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

GEF ID:	**9917**		
Country/Region:	**Micronesia**		
Project Title:	**Safeguarding Biodiversity From Invasive Alien Species in the Federated States of Micronesia**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**6004 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$200,000**	Project Grant:	**$4,141,509**
Co-financing:	**$18,766,262**	Total Project Cost:	**$22,907,771**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Sarah Wyatt**	Agency Contact Person:	**Michael Green**

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]	September 12, 2017 Yes, this project is aligned with the GEF's strategy on Invasive Alien Species.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	September 12, 2017 No, please briefly discuss any ongoing work related to the Ballast Water Treaty. September 26, 2017	

[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
		Yes. Thank you for the helpful information.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	September 12, 2017 No. Please provide more information on this project will ensure the financial sustainability of the activities developed. Sustainability is particularly important for IAS projects as even small lapses could allow a species in or lead to back sliding. Will the activities under component 1 include any programs with fines or other consequences? September 26, 2017 Yes. The use of volunteers is an interesting idea.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	September 12, 2017 Yes, it builds upon existing activities including the ridge to reef project to include IAS. At PPG, significant discussion is needed about coordination with other IAS initiatives supported by the GEF with UNDP and UNEP in the Pacific and the Caribbean. There are real opportunities for cost and effort	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		savings across these projects. For example, the app can and should be designed so it can be customized to different countries or contexts thus saving money in development costs. Data collation, public outreach materials, curriculum in IAS, and lessons learned are all good opportunities for collaboration.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	September 12, 2017 Yes. However, please note the GEF does support eradication in situations that meet the criteria as noted in the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy. Please clarify - will existing professionals, such as agricultural extension agents, receive training or will this be a separate program? During PPG, please address the following: Component 2: - How can these communication efforts and biosecurity training be better tied in with existing initiatives? Also, how will communications be targeted to relevant groups? - What partnerships are being leveraged particularly in the development of the app? There are apps such as Leaf Snap and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		iNaturalist that have the suggested functionality with a mission of conservation that could be good partners.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	September 12, 2017 No, it would be good to have greater discussion of how gender will be considered and brought into project development during the PPG. September 26, 2017 Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	September 14, 2017 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	September 14, 2017 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	• Focal area set-aside?	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	September 13, 2017 Not at this time, but the project is quite good overall. Please make the requested revisions and resubmit.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		An increased PPG is justified because of the significant expense required to reach the different states of FSM and conduct the needed consultations to build the broad community support and engagement that is needed for the success of such a project on IAS. September 26, 2017 The program manager recommends this project for technical clearance.	
Review Date	Review	September 14, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 26, 2017	
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		

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