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

GEF ID:	**9847**		
Country/Region:	**Vanuatu**		
Project Title:	**Expanding Conservation Areas Reach and Effectiveness (ECARE) in Vanuatu**		
GEF Agency:	**IUCN**	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; BD-1 Program 2; BD-3 Program 6;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$100,000**	Project Grant:	**$2,450,459**
Co-financing:	**$6,310,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$8,760,459**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Cyrille Barnerias**	Agency Contact Person:	**Solstice Middleby**

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]	2017-06-22 Yes. - Project is well aligned with BD1-programs 1 (mainly) and 2 as well as with BD-3 program 6. The project articulates with Aichi targets. Please provide SMART indicators by CEO endorsement at the latest to track the progress towards achieving the Aichi Targets.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the	2017-06-22 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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?		
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	2017-06-22 No. - The main drivers are well identified (climate change, population growth and low capacity leading to over-exploitation, habitat losses ...). - Elements from component 2 could also be reflected in the sustainability part as they will contribute to the sustainability of the project's results. - On replicability, could you please detail the active mechanism(s) that will be used to reach out to the other local communities? 2017-08-11 Yes - As mentioned in the PIF, we expect more details about the effective mechanisms for replication and scaling-up to be designed and negotiated during the PPG phase.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	2017-06-22 Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	2017-06-22 No. -the table shows a gap between the expected outcome 2.1 that is "increased Government revenue" and the corresponding outputs 2.1.1 and	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		2.1.2 that are more focusing on "assessment", "review" and "preparation of strategy". It would help if the outputs would reflect more concrete actions to reach the corresponding outcome. - Please correct the target for outcome 3.1 (not 500,000ha). 2017-08-11 Yes	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	2017-06-22 Yes. - As hinted in the paragraph on gender (page 22) we expect a full inclusion of gender considerations during the PPG phase.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	2017-06-15 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	2017-06-22 No. - Please see comments above. - In addition, could you also please clarify the numbers/% presented in	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the second paragraph of page 10 where numbers and % don't always seem to match (2.3% and 18km2)? If map of existing protected areas exists, it could be also helpful to add it. 2017-08-11 Yes, this project has been technically cleared for work program inclusion.	
Review Date	Review	June 22, 2017	August 02, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

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