



## 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:	Investments Towards Resilient Management of Guinea Current Large Marine Ecosystems		
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:	\$106,700,000	Total Project Cost:	\$126,947,607
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Astrid Hillers	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	(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.	

<sup>1</sup> 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"> <li>1. PLEASE by endorsement be specific on the AICHI targets addressed in detail.</li> <li>2. Please also be specific on the use of STAR resources. Please link country STAR allocations to output indicators.</li> <li>3. Please submit updated endorsement letters for all countries to reflect the additional IW funds for Benin which were added during PIF development.</li> </ol>	
	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>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	(9/6/2017). The drivers of coastal	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers<sup>2</sup> 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>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>for WACA will provide the larger, integrated interventions.</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>(9/6/2017). Yes, the project is designed to add innovation and green infrastructure measures to the larger IDA investments.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>(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:</p> <p>(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:</p> <p>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:</p> <p>"GEF will support the implementation of comprehensive prevention, early detection, control and management frameworks that emphasize a risk management approach by focusing on</p>	

## 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"> <li>- Please note the earlier comment on need for specific indicators that address convention commitments (BD/LD).</li> <li>- 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.</li> <li>- Please be more specific and consistent in allocating the GEF and co-finance either to component 5 or PMC.</li> </ul> <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>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	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"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	(9/6/2017). BD/LD: Yes, available at present time. (Benin and Togo)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	(9/6/2017). IW: Yes, available at present time.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	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"> <li>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).</li> <li>Please adjust the agency fee to 9 % as per GEF Fee Policy.</li> </ul> <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>	
<b>Review Date</b>	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
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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?		
	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?		

<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.