GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**5404**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Samoa)**		
Project Title:	**R2R - Testing the Integration of Water, Land, Forest & Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods in Pacific Island Countries**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5221 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**International Waters**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IW-1; IW-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$300,000**	Project Grant:	**$9,826,147**
Co-financing:	**$93,459,721**	Total Project Cost:	**$103,585,868**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Nicole Glineur**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jose Erezo Padilla**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating **country eligible**?	all participating countries are eligible	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	All participating countries operational focal points have endorsed the project as reflected in the LOES attached in PFD	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		
	• the focal area allocation?	IW: yes Total allocation is $10.126M. Please adjust accordingly	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Please delete PCB in tables and text Please indicate all SCCF amounts (GEF and co-financing) in brackets and do not factor in total. AS well as insert footnote as alloded to below. Please add $500,000 for regional coordination (cpt 5) to supplement the IW amount to deliver the requisite resources required for effective regional coordination. Please ensure that same numbers are reflected in PFD and PIF. SCCF:complementary indicative SCCF contributions and activities foreseen are now well reflected in components 3, 1,&4 11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Please make a foot note under Table 1 (project identification) to the mentioning of "GEF Focal Area" and in the project framework under component 3.3 (potential SCCF funded) that if these funds do not materialise this component and its activities will be deleted from the project document and will not be subsumed under IW funded activities. 12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Above point on SCCF have been addressed.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	SCCF activities are to be included in the project upon funding availability: complementary indicative SCCF contributions and activities foreseen are now well reflected in components 3,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		1,&4 11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Please include footnote that if SCCF funds do not meterialise before CEO Endorsement, Component 3.3 and its activities will be removed from the project and will not be funded by the IW funds available to the project. 12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Above point of SCCF have been addressed.	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	yes and it will highly contribute to its regional coordination 11th of April 2013 (cseverin):Yes, the project is alligned with the IW Focal area Results framework and will be among others be instrumental in implementing the National IWRM plans, that are presently being finalised in the region.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	At this stage yes. However, it will need to be completed at CEO endorsememt with a complementarity assessment 11th of April 2013 (cseverin):Yes, the proposed actions will support actions toward sustainable management of the water resources inthe pacific region, along with the lines as set forward in the pacific SAP.	UNDP is committed to ensure that duplication with other initiatives and links with activities already carried out by other donors and NGOs (some are included in baseline and coordination sections) and through the PAS & CTI program including GEF/ADB, CRISP GEF/WB, AFD, Australian, NZ programs are made

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	6. Is (are) the **baseline project(s),** including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	yes 11th of April 2013 (cseverin):Yes, The national and regional investments under the on going Pacific IWRM project have been able to facilitate an approach where multiple sectors have been working together towards formulating the national IWRM plans. Building on these IWRM plans, that will have been ministerial approved will be offering a strong baseline towards the sustainability of these investments.	
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	yes at this stage Please reflect revised parent program title under 1. project identification The text and table have been moved up into the alternative scenario section and strengthened by broadly summarising MTR findings and links to the detailed national â€˜results notes' on both the Pacific IWRM and GEF:IWLEARN webpages. 11th of April 2013 (cseverin):Yes, however, please do make specific mentioning (maybe in Component 4) that 1% of the GEF grant will go towards supporting GEF IWLEARN activities.). As mentioned please do at time of CEO Endorsement provide a much more detailed project framework including quantifiable outcome and output indicators, both on process as well as stress reduction levels.	The framework will include indicators, including stress reduction, to be developed during the PPG. Financial sustainability aspects will be developed during PPG and elaborated upon at CEO endorsement. Role of private sector national partnership forums will be factored in.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		12th of April 2013 (cseverin):Above point on IWLEARN have been addressed.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	yes	
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the **socio-economic benefits**, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?		please elaborate at CEO endorsement
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	yes 11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Please elaborate a bit under A2 (stakeholders) on the role and functionality of the Inter ministerial committees, both as political fora as well as convieners of the entire stakeholder group. 12th of April 2013 (cseverin):Addressed	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	yes Financial sustainability risks have been included 11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes a risk matrix have been included of potential risks, including a changing climate. The Matrix includes mitigation measures.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	yes	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.	yes	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	yes 11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, however, please do make following changes to Table D: the third line which is presently is mentioning IW and SCCF, should only mention SCCF and in the	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		next column, only CC adaptation. in the grant amount, agency fee as well as total it should only have 0's along with a footnote reference, into which the actual proposed amounts to be funded by SCCF is to be included. When making this change, please do make sure that the amounts in Table B and D matches. 12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Above point addressed	
	17. At PIF: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	yes	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	yes	
	19. At PIF, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	11th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes the PPG funds applied for is considered in line with the GEF norm.	
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	April 10, 2013. All GEF upstream comments have been satisfactorily addressed. PIF clearance is recommended, as soon as below comments have been addressed. Please resubmit. However, there are a few technicalities to address that require re-submission: 1. parent program total 2. revised total figure estimated at $10.126M 3. Please do include footsnotes where applicaple to the effect that if the SCCF funds do not materilise prior to CEO endorsement, the suggested component and associated SCCF activities will be removed from the project and will not be subsumed under the IW funded activities. 4. Please do include wording to support that IWLEARN activities will be supported with 1% of the GEF grant.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		5. Please do remove the mentioning of the Programme Coordination from Table D. 6. Please elaborate under A2 (stakeholders) on the role and functionality of the Inter ministerial committees 12th of April 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF is technically cleared and can be considered for inclusion in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**