA-2 (strengthening adaptive capacity) and CCA-3 (integrate adaptation into relevant plans and processes).	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. In seeking to build resilience of Sao Tome and Principe's agriculture and fisheries sectors to adverse effects of climate change, the project is	

[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
		consistent with the country's NAPA (2006), its National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (2005), its Second Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2012-16), and the objectives of the National Program on Food and Nutrition Security (2013-23).	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Innovation: Yes, the project is innovative for Sao Tome. Whereas other projects have tended to focus on one sector (e.g., crops) to boost food security, the proposed project looks at the full spectrum of natural resource base options (crops, fish and trees). Sustainability: Yes for PIF stage (the project will focus on building adaptation capacity at various levels). Please provide more information on measures that will be taken to ensure sustainability of project activities and outcomes by CEO endorsement. Scale up: Yes. All project activities have potential for scale-up and/or replication.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Yes, the adaptation actions proposed are additional to the baseline actions and address the risks posed by climate change.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate	FI, April 22, 2015: The PIF identifies an ambitious list of	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	proposed adaptation investments, including (and not limited to): installation of fish aggregating devices, equipping of fish ponds, adaptation measures in targeted areas, introduction of drip irrigation, small hillside dams, localized reforestation, EBA measures, technologies to enable reduction in fuelwood consumption, establishment of nurseries, distribution of equipment for safety at sea, piloting of climate-resilient crop varieties, livelihoods diversification, greenhouses, and pilot aquaculture schemes. (i) Is the requested amount of $3.5 million sufficient to adequately finance such a plethora of adaptation measures? (2) In several cases, only 2 of each adaptation measure have been proposed (e.g., equipping of 2 fish ponds, construction of 2 small hillside dams). How many people are likely to benefit from the very limited count of each investment? The PIF states that there will be 20,000 direct beneficiaries of this project, but it is unclear how. Recommended action: Please clarify how the seemingly low count of several of the proposed	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		measures have the potential to provide adaptation benefits to 20,000 people. Would it perhaps be better to cut back on the range of proposed adaptation activities in order to be able to reach more people? (3) Please also briefly explain execution arrangements. (4) The components do not seem to include policy options for mainstreaming adaptation in development in Sao Tome. Please discuss why. FI, July 2, 2015: Yes for PIF stage. After in-person discussions with relevant Agency staff about the number of activities, and a request to clarify how these will be additional to baseline efforts, the activities have been revised and are adequately presented for PIF stage. By CEO Endorsement: Please provide further specifics on the LDCF activities as these are further defined over the course of project preparation (actions, beneficiaries, and additionality).	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs	FI, April 22, 2015: Further information is requested. (1) Please discuss whether there are other	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	considered?	vulnerable/marginalized groups (besides women) that this project would provide resilience benefits to. (2) Given the high vulnerability of women as discussed in the PIF, will a gender analysis be conducted, and a gender strategy prepared on its basis? FI, July 2, 2015: Yes for PIF stage. The proposal takes into account the higher vulnerability of women to climate change in STP, relative to men. Women account for 90 percent of the workforce in fish marketing, over 80 percent of traders in food products and vegetables, and more than 90 percent of operators involved in small-scale processing of agricultural and fishery products. Yet poverty continues to affect women more than men. Youth are also vulnerable, with many unemployed or leaving rural areas for urban areas. The project will systematize the representation of women and youth in consultative and decision-making bodies to enable them to gradually improve their socio-economic status. By CEO Endorsement: Please also (i) include a section on the broader socio-economic benefits of the LDCF project (for example, expected increase in community	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		incomes due to livelihood diversification, improved health benefits, reduction in time/resources being spent to repair damaged boats, etc., as relevant), and (ii) the PIF states that a gender analysis was conducted for PRIAA (baseline project). Please ensure that the proposed LDCF-supported activities are also assessed for strong consideration of gender issues.	
Availability of Resources	7. 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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	FI, 4/22/2015: Not yet. Please respond to comments provided for items 5 and 6. Update, FI, June 3, 2015: The Agency re-submitted the PIF, but since it did not adequately address comments provided to the first review by GEF Sec, a meeting was requested with the Agency during the GEF Council, and specific concerns were discussed. The Agency agreed to re-	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		submit again, addressing these concerns. Upon agency request, the concerns were also conveyed in an email dated June 11. FI, July 2, 2015: Yes, the project is recommended for approval. However, it will not be processed for Council review and approval until adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF. By CEO Endorsement: Please respond to comments provided for items 3 (sustainability), 5 and 6. Update, FI, 10/20/2017: Yes. An updated PIF, including an annex summarizing the specific aspects that required updating, was submitted and cleared. The agency has affirmed the current relevance of the proposed project activities, given country adaptation priorities and needs. Though the baseline project has begun implementation, the agency has confirmed its continued suitability for this project, and has provided a table outlining the manner in which LDCF supported activities will be integrated within baseline actions as the project proceeds. The agency has also confirmed that information	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		provided on related initiatives for coordination remains valid. The Program Manager thus recommends the updated PIF for CEO approval given that resources available in the LDCF are sufficient to process the project for funding approval.	
Review Date	Review	April 22, 2015	May 07, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 02, 2015	June 21, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 20, 2017	

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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		