



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	5712		
Country/Region:	Liberia		
Project Title:	Improve Sustainability of Mangrove Forests and Coastal Mangrove Areas in Liberia through Protection, Planning and Livelihood Creation- as a Building Block Towards Liberia's Marine and Coastal Protected Areas		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,000	Project Grant:	\$963,994
Co-financing:	\$3,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,554,994
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	03/07/2014: Yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	03/07/2014: Yes, in a letter dated Feb. 18, 2014.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	03/07/2014: No, the proposed grant, including the Agency fees, exceeds the resources available from STAR allocation. The remaining STAR allocation for Liberia is \$ 1,149,944 to date. Please adjust accordingly the	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>proposed grant amount.</p> <p>03/25/2014:No, the remaining STAR allocation for Liberia is \$ 1,149,944 to date and not \$1,149,994. Please adjust accordingly the proposed grant amount.</p> <p>03/28/2014: Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>03/07/2014: Please see comment in the above cell. Liberia total allocation is less than \$7million, therefore Liberia can use the flexibility option to allocate its allocation in any or all of the three focal areas, without having to respect the respective proportions. The project proposal being significantly focused on BD objectives, therefore we encourage you to consider using this flexibility option to develop a BD project. If the flexibility option is retained, please update Table A accordingly.</p> <p>03/25/2014: Cleared.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	03/07/2014: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	03/07/2014: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	03/07/2014: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 	03/07/2014: N/A	
<p>Strategic Alignment</p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help</i></p>	<p>03/07/2014: The project is well aligned with the results framework and strategic objectives of BD-1 and BD-2. The project's outcomes respond well to LD-3 objective, however, as mentioned in Item 3, considering to the project's focus on biodiversity conservation, the limited budget of the project; it is suggested to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><i>achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>develop a BD stand-alone project. SMART indicators have been identified, baseline and targets will be defined for CEO approval. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>03/07/2014: Yes, the project is consistent with the recipient country's national strategies, including NBSAP, Liberia's PA Network Strategy. Cleared.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>03/07/2014: The baseline is well developed, including a comprehensive description of biodiversity loss drivers and sound assumptions. However, please provide further details on on-going initiatives implemented by the government/national agencies, NGOs, multi and bi-lateral partners. Please, also, further develop on CI on-going and past experiences which will contribute to the project success (e.g initiative in Barcoline, Community Agreement outcomes in other countries). Please, provide an insight of the investment/ funding for each of these major initiatives. This information will help to demonstrate the incremental value of the project. Beside the associated baseline projects mentioned, the project should build on LDCF projects; such as ID3885: Enhancing resilience of vulnerable coastal area to climate change risks, ID4950: Strengthening Liberia's capability to provide climate information and services to enhance climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		03/25/2014: Cleared.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>03/07/2014: Components, outcomes, and outputs are clear and well detailed.</p> <p>Table B: Please remove information regarding the timeline and output delivery. With PPG findings, some of the expected outcomes may change; therefore it is recommended to mention that outcomes/targets will be confirmed based on PPG result. Please, simplify the formulation of the outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Outcome 1.1 / output 1.1.1 and outcome 1.2/1.2.1 are similar; please re-formulate them. A option could be as follow: outcome 1.1: 15% of priority mangrove areas have been identified, delineated, and management plan to safeguard them completed; Output 1.1.1: A multi-stakeholder participatory process has been established to identified and delineate national protected area.</p> <p>Outcome 1.2: 5% of priority mangrove forest is safeguard through community based conservation agreements or other legal mechanisms; output 1.2.1: A multi-stakeholder and community process is established to identify and protect priority mangrove areas.</p> <p>Component 2: para A.1.4.10: as mentioned in Item 6, please further explain what the CA are, what are the outcomes in other countries where CI have developed them. para A.1.4.11, para A.1.4.13, para A.1.4.14: the sustainability of the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>livelihood activities developed beyond the project's life is essential. Therefore, could you please further develop how the project will secure activities' sustainability, and how the potential financial mechanism will be helpful.</p> <p>para A.1.5.4:Please confirm that the GEF project grant will not be used for funding coordination with other GEF projects.</p> <p>03/25/2014: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>03/07/2014: Yes, the global environmental benefit of the project is clear. The project aims to conserve and sustainably use at least 35% of the globally important mangrove forests. As mentioned in Item6, the incremental reasoning should be further developed to better demonstrate how the project will built on the exsiting national and local initiatives.</p> <p>03/25/2014: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>03/07/2014: Yes, the role of public participation, including CSOs, is relevant. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	03/07/2014: yes, the project takes into account the potential major risks. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	03/07/2014: Yes, the project is consistent and properly coordinated with other relevant initiatives. However, please confirm that the project will coordinate with regional and international mangrove networks. 03/25/2014: Cleared.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	03/07/2014: The project aims to conserve mangrove forests through extensive community involvement, local governments capacity building, and development of integrated land-use planning. The project will ensure financial sustainability of both PA and conservation agreements by ensuring their inclusion in a sustainable financing mechanism currently being developed by the government and the Global Conservation Fund. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	03/07/2014: yes, the GEF funding and co-financing indicated in Table B are appropriate. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	03/07/2014: The co-financing ratio is about 1:4; which is fine. Could you please confirm that CI cash contribution of \$1million will directly target the project's PA and CA? The co-financing from the private sector is welcomed. 03/25/2014: Please update Table C. Only indicative co-financing have to be listed, please remove the fufth line called "others". In the Column "type of cofinancing" indicate if it is either cash or in-kind. 03/26/2014: Cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	03/07/2014: The PMC is about 5.2% which is fine. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the	03/07/2014: Yes, a PPG is requested and the amount doesn't deviate from the norm. Cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	03/07/2014: N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	03/07/2014: The PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised in the above items. 03/25/2014: The PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised in Items 3 and 17. 03/27/2014: The project proposal is technically cleared and recommended for CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 07, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 25, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2014	

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**