



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 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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$200,000	Project Grant:	\$9,975,000
Co-financing:	\$30,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$40,175,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mame Diop

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.	
	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.	
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	

*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)
	equitable access	million, including PPG and fees) is available from the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>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).</i></p>	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards strategic objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2.	
	<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>	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.	
	<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>	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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>coastal risks.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. The revised</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>PIF provides further information regarding the baseline scenario and associated baseline investments, particularly as these relate to Component 1.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the previous recommendations (i) and (iii).</p> <p>11/04/2014 -- YES. The revised PIF clarifies the baseline investments planned</p>	

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?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8.</p> <p>11/04/2014 -- YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently detailed.</p>	
	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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>additional reasoning cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 adaptation works. The targeting of Component 2 also remains unclear.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the previous recommendations (i) and (iii).</p> <p>11/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>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.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks and appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described for this stage of project development.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>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 under the ongoing LDCF-financed project on climate information services.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the previous recommendation (i).</p> <p>11/04/2014 -- YES. Coordination and coherence with other relevant initiatives has been adequately clarified in the revised PIF.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 	<p>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.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under sections 6 and 8, please strengthen, if</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>necessary, the description of the project's innovative aspects as well as its potential for sustainability and scaling up.</p> <p>08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>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.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	and outputs?	<p>addressing the recommendations under sections 6, 7 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above.</p> <p>11/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6, 7 and 8 above.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>08/07/2014 -- NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above.</p> <p>11/04/2014 -- YES. Please refer to sections 6 above.</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>YES. At \$475,000 or 5 per cent of the sub-total for project components, the LDCF funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	
	<p>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</p>	<p>YES. A PPG of \$200,000 is requested, in line with the norm for projects up to \$10 million.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	
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?	<p>NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 16 and 17.</p> <p>08/07/2014 -- NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 8 and 12.</p> <p>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.</p>	
	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*	July 09, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	August 07, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 04, 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.**