



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

GEF ID:	9903		
Country/Region:	Sierra Leone		
Project Title:	Sustainable and Integrated landscape management of the Western Area Peninsula		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5542 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,209,909
Co-financing:	\$18,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$23,209,909
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Saskia Marijnissen

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	<p>13 September 2017</p> <p>Please consider the 2 points below:</p> <p>1- The project is aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and explicitly articulates which Aichi Targets. Nevertheless, for each of these targets, the identification of the SMART indicators is unclear. Please identify clearly the indicators that will be used to track the project's</p>	<p>1. In response to the GEF Secretariat's comments, we have revised and adjusted indicators in Table B to ensure that they are SMART and more explicitly demonstrate how project activities will contribute directly to achieving the specified Aichi Targets 7, 11, 12, and 20.</p> <p>Target 7 (areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, thereby ensuring conservation of biodiversity) is addressed under</p>

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>contribution toward achieving the Aichi Targets.</p> <p>2- In addition, Table F reports the same area for 2 different corporate results: globally biodiversity maintained and Sustainable Land Management. Please avoid double accounting and clearly distinguish the 2 GEB targets of the project.</p> <p>2 October 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.</p>	<p>Outcome 1: (i) incorporation of biodiversity considerations into sector policies and regulatory frameworks that are relevant for land-users in the WAP; and Outcome 2: (iv) 2,000 ha covered under SLM, thereby reducing loss of natural habitats and land degradation.</p> <p>Target 11 (terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes) is addressed under Outcome 1: (ii) approved and enforced zoning master plan for natural areas; and Outcome 2: (iii) designation of at least two new community coastal/mangrove PAs.</p> <p>Target 12 (the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained) is addressed under Outcome 2: (ii) stable or increased population of targeted endangered species within the landscape (e.g. chimpanzee, Colobus, manatee).</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Target 20 (mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels) is addressed under Outcome 3: (i) substantive increase in the government allocation for landscape management; and (ii) number of operationalised new financing mechanisms.</p> <p>The project also indirectly contributes to Aichi Targets 5 and 10, but as the indicators cannot be directly attributed to project activities we have now removed them from the PIF.</p> <p>2. Table F has been adjusted to avoid double accounting and distinguish the two separate Global Environmental Benefit targets. Target 2 on 120 million hectares under sustainable land management was set to 2,000 ha (covering the area that will be targeted for SLM).</p>
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>13 September 2017</p> <p>Some important national strategies are documented and align well with the proposal. Nevertheless, no reference is made to land degradation and</p>	<p>Reference is now made on consistency with national priorities and MEAs of which Sierra Leone is party, including the UNCCD as well as the LDN target setting process. We also included reference to the NAPA, which was previously omitted.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>UNCCD. Please, inform how the project is consistent to the national strategies relating to UNCCD and particularly the National Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) target setting process that was launched late 2016 in Sierra Leone.</p> <p>2 October 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the added information. Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>14 September 2017</p> <p>We understand that the sustainability will be ensured through the awareness raising, the capacity enhancement and the establishment of financing activities. The latter is crucial and we can expect that it will be developed with local beneficiaries through private activities. In that context, the sustainability in particular of the governance structures created by the project remains unclear. Please provide information on the way these structures will be maintained after the project duration and how they will be financed.</p> <p>2 October 2017</p>	<p>The project will not seek to establish entirely new governance structures. It will rather strengthen and build on existing mechanisms. The best governance structure will be explored during the PPG phase. This will partly be done by identifying and addressing gaps and overlaps in legal, sectoral policy, institutional and enforcement frameworks, as well as through capacity enhancement. We adjusted the text to clarify this better.</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>14 September 2017</p> <p>Please consider the 3 points below:</p> <p>1- A baseline is presented but it is unclear how it relates with the project proposal. Please provide information on the articulation between the baseline and the project to show synergy where possible and ensure avoiding overlaps.</p> <p>2- In the Coordination section, the proposal provide interesting reference to existing GEF investments the project can benefit from. Please take into account the other existing GEF projects which can also provide useful support or lessons to this new proposal, such as the Enabling Activities on biodiversity, climate adaptation and Capacity assessment and the GEF ID#3510 "Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Sierra Leone". This can be informed in the baseline section as these projects are under implementation.</p> <p>3- In addition, please note that the ID numbers of the mentioned GEF projects in the Coordination section</p>	<p>1. We revised the Baseline section to better describe and articulate the relevance of past/ongoing interventions for the planned project. This includes the collection of relevant biodiversity and REDD+ related data (USAID WABIC, RSPB, EU projects), and capacity enhancement investments (e.g. to NPAA and MLCPE for land policy implementation).</p> <p>2. The Coordination section was revised to include lessons learned from the past GEF-funded Enabling Activities on biodiversity, climate adaptation and capacity assessment, and the GEF project on Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management. Lessons will be distilled from these projects during the PPG and applied in the further articulation of the project.</p> <p>3. We previously erroneously included UNDP ID's and have now corrected this to reflect the correct GEF Project ID's.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>are incorrect (there are UNDP ID) and need to be corrected.</p> <p>2 October 2017</p> <p>1 and 2 : Thank you for the added information. Cleared.</p> <p>3: Except for the project ID number 5902, the GEF projects IDs are still incorrect. Please, during the PPG phase, correct accordingly the GEF IDs of the GEF projects that will be coordinated with or provide lessons to this proposal.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>14 September 2017</p> <p>Please consider the points below:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>1- The first component is about capacity while the second one is about implementation. This difference doesn't appear clearly in the outcomes of the components in table B as both are pretty the same: "the improved management... of the WAP Multi-Use Landscape". Please specify more clearly the outcomes of each component;</p> <p>2- All the components plan TA investments. The second component</p>	<p>1. The outcomes as listed in Table B have been revised to more clearly specify the difference between systemic and institutional capacity enhancement (Component 1) versus actual on-the-ground management implementation (Component 2). The description of Component 1 was left intact: Systemic and institutional capacity for sustainable multi-use landscape management, whereas Component 2 is now described as: 2. Implementation of Integrated Management of the Western Area Peninsula Multi-Use Landscape.</p> <p>2. Articulation of planned INV investments under Component 2 was revised in Table B as well as in the</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>also plans INV investments but the relative importance of the INV investments is not informed. To ensure concrete results on the ground, it is necessary to go beyond training, education, meetings, proclaimed PAs... and significant INV investments must be considered. Please provide more information of the share and of the kind of investments the project is considering to ensure effective change on the ground;</p> <p>3- Component 1 will identify and propose concrete actions for both enforcement and protection. Please explain how these actions will be implemented.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>4- There is no map of project localization and targeted areas (WAP landscape, National Park, area for potential buffer zones, urban areas...). Please provide an adequate map showing the landscape and where the activities will be implemented;</p> <p>5- The way the targeted users and the two new community managed PAs will be selected is unclear. Please provide information about the criteria</p>	<p>Project Justification narrative, to better clarify the kind of INV investments the project is considering (e.g. establishment of nurseries, seeds/seedlings, tools and equipment for alternative livelihood income generating activities). Further details of the specific investments will be provided during the PPG phase.</p> <p>3. Concrete actions will be identified for enforcement of the Master Plan (e.g. through improved demarcation, monitoring, capacity enhancement for PA rangers and police). In collaboration with FAO who are supporting the Government in enhancing capacity for implementation of the National Land Policy, strategies will be developed to address land tenure insecurities</p> <p>4. A map detailing the targeted Western Area landscape and the outline of the WAPNP has now been provided as an annex. Urban areas are indicated in grey and marked by the names of the various towns. Locations of buffer zones and coastal PAs tbd during PPG.</p> <p>5. We included initial criteria in the narrative. Locations for the community managed coastal/mangrove PAs will be selected based on set criteria including biodiversity value, accessibility, and potential for community buy-in (detailed</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>used to select the project beneficiaries.</p> <p>6- The insecurity of land tenure is considered in the proposal as a barrier to achieve conservation and effective management and it is not clear how the project is expected to address this issue. Please explain how the project plans to overcome this difficulty.</p> <p>7- The activities planned are unclear: the Plan is "operationalised", "species management initiatives are supported", the land users "are supported"... without going too far in details at this stage, please provide some more information regarding the concrete activities that are envisaged to support these general goals.</p> <p>2 October 2017</p> <p>Thank you for all the information provided. Cleared</p>	<p>criteria will be developed during the PPG phase).</p> <p>6. The reformed National Land Policy (2015) to which is referred in Section 6 (p. 15) aims to address land tenure insecurities. The project will coordinate with FAO (see Section 5, p14) which is supporting the GoSL with capacity enhancement for implementation of the Land Policy. We provided additional comments in the baseline situation description and under Component 1 to better clarify this.</p> <p>7. We revised the narrative of Component 2 to be more specific about the type of support that will be provided to operationalize the Master Plan. Exact sub-outputs and activities will be defined during the PPG phase,</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	14 September 2017	Cleared.
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? 	13 September 2017	PPG amount is now set \$150,000, and PPG is charged proportionally to the two

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Yes. Nevertheless, please consider the 2 points below:</p> <p>1- Some numbers in table E on PPG are incorrect: the amount in the first row is different from the total agency fee and the total PPG exceeds the maximum amount for a project until \$6 million which is \$150,000. In addition, PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas which is not the case. Please adjust the table A, B and E accordingly.</p> <p>2- The agency may consider using all the STAR allocation available for this project.</p> <p>3 October 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the adjustments. Cleared.</p>	<p>focal areas. The entire GEF grant budget figures were revised based on the current LoE (attached, version labelled 170905, signed 31st August 2017).</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>13 September 2017</p> <p>The requested grant is within the total resources available for the country. Nevertheless, there isn't enough STAR resources from the LD and BD Focal Area. Sierra Leone is eligible to have full flexibility to program the allocation across the three focal areas but this has to be specified in the LoE. Please revise the LoE informing the country make use of full flexibility</p>	<p>A new LoE was prepared to include the full remaining STAR allocation, and submitted for OFP signature. Pending review by the GoSL, we would be grateful if you could process this PIF review and clearance with the previous LoE. Amounts can be adjusted after we receive the new LOE.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and specify which amount of resources are moved from which Focal Area to which one. The LoE must also include the use of the resources for the PPG. Please complete the LoE accordingly in order to inform the total GEF grant requested.</p> <p>3 October 2017</p> <p>Cleared. Please note that a new LoE with the complete information about the use of full flexibility is still requested to the agency for a better clarity.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
<p>Recommendations</p>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>14 September 2017</p> <p>Not yet. Please address the comments above.</p> <p>2 October 2017</p> <p>Comments have been addressed adequately at PIF stage and the project is technically cleared and recommended for possible inclusion in a future work program.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Please take note of the following items to be addressed by ENDORSEMENT (during PPG phase):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- The best governance structure will to be explored; 2- Total partner investments in the land policy implementation process are not clear at this stage, and are expected be assessed in more detail; 3- Lessons from the other GEF projects will be distilled from these projects and applied in the further articulation of the project; 4- Baseline & targets of the outcomes in table B are expected to be determined; 5- Regarding the importance of the INV investments in component 2, further details of the specific investments will be provided; 6- Gaps in legal, sectoral policy, institutional and enforcement frameworks will be identified, and the project will subsequently support addressing these gaps to establish improved enabling conditions for integrated landscape management; 	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>7- Locations of buffer zones and coastal PAs are to be determined;</p> <p>8- Detailed criteria used to select the project beneficiaries will be developed;</p> <p>9- As regard to the clarification of the activities, exact sub-outputs and activities will be defined;</p> <p>10- The intervention of the private sector as investor and as part of the promoted economic activities should be adequately explored.</p>	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

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?		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the 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.