



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

GEF ID:	<b>8015</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Liberia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Enhancing Resilience Of Liberia Montserrado County Vulnerable Coastal Areas To Climate Change Risks.</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5550 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$2,163,540</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$4,163,540</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Alice Chibulu Luo</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Henry Diouf</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?		YES. As an LDC party to the UNFCCC, Liberia is eligible to receive funding from the LDCF.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?		Yes, a letter of endorsement was included with the submission December 2nd, 2014.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of		YES. The requested amount of

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		\$2,000,000 is available for Liberia under the principle of equitable access.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</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 project is aligned with CCA-1 and CCA-2.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>		YES. The project is consistent with several national strategies and plans, including Liberia's NAPA and National Communications (2013).
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, 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 project describes different ongoing baseline activities in Montserrado County, led by UNDP and the County government. For instance, the Request for CEO Approval highlights that UNDP is "supporting projects in coastal areas that are developing integrated coastal capacity and contributing to general resilience and adaptive capacity", and implementing capacity building activities through the "Liberia Decentralization and Local development

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>support" project. Other initiatives are being financed by donor support and the government (page 7). However, in describing these initiatives, it is not clear how they will benefit from the additional LDCF financing, as their activities (including any progress achieved) are not sufficiently described.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please provide a more detailed description of the specific baseline project interventions, and specifically how they will benefit from the additional LDCF resources.</p> <p>4-14-15, CL: YES. Comments have been addressed in the resubmission. The project is an extension of the an earlier UNDP project (GEF ID 3885: Enhancing Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks In Liberia). Recommended changes to the initial coastal protection design have presented need to request additional funding to support these activities (component 2) and additional capacity building activities (component 1).</p>
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>		<p>NOT CLEAR. Please address comments in 6.</p> <p>It is also not clear how project component co-financing in table B links to baseline projects described (in 6 above), particularly for component 2.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION. Please address comments in 6, and clarify baseline project co-financing.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			4-14-15, CL: YES. Comments have been addressed in the resubmission.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		<p>NOT CLEAR. The benefits and additional reasoning can not be adequately assessed until comments in 6 and 7 are addressed.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6 and 7.</p> <p>4-14-15, CL: YES. This project seeks to increase the resilience of Montserrado County through capacity building activities and coastal infrastructure investments. Adaptation benefits have been identified and additional cost reasoning has been adequately described in the project document (pages 26-32).</p>
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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>YES. The project's objective to protect vulnerable coastal communities in Montserrado County will provide both local and national benefits, and put communities in a better position to deal with climate-induced disasters. Initiatives also aim to support the County's socio-economic goals such as protecting economic activity and retaining access to essential infrastructure and other services.</p> <p>The project also has strong gender elements. The project document notes that gender equality issues will be considered throughout the duration of the project. For instance, by conducting a gender-based vulnerability assessment, and promoting female participation</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			during capacity building activities.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		YES. Several stakeholders have been identified, including NGOs and local communities, who will be involved at various levels; for instance, during awareness raising and implementation activities.
	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. For each outcome, risks and mitigation measures are adequately described in project document.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		YES. The project is coordinated with various initiatives supported by UNDP, including two LDCF project in Liberia "Enhancing Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks In Liberia" (GEF ID: 3885) and "Strengthening Liberia's capability to provide climate information and services to enhance climate resilient development and adaptation to climate change" (GEF ID: 4950).
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the</li> </ul>		NOT CLEAR. The project's innovative aspects cannot yet be assessed. Please address comments in 6 and 7 above.  RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6 and 7 above.  4-14-15, CL: YES.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		<p>INNOVATION: Coastal erosion is a major threat to coastal cities in Liberia, and in Montserrado County in particular, communities are already experiencing the impacts of sea-level rise and climate-induced coastal degradation further increasing pressures for land and other natural resources. The project is innovative in its approach to use the best coastal protection measures and technologies as to ensure strong coastal defense in the face of rising and stronger sea waves. The project is also flexible in its interventions - protection measures and technologies will vary across the project sites, and will be tailored to address existing challenges and limitations in community capacity.</p> <p>SUSTAINABILITY: The project's community-based approach will allow for stronger project ownership at both the local and national level. Local communities will be engaged in identifying, planning and construction of coastal protection measures, therefore ensuring overall project sustainability. These investments will also protect other infrastructure (such as the Blessing Road in Kru Town) supports communities in accessing markets and public services (e.g. hospitals); therefore also supporting economic growth and sustained livelihood for vulnerable communities.</p> <p>SCALING UP: Overall lessons learned from the project will be documented and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			shared across the country (and other countries) for potential scaling up of best practices.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		NA
	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?		YES. The cost-effectiveness of the project has been sufficiently described in section A.7. of the Request for CEO Approval. Specifically, a multi-criteria analysis was applied to prioritize activities based on their potential to yield positive benefits for economic development, gender equality, social capital and environmental management (page 15). Furthermore, cost-effectiveness will be guaranteed during project implementation by conducting cost-benefit analysis, as to justify the selection of any proposed technologies or intervention measures.
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.  RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please address comments in 6 and 7.  4-14-15, CL: YES. Comments have been addressed in the resubmission.
	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?		NOT CLEAR. No co-financing letters have been included with submission.  RECOMMENDED ACTION: 1) Please address comments in 6 and 7, and adjust co-financing amounts if necessary, and 2) Include co-financing letters with submission.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			4-14-15, CL: YES. Comments have been addressed in the resubmission. The project is an extension of an earlier project - (GEF ID 3885: Enhancing Resilience of Vulnerable Coastal Areas to Climate Change Risks In Liberia) - and therefore baseline investments remain the same as those described in the aforementioned project.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?		YES.
	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 PPG fund?		No PPG is requested.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>NOT CLEAR. No tracking tool has been included with submission. The updated tracking tool for the LDCF/SCCF can be downloaded on the GEF website: <a href="http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF">http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF</a></p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please include tracking tool with submission.</p> <p>4-14-15, CL: YES. Tracking tool has been included with resubmission.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		YES. This has been described in the project document.
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	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		NOT YET. Please address comments in 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17 and 21.  4-14-15, CL: YES. The proposed project is technically cleared. However, the project will be processed for CEO approval only once adequate, additional resources become available in the LDCF.
	First review*		January 22, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)		April 15, 2015
Review Date (s)	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.**