



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

GEF ID:	9390		
Country/Region:	Liberia		
Project Title:	Strengthening National Capacities to Meet Global Environmental Obligations with the Framework of Sustainable Development Priorities		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5796 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCCD-1; CCCD-3; CCCD-5; CCCD-5;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,500,000
Co-financing:	\$1,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$3,050,000
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Susan Waithaka	Agency Contact Person:	Tom Twining -ward

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	The project is aligned with the GEF 6 CCCD strategy - objectives 1,3 &5. SW 2/20/2016	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. The project mentions Liberia's Agenda for Transformation 2012-2017 which identified many of the same issues identified in the NCSA. In Liberia's medium-term Poverty Reduction Strategy II (2012-2018) there is a fifth pillar: Cross-Cutting	

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>Issues which includes the environment. During the Liberia Rio+20 National Consultative Workshop, Liberia identified five issues that are essential for accomplishing its development goals and objectives. Additionally, Liberia has also developed a National Capacity Development Strategy (2010).</p> <p>There is also mention of the NAPA and the NBSAPs and how this aligns with this project.</p> <p>However - the project has failed to mention Liberia's involved in the UNEP implemented Regional Project - funded by the Cross Cutting Capacity programme of the GEF - titled 'Piloting Integrated Processes and Approaches to Facilitate National Reporting to Rio Conventions Project'. A look at the reports emanating from that project may help shape this project and avoid duplication and repeat studies and activities.</p> <p>Further information requested. SW 2/20/2016</p> <p>Information provided. Furthermore - more information will be firmed up</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>during the PPG and is expected to be provided then. Engagement with the Agencies involved in the UNEP project will seek to further enhance synergies and collaboration</p> <p>Cleared SW 4/25/2016</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>Please elaborate more on the drivers - direct and indirect of global environmental degradation and barriers that the project will face. Provide a linkage between the weaknesses/challenges you are trying to address and the drivers.</p> <p>More information requested SW 2/20/2016</p> <p>Explanation provided - and more to be provided after the PPG. The four project components and the key outputs outlined serve to address these challenges. However, during the PPG, the system boundary of the project will be better delineated, i.e., which "drivers" will be addressed and which ones will not be addressed. This can only be determined on the basis of which development partners are willing to contribute to project outputs and activities, the priority set of capacities that can feasibly</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>addressed within the timeframe of the project, and national absorptive capacities.</p> <p>Cleared and information to be provided at CEO endorsement.</p> <p>SW 4/25/2016</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>No information is provided for baseline projects. The baseline has to be specifically described in order to assess how the GEF's increment will contribute to the project's objectives.</p> <p>Please provide this information</p> <p>SW 2/20/2016</p> <p>The PIF outlines the significant investment from the Norway in the amount of US\$ 150 million, resources that will help improve forest governance to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from deforestation. During the PPG, extensive in-country consultations will be required to identify the relevant set of baseline projects upon which the proposed CCCD project can build upon. Of the significant investments in Liberia that are related to the project's objective, only a subset of these will be relevant since the project must undertake targeted capacity development.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cleared 4/25/2016	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>The document outlines 4 components addressing the CCCD objectives 1,3&5.</p> <p>Component 1: please provide some clarification on some of the outputs. Output 1.2 - What is an integrated environment KM system? Output 1.3 is not clear. Output 1.4 - not much information has been given on the current status as far as the technologies are concerned. For output 1.6 - Who will be trained, how many trainings and for how many departments?</p> <p>Component 2: Which you may want to merge with Component 3 instead of having a separate component on awareness. In this way you empower national and local institutions and civil servants in the country to lead awareness. This will also be a cost saving measure to reduce the project amount.</p> <p>More specifically - 2.4 - what does this mean?</p> <p>Please go through and revise in particular Component 2 and 3 and reduce the outputs making them</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>sharper and clearer and quantified.</p> <p>More information requested. SW 2/25/2016</p> <p>Explanation provided. Cleared SW 4/25/2016</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>The project mentions that all government Ministries will be involved and names them. However while CSOs are mentioned as potential stakeholders none are actually named. It is important that CSOs are actively engaged in this type of project and so will urge you to mention some of the CSOs that will be involved in the project.</p> <p>More information requested. SW 2/25/2016</p> <p>Civil society organizations will be project stakeholders, but only during the PPG will consultations reveal which ones are more likely to be involved during project implementation at the preliminary stage. During implementation, other CSOs may become involved as they begin to be co-opted to carry out important awareness-raising activities. At the PIF stage, it is politically expedient not to mention any CSOs by name as this may</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		alienate certain other CSOs before the project has had a chance to conduct consultations with CSOs and other stakeholders during the PPG. To make such advance decisions is the anti-thesis of adaptive collaborative management that belie the innovativeness and technical soundness of the Cross-Cutting Capacity Development programme. Cleared SW 4/25/2016	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	N/A	
	• The focal area allocation?	Yes CCCD for GEF 6. Cleared SW 2/25/2016	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	The project has indicated that there is co-financing of 1,500,000. However \$800,000 of this amount is indicated as to be determined. This could put the project in jeopardy if this undetermined does not come in - so you may need to revise the budget taking this into account.	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Furthermore - it is expected that the total project amount will go down once the outputs are tightened up.</p> <p>The project is not yet recommended for clearance.</p> <p>More information requested.</p> <p>SW 3/7/2016</p> <p>The project has several areas that need to be clarified and these will be presented during CEO endorsement. The project is recommended for clearance and PPG.</p> <p>SW 4/25/2016</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 07, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 26, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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?	<p>No major changes in the project rational or design - however a number of PIF outputs have been reworded. While there are details in the Workplan - the outputs are not worded in a quantifiable manner. Please amend.</p> <p>5/10/2017</p> <p>Target indicators were added in Section C2.</p> <p>Cleared 9/8/2017</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>As mentioned above a tightening of the outputs to make them more focused would be useful to have an idea of the value for money. Outputs should be expressed the results of activities: they should be very concrete and, if possible, quantified (# of ha, # of training, # of participants, # of plans, of studies, etc). The formulation of outputs should help to figure out the value for money . This should especially be so for the awareness component.</p> <p>Output 3.4 - This output refers to education curricula. This is huge undertaking that should include curriculum development units and the government which does not seem to be the case here. Please elaborate on exactly what is entailed here and what really the outcome will be.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>For output 1.7 - following the PPG - for the piloting have other MEAs been identified and a high value sector plan been selected? Please be a bit more precise on how this piloting will take place.</p> <p>Revision requested</p> <p>5/10/2017</p> <p>Explanations and revisions provided. Cleared</p> <p>9/8/2017</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>Yes cleared</p> <p>5/10/2017</p>	
	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)	<p>Yes it does. Cleared</p> <p>5/10/2017</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>Co-financing will now be provided by EPA - USD 1.3Min kind and the UNDP \$200,000 in grant. The total amount remains the same as at the PIF stage.</p> <p>Cleared</p> <p>5/10/2017</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	Yes, the Capacity Development Scorecard has been completed. Cleared 5/10/2017	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes - the project has mentioned and looked at the report of the previous global funded project and will build further on capacities built - under component 4. Cleared 5/10/2017	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Yes a detailed M&E plan with costing is provided. Cleared 5/10/2017	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Component One of the project focuses on establishing a system or knowledge management which primarily refers to the data system. Please provide more details on how the project will learn from other projects and also document lessons learnt etc. Information requested 5/10/2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>The project will learn from other projects by convening workshops with participants from other projects to discuss lessons that they have learned in managing data and information. Section B.4 provides three paragraphs that detail how lessons will be learned from other projects. Paragraphs 124 and 125 also outline approaches to knowledge management. Component 3 on Improving awareness of global environmental values includes a number of activities that are essential to strengthening systemic and individual capacities central to institutionalizing sustainability, which was the single most important need that countries identified as part of their NCSA projects.</p> <p>Cleared 9/8/2017</p>	
Agency Responses	<p>11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF³ stage from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	<p>Not yet. The project has provided a list of stakeholders -and some have been described in a generic manner. Given that consultations have taken place during the PPG - I expect to</p>	

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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>have actual descriptions of stakeholders who were consulted or are expected to be involved in the project. The naming of CSOs consulted and to be involved was expected to be provided at CEO endorsement. In addition - there is mention of indigenous people but no mention of them in the stakeholder list.</p> <p>Please provide more detailed information on stakeholders who will be involved.</p> <p>Information requested</p> <p>5/10/2017</p> <p>Done. Cleared</p> <p>9/8/2017</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	N/A	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>Not yet. more information on stakeholders is requested. in addition more tightening of the outputs and information on a knowledge management plan and more clarification on the education curricula.</p> <p>Information requested</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>5/10/2017</p> <p>With respect to educational curricula, the project document was revised to clarify the nature of this output 3.4. This output concerns the improvement of educational curricula, not the creation or formulation of an entire educational curriculum. Instead, this output is focused on the development of an environmental module that would be integrated into targeted educational curricula at a select number of schools for piloting: three in the second year, six in the third, and nine in the fourth year. This output is not a huge undertaking, with the EPA working with the Ministry of Education, which was identified in Table 2 as an engaged stakeholder. Additional text was added to confirm their role in this particular output.</p> <p>All requested information has been provided.</p> <p>The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>Cleared 9/8/2017</p>	
Review Date	Review	May 11, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 08, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

