

# Enhancing the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities in Sinoe County of Liberia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10376

**Countries**

Liberia

**Project Name**

Enhancing the resilience of vulnerable coastal communities in Sinoe County of Liberia

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

11/26/2021

**Review completed by PM**

4/6/2022

**Program Manager**

Jason Spensley

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 22March2022:**

Cleared.

**GEFSEC 11March2022:**

We note the response below from 9March2022, but unfortunately in the CER table for "Core Indicators - LDCF" core indicator 2 (area of land) and Core Indicator 4 (people

trained) are both still reading as zero. Please be sure to provide the impact figures in this feature of the portal, which became operational a few months ago.

Additionally, we note that in the Excel document attached in the documents upload section, core indicator 2 is indicated as only 260 hectares impacted, which is extremely low and not acceptable. Further, the total number of people trained in this document is listed as 0. Please increase impact ambition for these core indicators and ensure they are indicated correctly in all relevant locations, in particular within the CER document itself, as well as the Excel file upload.

**GEFSEC 15 February 2022:**

We note the responses on indicators. However, core indicator 2 (area of land) and core indicator 4 (people trained) are showing as having zero impact at all. Please clarify the impact numbers for those core indicators within the CEO Endorsement form in the portal, as well as in the attached meta data Excel file.

**GEFSEC 13 Dec 2021:**

A) Please clarify that Output 2.2 will focus on sea and river defense priorities nationally, and not just in Sinoe County.

B) Regarding Output 3.2, 4.1, and 4.2: If the number of beneficiaries and hectares are reduced from the levels approved at the PIF stage, please clarify in table 1 if this is due to changing the sites, overestimations, or both. If the indicator levels are lower, please further consider and explain options to maintain the similar level approved at PIF stage, including by adjusting or increasing the target sites.

**Agency Response**

**M.C. 21 March 2022**

We can confirm that the portal now reads the correct figures for both Indicators 2 and 4. We have also uploaded the Excel Document with the correct figures for the two indicators to the RoadMap section of the GEF Portal (Annex 15, uploaded 22 March 2022).

The number of hectares, increased in response to previous comments, is reflecting 830 ha in the portal, and matches the Core Indicator file and the CEO Endorsement request. We believe this is the most realistic figure for the types of interventions directly attributed to the project. We do not think there is much scope to significantly increase the number of hectares beyond the 830 while still ensuring targets will be achievable during implementation. While the project uses ecosystem based approaches, which is measured by area under sustainable management, it also increases overall resilience in more ways that are not measured through the number of hectares (for example, improved EWS and decentralized planning capacity). Other measures such as the county ICZM plans, community action plans and guidance manuals will also increase the

number of hectares under improved sustainable management, but the impact may not be quantifiable during the life of the project. There is a risk that the project could over-promise and under-achieve at implementation.

For the number of hectares protected by flooding and erosion through hybrid solutions in Sinoe County, the small area can be attributed to the relatively small size of the selected village sites. There is therefore not much scope to increase the number of hectares of restored ecosystems around the village to more than the current amount while still having direct flood and erosion benefits on the villages.

Another consideration we have made is the size of the project budget. While the overall project budget is fairly large, much of this goes into the revetments and groynes within Sinoe County. This can be justified as Downtown-Mississippi and Sebeh are critically impacted by floods and erosion and immediate interventions are needed. So although the area covered by these interventions project are not large in terms of hectares, the positive impact on these communities is considerable. The amount of money needed for the revetments and groynes does mean that there is limited budget for scaling up the area restored through EbA much beyond what has been proposed.

For the number of hectares gained from diversified livelihoods, the major contributor would be the Integrated Farming Systems (IFS) livelihood while others such as fisheries do not make significant contributions in terms of physical areas under sustainable management. Furthermore, the current target hectares included in the calculations is based on households that would receive direct inputs from the project towards IFS.

We therefore propose to keep the target for Core Indicator 4 at the current level of 860ha that we are confident the project will be able to achieve, and is under the direct influence of the project.

M.C. 9 Mar 2022

Core Indicator 2: Area of land has been made more visible within the Indicator sheets, including Table 1 (currently pasted in the Annex F section of the GEF Portal due to lack of space) as well as Annex 15 in the Project Document. Additionally, the total area of land has been increased and the distribution across agricultural, rural and urban landscapes indicated. Values of people trained have been added to Core Indicator 4 and Objective 3 included in all LDCF indicator sheets within the CEO Endorsement and Project Document, as well as the LDCF Indicators Excel file.

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

A) Output 2.2 will be at the national level and will benefit all coastal counties. This has been clarified in the CEO Endorsement as well as the Project Document.

B) The rationale for the adjustment in the beneficiary and hectare numbers from the PIF stage for Outputs 3.2, 4.1 and 4.2 has been elaborated on in Table 1. For Output 3.2, the adjustment is attributable to changes in selected sites and overestimations during the PIF stage of the affected population and area that will receive coastal protection. Sites were changed as validations during the PPG stage determined that some sites were not under

direct threat from coastal flooding or erosion (please see Annex 13c: Site selection report for more details). Such sites were omitted from the project document. Population numbers were determined from 2020 estimates obtained from the Liberia Institute of Statistics and Information Services (LISGIS). For Outputs 4.1 and 4.2, the adjustment in beneficiary numbers was a result of overestimates during the PIF stage. Adjusted estimates were based on population estimates for 2020 from the LISGIS as well as realistic budgetary constraints. Because of the change in project sites following site visit validations and based on the final population numbers of these sites, it is not feasible to adjust the number of beneficiaries to be closer to the original PIF stage estimates.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 6April2022:**

Cleared.

**GEFSEC 29March2022:**

- A) UNDP grant: co-financing letter is not clear whether this will be ?in cash? or ?in-kind?.
- If it is cash contribution out of UNDP?s own budget, report as Grant and Investment mobilized.
- If it is in-kind contribution, report as In-kind and Recurrent expenditures.
- 
- B) Conservation International:
  - change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?Donor Agency?
  - change to ?In-kind? and ?Recurrent expenditures?
- C) Government Liberia grant:
  - Change ?Grant? to ?Public investment?
- 

**GEFSEC 11March2022:**

We note UNDP's indication that it will continue to explore other sources of co-finance prior to CEO Endorsement as well as complementary financing during implementation. Please continue to do so.

**GEFSEC 15Feb2022:**

We note with appreciation the newly identified co-financing from the Government of Liberia - EPA, as well as the increase in c-financing from Conservation International. We also note the explanations for the overall significant reductions in co-financing. We encourage UNDP to consider exploring other options to increase co-financing, including from other UNDP projects, to the extent possible prior to final CEO Endorsement, as well as complementing financing during project implementation.

Please indicate the source of co-financing for the Conservation International co-finance as from a civil society organization, as was the case at PIF. Also, we understand the EPA is part of the Government of Liberia so please indicate this as such in the co-financing table..

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

We note with significant concern the extraordinary reduction in the scale of co-financing approved for the basis of the PIF of \$53,700,000, and the co-financing amount indicated in the CER of \$4,203,000. Please clarify if there has been a typo or information on other sources of co-financing remains to be added in the CER. This scale of reduction of the sources, types and scale of co-financing would put the project at risk. Please explain and detail.

**Agency Response**

M.C. 6 April 2022

The suggested changes have been made across the CEO Endorsement Request and the Project Document, specifically to Section C and Section VIII, respectively.

Additionally, in response to previous comments on co-financing, the total co-finance amount has been increased to USD11,473,510 with the addition of parallel in-kind co-financing from the UNDP through the ?Livelihood and Employment Creation in Liberia? (USD3,430,000) and the ?Monrovia Metropolitan Coastal Resilient Project? (USD3,840,510). These changes have been reflected across the CEO Endorsement Request and Project Document, where applicable.

M.C. 21 March 2022

This is well noted, thank you.

M.C. 9 Mar 2022

The identification of Conservation International as a CSO and the EPA as a part of the Government of Liberia have been corrected in Section C of the CEO Endorsement and Table 12 of the Project Document.

The comment on further exploration of other sources of co-finance prior to CEO Endorsement as well as complementary financing during implementation is well noted. Potential sources will be explored.

M.C 1 Feb 2022

The co-financing amounts are correct and no further sources are anticipated. The discrepancy is primarily as a result of the initially identified grant co-financing from the USAID and World Bank of USD28 million and USD15 million, respectively. The co-financing from the USAID was identified in the PIF as being sourced from the "West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change (WABiCC)" project. This project "as noted by US comments during the PIF stage" does not support coastal activities and was concluded in 2020. The project is therefore not a viable source of co-financing. With regards to the World Bank grant, the co-financing was anticipated to be sourced from the "World Bank Forest Sector Project". Despite numerous engagements during the PPG stage, co-financing commitments were unable to be secured through the World Bank as implementation for the targeted project will only begin in Liberia in 2023. Co-financing commitments, however, were secured from other closely-aligned projects, including the "Conservation and sustainable use of Liberia's Natural Capital" and "Enhancing climate information systems for Resilient Development in Liberia" projects, respectively. Although the contributions from these sources are smaller than the amounts initially committed by USAID and the World Bank, the values are more targeted than the previous commitments and can be directly attributed to the achievement of specific project outputs.

With regards to government co-financing, the initial amount proposed in the PIF of USD10 million was an overestimate. Indeed, the potential for this being an overestimate of what the government is able to commit was flagged by the US reviewer during the PIF stage "especially in light of the unprecedented costs from the current Covid-19 pandemic."

The overarching objective in arriving at the finalized co-financing figures was to ensure that realistic amounts, certain to be available during the project period, were included in the detailed design.

#### GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

GEFSec 13Dec2021:

Yes

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSec 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response  
**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?  
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 22March2022:**

Cleared.

**GEFSEC 11March2022:**

Please note the new comments above on indicator figures still not adequately showing for Core Indicators 2 and 4. What is being referred to in the response below by table 1 and annex 7. In what documents? Please note that most important is including these figures in the CER in the LDCF indicators function in the portal itself, and ensuring the figures are consistent in any other supporting document uploaded to the documents upload function.

**GEFSEC 15 February 2022:**

Comment A below is cleared.

Regarding comment B below, please consider number of people that will be trained, given the relevant activities of the project. Please also consider opportunity to expand the relatively modest number of hectares and include these figures in the CER.



**GEFSec 13Dec2021:**

A) Please make all efforts to ensure the number of female beneficiaries is balanced with that of male.

B) Please indicate in the CER the amount of all core indicators, including hectares and number of people trained.

**Agency Response**

M.C. 21 March 2022

This has now been addressed. Please see earlier responses

M.C. 9 Mar 2022

The total area of land made more climate resilient through the project has been increased and divided across agricultural, rural and urban landscapes. The previous estimate had only included those areas for coastal mangrove protection, and not land on which climate-resilient livelihood activities will be implemented such as integrated farming systems. These changes have been indicated across all Indicator sheets, including Table 1 and Annex 7 of the CEO Endorsement as well as Annex 15 in the Project Document.

The number of people trained and hectares of land under climate resilient management have been indicated within all Indicator sheets, including Table 1 of the CEO Endorsement as well as Annex 15 in the Project Document.

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

A) Disaggregated beneficiary numbers in the core indicator sheets and project results framework of the CEO Endorsement and Project Document have been adjusted where possible to better balance the number of females with the number of males. Where male numbers exceed female numbers, this reflects the total estimated population gender ratios for the project sites.

B) The summarised core indicators and the full LDCF indicators sheet is provided below. The LDCF core indicators are reflected in the Core Indicator section of GEF Portal.

Climate Change Adaptation Strategy Objective	Corresponding Core indicator	Sex-disaggregated?
--	------------------------------	--------------------

1	<p>Reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation</p>	<p><b>Number of direct beneficiaries</b> <sup>1</sup></p> <p>Total: 570,969 (288,951 males, 282,018 females)</p> <p>National, county and district level officials and decision-makers receiving capacity training for incorporating coastal management into development plans: 500 (245 males, 255 females)</p> <p>7,487 (3,827 males, 3,660 females) people protected through hybrid adaptation measures in Sinoe County consisting of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? Downtown-Mississippi ? 2,939 (1,528 males, 1,411 females)</li> <li>? Sebeh ? 2,925 (1,446 males, 1478 females)</li> <li>? Nanakru ? 936 (475 males, 461 females)</li> <li>? Pungbor ? 173 (97 males, 76 females)</li> <li>? Tournata ? 87 (49 males, 38 females)</li> <li>? Bafu Bay ? 428 (232 males, 196 females)</li> </ul> <p>560,362 (277,110 males, 283,252 females) with improved access to improved climate information systems</p> <p>Individuals who receive business identification, development and management training: 9,000 (2,250 males, 6,750 females)</p> <p>Individuals receiving improved access to climate risk early warning information: 560,362 (283,252 males, 277,110 females)</p> <p><b>Area of land under climate-resilient management (ha)</b></p> <p>260 ha, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>? 52 ha in Downtown-Mississippi</li> <li>? 16 ha in Sebeh</li> <li>? 16 ha in Nanakru</li> <li>? 3 ha in Pungbor</li> <li>? 11 ha in Bafu Bay</li> <li>? 162 ha in Tournata</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p> <p>n/a</p>
---	--	---	-----------------------

2	Mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact	<b>Number of policies, plans or development frameworks that mainstream climate resilience</b> 19, including: ? 9 Integrated Coastal Management plans ? 1 Sea and River Defence Investment Management Plan ? 3 County Resilience Plans ? 6 Community Action Plans	n/a
---	---	---	-----

**2) META INFORMATION**

To be entered at PIF stage. No subsequent re-entry needed unless changes are made

**Table 13. Required meta-data for LDCF and SCCF project submissions**

LDCF ?	SCCF Challenge Window o	SCCF Incentive for adaptation/resilience mainstreaming o
This project involves at least one SIDS <sup>2</sup> o		
This project involves at least one fragile state ?		
This is a multi-trust fund project o		
A gender analysis will be undertaken for this project ?		
This project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector ?		
This project is exclusively related to the formulation and/or implementation of a NAP <sup>3</sup> o		
This project has an urban focus o		
This project covers the following sector(s):		
	Food and agriculture	20 %
	Natural resources management	10%
	Coastal zone management	40%
	Water resources management	%
	Disaster risk management	30%
	Other infrastructure	%
	Health	%
	Other	% Please specify
This project targets the following climate change exacerbated/introduced challenges:		
Sea level rise ?	Change in mean temperature o	Natural hazards ?
Land degradation o	Coastal and/or coral reef degradation ?	Groundwater quality/quantity o

**3) INDICATOR FRAMEWORK**

To be submitted at CEO Endorsement <sup>4</sup>, Mid-Term and Terminal Evaluation stages

- ✘
- ✘
- ✘
- ✘
- ✘
- ✘
- ✘

OBJECTIVE 1: REDUCE VULNERABILITY AND INCREASE RESILIENCE THROUGH INNOVATION AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER FOR CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION						
Outcome 1.1 Technologies and innovative solutions piloted or deployed to reduce climate-related risks and/or enhance resilience						
Output 1.1.1 Physical assets or infrastructure made more resilient to climate variability and change						
Choose as relevant	Enter number					
Km of road	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Ha of agricultural land	<input type="checkbox"/>					Core Indicator 2
No. of irrigation/water structures (e.g., tanks/ponds)	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No. of public buildings	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No. of Fishery or aquaculture ponds	<input type="checkbox"/>					
No. of ports	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Km of riverbank protection	<input type="checkbox"/>			Briefly describe:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Km of coastal protection	<input type="checkbox"/>			Briefly describe:	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Km of stormwater drainage	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Ha of surface permeability and green space	<input type="checkbox"/>					
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>			Briefly describe, with measurement unit	<input type="checkbox"/>	
No. of direct beneficiaries*	M	<input type="checkbox"/>	F	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total	<input type="checkbox"/> Core Indicator 1
No. of indirect beneficiaries	M	<input type="checkbox"/>	F	<input type="checkbox"/>	Total	<input type="checkbox"/>
*Please only put numbers for direct beneficiaries <sup>3,5</sup> of the climate-resilient physical assets.						
Output 1.1.2 Livelihoods and sources of income of vulnerable populations diversified and/or strengthened						
Choose as relevant	Enter activity description					
<input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture	<input type="checkbox"/>					
<input type="checkbox"/> Pastoralism / dairy	<input type="checkbox"/>					

<input type="checkbox"/>	Fisheries/aquaculture	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	No. of public buildings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Cottage industry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Beekeeping	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Agro-processing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Enhanced access to markets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Tourism or ecotourism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Reduced supply chain disruption	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Enhanced access to employment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No. of direct beneficiaries*	M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Core Indicator 1
No. of indirect beneficiaries	M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Note: At MTR and TE stages, please discuss how beneficiaries' incomes (and other aspects of socio-economic wellbeing contributing to enhanced resilience) improved as a result of the above interventions.

**Output 1.1.3 Vulnerability to climatic hazards is reduced through new or improved early warning systems (EWS) climate information systems**

This project expands access to EWS? If ticked, select hazard(s) as relevant, below.

Flood?	Severe storm?	Extreme temperature	Other	describe
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

No. of people reached by EWS, i.e., No. of direct beneficiaries	M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Core Indicator
---	---	-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	----------------

This project expands access to products and services providing climate information in climate-sensitive sectors? If ticked, select as relevant, below.

Temperature? Rainfall? Drought? Crop pest or disease? Human disease vectors? Other? if Other, please describe

No. of people receiving access to climate information	M	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	F	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Total	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Core Indicator
---	---	-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------	-------	-------------------------------------	----------------

How is the climate information being conveyed to users?

Mobile phone apps? Community radio? Extension services? Television? Leaflets? Other?

<b>Output 1.1.4 Vulnerability ecosystems and natural resource assets strengthened in response to climate change impacts</b>		
Type of natural ecosystem	<input type="checkbox"/>	No., unit <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

**Outcome 1.2 Innovative financial instruments and investment models enabled or introduced to enhance climate resilience**

**Output 1.2.1 Innovation incubators and/or accelerators introduced or strengthened**

If applicable, please select  How many adaptation technologies were introduced?

No. of entrepreneurs supported

Please describe in the box below (i) how the incubator/accelerator fosters innovation, and (ii) its potential to enhance climate resilience.

**Compressed stabilised earth blocks (CSEBs):** technologies for the construction of CSEBs (including brick presses) replace existing brick making techniques that are more expensive, use more cement and cause beach degradation through increased beach sand demands. This technique assists in increasing coastal resilience to climate change by reducing beach degradation and providing cheaper brick construction alternatives.

**Integrated Farming Systems (IFS):** Compared with subsistence farming of monoculture crops, IFS increases the efficiency of farmlands by allowing multiple crops or livestock to be farmed together that are additionally designed to support each other. This increases income security by reducing dependence on one income stream, while climate-resilient techniques such as the construction of dykes reduces the vulnerability of the system to climate change hazards.

**Fisheries boat motors and preservation technologies:** Boat motors combined with life jackets increase the safety of traditional canoe boats to increasingly hazardous ocean storms, while fish preservation technologies such as fish drying and cold storage units reduce fish losses, thereby making the sector more sustainable and increasing income security.

**Output 1.2.2 Financial instruments to enhance climate resilience developed**

PPP models  Cooperatives  Microfinance ?  Risk insurance  Other

If Other, please describe:

**OBJECTIVE 2: MAINSTREAMING CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION AND RESILIENCE FOR SYSTEMIC IMPACT**

**Outcome 2.1 Strengthened cross-sectoral mechanisms to mainstream climate adaptation and resilience**

**Output 2.1.1 Development/sector policies and plans integrate adaptation considerations**

Total number of policies/plans that will mainstream climate resilience	<input type="checkbox"/>	<b>Core Indicator 3</b>
--	--------------------------	-------------------------

Enter number and name(s) of plans/policies supported in each relevant category [6]<sup>6</sup>

Regional

National	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sub-national	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Local	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sectoral <sup>[7]</sup>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Did the plan/policy result in adjustments to laws or legal frameworks, or in regulatory reform? Y o N ? <i>if yes, please discuss:</i>		
<input type="checkbox"/>		

---

[1] This is a GCF Board-approved indicator.

[2] Small Island Developing State.

[3] National Adaptation Plan.

[4] For CEO Endorsements for which the first-time submission is occurring in GEF-7.

[5] Guidance on direct beneficiaries to be provided.

[6] Some of the policy/plans may be unknown at CEO Endorsement Request stage.

[7] Overlap is likely across the Sectoral and other categories.

## Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
GEFSec 15Feb2022:

Cleared.

---

**GEFSec 13Dec2021:**

Importantly, please deepen the analysis of the climate change adaptation problem that this project is aiming to address. In doing so, please expand on the current and anticipated climate impacts of climate hazards on the well being and livelihood activities of the target populations. For example:

A) Please strive to provide at least two impact scenarios on temperature increase and precipitation change (we note only RCP 8.5 is currently provided for temperature and sea level rise, and no RCP scenarios are provided for rainfall).

B) Please strive to more directly link the differing climate scenarios to a range of anticipated impacts on the target populations that this project will strive to address.

**Agency Response**

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

A) Future climate change predictions for temperature, rainfall and sea level rise have been adjusted in the Project Document, CEO Endorsement and Annex 13a: Climate change risk analysis to include multiple impact scenarios. Additionally, the RCP scenarios have been replaced where possible with the most recent Shared Socioeconomic Pathway (SSP) scenarios in accordance with the IPCC sixth assessment report on climate change.

B) More direct linkages have been included in the Project Document (Sections II.3.2, II.4, III.1, III.2, III.3, III.4), CEO Endorsement (Section 2 climate change hazards, problem statement and proposed solution) and Annex 13a: Climate change risk analysis (Sections 2 and 3).

See below several examples of revised text from the CER documents:

CEO Endorsement page 16: As stated above, Liberia's coastal zone is negatively affected by several climate change impacts, including increases in: i) sea level rise (SLR) of 20?30 cm by 2040?2059 resulting from increasing temperatures; ii) the frequency of high-intensity coastal storms caused by strong winds blowing over the surface of the ocean; iii) the intensity of rainfall events, demonstrated by an increase in precipitation on the maximum rainfall day of 9?18% by 2041?2060; and iv) rainfall variability, with wet season rainfall increasing by 1?2% and dry season rainfall decreasing by 4?13% by 2040?2059.

CEO Endorsement page 27: The proposed solution ? presented as Outcome 1 ? to addressing the abovementioned constraints is to create an enabling environment for local-level coastal adaptation planning and management in all coastal counties. Specifically, this will involve increasing the capacity of county- and district-level planners to implement measures that reduce the frequency and intensity of climate



change-induced flooding (IP1 and IP2 in Figure 3) and erosion (IP4) that result from future SLR and increasingly intense rainfall events predicted under the SSP1-1.9, SSP2-4.5 and SSP5-8.5 scenarios.

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSec 12Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
**GEFSec 12Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSec 12Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 22March2022:**

Please respond to the final comment on co-finance above.

**GEFSEC 11March2022:**

Please continue to note the comments on co-finance above.

**GEFSec 15Feb2022:**

Please note the comments on co-finance above.

**GEFSec 12Dec2021:**

Please see the comment above on co-finance.

Agency Response

M.C. 6 April 2022

Please see the response to the Co-financing comment above.

M.C. 21 March 2022

This is well noted.

M.C. 9 Mar 2022

This has been addressed. Please see the response to the co-financing comment below.

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

Please see the response to the comment on co-financing above. Further elaboration on the current co-financing amounts and sources has been included in Section C of the CEO Endorsement.

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSec 12Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSec 12Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

M.C. 16/03.2020

A country scale map has been included in the revised PIF.

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?  
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 11March2022:**

Cleared.

**GEFSEC 15Feb2022:**

The addition of table 5 is well noted. Please detail the CSOs and NGOs engaged.

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Please provide detail on the stakeholders engaged during the project design phase, and how they were engaged.

Agency Response

M.C. 9 Mar 2022

Well noted. Table 9 in the Project Document and Table 5 in the CEO Endorsement Request have been updated to reflect the engagements with both NGOs and CSOs.

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

A list of stakeholders engaged with during the project design phase and engagement methods used for each consultation has been included as Table 5 in the CEO Endorsement.

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 15Feb2022:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

A) Please highlight and strengthen as relevant gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators, and expected results.

B) Please explain how the project expects to include gender responsive measures to address gender gaps or project gender equality and women empowerment.

Agency Response

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

A) A paragraph has been added to Section 3 of the CEO Endorsement that highlights the project outputs and indicators that specifically address gender-responsiveness. Additionally, gender-specific sub-activities, indicators and targets that form part of the project's Gender Action Plan have been included in the CEO Endorsement as Table 7.

B) A summary of the gender-responsive approaches that will be taken during project implementation is included in Section 3 of the CEO Endorsement as Table 6. Additionally, specific activities and measures to ensure and track gender-responsiveness as proposed in the Gender Action Plan have been included as Table 7.

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 15Feb2022:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Please strengthen the considerations and description in private sector section. In doing so, please keep in mind that small holder farmers, fishing boat owners, and micro, small and medium enterprises are important elements of the private sector.

Agency Response

M. C. 1 Feb 2022

The private sector section in the Project Document (Section IV.2) and CEO Endorsement (Section 4) have been strengthened, including the expected engagement with smallholder farmers, fisherfolk and MSMEs.

Example revised text in the CER documents is provided below:

Project Document page 81 (Section IV.2): Output 3.1 will also include engagement with community businesses and MSMEs in the fishery, agricultural and construction sectors to ensure that proposed interventions adequately address their specific adaptation needs and do not impact them adversely in any way. Under Output 4.1, private sector representatives under LIFSCAA and other private sector stakeholders will assist the MoCI by providing expertise for business training which will be directed towards empowering and upskilling individuals ? particularly women ? and MSMEs within the target communities. In addition, private sector representatives such as members of the LIFSCAA or businesses involved in fishing, agriculture and construction will be approached to assist in sourcing sustainable and cost-effective equipment as well as provide best practices for livelihood options under Output 4.2. This involvement will include, for example, assisting in piloting the compressed stabilised earth blocks (CSEB) value chains. Through Output 4.2, the uptake of additional and climate-resilient livelihoods by private sector stakeholders in communities in all coastal counties ? including MSMEs, farmers, fisherfolk and individuals involved in construction ? will be facilitated and encouraged. Finally, MFIs such as Access Bank and BRAC will be engaged to assist in developing and providing climate-responsive financial products for entrepreneurs in target coastal communities, including individuals involved in the development of livelihoods under Output 4.2.

#### Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**Coordination**

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 15Feb2021:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Please articulate here the complementarity and consistency with Liberia's National Adaptation Planning process, including the support for it from the GCF (see here: <https://www.greenclimate.fund/document/adaptation-planning-support-liberia-through-undp>)

Agency Response

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

Details of the complementarity between and consistency of the proposed project with Liberia's National Adaptation Planning process have been included in Section 7 of the CEO Endorsement and reflected in Section II.8 of the Project Document. The support provided by the GCF has also been highlighted in the revised text. The text added to the CEO Endorsement and Project Document is provided below.

Liberia began its National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process in 2015 with the development of a roadmap based on: i) an evaluation of the existing climate change adaptation and mitigation initiatives; ii) an assessment of the knowledge, capacity and implementation gaps; and iii) an assessment of the capacity development needs. With support from the GCF, the objective of the project "To advance the National Adaptation Plans (NAP) process for medium-term investment planning in climate-sensitive sectors and coastal areas in Liberia" was to strengthen institutional frameworks and coordination for the implementation of the NAP process, expand the knowledge base for scaling up adaptation, develop capacity for mainstreaming climate change adaptation into planning and budgeting processes and systems, and formulate financing mechanisms for scaling-up adaptation, including public, private, national and international mechanisms. The proposed project will contribute to: i) expanding the knowledge base for scaling up interventions by introducing innovative technologies to support coastal adaptation planning under Outcome 2; ii) mainstreaming climate change adaptation into planning, budgeting processes and systems by strengthening the institutional capacity to address the vulnerability of coastal ecosystems (Outcome 1).

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response  
**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

**Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response  
**Benefits**



**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**14April2022:**

**Technically cleared, pending any related policy related matters.**

**7April2022:**

A new budget table was included in Annex E, thus now we can provide some comments on the table:

(i) For some reason some numbers show twice. Also it seems to be that the figures in the columns don't add the correct number in the column 'Total?'. Please verify and amend as it looks like all the numbers in the components show duplication in the M&E column.

(ii) On the Other Operating Costs: Not sure if there is a typo in the below budget line as an estimated roundtrip for 12 USD would mean 6,468 round trip to achieve the 77,625 USD budgeted. If this is the case please disregard the comment.

(iii) On the proportionality of the PMC: the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$11,273,510 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$563,675 instead of \$200,00 (which is 1.7%). As the costs associated with the project management have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion.

(iv) Following up on the previous comment, the positions of: *Project Manager, Project Assistant* and *Chief Technical Advisor* have been charged across the components and the PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. As the co-financing portion allocated to PMC has to increase (see comment (iii) above), there may be room to cover the costs of the Chief technical advisor to co-financing.

**GEFSEC 29March2022:**

Budget table: the way the budget is presented does not enable assessing the reasonability of each budget line charged to the different sources (project's components ? M&E ? PMC). This presentation is aligned with UNDP's budget structure, but not with GEF budget's structure as included in Guidelines. Please present the budget in a comprehensive manner with details using the GEF template, so a reader (including Council Members, who will review the project) can understand and assess accordingly. For example, the following line item repeats several times with budget allocation to component 1, 2, 3, 4 and PMC:

**GEFSEC 15Feb2022:**

Please provide further information on the \$330,000 for Geomat materials needed to prevent erosion of the revetments (e.g. how many and what the materials are).

To the extent possible, please provide a breakdown of the IFS (\$3000), fisheries (\$2079) and CSEB (\$2,400) costs per household.

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Regarding the budget in Annex E:

A) Please provide further breakdown on costs of livelihood options. In doing so, please indicate the unit cost of machinery, including boat motors, nets, etc. Please also indicate in this annex where information is located in this CER on how best available practice will be used in selecting boat motors, fishing equipment, geomats, etc., to minimize environmental and climate impacts.

B) Please provide further breakdown on costs and number of days needed for the equipment to set up the mini quarry.

Agency Response

M.C. 11 April 2022

i) It appears that the online platform version of the table displayed with some misalignment of the columns, resulting in values within the totals column displaying in the M&E column. This will be checked during resubmission. In the meantime, we provide the Excel file from which the table is derived for ease of verification.

ii) The values presented are correct and assume four trucks will each be contributing to the total number of round trips over a period of a year.

iii) This is well noted. The amount of co-financing that contributes to PMC costs has been increased as requested.

iv) The budget has been adjusted and both GEF funds and co-financing are contributing to the PMC costs associated with execution functions of Project Staff.

M.C. 6 April 2022

The comment and concern are well noted. The budget has now been presented in the correct format corresponding to the GEF structure, providing details that will inform the different readers.

M.C. 9 Mar 2022

Additional details on the material and cost breakdown for the geo textile have been added to budget note 22 in Annex 1: Total Budget and Work Plan and Section IX of the Project Document:

Thick woven needle punched geo textile to prevent erosion of the revetments (USD300,000). The cost is for USD10,000 per 6X100 m roll. Since the 1,500 m of revetment will require a geomat width of 12 m, the total geo textile length is doubled to a total length of 3,000 m.

Further details on the breakdown for the livelihood options have been added to budget note 37 in Annex 1: Total Budget and Work Plan and Section IX of the Project Document:

Equipment for identified livelihood options, including for:

- IFS, consisting of cassava cuttings (USD15), fishponds (USD900), fishing nets (USD15), African catfish fingerlings (USD300), Nile tilapia fingerlings (USD177), lime (USD63), poultry house (USD59), feeding trough (USD500), water trough (USD221), chicks (USD100), feed (USD500) and vaccines (USD150);
- fisheries, consisting of boat motors (USD2,846), fuel tanks (USD115), life jackets (USD216), sustainable fishing nets (USD256) and solar-powered refrigeration units (USD2730); and
- CSEBs, consisting of production site costs (USD6,472), diameter wire mesh (USD40), wheelbarrows (USD100) and manual Auram Press (USD2,988).

IFS costs include USD3,000 per household for 204 households (USD612,000); fisheries costs include US\$2,079 per household for 202 households (USD6,163 shared across 4 households for a total of USD420,100); and CSEBs costs include US\$2,400 per

household for 72 households (USD9,600 shared across 4 households for a total of USD172,800) (Activity 4.2.4).

Please see the Livelihood Options Cost Sheet in Annex 1 for further details. Information on best available practices for the selection of equipment is provided in Section IV.1 of the Prodoc under the description for Output 4.2.

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

A) Further breakdowns of livelihood option equipment costs have been provided in Annex 1: Total Budget and Workplan as a separate sheet. Additional information has also been added to budget note 37. Reference has been made in Annex 1: Total Budget and Workplan on where to find information on equipment selection, which has been included in the descriptions for Output 3.2 and 4.2 under Section IV.1 of the Project Document.

B) Further breakdowns of the equipment costs for setting up the mini-quarry and revetments have been provided as a separate sheet in Annex 1: Total Budget and Workplan. Additionally, more information has been added to budget notes 22 and 23.

#### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Yes

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**GEFSEC 13April2022:**

Technically cleared pending any remaining comments on policy related matters.

**GEFSEC 7April2022:**

Please address the remaining comments.

**GEFSEC 29March2022:**

Please address the remaining comments.

**GEFSEC 22March2022:**

Please address the remaining comment on co-finance.

**GEFSEC 11March2022:**

Please address the remaining comments.

**GEFSEC 22Feb2022:**

Please address the remaining comments.

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Please address the comments.

Agency Response

M.C. 11 April 2022

The additional remaining comments have been addressed.

M.C. 06 April 2022

The remaining comments have been addressed. Thank you.

M.C. 21 Mar 2022

Remaining comments have now been addressed as in the above.

M.C. 9 Mar 2022

Remaining comments have now been addressed as in the above.

M.C. 1 Feb 2022

Thank you for the comments provided. These have been addressed within the CEO ER and Prodoc package of documents, and specific responses to comments included in this review document.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 15Feb2022:**

Cleared

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Please clarify how each of the following Council comments have been fully addressed, and/or make revisions to the CER as needed to address them:

A) Theory of change: Germany appreciates that the proposal builds on the climate risk and vulnerability studies undertaken in the country's ongoing NAP process. Still, the final project document requires more detailed information on (i) the project-relevant outcomes of the climate risk and vulnerability studies, (ii) chosen adaptation measures, as well as (iii) how exactly these measures will contribute to adaptation. Germany suggests reviewing the theory of change at outcome and output level and link it to more specific indicators. This applies particularly to components 3 and 4.

B) Co-financing: Germany welcomes the high volume of co-financing. Among others, the proposal refers to indicative co-financing from the World Bank (USD 15 million) and USAID (USD 28 million). Germany requests to specify how and to which project outcomes and outputs this co-financing would contribute. The same is true for government co-financing. The proposal indicates Government co-financing of USD 10 million in all coastal counties rather than specifying the amount for Sinoe county only and attributing it to project activities. As the national budget 2019/2020 assigns USD 11 million to the Energy & Environment Sector, Germany would appreciate further elaboration on the numbers.

C) Synergies with other development efforts: Germany appreciates the inclusion of other relevant development activities. Germany is funding a scholarship for a master's in water science and engineering at the University at the IHE Delft Institute for Water Education for a project manager of the Ministry of Public Works and suggests using this developed capacity should for the project. In addition, Germany is supporting private sector activities in infrastructure development. Please explore synergies regarding transparent procurement, the implementation of construction contracts and capacity development for low-cost construction

D) Private sector: Germany appreciates the inclusion of the private sector. Compressed Earth Block Stabilisation (CSEB) technology is proposed as key private sector involvement. However, Sinoe has only 100.000 inhabitants; there might be limited demand and the final project proposal should develop additional business ideas to boost the private sector.

E) Clearly state what sea or river protection techniques or structures will be deployed.

F) Clearly customize the concept to the actual risks and hazards to be addressed. Most of the references are 10+ years old and much of that information is now outdated including settlements and population density. The proposal does not reference anything related to

anticipation of climate-related shocks and planning for them such as floods early warning, storms, sea wave surges etc.

G) Review the expected co-financing amount from USAID. The USAID-funded West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change (WABiCC) project provides support for transboundary protected areas in Liberia (e.g. Gola Rainforest National Park) and does not support any coastal activities in Liberia. Additionally, WABiCC is scheduled to end in 2020. Therefore, there should be no expectations of \$28 million in co-financing from WABiCC.

## Agency Response

M.C 1 Feb 2022

The responses to project review under Annex B of the CEO Endorsement have been modified to respond to the individual review comments more clearly and directly. The inserted responses to reviewers are provided below.

A) More reference to the NAP climate risk and vulnerability studies has been made throughout the CER. Indeed, recommendations made from these studies have actively informed the type and placement of proposed adaptation options in Sinoe County. Flooding risk and vulnerability maps from these studies have also assisted in informing the selection of target sites for hybrid interventions. Selected adaptation measures include two revetments in the communities of Downtown-Mississippi and Sebeh in Greenville, groynes along beach areas around Downtown-Mississippi and the restoration and conservation of mangroves and coastal forest in Greenville, Tournata, Bafu Bay, Pungbor and Nanakru. These measures have been selected based on the NAP climate risk and vulnerability studies in combination with site visits and consultations and will be further elaborated on and validated through Output 3.1. Elaboration on how these adaptation options will contribute to adaptation has been presented in the Project Document, CEO Endorsement and Annex 13d: Adaptation Options Report. Specific indicators, including the number of hectares restored, area in hectares protected from flooding and erosion and gender-disaggregated number of beneficiaries have been included in the Project Results Framework and LDCF Core Indicator sheets.

B) Details have also been added on the specific elements of the project that this co-financing contributes to. The GoL co-financing has been adjusted from USD10 million to USD1.7 million, which will contribute towards acquiring rocks for the construction of the revetments and groynes within Greenville under Output 3.2 as well as project management and procurement costs.

C) The Ministry of Public Works (MoPW) has been identified as an important partner to assist the Ministry of Mines and Energy (MME) in the implementation of adaptation options under Output 3.2. The German-funded water science and engineering capacity within the MoPW is welcome and will be utilised during project implementation. The Responsible Party for the construction of the hard infrastructure adaptation options is the MME, which has experience in implementing similar construction projects across

Liberia. Efforts will be made to procure appropriate construction contracts that utilise low-cost approaches and use local labour that benefits the surrounding communities.

D) Livelihood opportunities will be implemented in all coastal counties, meaning that demand for CBESs will be larger than that of Sinoe County alone. The demand potential for the construction of CSEBs will be investigated further and confirmed in the early stages of project implementation to ensure there is a local demand for this product, as some counties are more open to the technology than others. Where CSEBs are not viable, other alternative livelihood and value chain options will be implemented, including integrated farming systems and the support of climate-resilient fishing

E) Selected adaptation measures include two revetments in the communities of Downtown-Mississippi and Sebeh in Greenville, groynes along beach areas around Downtown-Mississippi and the restoration and conservation of mangroves and coastal forest in Greenville, Tournata, Bafu Bay, Pungbor and Nanakru. These measures will be further elaborated on and validated through Output 3.1 during project implementation.

F) Supporting information ? specifically relating to baseline drivers and current and future climate change risk ? has been substantially expanded in the Project Document and accompanying annexes. Efforts have been made to update information provided in the PIF with the most up-to-date values and sources available. In addition, a detailed problem statement, solution tree and theory of change have been incorporated into the Project Document, including diagrams for each

G) The originally identified co-financing from the World Bank and USAID have been omitted as the World Bank was unable to commit to co-financing while the USAID project has now ended. These have been replaced by commitments of USD1.5 million from the EPA through the project ?Enhancing Climate Information systems for Resilient Development in Liberia? and USD803,000 from Conservation International through the project ?Conservation and Sustainable Use of Liberia?s Coastal Natural Capital?. Co-financing from these sources will support Outputs 2.1 and 3.2, respectively.

#### STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments



Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**13April2022:**

**Cleared**

**7April2022:**

Please clarify if the work of the first activity (below) was prepared by who (consultant? Agency staff? Governmental Staff?). Please remove the green color as it makes difficult the reading.

**GEFSEC 29March2022:**

The PPG report doesn't give detailed break-down by expenditure category for PPG as requested ? please amend.

Agency Response

**M.C. 11 April 2022**

Details on who undertook the work have been provided. The green highlights have been removed as requested. They were initially included to indicate the areas with changes.

M.C. 06 April 2022

A detailed breakdown has now been provided in the PPG report.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Cleared

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC 13April2022:**

**Technically cleared pending any remaining comments on policy related matters.**

**GEFSEC 7April2022:**

Please address the remaining comments

**GEFSEC 29March2022:**

Please address the remaining comments.

**GEFSEC 22March2022**

Technically cleared, pending any further comments on policy matters and final indication by UNDP increase on co-finance.

**GEFSEC 11March2022:**

Not yet, pending addressing remaining comments.

**GEFSEC 22Feb2022:**

Not yet, pending addressing remaining comments.

**GEFSEC 13Dec2021:**

Not yet. Please address comments.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>12/14/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/15/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/11/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/22/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/29/2022</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**