Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEF ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Agency(ies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO: 640444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF Focal Area(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katya Kuang-Irho</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIF

art I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Yes. The proposed project is aligned with CCA objectives 1 and 2.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Yes. The project's objective is to strengthen the resilience to climate change of coastal communities and ecosystems in the Maritime region of Togo. The proposed initiative aims to address climate change adaptation through an integrated approach targeting the agriculture sector as a whole - which, in this context includes fisheries, forestry, and livestock. The project combines policy and capacity building activities with piloting concrete adaptation actions which restore degraded coastal ecosystems, support the adoption of diversified livelihoods of coastal communities, and support the adoption of best practice and innovative technologies to enhance production systems. The structure of the project, as presented in Table B, is sound; and the outcomes and outputs under each component are sufficiently clear and appropriate for this stage of project development.
Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Clarification requested. The co-financing amount of $46m is classified as recurrent expenditure, contributed by three baseline investments from IFAD, FAO, and JICA in Table C, however, this does not match the amount in the body text describing the baseline investments, which adds up to USD $36m.

Please clarify: What is the amount of the co-financing? And please ensure the amount is consistent across the submission.

GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Cleared. The requested correction has been made.

Agency Response

Comment addressed. The total amount of co-financing is $46M. The co-financing table under section b. ii) has been corrected and the amount is now consistent across the submission.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):
The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/10/2019 - Yes. Togo is currently eligible to access up to USD $10 million from the LDCF.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - Yes. the PPG is within the allowable cap for a project of this size.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - As per the email sent out to the Adaptation Task Force on April 3, please utilize the ‘Core Indicators and Metadata’ spreadsheet which is mandatory to be completed and submitted with LDCF/SCCF PIFs. There are two worksheets (tabs) in the spreadsheet: Table F and Set of Indicators, corresponding to Table F and Set of Indicators in the PIF criteria, respectively. (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)
spreadsheet and both tables: Project metadata & Core Indicators must be completed for all PIF submissions for the upcoming GEF-7 WP. Recommended action: Please fill out and upload the Core Indicators spreadsheet onto the roadmap section of the portal.

GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Yes. The core indicators and metadata spreadsheet has been filled in and uploaded onto the roadmap section of the portal.

Agency Response Done

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Recommended action: Please tag the project with all relevant keywords in Table G.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. This action has been completed.

Agency Response Done

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - Yes. The Togolese coastline is highly vulnerable to rising sea levels, which is exacerbated by coastal erosion and unsustainable human activities and a lack of sustainable coastal management. Coastal erosion, resulting in retreating coastline by 5 to 12 meters per year, is a real threat and a major constraint for the development of coastal infrastructure. Despite the baseline programs and projects described above, there are still key barriers that prevent stakeholders from taking adequate action to reduce vulnerability to impacts of climate change and increase resilience in Togo's coastal area, which are listed in Table 2.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Yes. The baseline scenario is well described in section 1ab, detailing the policy and legal framework, as well as ongoing technical support initiatives and investments, including the baseline investments which are providing co-financing to the proposed LDCF project.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Yes. The project's objective is to strengthen the resilience to climate change of coastal communities and ecosystems in the Maritime region of Togo. The proposed initiative aims to address climate change adaptation through an integrated approach targeting the agriculture sector as a whole - which, in this context includes fisheries, forestry, and livestock. The project combines policy and capacity building activities with piloting concrete adaptation actions which restore degraded coastal ecosystems, support the adoption of diversified livelihoods of coastal communities, and support the adoption of best practice and innovative technologies to enhance production systems. The structure of the project, as presented in Table B, is sound, and the outcomes and outputs under each component are sufficiently clear and appropriate for this stage of project development.
and appropriate for this stage of project development.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Yes. It is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-2 from the LDCF/SCCF strategy.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Clarification requested. In the section about additional cost reasoning, the agency has indicated that "The LDCF investment will leverage and augment the existing baseline. The project will contribute to safeguarding baseline development initiatives in the agriculture, fisheries, forestry and related coastal sectors against projected adverse climate impacts. The use of LDCF funds will target the margin between the current development baseline and an improved development scenario that promotes climate proofed technologies and incorporates best international CCA principles and practices." Is is not appropriate for the main activity of a proposed LDCF project to be climate proofing a baseline project.

Clarification: Please clarify that LDCF financing will leverage and build upon the baseline investments - not just climate proof them.

Agency Response
Comment addressed. To avoid confusion the reference to "safeguarding baseline development initiatives" has been eliminated from the above mentioned paragraph. The additional cost reasoning is also clearly and thoroughly described both in Part II section c) the proposed alternative scenario; as well as, in the co-financing projects table in section b. ii).

6. Are the project’s/program’s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Yes. The adaptation benefits generated by the proposed project are clear in the project design, and are reiterated in the body text, this includes: (i) increased knowledge and understanding of CC-induced threats on coastal production systems; (ii) provision of tools and training for 10,000 small farmers and 2,000 fishermen to improve their capacity to adapt to CC through: (a) rehabilitation and expansion of an aquaculture park; (b) a network of FFS adopting improved CCA strategies and practices, (c) farmer cooperatives adopting crop protection systems and sustainable land and water practices, (d) introduction of new varieties of cereals to increase food security; (iii) more resilient rural livelihoods through the incorporation of innovative technologies and a broader array of income opportunities including sustainable aquaculture, agro-forestry, eco-tourism; (iv) the implementation of community actions plans for the restoration and sustainable management of coastal ecosystems; and (vii) mainstreaming CCA into fisheries, forestry and agricultural policies and programs and increasing institutional capacity at national level to develop cross-sectoral CCA policies, strategies and programs. Additionally, the project will generate strong biodiversity co-benefits, which is also demonstrated in the proposal.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - The project has some innovative aspects, promoting an integrated eco-systems based approach to adaptation designed to enable local communities to adopt diversified livelihoods to increase their resilience to climate change. Strong inter-institutional capacity building activities, including the establishment of an inter-sectoral coordination mechanism, coupled with dialogue and awareness raising, increases the likelihood of project sustainability. At the local level, the self-reinforcing synergy between plants and methods
introduced to participating communities will ensure local ownership and lend itself to replication.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project’s/program’s intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - Yes. This information is included in a table and map.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - Clarification requested. A detailed table is included in the stakeholders section of the submission, however the submission indicates that private sector entities will be included in the stakeholder engagement process, although none are included in the table.

Clarification: Which private sector entities?
GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Cleared. Relevant private sector entities have been added to the stakeholder engagement matrix.
Agency Response
Comment addressed. Private sector entities have been included in the stakeholder table as suggested.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - Clarification requested. The submission indicates that a needs analysis and a gender analysis will be undertaken as part of the project but does not indicate when.

Clarification: Please clarify if the gender and needs analyses will be undertaken at PPG?
GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Cleared. The gender analysis will be undertaken at PPG.

Agency Response Comment addressed. Text has been added to indicate that the gender and needs analyses will be undertaken at PPG.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

https://gefportal.worldbank.org/App/#/gefsecreview/pmreview/view/65e09942-6854-e911-a830-000d3a375590/view
GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - **Clarification requested** - The proposal refers to the financial services industry, but the project design does not seem to include activities related to financial instruments or tools. Is this more through MIFA that this will be done? Additionally, the project seems to have potential amongst co-ops as well as for developing the eco-tourism industry but neither are mentioned in the private sector section.

GEFSEC, 4/22/2019 - Cleared. The agency has clarified that the project aims to engage with the financial services industry through MIFA and ProMIFA. References to the agricultural co-ops and eco-tourism industries have been added to the PIF submission.

**Agency Response**

It is not the scope of the project to establish or set up financial tools and/or instruments but to engage with the financial service industry through MIFA and the IFAD baseline project ProMIFA (Project for Incentive Facility Support for Risk-Sharing in agriculture). The project will raise awareness among small agri producers on available financial tools while at the same time sensitizing the financial industry on ecosystem restoration to facilitate potential partnerships.

Reference to agricultural co-ops and eco-tourism industry has been included in the PIF in the engagement with private sector industry

**Risks**

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Clarification requested. Fiduciary risk is not mentioned in the risk matrix.

**Clarification:** Please indicate whether fiduciary risk is foreseen to be an issue and how it will be addressed.

GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Cleared, fiduciary risk has been added to the risk matrix and further analysis will be undertaken at PPG to ensure the best mitigation measure.
Agency Response Comment addressed. Text has been added in the risk matrix under the mitigation measures column of the first risk to indicate that a fiduciary risk assessment of the main executing partners will be conducted during PPG phase to help identify the most appropriate execution modality option for Project implementation. Depending on the assessment risk rating, a full or a hybrid Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) agreement - to use FAO’s terminology - will be discussed with the implementing partner. Unless updated HACT assessments of the implementing partners already exist, an independent firm will be hired to conduct the fiduciary assessment during PPG.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - More information requested. The project will be executed by FAO, with support from the national, prefecture, and municipality government offices and a PSC will be established to ensure proper coordination. The aspect that is unclear is regarding coordination with LDCF and GCF financed initiatives.

Recommended action: Please indicate if the FAO team is aware of the projects in Togo in the GCF pipeline, as well as GCF-financed NAP readiness activities in Togo; and whether and how it will coordinate with these projects. Additionally, there are two additional projects being implemented in IFAD and the World Bank with LDCF-financing - the former being an agriculture project and the latter being a disaster and land management project. Please indicate whether and how coordination will be undertaken with these.

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - More information requested. The project will be executed by FAO, with support from the national, prefecture, and municipality government offices and a PSC will be established to ensure proper coordination. The aspect that is unclear is regarding coordination with LDCF and GCF financed initiatives.

Recommended action: Please indicate if the FAO team is aware of the projects in Togo in the GCF pipeline, as well as GCF-financed NAP readiness activities in Togo; and whether and how it will coordinate with these projects. Additionally, there are two additional projects being implemented in IFAD and the World Bank with LDCF-financing - the former being an agriculture project and the latter being a disaster and land management project. Please indicate whether and how coordination will be undertaken with these.
GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - One clarification recommended. The agency has clarified that FAO is working directly on the GCF-financed NAP readiness proposal, which focuses on rural development sectors and provides further details regarding the IFAD and WBG implemented LDCF projects. It would be much appreciated if the text relating to the GCF readiness activities as well as relevance to the NAP process could be added to the body text of the submission.

GEFSEC, 4/25/2019 - Cleared. The recommended action has been taken.

Agency Response

The FAO office is providing technical assistance to the Government of Togo in developing the GCF financed NAP readiness proposal by September 2019. FAO’s direct involvement in the NAP readiness development process will ensure alignment between the two initiatives.

The NAP readiness project intends to develop regional plans for climate change adaptation in rural development sectors (agriculture, forestry, livestock, water resources and fisheries) and will cover the five regions of Togo while the LDCF project will focus on the Maritime region. Early lessons and feedback from each project will inform the implementation of the other. As proposed in the project knowledge management and communication strategy, a two ways flow of information between the two projects will ensure complementarity of the initiatives and will allow building synergies where appropriate.

Moreover, coordination between the proposed LDCF project and the GCF portfolio will be facilitated by the Directorate of the Environment that hosts both the GCF NDA and the UNFCCC Focal Point. Both focal points were directly consulted during PIF formulation and this will continue throughout project design and implementation.

In terms of coordination with other LDCF financed projects, when developing the PIF, the design team took into consideration the entire GEF portfolio in the country (including LDCF and GEF TF projects under implementation, those about to end and those in formulation phase – GEF 7). Relevant project teams where consulted to explore potential collaborations and synergies and the consultation process will continue throughout PPG and during implementation. Moreover coordination with both ADAPT (IFAD led) and PGICT (WB led) will be sought through each project PSC’s as the same stakeholders, including the FAO country office, are members to these. Text has been added in section 6 (Coordination) of the PIF to include collaboration with ADAPT and PGICT.

25/April/2019

Addressed - The text has been included in the body of the submission as suggested.

Consistency with National Priorities
Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/11/2019 - More information requested. The proposed initiative is well aligned with Togo's NAPA priorities and NatComms and NDC, however there is no mention of the NAP process. Additionally, a number of the national plans listed in section 7 of the portal submission seem to be outdated. Additionally, are there any national climate policies?

Recommended action: Please indicate whether and how the proposed initiative will coordinate with and inform the ongoing in-country NAP process. Please update the relevant national policies and plans mentioned, such as SCAPE which only covers up to 2018, and others; and include any national climate policies.

GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - First comment relating to outdated policies is cleared. Please see previous comment on coordination and kindly add references to the NAP process into the body text of the submission.

GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Cleared. References to the NAP process have been added to the submission.

Agency Response

Comment addressed. Reference to NAP also included in the body of submission in the Coordination Section

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Somewhat, more clarification requested. The KM section offers some disparate sentences presenting information on how knowledge will be captured and disseminated, but does not constitute a cohesive approach.
**Recommended action:** Please consider briefly outlining a cohesive approach to how knowledge will be generated, captured, and shared as part of the project activities. Considering this is only PIF stage, specific details, such as a timeline are not needed, but a preliminary strategy, as opposed to what has been currently been presented, would be appreciated.

GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Cleared. Sufficient information regarding the KM approach has been provided for this stage of project development. The functions of the KM strategy will include: i) providing a guiding framework for knowledge management and communication; ii) identifying communication and KM gaps and propose corrective measures; iii) providing a framework for timely and accurate information flow; iv) identifying and packaging information and knowledge for specific user audiences; v) documenting and sharing best practices.

**Agency Response**

Under Component 4, and more specifically output 4.1.3, a knowledge management and communication strategy (KMC) will be developed covering the entire lifespan of the Project. The strategy will be developed following a series of workshops and meetings starting with a stakeholder mapping workshop, technical working group meetings and finally a validation workshop. The strategy will outline some concrete proposals and guidelines while stipulating an institutional KMC Framework defining the relationships between the project and the different stakeholders and streamlining the flow of information. Its purpose will be to create better synergies between the project and the different stakeholders. And also explain how crises and grievances in the project area will be handled.

The functions of the strategy will include: i) providing a guiding framework for knowledge management and communication; ii) identifying communication and KM gaps and propose corrective measures; iii) providing a framework for timely and accurate information flow; iv) identifying and packaging information and knowledge for specific user audiences; v) documenting and sharing best practices.

Specific objectives of the strategy will include: i) to develop a KMC framework for implementing partners and stakeholders; ii) to enhance efficient and effective communication amongst project stakeholders; iii) to establish a mechanism for timely and accurate information flow; iv) to develop appropriate materials and tools for knowledge and information sharing and v) to develop guidelines for documenting and sharing best practices.

The above text has been included under the Knowledge Management section of the PIF.

**Part III – Country Endorsements**

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
GEFSEC, 4/12/2019 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit.
GEFSEC, 4/24/2019 - Not yet, please refer to flagged items and resubmit.
GEFSEC, 4/25/2019 - Yes, this project is being recommended for clearance and to be considered for inclusion in the June 2019 LDCF work program.
GEFSEC, 5/1/2019 - According to the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle, the documentation must include an explicit request signed by the GEF OFP indicating the specific roles and responsibilities of all partners, including any execution activities provided by FAO. The request should provide a sound justification for the execution activities that the FAO may perform. Kindly either submit such a letter, which must then be approved by the GEF, OR remove the intent of FAO to execute some of the project activities.
GEFSEC, 5/2/2019 - Cleared. FAO has removed itself from performing any execution activities for this project.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

GEFSEC, 5/1/2019 - PMC from the co-financing part is only 1% of the co-financing resources. While there is not a Policy on this regard, it is a regular practice that the co-financing PMC portion is at least as equal as the GEF PMC portion, which is 5%. Please address this difference by the time of CEO Endorsement.
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