

Part I: Project Information		Response
GEF ID		10165
Project Title		Strengthening resilience to climate change of coastal communities in Togo
Date of Screening		May 21st, 2019
STAP member Screener		Toth, F.
STAP secretariat screener		Zommers, Z.
STAP Overall Assessment		Minor issues.
		<p>The Togolese coastal zone suffers from a combination of socioeconomic and climate pressures, and management problems with natural resources. Efforts to mend one or the other problem separately is likely to fail because individual improvements could easily be undermined by the remaining poor conditions in other areas. Hence the STAP welcomes the integrated approach to tackling pervasive challenges in a coordinated manner.</p> <p>This PIF presents a good problem statement. However, the project would benefit from a detailed Theory of Change and further evaluation of whether or not the activities proposed will address the drivers of risk. For example, marine sand and gravel extraction is listed as a principal risk to coastal ecosystems and form of economic income. The substitute economic activity proposed by the project includes developing handicrafts, medicinal plant production, or tourism. A detailed evaluation is needed to confirm whether or not such activities represent viable livelihood alternatives. If not, sand mining is likely to continue. Torres et al (2017) note that demand for sand is likely to only increase and illegal extraction is rampant. STAP recommends that the proponents improve the following items: theory of change with the related contingency planning, specifying the project's results in the form of more quantitative indicators, innovations (their nature, sources, complementarity), risk assessment and management, and knowledge management.</p>
Part I: Project Information	What STAP looks for	Response
B. Indicative Project Description Summary		
Project Objective	Is the objective clearly defined, and consistently related to the problem diagnosis?	Yes
Project components	A brief description of the planned activities. Do these support the project's objectives?	Yes
Outcomes	A description of the expected short-term and medium-term effects of an intervention.	Yes
	Do the planned outcomes encompass important global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits?	Properly described
	Are the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits likely to be generated?	Yes
Outputs	A description of the products and services which are expected to result from the project. Is the sum of the outputs likely to contribute to the outcomes?	Clearly described.
Part II: Project justification	A simple narrative explaining the project's logic, i.e. a theory of change.	No formal theory of change presented.
1. Project description. Briefly describe:		

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (systems description)	Is the problem statement well-defined?	Yes
	Are the barriers and threats well described, and substantiated by data and references?	Yes
	For multiple focal area projects: does the problem statement and analysis identify the drivers of environmental degradation which need to be addressed through multiple focal areas; and is the objective well-defined, and can it only be supported by integrating two, or more focal areas objectives or programs?	Yes
2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects	Is the baseline identified clearly?	Yes
	Does it provide a feasible basis for quantifying the project's benefits?	The baseline is an adequate support for the proposed project but no data are presented for quantifying its benefits.
	Is the baseline sufficiently robust to support the incremental (additional cost) reasoning for the project?	
	For multiple focal area projects:	
	are the multiple baseline analyses presented (supported by data and references), and the multiple benefits specified, including the proposed indicators;	
	are the lessons learned from similar or related past GEF and non-GEF interventions described; and	
	how did these lessons inform the design of this project?	
3) the proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project	What is the theory of change?	Regrettably, no formal theory of change is presented.
	What is the sequence of events (required or expected) that will lead to the desired outcomes?	
	· What is the set of linked activities, outputs, and outcomes to address the project's objectives?	
	· Are the mechanisms of change plausible, and is there a well-informed identification of the underlying assumptions?	It is unclear if the indicated outputs in Component 2 will be sufficient to address drivers of degradation and provide sufficiently large economic incentives to stop degradation. Sustainability of the proposed community CCA action plans are unclear given increasing population and economic pressures. Land management plans and enforcement of regulations will be critical to ensure long term protection of coastal ecosystems. STAP suggests the development of a plausible logical framework, and further refinement of proposed activities, during the next phase of project development.

	· Is there a recognition of what adaptations may be required during project implementation to respond to changing conditions in pursuit of the targeted outcomes?	No such concerns are presented. They should be considered and proper fallbacks developed. Tying the specified sequence of actions and events together in a theory of change would also enable this kind of contingency planning.
5) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEF trust fund, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing	GEF trust fund: will the proposed incremental activities lead to the delivery of global environmental benefits?	Yes
	LDCF/SCCF: will the proposed incremental activities lead to adaptation which reduces vulnerability, builds adaptive capacity, and increases resilience to climate change?	Yes
6) global environmental benefits (GEF trust fund) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)	Are the benefits truly global environmental benefits, and are they measurable?	Yes
	Is the scale of projected benefits both plausible and compelling in relation to the proposed investment?	Benefits are plausible, but not a single core indicator is quantified. The STAP recommends that the proponents make an effort to produce a few quantified core indicators to allow better understanding of the expected GEBs.
	Are the global environmental benefits explicitly defined?	
	Are indicators, or methodologies, provided to demonstrate how the global environmental benefits will be measured and monitored during project implementation?	No, see above
	What activities will be implemented to increase the project's resilience to climate change?	The project itself revolves around increasing resilience to climate change.
7) innovative, sustainability and potential for scaling-up	Is the project innovative, for example, in its design, method of financing, technology, business model, policy, monitoring and evaluation, or learning?	The integrated treatment of various aspects of climate resilience in coastal communities is novel in this region. A few examples of information systems, product and process innovations are mentioned, but a lot more (e.g. business mode, financing, institutions) would be possible and needed. Their coordinated implementation would also foster spreading and scaling up efforts to enhance climate resilience.
	Is there a clearly-articulated vision of how the innovation will be scaled-up, for example, over time, across geographies, among institutional actors?	
	Will incremental adaptation be required, or more fundamental transformational change to achieve long term sustainability?	Given the multiplicity of socioeconomic and environmental challenges in the Togolese coastal zone, deep transformational change would be required to achieve long-term durable reduction of climate exposure and sensitivity. It is unclear that this project will be able to achieve that as it currently stands.
1b. Project Map and Coordinates. Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.		Provided

<p>2. Stakeholders. Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous people and local communities; Civil society organizations; Private sector entities. If none of the above, please explain why. In addition, provide indicative information on how stakeholders, including civil society and indigenous peoples, will be engaged in the project preparation, and their respective roles and means of engagement.</p>	<p>Have all the key relevant stakeholders been identified to cover the complexity of the problem, and project implementation barriers?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>What are the stakeholders' roles, and how will their combined roles contribute to robust project design, to achieving global environmental outcomes, and to lessons learned and knowledge?</p>	<p>Stakeholders' roles are properly assigned and consistent with their real life positions and responsibilities.</p>
<p>3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Please briefly include below any gender dimensions relevant to the project, and any plans to address gender in project design (e.g. gender analysis). Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? Yes/no/ tbd. If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality: access to and control over resources; participation and decision-making; and/or economic benefits or services. Will the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? yes/no /tbd</p>	<p>Have gender differentiated risks and opportunities been identified, and were preliminary response measures described that would address these differences?</p>	<p>Only vaguely. Some explicit response measures are mentioned, e.g. Women Artisan Cooperatives.</p>
	<p>Do gender considerations hinder full participation of an important stakeholder group (or groups)? If so, how will these obstacles be addressed?</p>	<p>No such hindrances are mentioned.</p>
<p>5. Risks. Indicate risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design</p>	<p>Are the identified risks valid and comprehensive? Are the risks specifically for things outside the project's control?</p>	<p>The identified risks are valid but their scope is rather limited; most are outside the project's control. If aquaculture is promoted by the project further risk assessment may be needed. Pollutants from aquaculture include nitrogen-based waste which causes oxygen depletion in coastal environments, additionally use of antibiotics, antifoulants, and pesticides are all harmful to the marine environment.</p>
	<p>Are there social and environmental risks which could affect the project?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
	<p>For climate risk, and climate resilience measures:</p>	
	<p>How will the project's objectives or outputs be affected by climate risks over the period 2020 to 2050, and have the impact of these risks been addressed adequately?</p>	<p>Climate risks are severe, and the central objective is to reduce vulnerability to them.</p>

	· Has the sensitivity to climate change, and its impacts, been assessed?	Yes, a sensible initial impact assessment is presented, but more would be desirable in the next project development step.
	· Have resilience practices and measures to address projected climate risks and impacts been considered? How will these be dealt with?	
	· What technical and institutional capacity, and information, will be needed to address climate risks and resilience enhancement measures?	
6. Coordination. Outline the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other related initiatives	Are the project proponents tapping into relevant knowledge and learning generated by other projects, including GEF projects?	Yes
	Is there adequate recognition of previous projects and the learning derived from them?	Yes
	Have specific lessons learned from previous projects been cited?	Yes
	How have these lessons informed the project's formulation?	
	Is there an adequate mechanism to feed the lessons learned from earlier projects into this project, and to share lessons learned from it into future projects?	Yes
8. Knowledge management. Outline the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, and how it will contribute to the project's overall impact, including plans to learn from relevant projects, initiatives and evaluations.	What overall approach will be taken, and what knowledge management indicators and metrics will be used?	Some elements of KM appear in several components (e.g. project monitoring and dissemination of results in Component 4), but the overall KM plan under Point 8 is rather poor and needs substantial improvement to allow all results and benefits of the project to spread and scale up.
	What plans are proposed for sharing, disseminating and scaling-up results, lessons and experience?	
STAP advisory response	Brief explanation of advisory response and action proposed	
1. Concur	STAP acknowledges that on scientific or technical grounds the concept has merit. The proponent is invited to approach STAP for advice at any time during the development of the project brief prior to submission for CEO endorsement.	
	* In cases where the STAP acknowledges the project has merit on scientific and technical grounds, the STAP will recognize this in the screen by stating that <i>"STAP is satisfied with the scientific and technical quality of the proposal and encourages the proponent to develop it with same rigor. At any time during the development of the project, the proponent is invited to approach STAP to consult on the design."</i>	

<p>2. Minor issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP has identified specific scientific /technical suggestions or opportunities that should be discussed with the project proponent as early as possible during development of the project brief. The proponent may wish to:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised;</p>	
	<p>(ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development, and possibly agreeing to terms of reference for an independent expert to be appointed to conduct this review.</p>	
	<p>The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	
<p>3. Major issues to be considered during project design</p>	<p>STAP proposes significant improvements or has concerns on the grounds of specified major scientific/technical methodological issues, barriers, or omissions in the project concept. If STAP provides this advisory response, a full explanation would also be provided. The proponent is strongly encouraged to:</p>	
	<p>(i) Open a dialogue with STAP regarding the technical and/or scientific issues raised; (ii) Set a review point at an early stage during project development including an independent expert as required. The proponent should provide a report of the action agreed and taken, at the time of submission of the full project brief for CEO endorsement.</p>	