



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

GEF ID:	<b>10027</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Sierra Leone</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Building and strengthening Sierra Leone's national capacity to implement the transparency elements of the Paris Agreement</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CBIT-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$50,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,344,495</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$200,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,544,495</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Milena Vasquez</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>geordie colville</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: Not yet, there is no mentioning on the process of the country's Biennial Update Report.  MGV/JDS, June 5, 2018: Comment cleared.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: Not yet,	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>following comments are raised below :</p> <p>1)There is no mentioning of main sectors of priority and national GHG emissions data based on the work developed for the Third National Communication .</p> <p>2)Information on the impacts of climate change in the country is also missing, root causes have not been identified as well as the most vulnerable sectors towards the impacts of climate change.</p> <p>3) Please clarify if the project will build the capacity based on lessons learned from existing mechanisms and structures already put in place such as former NCs.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, June 5, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: Not yet, please address following comments below:</p> <p>1) The proposal should be more specific about the key sectors for</p>	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>which capacity building efforts for enhanced transparency will take place, as well as the logic for prioritizing these sectors, both for adaptation and mitigation.</p> <p>2) The project intends to promote approaches and initiatives, provide free and open methods, data and tools complementary to mandated reporting by national governments. Information is missing in the training on specific MRV tools and which stakeholders will be trained.</p> <p>3)The project mentions the need for institutional arrangements to be established across various ministries, yet the proposal does not provide sufficient information regarding activities that establish an institutional arrangement and/or involve sectors of interest such as ministries of energy, forestry, agriculture etc.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, June 5, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: Not yet, please address the comments below:</p> <p>1) Under the Global Environmental Benefits section include targets of GHG emission reduction the country has put in place in order to support the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>development of this project.</p> <p>2) It is unclear how an 'NDC Transparency System' as described in Component 1 will be established by the proposed project activities. Furthermore, it is also unclear how such a system will interact and inform the Integrated Platform for Data Sharing and Policy Making proposed in Component 2. Please clarify.</p> <p>3) Please clarify how output 1.1.1. will support the development of legal/ institutional arrangements and binding instruments. Also, describe the institutional arrangements to be implemented and how external stakeholders (e.g. academia) will be formally included. Which are the prioritized sectors for mitigation and adaptation?</p> <p>4) Output 1.1.2 - Clarify why sectoral guidelines, methodologies, and indicators are being developed for adaptation only. Also, please elaborate if this output is intended to address the adaptation co-benefits of mitigation projects or the mitigation co-benefits of adaptation projects.</p> <p>5) Output 1.1.3. - There is not enough information available to evaluate the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>need for this output. Please clarify, re-frame or remove.</p> <p>6) Output 2.1.2.- the output appears to overlap with output 1.1.2., and in fact could be merged into one. In addition, and where available, please incorporate the lessons learned and sector-specific information from already established MRV systems in Sierra Leone.</p> <p>7) Output 2.1.3- this output could be interpreted rather as an outcome. Please clarify, re-frame or remove.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, June 5, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: Yes.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	MRS/JDS, April 4, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MRS/JDS, 4 April 2018: Not at this time. The proposed project requires considerable reorganization, preparation and elaboration. However, there is a clear need for capacity building if Sierra Leone is to meet the PA's ETF requirements. Please address comments in box 2,3,4 and 5.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, June 5, 2018: All comments have been adequately addressed. The P.M. recommends CEO PIF Approval.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	April 04, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.