



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

GEF ID:	9208		
Country/Region:	Palau		
Project Title:	Integrating Biodiversity Safeguards and Conservation into development in Palau		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5645 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,233,562
Co-financing:	\$17,585,000	Total Project Cost:	\$21,818,562
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Johan Robinson

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	August 7, 2015 Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	August 7, 2015 Yes, the project is in line with national priorities.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	August 10, 2015 Yes. This project will set up systems,	

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	including invasive species management and land use planning, that will address the drivers of environmental degradation in Palau.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	August 10, 2015 Yes. This project has sound incremental reasoning.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	August 10, 2015 Yes. During PPG development, please elaborate on the strategies for the development, implementation, and enforcement of minimum standards for the tourism industry and other sectors included in the mainstreaming work as minimum standards will be crucial in protecting the endemic and vulnerable biodiversity of Palau.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	August 10, 2015 Yes. This project includes gender elements, IPs, and CSOs.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	August 10, 2015 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	August 10, 2015 Yes. This project takes advantage of	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Palau's full flexibility.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	August 10, 2015 Yes. This project is being recommended for technical clearance along with the requested PPG.	
Review Date	Review	August 10, 2015	
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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.