



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF Program ID:	5395		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Samoa)		
Program Title:	R2R- Pacific Islands Ridge-to-Reef National Priorities – Integrated Water, Land, Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Biodiversity, Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihoods		
GEF Agency:	UNDP, UNEP and FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	5217 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-2; BD-5; LD-1; LD-2; LD-3; CCM-5; IW-1; IW-3; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2; CCA-1; CCA-2; CCA-3; Project Mana; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$82,925,296
Co-financing:	\$333,046,794	Total Project Cost:	\$415,972,090
PFD Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
		Expected Program Start Dt:	
Program Manager:	Nicole Glineur	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments on Program Framework Document
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the program?	<p>Yes all LOEs have been received and all countries endorsed the program and their respective countries PIF during the April 2013 Constituency meeting.</p> <p>However, 2 glitches need to be corrected:</p> <p>1. Uniformity with LOEs of PFD and PIFs submitted under PFD and PIFs are not always then same (e.g. Cook Islands & Nauru). The PFD ones are more recent.</p> <p>2. when exercising their flexibility option, some countries have forgotten to specify which FA they were concentrating their resources on. Please revise ASAP.</p> <p>4/15/13</p>

		Uniformity of LOEs is being ensured between PFD and submitted PIFs
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Are the Agencies' comparative advantages for this program clearly described and supported?	yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	
	5. Does the program fit into the Agencies' programs and staff capacity in the country(ies)?	yes
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• the STAR allocation?	yes: BD, CC, LD
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes: IW, SFM, and potential SCCF upon funding availability
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	yes
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	SSCF projects have been prepared and will be submitted pending availability of funding
Program Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	
	7. Is the program aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	yes: BD, CC, LD, SFM, LDCF, SCCF Please correct the following glitches and update figures: 1. Total IW PIF and Countries contributions: \$ 13.1375M IW PIF: \$10.126M (including the \$500,000 coordination) 2. Table B: Provide the breakdown of Trust Funds. They can not be combined 3. Table C: Provide In-kind and Cash cofinancing amounts separately. They can not be combined 4. Table C: Please provide separate lines for each Agency's contributions which can not be combined 5. Delete all PCB figures and references (in table1, etc) and e 6. Provision SCCF funding and co-funding (brackets) and do not factor them into total as they are pending availability 4/15/13. above has been corrected
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	yes
	9. Is the program consistent with the recipient country(ies)' national strategies and plans or reports and	yes

	assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of program outcomes?	yes
Program Design	11. Is the description of the baseline scenario/baseline project – what would happen without GEF financing – reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions?	The baseline has been strengthened to include all PICs and reflect situation with and without project
	12. Are the activities to be undertaken by the program partners (or for which they will provide funding) sufficient given the nature of the program and is it likely that these activities (or funding) will not materialize if the GEF does not fund this program?	
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>yes</p> <p>All SCCF activities are provisional upon funding availability</p> <p>The following needs to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PFD has the correct parent program title which has yet to be reflected in the child projects. Consistency is needed and parent title has to be adjusted in all projects. 2. As reflected during the April 2013 meeting and project reviews, a few countries would benefit from concentrating their resources to maximize impact. 3. The goal of the program is now strengthened to reflect national priorities and regional baseline. Please add in that section a summary table grouping countries by thematic focus to reflect the big picture from onset. 4. Financial sustainability and role of private sector will need attention and strengthening during project preparation <p>Please address the f</p>
	14. Is the program framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>overall yes</p> <p>The following needs to be addressed:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The PFD has the correct parent program title which has yet to be reflected in the child projects. Consistency is needed and parent title has to be adjusted in all projects. 2. As reflected during the April 2013 meeting and project reviews, a few countries would benefit from concentrating their resources to maximize impact.

		<p>3. The goal of the program is now strengthened to reflect national priorities and regional baseline. Please add in that section a summary table grouping countries by thematic focus to reflect the big picture from onset.</p> <p>4. Financial sustainability and role of private sector will need attention and strengthening during project preparation</p> <p>Please address the following during projects preparation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the coastal areas, the project needs to have explicit interlinkages with ongoing international efforts to quantify and determine satisfactory methodologies for determination of blue/coastal carbon. -Training to develop an understanding for the need for the protection of natural carbon sinks and stores, and to build the capacity to recognize and monitor such assets should be added in addition to other stated training areas. -An information base needs to be formed through which lessons learned from developing and implementing different aspects of the new comprehensive R2R program could be exchanged. -Knowledge platform only marginally includes other FAs besides IW, it is suggested to expand this output to also focus on topics related to other focal area such that PICs where a certain FA topic is not covered by R2R may have an opportunity to gain from activities happening in other PICs. -Strong in-region network of experts and professionals involved in R2R needs to be built to initiate and sustain R2R efforts and to strengthen the existing (weak) networks in the region.
	<p>15. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the program, and b) how they will support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	<p>yes</p>
	<p>16. Is public participation taken into consideration, and the roles of the various stakeholders identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>yes</p>
	<p>17. Does the program take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>Yes. Financial sustainability risk now included</p>

	18. Is the program consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	yes These aspects will need strengthening in some projects (e.g. IW) during project preparation
	19. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	yes
Program Financing	20. Is funding level for program management cost appropriate?	Fees of 9% both for GEF TF and GEF LDCF
	21. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	yes
	22. Comment on the indicated co-financing.	Please confirm AFD co-financing and other relevant co-financing at CEO endorsement stage and explain in detail in relevant PIFs
	23. Are the co-financing amounts that the Agencies are bringing to the program in line with their roles?	yes
Program Monitoring and Evaluation	24. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	Tracking Tools for each project will be included at CEO endorsement
	25. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
Agency Responses	26. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:	
	• STAP?	
	• Convention Secretariat?	
	• Council comments?	
	• Other GEF Agencies?	
Secretariat Recommendation		
PFD Clearance	27. Is PFD clearance being recommended?	GEF upstream comments were satisfactorily addressed. PFD clearance will be recommended pending on addressing above issues April 15, 2013 GEF comments have been satisfactorily addressed. Please address all the comments made on substance of the proposed projects during the preparation phase. Clearance of PFD is recommended.
	28. Items to consider at subsequent	

	individual project submissions for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.

REQUEST FOR PROGRAM COORDINATION BUDGET/PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT FOR PROGRAM APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
Program Coordination Budget/Project Preparation Grant for Program	1. Are the proposed activities for program coordination appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PCB/PPG for Program approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.