



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

GEF ID:	5517		
Country/Region:	Micronesia		
Project Title:	R2R Implementing an Integrated "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Enhance Ecosystem Services, to Conserve Globally Important Biodiversity and to Sustain Local Livelihoods in the FSM		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5179 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; LD-3; IW-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,689,815
Co-financing:	\$17,861,500	Total Project Cost:	\$22,701,315
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	08/20: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	08/20: Yes, in a letter dated August 5, 2013.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	08/20: STAR resources remaining to be allocated is US\$5,100,399. The total budget proposal requests US\$5,258,476 from STAR; which exceed the amount available. Please revised accordingly.  08/28: The total budget requested is	

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		\$5,275,398; which is under the remaining STAR resources. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	08/20: Please see comment above.  08/28: Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	08/20: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	08/20: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	08/20: N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	08/20: There is a discrepancy between Table A, D and E. The request has to fit with the agreement reached at the PFD stage; which was US\$175,000 (including program amount, fees, and PPG), please update accordingly. Furthermore, please make sure that activities are included in the PIF on the Small IW increment, consistent with IW Objective 3 under GEF 5. Further ensure, that these activities will support actions towards facilitating adoption of integrated approaches with water-related outcomes through harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities. Furthermore, please do ensure that these results and lessons learned will be shared with the regional project "Testing the integration of Water, Land Forest and Coastal Management to Preserve Ecosystem Services, Store Carbon, Improve Climate Resilience and Sustain Livelihood's in Pacific Island Countries.  08/28: Cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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).</i></p>	<p>08/20: Yes, the project is well aligned with LD3, BD1 and BD2, and IW objectives. Please, develop SMART indicators for each outcomes. It is noted that the targets of these indicators will be defined during PPG phase.</p> <p>08/28: Baseline and targets of indicators for each expected outcomes will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>08/20: Yes, the project is in line with the NBSAP, the Strategic Development Plan, and the Micronesia Challenge. Cleared.</p>	
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>08/20: The baseline provides an overview of the problems being addressed. Please provide further details of scale or magnitude regarding overexploitation and pollution. For example how much species/habitat is lost due to unsustainable fishing practise; how much of mangrove is lost to urbanization, how much of land, groundwater is degraded due to farm development ? Details of levels of investment are provided however please briefly present the major related programs, initiatives funded by those fundings.</p> <p>08/28: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>08/20: The project design is clear and focused on few FA outcomes and outputs. However, please develop SMART indicators for each outcomes</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and be more specific with the expected outputs. For example, how many integrated land use plans will be developed, how much additional finance is it expected to secure and through which mechanism.</p> <p>Please ensure that Table B matches well with the text. For example, Component1 /Output third tirt does not appear to be reflected in the text (secure additional finances for SLM investments).</p> <p>Component1: Overfishing and hunting are identified as the most urgent and critical threat, why are they not addressed in the project proposal? One of the barrier identified to SLM is the lack of capacity in the government and in the local community. What are the activities planned to overcome this barrier? One of the project's objective is to set-up a multisector planning platform, this is not well reflected in Table B and in the text. GEF doesn't fund habitat restoration. GEF supports habitat rehabilitation only if there is GEB. Only SFM supports reforestation. Therefore, please provide further information on the expected activities described in Table p11/ second row.</p> <p>Component 2: METT will have to be provided for each PA at CEO endorsement. Please explain how the area have been/</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>will be selected to become PA. Financing is key for ensuring the sustainability of PA, therefore please provide information on the financial status of existing PA and the expected source of financing for the new PA.</p> <p>It is noted that the project will strengthen the government capacity in PA management, however, as stated in the text, local community will be the primary agent to manage community PA; please confirm that capacity of those stakeholder will be also re-inforced.</p> <p>08/28: As mentioned in Item6, the baseline of each indicators will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. The result of the selection process, and the list of targeted areas for new PA will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. Detailed information regarding the financial status of each concerned PA and the PA network will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>08/20: Micronesia forms part of the two global 200 WWF ecoregions and is part of the Polynesia/Micronesia Hotspot, one of the most endangered terrestrial ecosystems globally. The GEB will be reach through (i) the development of integrated land use management over 55,000 ha and (ii) the improvement of PA management effectiveness over 16,000ha. Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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?</p>		<p>08/20: Socio-economic benefits are mentioned but at a very generic level, please provide some specifics that will arise from this project including gender dimensions, and how these will support the sustainability of outcomes post-project. Preliminary figures on the revenue generated for communities, or the number of people involved in the SLM activities could be useful.</p> <p>08/28: Will be addressed at CEO endorsement.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>08/20: A range of organization is listed in A.2. Local communities and CSOs are mentioned in the text but regarding the importance of their role in the PA development, SLM implementation; please provide clear description on how they will be involved, how their capacity will be strengthened.</p> <p>08/28: Cleared.</p>	
	<p>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)</p>	<p>08/20: Yes, initial information on the potential risks is given. Further detail, including mitigation measures, is expected at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>08/20: Yes, the project will establish a technical working group, which will gather technical experts working on related issues. As mentioned in Item 6, please provide a brief description of on-going major programs, initiatives.</p> <p>08/28: Cleared.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>08/20: The project will establish a new approach to land use planning, bringing all the relevant stakeholders together to develop Integrated Land Management Plans. As a child project of the Ridge to Reef program for the Pacific, this project will have opportunity to scale-up its experience to other Pacific small island countries. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>08/20: The indicative GEF funding and co-financing are appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes. Clear.</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF:</u> 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?</p>	<p>08/20: The co-financing ratio is about 1:3.7; which is acceptable. 97% of the co-financing is in cash. Co-financing is provided by the government, four local government entities, and NGOS. NGO's co-financing is US\$9,3M, which</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	represents more than 50% of the co-financing; further detail about this co-financing will be useful.  08/28: Initial information has been shared. Cleared.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	08/20: The funding level for project management cost is 4.9%; which is appropriate. Cleared.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , 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? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	08/20: Yes, a PPG is requested. The amount requested is under the norm. Cleared.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	08/20: N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	08/20: The PIF cannot not be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised in the different items.  08/28: The project is technically cleared, and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	August 20, 2013	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	Additional review (as necessary)	August 28, 2013	
	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.**