



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

GEF ID:	5209		
Country/Region:	Sierra Leone		
Project Title:	Building Resilience to Climate Change in the Water and Sanitation Sector		
GEF Agency:	AfDB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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-2; CCA-3; CCA-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,000,000
Co-financing:	\$28,735,000	Total Project Cost:	\$32,735,000
PIF Approval:	January 25, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	March 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Saliha Dobardzic	Agency Contact Person:	Lubunga Rogers

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. Sierra Leone is a party to the UNFCCC and has completed a NAPA in December 2007.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	The endorsement letter by the OFP was not available. Recommended action: please supply the OFP letter. Update 1/22/2013: The endorsement letter has been provided.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes. AfDB has been involved in the water and sanitation sector in the country for over 40 years and has supported a number of initiatives.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	n/a	

	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the project fits into the Agency's program. It is unclear if the staff capacity in the country is adequate for the implementation of the project.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	n/a	n/a
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	Yes, the funding requested under this project is available for Sierra Leone under the principle of equitable funding.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	n/a	n/a
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	n/a	n/a
	• focal area set-aside?	n/a	n/a
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes. Components 1 through 5 are aligned with the LDCF objectives, outcomes and outputs identified.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	Yes. The project targets LDCF strategic objectives CCA-1 (reducing vulnerability), CCA-2 (increasing the adaptive capacity), and CCA-3 (transfer of technology for adaptation).	
	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?	Yes. The project is consistent with the countries NAPA which identified water and health (and sanitation) as two of the six key sectors where adaptation needs are centered. It is aligned with the NAPA's priorities for water: 1. Improve water research, monitoring and management; 2. Improvement of the efficiency of existing water supply systems in both urban rural areas; and 3. Promote rain water harvesting and	

		system for fresh water bodies, and Health: 1. Develop appropriate sanitation programs	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	Yes. A knowledge management component is included, and training for staff and community trainers under the various components of the project is included.	
Project Design	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>Not clear. While the problem is well described, the description of the baseline project is currently missing some information, namely: 1) The overall budget for that project is not mentioned nor is the funding sources clearly stated. The AfDB seems to be the main funder, but this is not directly stated in section B1. 2) It is not clear if the LDCF funding will be allocated to those same districts as the baseline project. 3) No mention of the climate dimension is made. What are the impacts of climate change on the baseline project? What are the climate change vulnerabilities? 4) What is the timeline of the baseline project?</p> <p>Recommended action: Please revise the section to provide a more detailed description of the business as usual development for the water and sanitation sector in the absence of climate change as well as the baseline project(s) to which the LDCF intervention will be additional, ensuring that B1 section is complete.</p> <p>Update 1/22/2013: All the outstanding issues have been addressed as requested.</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>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>Since as stated in point 11 above, the BAU scenario is not entirely clear and nor is the baseline project, this question will be reassessed after comments under section 11 have been adequately addressed.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please review section B1 of the PIF and review the additionality of the project as appropriate, linking the baseline project(s) to the LDCF-funded activities.</p> <p>Update 1/22/2013: The additional cost reasoning is now clear, with clear linkages between adaptation and baseline activities.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>Not clear. The project framework seems sound; however, please refer to Points 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please review the project framework in light of the recommendations made under points 11 and 13 above.</p> <p>Update 1/22/2013: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>Not clear.</p> <p>Recommended action: Please see 11 and 13 above</p>	

		Cleared.	
	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, clear.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>Yes. The mention of the role of local and indigenous communities and that of the WASH committees is made. However, this is done in a general manner.</p> <p>Recommended action: by CEO endorsement, please clarify the civil society and indigenous groups involved as well as the mechanisms for their involvement.</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)	Yes. Risks are identified and mitigation measures seem appropriate.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, particularly with two other LDCF-financed projects in the country, one under implementation and another one recently approved. AfDB is already coordinating with UNDP as the IA of those projects.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	No. Project management should be no greater than 5%. It is currently now at 9.9%. Recommended action: Please adjust the management cost. Update 1/22/2013: The project management cost has been adjusted to 5%.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Yes.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project 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?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	NA	
	• Convention Secretariat?	NA	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	NA	
Secretariat Recommendation			

Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	Not at this stage. Please refer to points # 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 23 Update 1/22/2013: Not yet. In line with the new fee structure, effective Jan 1, 2013, the agency fee should be revised to 9.5% of the project cost. Following this adjustment, the PIF will be ready for recommendation. Update 1/23/2013: Following the resubmission of the PIF reflecting the revised agency fee structure, the project is ready to be recommended.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 22, 2013	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 23, 2013	
	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	Yes.

	2. Is itemized budget justified?	Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	Yes.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 09, 2013
	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.