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

GEF ID:	**5902**		
Country/Region:	**Sierra Leone**		
Project Title:	**Adapting to Climate Change Induced Coastal Risks Management in Sierra Leone**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5178 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$200,000**	Project Grant:	**$9,975,000**
Co-financing:	**$31,800,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$42,175,000**
PIF Approval:	**October 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**December 02, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Dustin Schinn**	Agency Contact Person:	**Clotilde Goeman**

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**?	YES. Sierra Leone is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	DS, July 8, 2017: Yes, unchanged.
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	YES. A Letter of Endorsement, signed by the Operational Focal Point and dated June 19, 2014, has been attached to the submission.	DS, July 8, 2017: Yes, unchanged.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of	YES. The proposed grant ($11.14	DS, July 8, 2017:

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access	million, including PPG and fees) is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	Yes, unchanged.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	DS, July 8, 2017: Yes. Project aligns with CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 objectives.
	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?	YES. The proposed project would address several of Sierra Leone's NAPA priorities, particularly those associated with hydro-meteorological and climate information services, coastal-zone management and sea-level observation. The project is also aligned with Sierra Leone's National Environmental Policy, the National Land Policy and Land Commission Act, as well as the upcoming National Disaster Risk Management Policy.	DS, July 8, 2017: Unchanged. However, please also clarify whether the project helps implement the country's first NDC under the Paris Agreement. DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared.
	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?	NOT CLEAR. The PIF provides a clear and concise description of the baseline situation with respect to the projected impacts of climate change on Sierra Leone's coastline, and some of the key barriers to systematically addressing	DS, July 8, 2017: Unclear. While the other LDCF-funded projects, that are listed as baseline initiatives, clearly show potential for synergies and should be closely coordinated with the proposed project,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		coastal risks. In contrast, while the PIF briefly mentions two UNDP projects, it is not clear what baseline investments or initiatives are planned and underway in the coastal areas that the proposed project would target, how these would affect the vulnerability of coastal assets and livelihoods, and how these relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C of the PIF. Moreover, with respect to Component 1, it is not clear what hydro-meteorological and oceanographic monitoring equipment and capacities are currently in place and how such capacities are expected to evolve under the baseline scenario, given any relevant baseline investments. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (i) what baseline investments or activities are planned and underway in targeted coastal areas and how these would affect the vulnerability of coastal assets and livelihoods; (ii) what hydro-meteorological and oceanographic monitoring equipment and capacities are currently in place and how such capacities are expected to evolve under the baseline scenario; and (iii) how relevant baseline investment and initiatives relate to the indicative sources and amounts of co-financing provided in Table C of the PIF. 08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The revised	there were several other baseline initiatives listed in the PIF. Please clarify why the baseline initiatives in particular relating to infrastructure, from the government infrastructure fund, and from other multilateral entities (European Commission, AfDB, IDB, Kuwait Fund, Saudi Fund, and OFID) has not been realized at CEO Endorsement stage. Please further describe in detail how the proposed project would coordinate with, or be embedded in, the West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change project (USAID, ECOWAS etc), and whether the coordination process has been discussed already during PPG phase as this is seen as fundamental for the effective implementation of this initiative, utilize synergies and avoid any potential overlap. DS, September 6, 2017: The agency provided as a response that: (i) "Discussion have been initiated with the different infrastructure-related projects and a strong coordination will be sought during the implementation of the LDCF project. However, due to the Ebola outbreak, most of these projects have experienced significant delays and did not show relevant progresses yet. Key stakeholders for these projects will be invited to the initiation workshop to identify the potential for collaboration and possible additional co-financing are under discussion."

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		PIF provides further information regarding the baseline scenario and associated baseline investments, particularly as these relate to Component 1. With respect to Component 3, however, the baseline investments mentioned as part of the Agenda for Prosperity remain unclear. The PIF does not indicate what areas would benefit from coastal adaptation works, or how those areas would be identified, and it remains unclear what baseline investments and assets would be enhanced through these works. In addition, the PIF could describe how the investments under the Agenda for Prosperity relate to the indicative amount of co-financing provided in Table C. $20 million is cited, but it appears to represent a broader investment program rather than co-financing specifically associated with the proposed LDCF grant. Moreover, the Agenda for Prosperity would be financed through multiple sources, whereas only the national government and UNDP are found among the sources of co-financing in Table C. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the previous recommendations (i) and (iii). 11/04/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies the baseline investments planned	(ii) "We acknowledge that coordination is key for increasing the chances of success for both WaBICC and the GEF-funded project. Representatives of the WaBICC project were engaged during the PPG phase, and will be invited as observers during PSC meetings to enhance coordination. The project furthermore aims to incorporate results from analyses done as part of the WaBICC, including GIS-based coastal assessments. A sentence was added under the table in the section '2.4.1. Partnerships' and in Annex 2 'Stakeholder consultations'." However, please explain and reference these developments and challenges in the CEO Endorsement Request itself, in the section on baseline initiatives. It is technically unfeasible to use any other LDCF-financed projects as a baseline project, given the principle of additionality. It therefore needs to be clear what the baseline is (in this case, national development plan funding, and potentially WaBICC) and how the proposed LDCF grant will build on these baseline investments. DS, October 23, 2017: Comments cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and underway that would likely be enhanced by the proposed project. The re-submission also provides further details on the different sources of indicative co-financing.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8. The Project Framework, while generally sound, seems to lack an outcome corresponding to Output 3.3. The description of Component 3 also fails to capture the proposed soft and hard adaptation works that would be carried out under this output. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, (i) please adjust the project framework accordingly, as appropriate; and (ii) ensure that the description of Component 3 as well as relevant outcomes capture the investments proposed under Output 3.3. 08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8. 11/04/2014 -- YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently detailed.	DS, July 8, 2017: Partly unclear. While the project framework overall is clear and sound, some issues remain: (1) Please clarify how outputs 1.2 and 1.4 relate to each other, and why Output 1.4 is needed in light of the institutional strengthening that is already foreseen to be supported under Output 1.2. (2) Please clarify why activities in the project document are labeled as "indicative" given the PPG phase has provided resources and time to identify which activities are feasible, effective and desired. Please also include the number/quantity of envisaged equipment to be procured/installed for each output, and in particular for investment-related outputs. For technical assistance-related outputs, please provide an estimate of the expected number of beneficiaries or other metrics such as number of sub-national or national plans/policies strengthened etc. (3) What is the envisaged investment for Output 3.5 on Early Warning Systems (EWS)? Please add further information in Table B on the type of EWS proposed under this Output, including quantity and type of equipment to be procured

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			etc; please also clarify how this will interlink with the monitoring systems to be installed under Component 1. (4) Please provide further information on what specific "adaptation strategies for alternative livelihoods" are envisaged under Output 3.2 in Table B. (5) In regard to Output 3.3, which was added after PIF approval, please consider whether additional methods other than Compressed Stabilized Earth Block (CSEB) could be helpful in making good use of local resources and recycle materials that could be used for new buildings. Perhaps some other methods/concepts could be used to complement and diversify the CSEB methodology. DS, September 9, 2017: All of the previously provided comments cleared, however, please confirm that at least 50-60% of LDCF grant resources will be spent on actual, concrete investments on the ground as opposed to capacity building/technical assistance. Some of the components, such as for instance Component 3, seem to mostly comprise capacity-building related outputs, yet are categorized as "investment". Please enhance clarity to this effect in Table B of the CEO Endorsement Request.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			DS, October 23, 2017: Comments cleared.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. The PIF provides a concise description of the proposed, additional adaptation measures that the project would carry out. In absence of further clarity regarding relevant baseline investments and initiatives, however, the additional reasoning cannot be adequately assessed at this time. With respect to targeting, it is not clear whether the emergency and preparedness plans would be developed across the entire 400 km coastline; and whether all tangible coastal protection measures would target the Western Area Peninsula and, if so, on what basis this area has been prioritized. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please (i) revisit the additional reasoning for components 1 through 3; and (ii) clarify the targeting principles applied under components 2 and 3. 08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. The revised PIF provides a clearer additional reasoning. The Agency, in its response to GEFSEC comments, notes that support towards sand miner youth associations would target the Western Area Peninsula, but it does not clarify whether this is the case for the proposed soft and hard coastal	DS, July 8, 2017: Partly unclear. Please provide a description of the methodology and reasoning used to calculate the number of hectares of globally significant biodiversity maintained in Table E, or remove/adjust the estimated number of hectares as appropriate. The tracking tool regarding adaptation benefits will be assessed after comments under Question 7 have been integrated. DS, September 6, 2017: Response insufficient. Please note that restoring/rehabilitating degraded mangrove areas per se is not automatically considered globally significant biodiversity. Please remove the estimated figure from Table E. DS, October 23, 2017: Comment cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		adaptation works. The targeting of Component 2 also remains unclear. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the previous recommendations (i) and (iii). 11/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.	
	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?		DS, July 8, 2017: Please reference the GEF Gender Equality Action Plan. DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	YES. Public participation has been adequately described for this stage of project development. The proposed project would directly engage women and youth groups under Component 3.	DS, July 8, 2017: Yes.
	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)	YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described for this stage of project development.	DS, July 8, 2017: Partly unclear. Please add the risks of climate change in the matrix on project risks under A.5, and provide an explanation of the envisaged risk mitigation measures. DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared.
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	NOT CLEAR. Given that the proposed project would carry out additional investments in hydro-meteorological and oceanographic monitoring, it would seem important to understand more clearly to what extent it would complement and build on the investments carried out	DS, July 8, 2017: Partly unclear. Please refer to question 6 above. DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		under the ongoing LDCF-financed project on climate information services. In addition, if relevant, it would be helpful if the PIF could clarify briefly how the project --Component 2 in particular -- relates to activities planned or carried out in support of Sierra Leone's NAP process. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify (i) to what extent the proposed project would complement and build on the investments carried out under ongoing the LDCF-financed project on climate information services; and, if relevant, (ii) how the project relates to activities planned or carried out in support of Sierra Leone's NAP process. 08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The revised PIF clarifies how the project relates to activities planned or carried out in support of Sierra Leone's NAP process. The PIF also describes other LDCF-investments in climate information services, but it does not clarify how coordination and complementarity with these investments would be sought through the proposed project. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the previous recommendation (i). 11/04/2014 -- YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives has been adequately clarified in the revised PIF.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • 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.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. In absence of a clear baseline scenario and additional reasoning, the project's innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please strengthen, if necessary, the description of the project's innovative aspects as well as its potential for sustainability and scaling up. 08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. 11/04/2014 -- YES. The proposed project would apply the best available knowledge of the adverse effects of climate change on Sierra Leone's coastal zones to design and implement tangible, locally appropriate adaptation measures to reduce the vulnerability of coastal populations, livelihoods and assets. By combining hard and soft adaptation measures with awareness campaigns, enhanced planning and policies, and continuous access to improved climate information; the proposed project also outlines a credible strategy to ensure sustainability, and to pave the way for scaling up.	DS, July 8, 2017: Cleared.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		DS, July 8, 2017: Partly unclear. Please refer to Question 17 below.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared.
	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?		DS, July 8, 2017: Yes.
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?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 7 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary. 08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above. 11/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above.	DS, July 8, 2017: Partly unclear. Please refer to Question 17 below. DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared.
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under Section 6, please adjust the indicative sources, types and amounts of co-financing accordingly in Table C, and ensure that these are consistently provided across the PIF. 08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.	DS, July 8, 2017: Unclear. Please clarify (1) why the majority of co-financing, which was listed and planned with as grant financing, has been transformed into in-kind co-financing; (2) Please further describe the impacts this change may have on the project design, including the ability of the project to deliver on its objectives, as well as its embeddedness in national processes and initiatives. (3) Please list the two secured sources of co-financing from the national

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		11/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 above.	government individually/as separate items, in Table C. DS, September 6, 2017: Partly unclear. While the co-financing has been clarified by the agency, and is now listed as grant co-financing in Table C of the CEO Endorsement Request and in the project document, the letter confirming co-financing from the government lists in-kind co-financing only. Would it be possible to align the letter of support by the government with what is listed in Table C? DS, October 23, 2017: Comment cleared.
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	YES. At $475,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.	DS, July 8, 2017: Yes, unchanged.
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	YES. A PPG of $200,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects up to $10 million.	DS, July 8, 2017: Unclear. The CEO Endorsement Request includes an overview of the status of budgeted PPG amount including amount spent to date and amount committed, however, the level of details is insufficient. Please provide further detail on the specific activities financed under the PPG. DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared.
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	N/A

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		DS, July 8, 2017: Unclear. Please attach tracking tool as Excel file. DS, September 6, 2017: Comment cleared. Excel file with tracking tool and sound and clear targets for relevant indicators has been provided.
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		DS, July 8, 2017: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		DS, July 8, 2017: Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 17. 08/07/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 12. 11/04/2014 -- YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for clearance/approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		DS, July 8, 2017: Not yet. Please address and incorporate

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Approval			comments under Question 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19 and 21 and submit revised CEO Endorsement Request. DS, September 6, 2017: Not yet. Please address and incorporate remaining comments under Question 6, 7, 8 and 17 and submit revised CEO Endorsement Request. DS, October 23, 2017: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.
	First review*	July 09, 2014	July 08, 2017
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 07, 2014	September 06, 2017
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 04, 2014	October 23, 2017

* **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.**