GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9823**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu)**		
Project Title:	**Support to Eligible Parties to Produce the Sixth National Report to the CBD (Pacific)**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1 Program 1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	**$1,270,500**
Co-financing:	**$590,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$1,860,500**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Mohamed Sessay,**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	May 10, 2017 Yes, this is an enabling activity for producing the 6th National Report.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	May 10, 2017 Yes, fully in line with the requirements of the 6th National Report.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	

[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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	May 10, 2017 Not applicable for an enabling activity. Cleared.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	May 10, 2017 Enabling activities are fully incremental. Cleared.	
	6. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	May 10, 2017 Yes clear for achieving project objectives, but national reporting will not produce GEBs, per se. Cleared.	
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	
	9. 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)	May 10, 2017 The project presents an adequate risk assessment for national reporting. Cleared.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	May 10, 2017 Yes. Cofinancing is not required for enabling activities, however, in the OFP	

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		endorsement letters, confirmation of in-kind contributions is provided. Cleared.	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	May 10, 2017 NA.	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	May 10, 2017 NA.	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	
	15. Does the project have description of knowledge management plan?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	May 10, 2017 NA.	
	• The focal area allocation?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	May 10, 2017 NA.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation	May 10, 2017	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	or Technology Transfer)?	NA.	
	• Focal area set-aside?	May 10, 2017 Yes this is funded from the biodiversity focal area set aside.	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	May 10, 2017 Yes.	
Review Dates	First Review	May 10, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		