GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9923**		
Country/Region:	**Liberia**		
Project Title:	**Building and Strengthening Liberia's National Capacity to Implement the Transparency Elements of the Paris Climate Agreement**		
GEF Agency:	**CI**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CBIT-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,344,495**
Co-financing:	**$1,500,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,844,495**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Dustin Schinn**	Agency Contact Person:	**Orissa Samaroo**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	DS, September 26, 2017: Yes, project aligns with CBIT objectives.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS, September 26, 2017: Partly unclear. While the project aligns with the country's INDC, however, please also provide information on how the proposed capacity building support would target already identified capacity	Additional text to the INDC component added to the table in Para 43. A new Para 6 has been included to specifically describe capacity needs identified in the National Communication.

[1] 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
		needs as per the National Communication. Please provide a description of the capacity needs identified in the National Communication, if any, and the INDC, along with an overview of the approach which this project would take to address these needs. DS, November 2, 2017: Comment cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	DS, September 26, 2017: Unclear. While the proposed project acknowledges that sustainability considerations will be integral to the project design through multi-stakeholder consultations and participation, some questions remain. In particular, how will the reliance on consultants for data compilation and analysis be addressed and reduced? How will GHG monitoring be institutionalized in a way that protocols for instance for GHG monitoring will be in place and duly followed even if there is staff turnover in national government authorities? DS, November 2, 2017: Comment cleared.	The project will not rely solely on consultants. However, the project will ensure institutional consolidation of methodologies and protocols for GHG data collection that are uniform and used by all sectors for the purposes of transparency. These changes have been reflected in Para 38.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	DS, September 26, 2017: Partly unclear. Please see comment	Comment addressed in table in Section 5: Coordination. The table was updated to

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		under Question 2 above. In addition, please explain whether any other support, bilateral or multilateral, for capacity building for enhanced climate transparency, is already ongoing or planned in the country. If so, please provide an explanation how the different support streams will interact and complement each other. DS, November 2, 2017: Comment cleared for PIF stage, however, detailed information on coordination with other initiatives, including in particular how individual CBIT project activities will complement other initiatives such as for instance the initiative funded by the Coalition for Rainforest Nations, is considered essential. This is considered a key requirement for the implementation phase, given that several initiatives seem to focus on for instance the AFOLU sector and the strengthening of national capacity related to GHG inventories.	provide details on linkages with ongoing national level programs (the Liberia Forest Sector Project) and projects which identified capacity building needs to enhance climate transparency.
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	DS, September 26, 2017: Partly unclear. While the overall approach is clear and sounds, some questions remain: (1) The CBIT support needs to address capacity constraints and needs that are identified by the country	(1) Outcome 2.2 has been deleted. (2) Components 1 and 3 have been adjusted to show the distinction between the transparency system VS the platform to share data. This is reflected in Para 14 and 29 and 30.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		itself. It is questionable why the project currently proposed to enhance "Liberia's commitment to nature based solutions in its NDC" (Outcome 2.2). If there is a commitment by the government to pursue nature based solutions, the capacity needs to enhance transparency in this regard can be supported by CBIT, however, the CBIT support is not intended to prescribe any government commitments. CBIT support needs to be country-driven. Please clarify and if necessary adjust the text, as appropriate. (2) How is Component 3 adding value to Component 1? It seems as if data sharing systems to inform policy making (Component 3) is an important aspect of CBIT, but already part of Component 1. In order to maximize the efficacy of CBIT support, any potential duplication should be avoided. For instance, Output 1.2.1 already seeks to established an online system for collecting and managing all NDC information and data. Please align the two components in a way that avoids overlap and, as appropriate, reduce the amount of resources being sought for these two components.	CI-GEF Agency, Nov 9, 2017 Inconsistencies in funding amounts have been rectified.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		DS, November 2, 2017: Previous comments are cleared, however, the individual components in Table B including project management cost now add up to $1,344,315, which is inconsistent with the total stated at $1,344,495. Please clarify and ensure coherence. DS, November 14, 2017: Comment cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, September 26, 2017: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	DS, September 26, 2017: This project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	DS, September 26, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments under Questions 2, 3, 4 and 5 and resubmit revised PIF. Please also note	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		that the Project Management Cost needs to be reduced below 10 per cent of the subtotal. DS, November 2, 2017: Not yet. Please address remaining comment under Question 5 and ensure coherence of figures. DS, November 14, 2017: All comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO clearance and PPG.	
Review Date	Review	September 26, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 02, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 14, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] 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.