



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9573		
Country/Region:	Liberia		
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable use of Liberia's Coastal Natural Capital		
GEF Agency:	CI	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 10; LD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$3,944,220
Co-financing:	\$10,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$13,944,220
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Ian Kissoon

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	August 04th 2016 - Yes it is aligned with BD 4.10 by improving Effective Management of the National Ecological Infrastructure - Regarding the link between the project Outcome 3.1 and LD 1.1, please try to be more explicit to correspond to the GEF programming directions. In particular the outcomes should refer to one or more of the 5	

¹ 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>points listed in para 24 page 140 of the GEF programming directions.</p> <p>- Please list the AICHI targets the project will help to achieve with SMART indicators.</p> <p>9-23-16 Cleared</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>August 04th 2016</p> <p>- Yes it is consistent with NBSAP under revision and with the Agenda for Transformation.</p> <p>9-23-16 Cleared</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>August 04th 2016</p> <p>- Main drivers are identified: Infrastructure development, Over-harvesting and over-hunting, agricultural expansion, illegal sand mining, unregulated waste disposal.</p> <p>- Please indicate if logging (specifically / harvesting) and IAS (Chromolaena odorata, Lantana camara, Eichornia crassipes, feral animals ...) are seen as main threats?</p> <p>- Please address the risks linked to</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>foreign investments and how the project will allow to reduce the negative impacts of foreign investments on Natural Capital?</p> <p>- Innovation is well developed and the project should definitely be innovative.</p> <p>- for scaling up, it could be useful to invite other communities than those that will implement the project (at least in the second half of the project) to prepare for a scaling up of the project.</p> <p>9-23-16 Cleared</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>August 04th 2016</p> <p>Yes,</p> <p>- Please add a reference to the GEF-UNDP projects "Strengthening National Capacities to Meet Global Environmental Obligations with the Framework of Sustainable Development Priorities (9330)" and "SPWA-BD: Biodiversity Conservation through Expanding the Protected Area Network in Liberia (EXPAN) (3837)" to make sure the current project will be coordinated with them.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Some GEF-UNDP SGP projects could also have links with the proposed project like "Combating erosion in local coastal Liberia ", " Building Farmers' Capacity to Increase Rice Production... " ... https://sgp.undp.org/</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please clarify the links between the Liberia Conservation trust fund and the LCAF ? - The document indicate that local communities have a limited understanding of the true value of the land and important impacts by their over-use of natural resources (sand, fish, wood ...). Please clarify how the project can better the local communities' awareness through the Natural Capital Accounting? - Thanks for providing Targets for outcomes. Please clarify how you intend to measure local livelihoods (p22) - Please indicates if the inter-relations between ecosystems will/can be taken into account in the NCA as the value of an ecosystem also depend of the services it provides to other ecosystems (ie mangroves <-> close marine ecosystems). 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>9-23-16</p> <p>The Baseline projects for the GEF is not the same as Background information. For the GEF, the baseline project(s) are those investments that will take place whether or not the GEF grant gets approved. These are the investments on which the GEF funds will stand to generate Global Environmental Benefits. Following on this, please remove the projects in the Table under paragraph 14 (p.12-14) that do not comply with this definition.</p> <p>Once you have the list of Baseline projects, please build the Incremental Reasoning currently on p.23. Please notice that only a couple of projects in that table of pages 12-14 are mentioned in the Incremental Reasoning section. This shows that the Baseline for this project is much narrower.</p> <p>3-31-17 Email was sent to Agency requesting clarification on NCA methods</p> <p>4-1-17 Issue properly addressed. Cleared</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>August 04th 2016</p> <p>Yes, with a few comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - on Output 1.1.2, please add "at least" to be consistent. What are the chances to have more than one coastal ecosystem assessed? - Outcome 1.1: Please propose a target for the capacity improvement and the output 1.1.5 - Output 2.14: how much of financing and project management time do you plan to provide for the Small Grant mechanisms? Do you already have general guidelines to target the project that could be eligible? A target could be the ratio of funds used on the small grants mechanism. <p>9-23-16</p> <p>The PIF requires some additional work to make clearer what the project will effectively do and how it plans on tackling the issues at stake.</p> <p>1. Please clarify what does actually mean to "mainstream natural capital accounting into Liberia Sustainable Development". While the concept is widely used and sounds good on</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>paper, it is difficult to visualize it in reality. The proponents may want to provide some role models as of how this will look like when completed.</p> <p>2. Along the same lines, what does it mean to have an "operational framework" for national level natural capital accounts? Please provide some examples from the current practices in the field.</p> <p>3. Considering the status of the carbon markets, it is not clear why the project wants to get out of the activities leading to output 2.1.1. Please elaborate or remove.</p> <p>4. It is unrealistic to think that this project and component 2 can develop a national PES scheme. The experience of the GEF is that in order to do something meaningful, a full project will be needed to get a national PES scheme in place. This is not something the project cannot achieve within time and budget.</p> <p>5. Please elaborate on the most likely "market-based conservation-friendly enterprises" that have a chance to be developed and implemented in the context of Liberia's coastal development. While the idea is good</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>on paper, if not rooted in the reality of the target area, this is unlikely to get any tangible and measurable results. Some real-life markets generated the idea to include them in this project. What are they?</p> <p>6. The GEF is interested in hearing more about the "Conservation Agreements" the Government is planning on expanding. Feel free to add a "Box" or an appendix to elaborate on this subject. It is central to Component 3.</p> <p>7. What are the "national stewardship models" mentioned in output 3.1.2?</p> <p>8. If one were to divide the cost of the project (GEF \$3.9M) by the target area (50,000 ha in Table F), the cost per hectare is about \$80. If one considers the co-financing (\$10M), the cost is even much higher (\$280). That is a very steep price for the conservation of a hectare. Please elaborate or amend figures.</p> <p>9. Please elaborate and justify the "Specific areas that need improvement..." listed in paragraph 28. They are very generic, making difficult to know if these are actual barriers in Liberia.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>10. Please elaborate on the specific tools to be used for the Natural Capital Accounting, and what natural assets will be accounted for. This needs to be a finite list as it is virtually impossible to tackle all natural assets in a single exercise. That would be beyond the means of this project.</p> <p>11. The list of stakeholders should only include those that will be directly related to the development and implementation of the project. It is difficult to believe that it is necessary to engage all the 21 Stakeholders listed on pages 27-30.</p> <p>12. The level of risks associated with this project appear to be very low (very optimistic). Please re-evaluate. For high risk activities, please include mitigation measures as part of the proposed activities.</p> <p>13. The list of projects under the coordination with other GEF-Financed and other initiatives is exceedingly long. Please only list those that are directly related to the proposed work. As in the case of the list of stakeholders, it is difficult to believe that this project will have the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		man power, budget and time to actively coordinate with all these projects (p.32-34). 4-1-17 Cleared	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	August 04th 2016 Yes. The project will develop a gender Mainstreaming Plan (GMP) during the PPG phase.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	August 04th 2016 Not for the LD part \$1,094,600 instead of \$1m. Yes for the BD part. 9-23-16 Yes, the LD part has been adjusted to correspond to the amount available. Cleared	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	August 04th 2016 No, The project is not recommended	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>for clearance. Please address the issues identified in the previous comments.</p> <p>9-23-16 No. Please address outstanding issues listed under items 4 & 5. Thanks.</p> <p>4-1-17 Yes. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	August 04, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 07, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 23, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.