



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

GEF ID:	<b>4599</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Sierra Leone</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Building Adaptive Capacity to Catalyze Active Public and Private Sector Participation to Manage the Exposure and Sensitivity of Water Supply Services to Climate Change in Sierra Leone</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4613 (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):	<b>CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$70,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,940,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$10,150,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$13,160,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>December 20, 2011</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>January 19, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Saliha Dobardzic</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Mame Diop</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 country eligible?	Yes, Sierra Leone is an LDC and has completed its NAPA.	Yes, no change.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	The Agency's comparative advantage for this project is based on its strategy to strengthen institutions and local governance capacity. However, the UNDP does not have a comparative advantage in the Water Services sector in Sierra Leone. Currently, the most substantial investments in this sector are from AfDB (Rural Water and Sanitation	No change since PIF.

\*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Program, US\$24 M)</p> <p>The World Bank is funding the 7-year US \$47 million Power and Water Project to improve sustainable access to essential power, rural water supply and sanitation.</p> <p>In addition, the UNDAF does not give UNDP a clear-cut mandate to undertake the activities proposed. For example, it is UNICEF that is leading the WASH program, with the UNDP, as confirmed by the proposal, contributing in a peripheral way.</p> <p>In summary, the rationale for the comparative advantage as presented in the PIF does not convincingly argue that UNDP is the best-qualified agency, as opposed to AfDB and the World Bank.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide further justification.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011, Recommended Action: In addition to the justifications provided, it is necessary to clarify the investment components vis a vis technical assistance components (please see point 14 on "Project Framework", before it can be concluded whether UNDP has the comparative advantage.</p> <p>Update 12/4/2011: The investment and TA components</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>have been disaggregated. This is satisfactory. However, it is clear that the success of the investment component, which constitutes a substantial portion of the project, depends on closely integrating it with the DFID-funded intervention in the water sector.</p> <p>Recommended Action: By CEO Endorsement, please provide detailed information on the integration, complementarity, and coordination arrangements between the proposed initiative and the DFID-funded intervention.</p>	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	The staff capacity on the country appears to be adequate. The fit of the project in the Agency's program can also be justified, on the basis of UNDP's comparative advantage in institution and capacity building.	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide a brief description of the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: Cleared. The description of the UNDP Sierra Leone Country Office and the fit of the project in the agency program have been provided.</p>
Resource	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	Yes, the LDCF funding is available under the principle of equitable access.	Yes, no change.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>Yes, namely objectives CCA-1 and CCA-2</p> <p>Update 12/04/2011: The version received on Nov 17, 2011, only identifies focal area objective CCA-1 in Table A. All relevant focal area objectives should be identified.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please include CCA-2 and CCA-3 objectives, with associated FA Outcomes and Outputs. Funding should be disaggregated for each Outcome listed (at least one Outcome should be listed per FA Objective.)</p> <p>Update 12/12/2011: Table A has been updated to include CCA-2 and CCA-3. Corresponding Outcomes and Outputs are also included; namely: Outcome 2.2 and 3.2, and Outputs 2.2.2 and 3.2.1. Funding is also disaggregated for each Outcome: \$800,000 for Outcome 1.1, \$1,700,000 for Outcome 2.2 and \$300,000 for Outcome 3.2.</p>	Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF	Yes, as mentioned in 7.	Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	objectives identified?		
	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?	The project is consistent with the NAPA of Sierra Leone.	Yes, no change.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The capacities developed accordingly would be expected to contribute to the sustainability.	<p>Not clear. This question will be reassessed after the revision of the submission, particularly #11 and #13. It does appear that there will be an effort to ensure capacity building towards the sustainability of the project outcomes. For instance, the training and awareness activities will be institutionalized at the EFA Lakka Environmental Learning Center, a local NGO.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: Not entirely. The capacities developed are expected to contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes, namely through expanding human resource capacity, and establishment of a lessons learning mechanism and up-scaling.</p> <p>Recommended action: Kindly provide more details on the lessons learning mechanism and upscaling -- please describe the mechanism, how it will be funded beyond the life of this project, and how will upscaling be planned, initiated, managed, and financed?</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>FI, 12/2/13:  Yes. (1) The project will build capacity at both institutional and individual (technical, policy) levels on consideration of climate risk in water sector related activities and planning. This is expected to result in climate-resilience-friendly adjustments to related policies and regulations. (2) Participatory processes established at the local level through the project are expected to continue to facilitate knowledge-sharing within communities. (3) Lessons and technologies emerging from the project will be well-documented and shared with current and potential future stakeholders through multiple measures (local fora, radio, etc.), and (4) the project will coordinate with knowledge platforms of existing programs such as WASH, enabling communities and decision-makers to access information to guide their decisions about water management while taking climate change into account.</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>The baseline projects are sufficiently described. However, the UNDP/WWF/EU regional program does not appear to be relevant to the proposed project. In addition, please see comments concerning project framework (#14).</p> <p>Furthermore, it seems that the dominant assumption behind the project,</p>	<p>Not clear. The baseline situation or problem, and baseline project are not clearly and succinctly described.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please consider providing a more brief and clear description of the baseline problem and how the baseline project addresses it, or will address it.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>Component 2 in particular, is that the shortcomings in the Water Sector in Sierra Leone can be directly linked to climate change. This is not convincing, and as such it is unknown whether adaptation actions would result in any meaningful improvement in water services provisioning.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please ensure that the selected baseline projects are fully relevant to the project proposed for funding under the LDCF. Furthermore, it is essential that a strong rationale is presented as to why adaptation funding is necessary in order to successfully reach the overall development objective.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: Additional clarifications provided are satisfactory.</p>	<p>Update 10/31/2013: The baseline projects and problems are currently well defined, and appear to be based on sound data and assumptions.</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. Please see comments no. #11 and 13.</p> <p>Recommended action: Upon revision according to comments #11 and #13, please also briefly describe the cost-effectiveness analysis undertaken and its results.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: The cost effectiveness has been assessed at various levels and at various stages of the process, starting with the NAPA, consultations at the project design stage, and will continue on specific issues (i.e. choice of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			technology) during the early phases of implementation.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	<p>Not entirely. The additional cost reasoning for Components 1 and 2 is generally sound.</p> <p>For Component 3 it is unclear what the connection of the described additional adaptation benefit is with respect to components 1 and 2. In other words, it is unclear, based on the additional reasoning why Component 3 would be part of this project.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: Component 3 has been removed. This is cleared.</p> <p>However, see point 14.</p>	<p>Not clear. The additional activities are not clearly presented in the proposal.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please consider providing a more brief and clear presentation of the adaptation activities to be financed by the LDCF, and how they are additional vis-a-vis the baseline.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: Yes, the activities proposed are based on additional cost reasoning.</p>
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>No. The project framework seems to be a collection of mostly unrelated initiatives, some with a focus on strengthening the water infrastructure, and some with coastal disaster risk preparedness.</p> <p>Recommended Action: It is recommended that the project be scaled down considerably, and that the costs of the components be significantly reduced. Streamlining of the project is necessary, for example, removing Component 3 entirely, and restructuring the rest, for example, under Component 2, expected outputs a and e are very similar, that it seems it would be better to consolidate and present them as a single output.</p>	<p>Not yet. This question will be reassessed following responses to #12 and #13 even though the project framework as is presented currently is clear.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: Cleared.</p>



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update 10/27/2011: Component 3 has been removed. In general, the project framework is sound. However, components 2-d and 2-e are not investment activities, but capacity building.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please disaggregate these activities from the true investment activities, and present the anticipated cost of the investment activities.</p> <p>Update 12/05/2011: This has been done.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>For the PIF stage, the applied methodology and assumptions seem generally appropriate.</p>	<p>Not clear at this stage. This will be revisited after #11 and #13 are addressed.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: Cleared.</p>
	<p>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?</p>	<p>The socio-economic benefits, including the gender dimensions have been described.</p>	<p>Not clear. It is clear that the socio-economic benefits of improvement of water service provision, including quality, are potentially substantial and would have an especially significant positive impact on women and children. However, it is stated in the proposal that gender specific concerns are specifically considered and would be followed-up on during implementation without providing some detail.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide a brief description of how gender-</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>specific concerns are being considered and how they will be reflected in the implementation.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: The proposal states that gender specific concerns are specifically considered and will be follow-up on during implementation and that gender sensitive formulation of project activities have been specifically integrated throughout the project design. However, it is still unclear which project activities reflect gender considerations, and how.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Kindly outline activities in the project that have a specific, measurable integration of gender considerations and/or provide more concrete examples of how this will be done.</p> <p>FI, 12/2/13: Yes. Two indicators specifically pertaining to project benefits for women/girls have been provided, to be achieved by 2017: (i) reduction in water collection time from 1 hr per trip to 15 min, and (ii) reduction in incidence of water-borne disease by 60%. In addition, gender considerations will also be taken on board in the process of designing and implementing project activities, through training and awareness-raising, highlighting of gender-related aspects of climate risk</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			in informational/training materials, and the use of gender-sensitive evaluation tools to ensure effective involvement of women. Gender specific assessments will be undertaken for the design of climate resilient infrastructure, and consultations will be undertaken with both men and women to determine their respective roles in managing the water scheme.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>No information on CSOs and indigenous people is provided.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide the requisite information.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: Minimal information has been provided. This is not sufficient.</p> <p>Recommended action: As public participation is an important aspect of LDCF funded-projects, a more in-depth indication of how public participation will be facilitated is necessary before the PIF can be approved.</p> <p>Update 12/04/2011: Further clarifications have been provided, namely that the PPG resources will be used to engage key stakeholders at various levels.</p>	Clear. However, please see #16.
	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)	The project takes into account potential major risks. However, one risk is that of duplication and lack of coordination with other initiatives, resulting in inefficient use of resources, and a loss of	Yes. The key risks have been identified as have the measures to mitigate them.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>opportunity for building climate change resilience in Sierra Leone.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please address the above-mentioned risk.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: The project will be harmonized with other initiatives through SLEPA and Climate Change focal point. Programmatic coordination with development partners will be ensured through coordination mechanisms established by the UN Joint vision. The PPG phase duplication will be discussed and will also result in the establishment of a coordination mechanism for the implementation phase.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>No, the project is not well coordinated with the LDCF intervention "Integrating Adaptation to Climate Change into Agricultural Production and Food Security in Sierra Leone" which is implemented by IFAD. That project has a component on government capacity building and awareness raising on climate change, including training, and climatic data collection. Based on the PIF presented, it appears that the project under review is not taking into account and building upon this capacity and other elements of the project that is implemented by IFAD.</p> <p>Furthermore, the section B.6 (Outline the coordination with other related initiatives) and section C (Describe the GEF Agency's comparative advantage to</p>	<p>Not clear. While the proposal states that the Ministry of Water Resources (the executing agency for this project) will have the responsibility of coordination of all sector related projects in the country, it was requested at PIF stage by a Council Member to know how this project will collaborate with parallel efforts underway.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide a matrix listing all relevant efforts underway, such as the Sanitation and Water for All, and clear description of how the value added by the project proposed vis-a-vis such each such effort.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>implement this project) does not adequately represent the current situation in the reconstruction and development effort in Sierra Leone, specifically in terms of ongoing or planned projects in the water sector, or UNDP's role in it.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide further justifications.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: There will be an effort to coordinate properly with the IFAD-implemented intervention, as well as others, as discussed under "risks." This will be critical, and coordination plan should be developed by CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>This has been done -- cleared.</p>
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>It is not clear what the project implementation/execution arrangements would be.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please provide further justifications.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: Implementation/execution arrangements appear yet to be determined. It seems that no substantive discussion has taken place. The proposal that the Ministry of Energy and Water Resources will be the national executing agency, with day-to-day functions assumed by the Directorate of Water Resources, appears to be sound. The final institutional arrangement will be examined in consultation with national authorities</p>	<p>Clear. Various stakeholders will be engaged in the implementation, with the Water Department at the Ministry of Water Resources holding the main responsibility for the overall project implementation, as well as setting up a PIU to direct execution.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		during the PPG phase.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Yes, the project structure changes are acceptable in light of complementing a related AfDB project, and the justifications have been provided.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>No. At USD350,000, the project management cost is too high. The project management cost should not exceed 5% of the total grant amount.</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: Revised project management cost is acceptable.</p>	Yes, at 5% of the grant, it is acceptable.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>The funding appears to be very high for individual components, namely Components 1 and 3.</p> <p>Recommended Action: Please reanalyze the costs of the project, and consider using as a reference similar projects, for example, "Integrating Adaptation to Climate Change into Agricultural Production and Food Security in Sierra Leone"</p> <p>Update 10/27/2011: Cost for component 1 has been revised, and component 3 has been removed. This is cleared. However, it is unclear how much funding will be allocated to investments, as opposed to capacity building.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please</p>	Yes, it appears adequate.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>disaggregate (same comment as under no. 14, "Project Framework")</p> <p>Update 12/12/2011: This has been done.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>The cofinancing level is appropriate, with over USD26M in grant cofinancing presented.</p>	<p>No. The cofinancing level has changed significantly, with the exclusion of the DFID intervention, to \$10 million. However, while the project is no longer intended to be lined to the DFID intervention, the cofinancing letter from the Government references the amount associated with DFID, despite not listing it. It does not appear that the cofinancing letters for the \$10 million have been supplied.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please provide clarifications or provide the support letters for the missing cofinancing amounts.</p> <p>Update 10/31/2013: UNDP cofinancing letter in support of \$1,150,000 is not available. Kindly supply the missing letter.</p> <p>FI, 12/2/13: Clarification is requested. Table C of the CEO Endorsement Request specifies \$1.15 million from the UNDP in "grant" financing. However, the attached cofinancing letter from UNDP dated July 5, 2013 specifies "support" of \$150,000 and "in-kind co-financing" of \$1 million. Please ensure that the co-financing letter accurately reflects</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			the type and amount of co-financing specified in Table C.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The cofinancing amount that the Agency is bringing is in line with its role.	Yes.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Not clear. The filled out tracking tool has not been received.  Update 10/31/2013: Kindly supply the filled out AMAT Excel file with the resubmission.  FI, 12/2/13: Yes, the AMAT is attached.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes. This is adequate, but may need to be revised in light of other revisions.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		For the most part. Please see comments under #19.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	No. Key issues are on the design of the project, overlap with other initiatives, and concerns regarding the Agency's comparative advantage. Numerous other problems with the proposal as is, as listed under items #3, 11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, and 24.  Update 10/27/2011: The project concept is much improved	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>since the previous version, however some concerns remain. Overall, while the current project idea appears sound, it is difficult to determine the additional benefits of the intervention given the scarcity of information on the size of the intended activities. Specifically, it is unclear what proportion of the project will be true investment interventions, as opposed to capacity building. In addition, as public participation is an important aspect of LDCF funded-projects, a more in-depth indication of how public participation will be facilitated is necessary before the PIF can be approved.</p> <p>Update 12/05/2011: All previous comments have been addressed satisfactorily for the PIF stage. There is however one issue remaining, please see comment no. 7., concerning alignment with the LDCF/SCCF project framework.</p> <p>Update 12/12/2011: Issues raised in Section 7 have been addressed. PIF approval is recommended.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>Implementation arrangements. Involvement of the CSO groups. Arrangements for coordination with other related initiatives, for example, ensuring that the activities in the Kono district (also beneficiary of the other LDCF project) are well coordinated, synergistic, and cost-effective. Namely,</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		information on the integration, complementarity, and coordination arrangements between the proposed initiative and the DFID-funded intervention (but also others, as appropriate) is required.	
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.
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		Not yet. Please see comments under 5, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19, 25, and 29.  10/31/2013: Not yet. CEO Endorsement will be recommended after comments under 10, 16, 25, and 27 are successfully resolved.  FI, 12/2/13: Not yet. CEO Endorsement will be recommended after comment under Item 25 has been resolved.  Update 4/15/2014: The project is now recommended for endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 08, 2011	July 24, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	November 30, 2011	October 31, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 05, 2011	December 02, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 12, 2011	April 15, 2014
	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**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	Yes, the proposed activities for project preparation and coordination are appropriate.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	The PPG will be approved when the PIF is approved.  Update 12/12/2011: PPG is recommended for approval at this stage, since PIF is recommended for approval.
	4. Other comments	Adequate implementation and coordination arrangements should be in place by the time of CEO endorsement, and preparations for adequate public participation should be carried out in the course of project preparation.
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.