

2019

Project Implementation Review (PIR)

**Coastal risks management**

[Basic Data](#_Toc1)

[Overall Ratings](#_Toc2)

[Development Progress](#_Toc3)

[Implementation Progress](#_Toc4)

[Critical Risk Management](#_Toc5)

[Adjustments](#_Toc6)

[Ratings and Overall Assessments](#_Toc7)

[Gender](#_Toc8)

[Social and Environmental Standards](#_Toc9)

[Communicating Impact](#_Toc10)

[Partnerships](#_Toc11)

[Annex - Ratings Definitions](#_Toc12)

# Basic Data

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Information** |
| UNDP PIMS ID | 5178 |
| GEF ID | 5902 |
| Title | Adapting to climate change induced coastal risks management in Sierra Leone |
| Country(ies) | Sierra Leone, Sierra Leone |
| UNDP-GEF Technical Team | Climate Change Adaptation |
| Project Implementing Partner | SLE10 (Sierra Leone) |
| Joint Agencies | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Project Type | Full Size |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Description** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Contacts** |
| UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser | Mr. Muyeye Chambwera (muyeye.chambwera@undp.org) |
| Programme Associate | Ms. Feven Fassil (feven.fassil@undp.org) |
| Project Manager  | Ms. Bintu Moseray (bintu.moseray@undp.org) |
| CO Focal Point | Ms. Tanzila Sankoh (tanzila.sankoh@undp.org) |
| GEF Operational Focal Point | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Project Implementing Partner | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Other Partners | *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Overall Ratings

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Overall DO Rating | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall IP Rating | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall Risk Rating | Substantial |

# Development Progress

|  |
| --- |
| **Description** |
| **Objective****Strengthen the ability of coastal communities to systematically manage climate change risks and impacts on physical infrastructure and economic livelihoods** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2018** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| The percentage change in vulnerability of youth and women living in the pilot sites to climate change induced risks threatening the coastal zone. |  The baseline will be determined in the pilot sites in the inception phase through a VRA. | 20% increase in the VRA score by Mid-Term. | More than 50% increase in the VRA score by the end of project | *(not set or not applicable)* | This will be determined based on the Vulnerability Risks Analysis (VRA)/ Coastal Vulnerability Assessment (CVA) findings. The ToR has been developed and the recruitment process is underway and expected to be completed by end of mid September, 2019.  |
| Number of direct project beneficiaries. | The number of youth and women in the pilot sites will be determined in the inception phase through a VRA. | 23,200 youth and women in all the six pilot sites are registered as project beneficiaries and are involved in adaptation measures determined through a VRA by Mid-Term. | At least 58,000 women and youths are registered as project beneficiaries and are involved in adaptation measures determined through VRA score by the end of project. | *(not set or not applicable)* | The total number of targeted youth and women in the pilot sites will be determined post completion of the VRA/CVA and will be available during the next reporting period. Meanwhile, the project has begun implementation of ancillary activities and has directly benefitted 1,469 (778 male & 691 female) as a result of capacity building activities undertaken by the five Implementing Partners (IPs). Specifically, these include trainings in ; Global Climate change; Remote sensing Applications; and awareness raising massages to enhance decision-making and foster public awareness on the appropriate adaptation options.   |
| *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **On track** |
| **Outcome 1****Enhance the availability of high quality climate risk information that is critical for development decision-making in the coastal zone.** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2018** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Percentage of coastal area in the 6 communes covered under improved observation to generate quality climate risk information. |  Currently no climate/weather and marine monitoring station is installed in the six sites targeted by the project. |  At least 30% of coastal area of the six communes is covered with coastal climate/weather and marine monitoring stations (ONSs). |  At least 65% of coastal area of the six communes are covered with coastal climate/weather and marine monitoring stations (ONSs). | *(not set or not applicable)* | Specifications for weather stations have been developed by the country office (CO) in consultation with the Sierra Leone Meteorological Agency with support from the Regional procurement unit (RPU) in the Regional Bureau of Africa (RBA). The procurement process to procure; six Oceanographic Monitoring System (OMS) equipment complete with remote data transmission; one mobile Automatic Weather Station (AWS); four remote sensing image processing software packages and equipment to assist climate and oceanographic monitoring are currently underway and expected to be completed by the end of the forth quarter. Installation of these equipment will however commence in the first quarter of 2020. Additionally, to enhance the capacity of technical staff to understand climate change impact on the coastal environment, 30 technical staff from relevant institutions were trained by IMBO on Drivers of Global climate change and remote sensing techniques in November 2018 (Annex 1). It is expected that the training will help staff to gain better understanding on the risks posed by climate change and develop appropriate adaptation measures.  |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **On track** |
| **Outcome 2****Develop appropriate protection measures, policy/legal tools and integrated coordination mechanisms to improve /support policy design and implementation in dealing with current and long-term coastal challenges.** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2018** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| Number of ICZM plans that integrate climate change SLR induced risks and vulnerability. | Currently the ICZM and associated policies do not integrate climate change SLR induced risks and vulnerability.  | At mid-term 6 CVA (one for each commune) have been developed and a draft implementation plan for MSP is available to inform the ICZM plans strengthening. | At the end of the project 7 Coastal Policy Guidance documents at the National (1) and District (6) levels integrate climate change SLR induced risks and vulnerability and an EbA guidance manual to support construction of ecosystem based interventions.  | *(not set or not applicable)* | The project team collaborated with USAID funded WA BICC project to validate coastal climate change adaptation plan. The plan is expected to serve as a guide that will help government, national and international practitioners and policy-makers that are seeking to address the challenges of climate change at the coastal realm to identify feasible interventions that could help increase the resilience of coastal communities and ecosystems. The plan will form the basis of ICZM formation. (See weblink for reference) https://www.wabicc.org/sierra-leone-validates-climate-change-adaptation-plan-as-stakeholders-prepare-for-action/  |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **On track** |
| **Outcome 3****Public awareness enhanced and climate resilient alternatives to sand mining promoted for better adhesion of policy makers and communities on adaptation.** |
| **Description of Indicator** | **Baseline Level** | **Midterm target level** | **End of project target level** | **Level at 30 June 2018** | **Cumulative progress since project start** |
| 3a. Number of technical officers and policy makers qualified to conduct awareness raising campaigns to disseminate knowledge on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, and Sectoral and Livelihood Adaptation Planning issues in the six coastal districts (Conakry Dee, Lakka & Hamilton, Tombo, Shenge and Turtle Island).  | 3a. Currently no technical officers and policy makers are qualified to conduct awareness raising campaigns capacity buildingon Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, and Sectoral and Livelihood Adaptation Planning delivered. | 3a. At Mid-Term, at least 25 technical officers and policy makers qualified to conduct awareness raising campaigns on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, and Sectoral and Livelihood Adaptation Planning issues in the six coastal districts. | 3a. At the end of the project at least 50 technical officers and policy makers qualified to conduct awareness raising campaigns on Integrated Coastal Zone Management (ICZM), Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment, and Sectoral and Livelihood Adaptation Planning issues in the six coastal districts. | *(not set or not applicable)* | The capacity of 1,102 (561 male and 541 female) project beneficiaries including community leaders and other relevant stakeholders were built in all the six project locations by The Min. of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR), National Tourist Board (NTB)and Media Reform Coordinating Group (MRCG) to promote public awareness raising interventions at both District and Chiefdom levels on existing and potential coastal hazards to climate change and the importance of the different adaptation options (Annex 2).  |
| 3.b Number of youth and sand mining groups previously engaged in sand mining adopt alternative climate-resilient livelihoods | 3b. Currently no viable alternatives are offered to youth engaged in sand-mining  | 3b. At Mid-Term, at least 5 youth and sand mining groups adopted alternative livelihoods, and 90 masons and 90 block makers produce and use CSEB for construction; | 3b. At the end of the project, at least 10 youth and sand mining groups adopted alternative livelihoods and 90 masons and 90 block makers produce and use CSEB for construction and are fully engaged in this activity; | *(not set or not applicable)* | To understand the needs of youth and sand mining groups in the various communities, the project team (Project Manager & M&E) developed questionnaires and conducted rapid assessment mission to all the targeted locations engaging local leaders, youth leaders, women's leaders and other community stakeholders to determine and prioritized appropriate alternative livelihood options and designed innovative strategy that support coastal adaptation for climate resilient. In addition, procurement process in underway for the procurement of two outboard engines including fishing gears for targeted youth groups in two communities (Lakka & Hamilton). Delivery of these equipment is expected by end October. (Annex 3)  |
| 3c. Number of ha of mangrove restoration, undertaken in the six pilot sites to protect coastal community and infrastructure at risks.  | 3c. Currently there is no EbA work being undertaken in the six pilot sites to protect coastal community and infrastructure at risks. | 3c. By Mid-Term at least 50% (250 ha) of planned area of mangrove restoration is undertaken in the six pilot sites to protect coastal community and infrastructure at risks. | 3a. By the end of project 500 ha of mangrove restoration is undertaken in the six pilot sites to protect coastal community and infrastructure at risks. | *(not set or not applicable)* | The mangrove restoration activity is planned to commence in the forth quarter of 2019 by partnering with two local NGOs. The process of recruitment has been initiated and call for proposal/ToR have been developed for local NGOs engagement on mangrove restoration (100 ha). The recruitment process is expected to complete by mid September. Meanwhile, mangrove rehabilitation is expected to continue till 2021 to achieve the targeted 500ha.  |
| **The progress of the objective can be described as:** | **On track** |

# Implementation Progress



|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Cumulative GL delivery against total approved amount (in prodoc): | 3.41% |
| Cumulative GL delivery against expected delivery as of this year: | 5.78% |
| Cumulative disbursement as of 30 June (note: amount to be updated in late August): | 340,291 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Key Financing Amounts** |
| PPG Amount | 200,000 |
| GEF Grant Amount | 9,975,000 |
| Co-financing | 31,800,000 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Key Project Dates** |
| PIF Approval Date | Dec 1, 2015 |
| CEO Endorsement Date | Nov 6, 2017 |
| Project Document Signature Date (project start date): | Apr 25, 2018 |
| Date of Inception Workshop | Jul 19, 2018 |
| Expected Date of Mid-term Review | Oct 25, 2020 |
| Actual Date of Mid-term Review | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Expected Date of Terminal Evaluation | Jan 25, 2023 |
| Original Planned Closing Date | Apr 25, 2023 |
| Revised Planned Closing Date | *(not set or not applicable)* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Dates of Project Steering Committee/Board Meetings during reporting period (30 June 2018 to 1 July 2019)** |
| 2018-08-24 |
| 2019-02-07 |

# Critical Risk Management

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Current Types of Critical Risks  | Critical risk management measures undertaken this reporting period |
| Other | Insufficient institutional engagement and coordination among implementing partners. To address this, the technical steering committee was formed by the project team incorporating relevant IPs (Min. of Fisheries and Marine Resources; Environmental Protection Agency; National Tourist Board; Institute of Marine Biology and Oceanography; Min. of Works and Public Assets; Sierra Leone Meteorological Agency) to ensure information on project activities are coordinated and challenges discussed. During the start of the project implementation, regular meetings were held to discuss issues on project implementation and achievement of project results. This meetings provided a platform to enhance efficient implementation process.  |
| Environmental | Limited capacity among project counterparts to identify, install and maintain marine and weather equipment delayed the procurement processes. This delay posed challenges to provide credible marine and weather information. However, preliminary training was conducted by IMBO and SLMet Agency to strengthen the capacity of technical staff from the relevant IPs. The training will enhance the capacity of technical staff to adequately handle the equipment, monitor and provide reliable marine and weather information.  |

# Adjustments

**Comments on delays in key project milestones**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Manager: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure. If there are no delays please indicate not applicable.** |
| The inception workshop was delayed as a result of the change that took place in the national governance structure. The project document was official signed in April, 2018 and this time coincided with the just concluded national electioneering process in April 2018 which had an effect on finalization of the recruitment processes of project staff. This also posed challenges on the movement of RBA staff to the CO for planning of an earlier inception workshop until 19th July. This delay had an impact in the implementation of the first year work plan as most of the activities were rephrased to the second year including the procurement processes that should have commenced in the first year. However, the project team effectively planned with the IPs and develop a compressive procurement plan which was shared with the Regional Procurement Unit (RPU) for technical support.  |
| **Country Office: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure. If there are no delays please indicate not applicable.** |
| The CO was going through political transformative processes at the time when the project document was official approved in April which delayed the initial date slated for the inception workshop. This delayed also had a ripple effect on the initial implement of the project in the first year. However, some progress has been made towards achieving project outcomes in ensuring timely procurement of project equipment that contribute to reliable marine and weather information which is also key in developing adaptation options.  |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser: please provide comments on delays this reporting period in achieving any of the following key project milestones: inception workshop, mid-term review, terminal evaluation and/or project closure. If there are no delays please indicate not applicable.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Ratings and Overall Assessments

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Role** | **2019 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2019 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Project Manager/Coordinator** | Moderately Unsatisfactory | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | The DO rating is moderately unsatisfactory although some progress was made towards achieving project objective. Project implementation in the first year was delayed due to change in the national governance structure. This in- turn delayed the procurement processes of marine and weather equipment in the first year of implementation. However, project team together with IPs had several planning meetings and developed detailed procurement plans with specifications for Regional support. Project resources was also rephrased for the second year of implementation. The collaborative effort will ensure timely delivery of project equipment that support access to reliable climate-related data for the nation.  Outcome 1: Access to climate-related data and information underpins the ability of decision-makers to make informed decision and planning regarding climate and marine parameters for the nation. In a bid to achieving this outcome, the capacity of 30 technical staff from the relevant IPs institutions were strengthened by training them on global climate change and satellite remote sensing technology by IMBO. It is hoped that the training provided will enhance their capacity to gain better understanding on climate and oceanographic data collection and weather forecasting.  Outcome 2: The second outcome; "develop appropriate protection measures, policy/legal tools and integrated coordination mechanisms to improve /support policy design and implementation in dealing with current and long-term coastal challenges". EPA conducted preliminary assessment in 2018 on the six project sites to understands the level of asset and infrastructures vulnerable to coastal storm. The assessment report will provide informed decision on further studies to be carried out for the project and assist in designing appropriate protection measures necessary for dealing with the challenges and risks of climate change. Additionally, in building synergies towards a common objective, the project team collaborated with USAID funded WA BICC project in the validation of Coastal Climate Change Adaptation plan. This plan will support the formation of ICMZ at both nation and district levels and provide information on adaptation measures in the coastal zones.  Outcome 3: Adaptation strategies designed for alternative livelihoods to strengthen coastal communities resilience to climate change impact on the coastal zone so as to reduce pressure on natural resources. Training of trainers workshop was conducted by both NTB and MFMR targeting community stakeholders on public awareness messages/strategies on the negative impact of climate change especially along the coastal zones to achieve this outcome. These messages/strategies will create awareness among community stakeholders to understand the negative impact of climate change and the effect of unsustainable fisheries and land management and design appropriate adaptation measures/policies for coastal zones. Also, the project funded Media Reform Coordinating Group (MRCG) to undertake an outreach communication, information and awareness raising messages in the six coastal communities to show and discuss the causes, effects and proposed solutions together with project beneficiaries for addressing climate change risks.  Overall Progress: In general, progress towards project objective is on track despite initial delay in project implementation in the first year. Through effective planning and collaboration among IPs and with support from the RBA team, the project is near completion in ensuring achievement of project outcome. However, the project is moderately unsatisfactory because of delay in the procurement processes.  |
| **Role** | **2019 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2019 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **UNDP Country Office Programme Officer** | Moderately Unsatisfactory | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| Overall Assessment | Overall, the DO rating is moderately unsatisfactory. The project was approved in April with no commitment of donor funds at that time. However, the CO used its resources for initial start-up of the project including hiring of project staff. Project implementation in the first year was delayed until August after the inception workshop. This in- turn delayed the procurement processes of weather station equipment in the first year. However, project team did an implementation plan and share with Regional Office for support. The CO and RO are working very had to ensure timely delivery of project equipment which will contribute to achieving project results. The CO is also collaborating with the relevant implementing partners (IP) for timely delivery of activities.  |
| **Role** | **2019 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2019 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **GEF Operational Focal point** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Role** | **2019 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2019 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Project Implementing Partner** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Role** | **2019 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2019 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **Other Partners** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *- IP Rating provided by UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser and UNDP Country Office only -*  |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **Role** | **2019 Development Objective Progress Rating** | **2019 Implementation Progress Rating** |
| **UNDP-GEF Technical Adviser** | *(not set or not applicable)* | *(not set or not applicable)* |
| Overall Assessment | *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Gender

**Progress in Advancing Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

This information is used in the UNDP-GEF Annual Performance Report, UNDP-GEF Annual Gender Report, reporting to the UNDP Gender Steering and Implementation Committee and for other internal and external communications and learning.  The Project Manager and/or Project Gender Officer should complete this section with support from the UNDP Country Office.

|  |
| --- |
| **Gender Analysis and Action Plan:** *not available* |
| **Please review the project's Gender Analysis and Action Plan. If the document is not attached or an updated Gender Analysis and/or Gender Action Plan is available please upload the document below or send to the Regional Programme Associate to upload in PIMS+. Please note that all projects approved since 1 July 2014 are required to carry out a gender analysis and all projects approved since 1 July 2018 are required to have a gender analysis and action plan.** |
| [Annex 4\_Gender Analyses\_Prodoc.docx](https://undpgefpims.org/attachments/5178/214389/1728596/1743275/Annex%204_Gender%20Analyses_Prodoc.docx) |
| **Please indicate in which results areas the project is contributing to gender equality (you may select more than one results area, or select not applicable):** |
| Contributing to closing gender gaps in access to and control over resources: Yes |
| Improving the participation and decision-making of women in natural resource governance: Yes |
| Targeting socio-economic benefits and services for women: No |
| Not applicable: No |
| **Please describe any experiences or linkages (direct or indirect) between project activities and gender-based violence (GBV). This information is for UNDP use only and will not be shared with GEF Secretariat.**  |
| N/A |
| **Please specify results achieved this reporting period that focus on increasing gender equality and the empowerment of women.** **Please explain how the results reported addressed the different needs of men or women, changed norms, values, and power structures, and/or contributed to transforming or challenging gender inequalities and discrimination.**  |
| Deliberate effort was made by the project for an increase in women participation in all the capacity building provided. In all the capacity building trainings provided, 47% (691) of the total population (1,469) are women as against 53% (778) men indicating greater representation of women. Capacity building among others will help build their confidence, improve their decision-making ability hence improving control over assets especially the natural resources thereby building their resilience on some of the risks that might be posed by climate change .  |
| **Please describe how work to advance gender equality and women's empowerment enhanced the project's environmental and/or resilience outcomes.** |
| Women in the coastal zones rely increasingly on fishing. The project team will collaborate with MFMR on the formation of women in fisheries groups and provide alternative livelihood support. Moreover, the project is in the process of procuring fish processing facilities (five solar cold rooms and 2 ovens for fish drying) by the end of the forth quarter. These facilities alongside capacity building will ensure better livelihood opportunities and enhance the coping mechanism against any environmental hazards.  |

# Social and Environmental Standards

**Social and Environmental Standards (Safeguards)**

The Project Manager and/or the project’s Safeguards Officer should complete this section of the PIR with support from the UNDP Country Office. The UNDP-GEF RTA should review to ensure it is complete and accurate.

|  |
| --- |
| **1) Have any new social and/or environmental risks been identified during project implementation?** |
| No |
| **If any new social and/or environmental risks have been identified during project implementation please describe the new risk(s) and the response to it.**  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **2) Have any existing social and/or environmental risks been escalated during the reporting period? For example, when a low risk increased to moderate, or a moderate risk increased to high.**  |
| No |
| **If any existing social and/or environmental risks have been escalated during implementation please describe the change(s) and the response to it.**  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **SESP:** [Annex 10 SESP.docx](https://undpgefpims.org/attachments/5178/214389/1706289/1706805/Annex%2010%20SESP.docx)**Environmental and Social Management Plan/Framework:** *not available* |
| **For reference, please find below the project's safeguards screening (Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) or the old ESSP tool); management plans (if any); and its SESP categorization above. Please note that the SESP categorization might have been corrected during a centralized review.**  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **3) Have any required social and environmental assessments and/or management plans been prepared in the reporting period? For example, an updated Stakeholder Engagement Plan, Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) or Indigenous Peoples Plan.**  |
| No |
| **If yes, please upload the document(s) above. If no, please explain when the required documents will be prepared.** |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |
| **4) Has the project received complaints related to social and/or environmental impacts (actual or potential )?**  |
| No |
| **If yes, please describe the complaint(s) or grievance(s) in detail including the status, significance, who was involved and what action was taken.**  |
| *(not set or not applicable)* |

# Communicating Impact

|  |
| --- |
| **Tell us the story of the project focusing on how the project has helped to improve people’s lives.** **(This text will be used for UNDP corporate communications, the UNDP-GEF website, and/or other internal and external knowledge and learning efforts.)** |
| Title: Local Leaders embrace sand mining policy Sand mining is one of the major livelihood opportunities for many youths within the coastal communities; predominantly around the capital city of Freetown. This demand continues to increase with the increase in population growth. However, the indiscriminate, unregulated and over exploitation of this product across coastal areas has had a significant impact on sea water level, thus causing frequent flooding, coastal erosion, depletion of land areas located near the sea and destruction of physical infrastructure. As such, coastal zones have become increasingly vulnerable to these effects and risks posed by sand mining and climate change.  Adapting to climate change induced coastal risks management in Sierra Leone a 5-year GEF funded project implemented by UNDP in collaboration with four primary IPs aimed at strengthening the ability of coastal communities to systematically manage climate change risks and impact on physical infrastructure and economic livelihoods in six coastal communities. Since last year, the project worked with its partners to raise awareness of coastal communities on the risks posed by climate change and more especially the indiscriminate sand mining effect. Recent assessment (unreported) in project communities has revealed that sand mining as a livelihood activity has been discouraged and regulations placed on it by local community leaders. This action by local community leaders has helped to minimize the rate of exploitation of this natural resource in coastal communities, thus reducing the risks posed while at the same time supporting adaptation in coastal communities. Through these trainings, at least, some members of the community can now identify climate change risks and factors that accelerate climate change. Now community leaders can take actions against the indiscriminate sand mining activities that has been taking place in their localities. All thanks to the GEF funded project, that has increased the knowledge based of these communities.   |

**Knowledge Management, Project Links and Social Media**

|  |
| --- |
| **Please describe knowledge activities / products as outlined in knowledge management approved at CEO Endorsement /Approval.** **Please also include: project's website, project page on the UNDP website, blogs, photos stories (e.g. Exposure), Facebook, Twitter, Flickr, YouTube, as well as hyperlinks to any media coverage of the project, for example, stories written by an outside source. Please upload any supporting files, including photos, videos, stories, and other documents using the 'file lirbary' button in the top right of the PIR.** |
| N/A |

# Partnerships

**Partnerships & Stakeholder Engagment**

Please select yes or no whether the project is working with any of the following partners. Please also provide an update on stakeholder engagement. This information is used by the GEF and UNDP for reporting and is therefore very important!  All sections must be completed by the Project Manager and reviewed by the CO and RTA.

|  |
| --- |
| **Does the project work with any Civil Society Organisations and/or NGOs?** |
| Yes |
| **Does the project work with any Indigenous Peoples?** |
| Yes |
| **Does the project work with the Private Sector?** |
| No |
| No |
| **Does the project work with the GEF Small Grants Programme?** |
| No |
| No |
| **Does the project work with UN Volunteers?** |
| No |
| No |
| **Did the project support South-South Cooperation and/or Triangular Cooperation efforts in the reporting year?** |
| No |
| No |
| **CEO Endorsement Request:** [5178\_LDCF\_Sierra Leone\_CEO endorsement dated 21 Sept.docx](https://undpgefpims.org/attachments/5178/214389/1704237/1708996/5178_LDCF_Sierra%20Leone_CEO%20endorsement%20dated%2021%20Sept.docx) |
| **Provide an update on progress, challenges and outcomes related to stakeholder engagement based on the description of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan as documented at CEO endorsement/approval (see document below). If any surveys have been conducted please upload all survey documents to the PIR file library.** |
| N/A |

# Annex - Ratings Definitions

**Development Objective Progress Ratings Definitions**

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Project is on track to exceed its end-of-project targets, and is likely to achieve transformational change by project closure. The project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Project is on track to fully achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. The project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Project is on track to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure with minor shortcomings only.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is expected to partially achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure with significant shortcomings. Project results might be fully achieved by project closure if adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is not expected to achieve its end-of-project targets by project closure. Project results might be partially achieved by project closure if major adaptive management is undertaken immediately.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Project is off track and is not expected to achieve its end-of-project targets without major restructuring.

**Implementation Progress Ratings Definitions**

(HS) Highly Satisfactory: Implementation is exceeding expectations. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and risk management are fully on track. The project is managed extremely efficiently and effectively. The implementation of the project can be presented as 'outstanding practice'.

(S) Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and risk management are on track. The project is managed efficiently and effectively. The implementation of the project can be presented as 'good practice'.

(MS) Moderately Satisfactory: Implementation is proceeding as planned with minor deviations. Cumulative financial delivery and management of risks are mostly on track, with minor delays. The project is managed well.

(MU) Moderately Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces significant implementation issues. Implementation progress could be improved if adaptive management is undertaken immediately. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are significantly off track. The project is not fully or well supported.

(U) Unsatisfactory: Implementation is not proceeding as planned and faces major implementation issues and restructuring may be necessary. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones, and/or management of critical risks are off track with major issues and/or concerns. The project is not fully or well supported.

(HU) Highly Unsatisfactory: Implementation is seriously under performing and major restructuring is required. Cumulative financial delivery, timing of key implementation milestones (e.g. start of activities), and management of critical risks are severely off track with severe issues and/or concerns. The project is not effectively or efficiently supported.