



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

GEF ID:	4950		
Country/Region:	Liberia		
Project Title:	Strengthening Liberia's Capability to Provide Climate Information and Services to Enhance Climate Resilient Development and Adaptation to Climate Change		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4858 (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-2; CCA-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$6,730,000
Co-financing:	\$11,859,700	Total Project Cost:	\$18,689,700
PIF Approval:	June 14, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	July 19, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Knut Sundstrom	Agency Contact Person:	Mark Tadross

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	YES. Liberia is an LDC Party to the UNFCCC and it has completed its NAPA.	YES. Liberia 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 April 3, 2012, has been attached to the submission.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	YES. UNDP has a comparative advantage in technical assistance; including information services, institutional capacity building, and policy support; for climate change adaptation.	YES.
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	NA

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	YES. UNDP has a strong presence and relevant programming in the country, particularly in the field of climate change adaptation and disaster risk management.	YES.
Resource Availability	6. 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 equitable access	YES. The proposed grant (\$7.425 million, including the Agency fee) is available under the LDCF in accordance with the principle of equitable access.	YES.
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	YES. The proposed project is fully aligned with the LDCF/SCCF results framework.	YES.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	YES. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and, specifically, CCA-2.1 on increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and climate change -induced risks; as well as CCA-2.2 on strengthened adaptive capacity to reduce risks to climate change -induced economic losses.	NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would contribute towards CCA-2 and, specifically, outcomes 2.1 and 2.2. The Request for CEO Endorsement does not, however, provide a breakdown of grant and co-financing by CCA outcome. RECOMMENDED ACTION: In the Focal Area Strategy Framework (Table A), please provide a breakdown of grant and co-financing by CCA outcome.

	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>YES. The project would directly contribute towards Liberia's second highest NAPA priority, namely to "enhance adaptive capacity through the rebuilding of the national hydro-meteorological monitoring system and improved networking for the measurement of climatic parameters".</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project addresses Liberia's second NAPA priority on enhancing adaptive capacity through the restoration of the national hydro-meteorological and meteorological monitoring system.</p> <p>The project is also aligned with Liberia's Second Poverty Reduction Strategy, the National Environment Policy, the National Reconstruction and Development Plan, the 2008 National Food Security and Nutrition Strategy, and the 2009 Food and Agriculture Policy and Strategy.</p>
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project would invest in hydro-meteorological monitoring and early warning infrastructure, and provide associated technical assistance. Provided that Liberia's National hydro-meteorological infrastructure has been heavily degraded over the past decades, due to fourteen years of civil war but also due to a consistent lack of investment, sustainability is a key concern. Accordingly, in addition to exploring private sector participation and paid-for services, the PIF should discuss the ways in which the project would strengthen the mandate and the legislative framework, as well as help ensure the adequate medium and long-term public financing of the Meteorological Service.</p> <p>Moreover, concerns over sustainability should be better considered in the risk analysis (see Section 18 below).</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project addresses current gaps in Liberia's hydro-meteorological monitoring capacity and early-warning systems in an integrated manner, with a focus on hardware, software, capacity building, planning, coordination, and finance. The project includes a specific sub-component aimed at exploring innovative public and private financing models to ensure the sustainability of the proposed investments. A detailed sustainability strategy is presented in section 2.7 of the Project Document.</p>

		<p>provide further information as to how the project would strengthen the mandate as well as help ensure the adequate medium and long-term public financing of the Meteorological Service.</p> <p>05/22/2012 -- YES. Outputs 3.3 and 3.4 have been strengthened with greater attention to project sustainability as well as medium and long-term public and private financing for the EWS.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>11. 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>NOT CLEAR: The proposed project would build primarily on five baseline initiatives, namely (i) Strengthening the water resources and power sectors (co-financing: \$5.38 million); (ii) Liberia Agriculture Sector Investment Programme (LASIP) (co-financing: 4.96 million); (iii) MetAgri seminars on weather, climate and farmers (co-financing: \$39,000), an initiative financed by the WMO and implemented jointly with FAO; (iv) Building National and Local Capacities for Disaster Risk Management in Liberia (co-financing: 940,000); and (v) GoAL WASH project to support water supply and sanitation (co-financing: \$526,746).</p> <p>While the five initiatives form a relevant baseline for the proposed project, these do not appear to fully capture the range of processes on which the project would build and towards which it would contribute (as indicated in Section B.2 of the PIF). In particular, the LDCF grant would play an instrumental role in strengthening the Meteorological Service and the National Disaster Relief Commission (NDRC). Some of the</p>	<p>YES. The proposed project would primarily build on (i) the Institutional Strengthening and Capacity Building of the Energy and Water Resources Cooperation project, financed by the Norwegian Water Resources and Energy Directorate (NVE); (ii) the MetAgri Roving seminars on Weather, Climate and farmers, financed by WMO and implemented jointly with FAO; and the the Agriculture Sector Rehabilitation Project. The project would also strengthen other existing government activities and budget lines, captured as in-kind baseline financing from relevant national agencies.</p>

		<p>may qualify as part of the project baseline, and the associated budget lines may be considered as co-financing. As the predictability of disease outbreaks depends in part on climate factors, this intervention should also consider complementing health programs that deal with the control of key climate-sensitive diseases, such as the National Malaria Control Program (NMCP). Also, as a basis for output 2.2, relevant initiatives in the area of access to early warning and meteorological communications should be included among the baseline projects.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the PIF captures the full range of baseline initiatives on which the proposed project would build, as well as the associated co-financing.</p> <p>05/22/2012 -- YES. The re-submission includes the National Malaria Control Programme among the baseline initiatives. Baseline activities and associated co-financing from the Government of Liberia and NDRC, as well as further baseline initiatives towards which the proposed project would contribute, will be specified by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. The proposed project appears to have been designed in a cost effective manner. Section 2.6 of the Project Document demonstrates that sufficient cost comparison has been carried out for all key components of the project.</p>

			<p>simultaneous submission of 9 similar projects in the region, and with a view to enhancing cost-effectiveness, the Request for CEO Endorsement could explore approaches to enhance regional coordination and collaboration. This would also respond the request of the LDCF/SCCF Council, captured in the Highlights of its 12th meeting.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider, from the perspective of cost-effectiveness, approaches to enhance regional coordination and collaboration, including activities carried at the regional level.</p> <p>07/31/2013 “ YES. The re-submission clarifies how the proposed project will seek to capture the potential cost savings arising from close collaboration with the 9 similar projects in the region. In particular, opportunities for joint procurement and training activities have been identified, as well as modalities for inter-country information sharing.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The additional cost reasoning, as currently presented, is very clear. However, upon addressing the recommendations under Section 11 above, it should be ensured that Section II.B.2 refers to the full range of relevant baseline initiatives, including in the areas of health and access to early warning and meteorological communications.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under</p>	<p>YES. The Request for CEO Endorsement provides a detailed description of the baseline scenario and associated gaps and needs, as well as the additional activities proposed for LDCF financing.</p>

		<p>sections II.B.1 and II.B.2 are entirely consistent in terms of baseline initiatives.</p> <p>05/22/2012 -- YES. The additional baseline initiatives and their associated co-financing, as provided in the re-submission, have been consistently reflected in Section II.B.2 of the PIF.</p>	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	YES. The project framework is sound and very clear.	<p>YES. The project framework is sound and sufficiently clear.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to the recommendation under Section 12 above, and make appropriate adjustments in the Project Framework in response to the request of the LDCF/SCCF Council, if necessary.</p>
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	YES. The adaptation benefits associated with the activities proposed for LDCF financing are clearly described, based on appropriate assumptions and methodology.	YES.
	16. 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?	YES. The PIF describes well the socio-economic benefits associated with the proposed project.	YES. The expected socio-economic benefits, as well as the gender dimensions of the proposed project have been adequately described.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	YES. While focusing on the national level, the proposed project would engage local communities through pilot initiatives that test the effectiveness of the early-warning systems developed. Moreover, the project outcomes would be highly relevant for future climate-resilient development at the community level, in a variety of sectors.	YES. Public participation, including the role of CSOs, has been adequately considered. A stakeholder engagement plan for project implementation is presented in Section B.1 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.

	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 10 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider, in Section II.B.4 of the PIF, risks associated with the sustainability of the investments in hydro-meteorological infrastructure, and associated technical assistance.</p> <p>05/22/2012 -- YES. The re-submission considers in further detail risks associated with sustainability, as well as appropriate mitigation measures.</p>	<p>YES. Relevant risks, along with appropriate mitigation measures have been adequately described in Section B.6 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Coordination with other relevant initiatives, notably the two UNDP-LDCF projects currently under implementation, is well described for this stage of project development. In addition, however, the PIF should describe coordination and integration with relevant key interventions in a variety of sectors that apply the products and services provided through the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please consider how the proposed project will tap into relevant ongoing or planned developments or investments in health, infrastructure development, transportation, telecommunications, etc. in Liberia.</p> <p>By CEO Endorsement, please consider developing a broad-based analysis of the relevant initiatives in various economic sectors that could underpin the long-term sustainability of the hydro-meteorological infrastructure and</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. The Request for CEO Endorsement and UNDP Project Document describe adequately the ways in which the proposed project would be coordinated with and complementary to other relevant initiatives in the country and the wider region.</p> <p>Please refer, however, to Section 12 above. In addition, the Request for CEO Endorsement could discuss the relationship between the proposed project and other, similar LDCF-financed initiatives under preparation in the region, including potential synergies.</p> <p>07/31/2013 – YES. Relevant opportunities for coordination and collaboration have been considered in detail in the re-submission, with a focus on synergies with other, similar LDCF-financed initiatives.</p>

		05/22/2012 -- YES. Other relevant initiatives have been adequately considered for this stage of project development. The re-submission clarifies how further initiatives and stakeholders will be considered and consulted during project preparation to ensure adequate coordination.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	NA	YES.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		YES.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>NO. The proposed funding level for project management cost is \$335,000, or 5.2 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that the funding level for project management cost does not exceed 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.</p> <p>05/22/2012 -- YES. At \$315,000 or less than 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3, the proposed funding level for project management is appropriate.</p>	YES. At \$315,000, the funding level for project management costs is below 5 per cent of the sub-total for components 1 through 3.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 11 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 12 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations under</p>

		<p>co-financing, for components 1 and 2 in particular, reflects all relevant baseline initiatives, including budget lines for the Meteorological Service and the NDRC.</p> <p>05/22/2012 -- YES. The indicative co-financing per component has been adjusted as recommended.</p>	<p>grant and co-financing amounts accordingly, if necessary.</p> <p>07/31/2013 â€“ YES.</p>
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>Please refer to Sections 11 and 24 above. The overall co-financing level is currently quite low, at \$11,845,746, resulting in a co-financing ratio of 1:1.75.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing recommendations under Section 11 above, please raise the overall co-financing level accordingly.</p> <p>05/22/2012 -- YES. The re-submission includes additional baseline initiatives, which raise the total indicative co-financing to \$28.43 million, resulting in a co-financing ratio of 1:4.2.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide letters of confirmation for all sources and amounts of co-financing.</p> <p>07/31/2013 â€“ YES.</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. In line with its role, UNDP would bring \$1.47 million.</p> <p>Section II.C.1 of the PIF refers incorrectly to co-financing associated with the two ongoing UNDP-LDCF projects. This is not described in Table C or Section II.B.1 of the PIF. Please note that other LDCF projects cannot provide co-financing towards the proposed project.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please ensure that Section II.C.2 of the PIF, describing Agency co-financing, is consistent with Table C and the</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. It is unclear whether UNDP is bringing any co-financing towards the proposed project, contrary to what was indicated at PIF.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please clarify whether UNDP would bring any co-financing towards the proposed project, as indicated in the original PIF, and provide appropriate confirmation thereof.</p> <p>07/31/2013 â€“ YES. UNDP will bring \$200,000 in confirmed co-financing towards the proposed project.</p>

		Section II.B.2. 05/22/2012 -- YES. Agency co-financing is consistently described across the revised PIF.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		YES. The Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) has been completed with baselines and targets for relevant indicators.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	NA
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	NA
	• Council comments?		NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 12 and 19 above. RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address the recommendations under sections 12 and 19. 07/31/2013 â€œ YES.
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	YES.
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 23, 24, 25, and 26 above. 05/22/2012 -- YES.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Please refer to Section 19.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		YES.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval		NOT YET. Please refer to sections 8, 10, 13, 24, 25, 26, and 28.

			07/31/2013 à€“ YES.
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 13, 2012	July 08, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	May 22, 2012	July 31, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes, the proposed activities are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes, the itemized budget is justified.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes, PPG approval is being recommended
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 08, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* 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.