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

GEF ID:	**9833**		
Country/Region:	**Papua New Guinea**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening capacity in the agriculture and land-use sectors for enhanced transparency in implementation and monitoring of Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) under the Paris Agreement in Papua New Guinea**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Climate Change**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CBIT-1; CBIT-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$863,242**
Co-financing:	**$1,550,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,413,242**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Dustin Schinn**	Agency Contact Person:	**Hitofumi Abe (Mr),**

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]	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental	DS, May 22, 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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes. However, paragraph 35 mentions an FAO Global CBIT programme, which has not been proposed or reviewed by the GEF Secretariat at this point in time. An approval of the proposed project in Papua New Guinea hence does not imply in any form an endorsement of the notion of a potential FAO Global CBIT programme at this point in time.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, May 22, 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?	DS, May 22, 2017: This project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	• 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?	DS, May 22, 2017: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO approval, acknowledging the considerations stated under Question 4. At CEO Endorsement Request stage, please provide a clearer description of how the project's data and results will also feed back into the national decision-making process, to enhance the country's ambition over time, and for all relevant actors and ministries to be able to not just contribute, but to benefit from, the proposed project.	
Review Date	Review	May 22, 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?		
	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.