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

GEF ID:	**10046**		
Country/Region:	**Vanuatu**		
Project Title:	**Ecosystem Restoration and Sustainable Land Management in Tongoa Island**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Land Degradation**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**LD-1 Program 2; LD-2 Program 3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$45,662**	Project Grant:	**$867,580**
Co-financing:	**$1,338,100**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,205,680**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Asha Bobb-Semple**	Agency Contact Person:	**Aru Mathias**

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]	3/26/2018 ABS: Yes the project is aligned to GEF strategic objectives under the LD Focal Area.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	3/26/2018 ABS: The project is consistent with priorities under National Plans. However there is no mention made of how the project will contribute to	4/17/2018: Noted and addressed in the revised PIF (Section 6 on Page 12, Paragraph: Vanuatu's National Action Plan (NAP)).

[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
		Vanuatu's commitments under the UNCCD. 4/30/2018 ABS: Cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	3/26/2018 ABS: Not fully. The issues of drivers and innovation have been indicated. Sustainability has not been fully addressed. Please see comments under Question 5. 4/30/2018 ABS: Cleared.	4/17/2018: Noted and addressed (kindly refer to the response to Question 5).
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	3/26/2018 ABS: Not fully. Please provide further details on how this project will have a transformational impact on Vanuatu as a whole. Given the small target area and the small hectare numbers in Table B and E (110ha) we recommend that the PIF provides details on how these activities can be replicated on a wider scale.	4/17/2018: Noted and addressed in the PIF. An additional output has been added under Component 3 (Output 3.1.3 in Table B; A paragraph of Component 3 on Page 8), and text added under component description and Scaling up and Replicability section (Page 9). Yes. Given the limited field level assessments conducted so far in the island

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Is there potential to increase the scale of the project to include additional hectares of the agricultural and forest lands mentioned on Pg. 4 of the PIF or other regions of Vanuatu? 4/30/2018 ABS: Thank you for this information. The project title and objective both refer to the entire Tongoa island, so we expect that the design of the project should focus on introducing SLM on the entire area available for SLM. As it stands currently, the size of the target area(ha) does not match up to the value of the investment. Please rework and increase the scope of the project. 5/30/2018 ABS: We have noted the increase in target hectares and recommend consideration for additional hectares during the project preparation phase.	and the dearth of data on the ground, Govt. of Vanuatu and FAO decided to provide conservative figures at this stage. Further efforts will be made to identify potential increase in scale by including additional hectares during the PPG phase (through field level assessments and detailed consultations). 5/24/2018: Based on the consultation with the government counterpart, the target area has increased to 900 ha. The following changes have been made in the revised PIF: - Component 2 in Table B (Page 2); - Project Target in Table F (Page 3); - Narrative of Component 2 (Page 7); - Narrative of Global Environmental Benefits (Page 8-9)
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	3/26/2018 ABS: Not fully. Please address the following comments. -For better clarity on the project framework, we recommend rearranging the Outputs related to	4/17/2018: Addressed in the revised PIF (Table B and the paragraphs of Component 1 and 2 on Page 7). Noted and addressed in the revised PIF (Table B; in the description of Component

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		capacity building, institutional strengthening and enabling environment under one Outcome and implementation and field based activities under a different Outcome. In this regard, please consider shifting Outputs 2.2.1 to Outcome 1 and Output 1.1.1 to Outcome 2. -Output 1.1.2- Will there also be training of government support/agricultural officers to assist in ensuring sustainability and replication/upscaling in other regions? What about including a civil society representative such as VANGO in the training, this would also help with replication/upscaling? -Is there consideration for training in other areas related to implementation of the SLM plan, such as forest restoration techniques, sustainable extraction of NTPs, monitoring of progress under the plan or tracking of changes in land use. This will help to ensure that the activities and plans can be managed and monitored beyond the life of the project. -Outcome 2- Please include an indicator which represents the number of persons whose livelihoods will be improved and potential % improvement income (if known or	1 on Page 7). Yes. This has been made more explicitly in the revised PIF (Description of Output 1.1.2 in Table B; in the description of Component 1 on Page 7). An indicator included in Table B. However, the number of households and the percentage of income increase will be defined during the PPG phase. Addressed in the revised PIF (Table in Section 2: Stakeholders on Page 9). In addition, the Technical Cooperation Programme developed and implemented by FAO as co-financing will include a major component on improving market access. This has been added in the revised PIF (in the table regarding Co-financing sources on Page 6). Expected FAO co-financing has been increased accordingly (Table A, B and C). The improved access to credit will be through working closely with microfinance organizations like South Pacific Business Development Microfinance Ltd. Microfinance organizations have been added as stakeholders in the revised PIF (table of Section 2: Stakeholders on Page 10).

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		can be estimated). -The producer associations/councils should be integrally involved in the delivery of community based enterprise component of Output 2. It does not appear that they have been listed as a stakeholder (Pg. 9) - Please also include how access to credit will be managed or improved (either under this project or a parallel project) so as to ensure the achievement of the expected results under these community based enterprises. 4/30/2018 ABS: Cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	3/26/2018 ABS: Not fully. - Has a gender assessment been undertaken for Vanuatu or been proposed for recently a approved GEF project, that this project can utilize? If not, this should be considered at the PPG stage. - Please see comments above re civil society. 4/30/2018 ABS: Cleared.	4/17/2018: Country wide gender assessment is expected to be conducted shortly under the GEF-5 project Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management. The project will utilize the assessment results for the project document. Addressed through inclusion of govt. staff and civil society in the capacity building activities. Kindly refer above to response to Question 5.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	3/26/2018 ABS: Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	3/26/2018 ABS: Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A	
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	3/26/2018 ABS: Not at this time. Please address the comments above. 4/30/2018 ABS: Not at this time. Please address the comment under question 4. 5/30/2018 ABS: Please refer to the recommendation on the project target area when preparing the PPG. The PM recommends this project for technical clearance. A final decision on clearing, however, will be made based on availability of resources in the final months of GEF-6.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Review Date	Review	March 26, 2018	April 17, 2018
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 30, 2018	May 24, 2018
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 30, 2018	

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)		

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

[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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		