



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

GEF ID:	5381		
Country/Region:	Nauru		
Project Title:	R2R- Implementing a "Ridge to Reef" Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functions in Nauru (R2R Nauru)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5218 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-3; IW-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$85,000	Project Grant:	\$2,644,358
Co-financing:	\$6,353,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,082,358
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Erez Padilla

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> ?	04/10/2013: Yes.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	04/10/2013: Yes, in a letter dated March 21, 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>	04/10/2013: Nauru is a flexible country and therefore at liberty to reallocate between FAs. As at 04/10/2013 remaining STAR allocation stood at: CC \$0.8; BD \$1.5; LD \$0.5. The proposed project funding total is within the remaining amount.	

\*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>04/10/2013: The project is oriented on BD/LD strategies. The project does not clearly address the CCM strategy. Therefore, it is recommended to either use the flexible mechanism and allocate the CCM money to an other Focal Area or integrate clear outputs/outcomes addressing CCM-5 objective under Table B.</p> <p>If the flexible mechanism is chosen, please clearly mention in the LoE letter that the flexible mechanism will be used.</p> <p>04/15/2013: Addressed. It is well noted that the flexible mechanism will be used. The revised LoE will have to be provided during the week of 15th April 2013, including the flexibility provision.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>04/10/2013: The project requests \$175,000 from IW; which is fine. Nauru is using more than \$2 million from BD and LD STAR allocations. The use of the SFM/REDD+ incentive can be proposed. Although there is a focus on coastal and marine biodiversity, part of the activities in the river basin are associated to multiple environment and social benefits in agroforestry systems. Conservation and restoration of Calophyllum forests or even mangroves can be taken into account, as well as all transversal activities related to capacity</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>building and knowledge tools can qualify for incentive investments from the SFM/REDD+ Program (cf. more references on agroforestry.net, or Thaman et al., 2009).</p> <p>04/15/: Cleared.</p>	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>? <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>04/10/2013: The project is well aligned with the BD, LD and IW strategies. However, please provide some clarification regarding the alignment with BD-1. Please, confirm that LMMAs will have either no take zone or area of conservation, see comment on item 7. The project has explicitly articulated which Aichi targets the project will help to achieve, however, please indicate which smart indicators will be used to track the progress. Please refer to comment on Item 3 regarding the CCM strategy.</p> <p>04/15/2013: Addressed. The SMART indicators will be provided at CEO endorsement stage.</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>04/10/2013: The project is consistent with the national sustainable development strategy. The project activities are in line with the actions recommended in the NBSAP and drafted NAP. The project will contribute to the National Water, Sanitation and Hygiene policy.</p>	
	<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</p>	<p>04/10/2013: The baseline is comprehensive. However, please provide more information about the SPC program which aims to support the artisanal fisheries monitoring and will provide</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?	<p>training on monitoring, and how the project will build on it.</p> <p>04/12/2013: Addressed.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>04/10/2013:The project framework is clear. However, please address the following issues:</p> <p>Component 1: The BD objective 1 is to improve the management effectiveness of Protected Areas. Therefore, as mentioned Item 4, please specify the main objective of the LMMAs: conservation (no take area) or sustainable use (sustainable fisheries practises). If the purpose of the LMMA is to focus on mainstreaming biodiversity conservation into fisheries practices, it is recommended to put the activities under BD2. If the LMMA purpose is to protect marine biodiversity; at CEO endorsement, please provide the METT excel sheet for each of the LMMA. Please, clarify how LMMA will be chosen and defined. Reference is only made on the process for delimitating their boundaries (p9). What are the LMMA authorities (p11)? Regarding the poor insitutional framework for marine environmental conservation, please explain how the project will help to anchor the LMMA into the national policy/ legislation.</p> <p>Component 2: Please, make a reference of the IWRM national plan in one of the expected outputs. The phosphate mining is listed as one of the major threat, please explain the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>rational of not having include activity targeting reduction/mitigation of the mining environmental impact.</p> <p>The "innovative measure" is welcomed, however, the added value leading to global environment benefits has to be demonstrated at CEO endorsement (cf. output 2.1.5).</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, the activities in the result framework should be justified based on the incremental reasoning.</p> <p>Component 3 Please be more explicit on the targeted output 3.1.1.</p> <p>04/15/2013: Addressed.</p> <p>Component1: It is well noted that the information regarding the LMMA governance, objectives, status will be provided at CEO endorsement. It is also noted that the project will add support to the LMMA legal framework development.</p> <p>Component2: More detail about 2.1.5 will be provided at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>04/10/2013: The project design is well balanced between processes of governance, development of management plan, and pilot activities on the ground. More than US\$1 million will be dedicated to the LMMA development. Therefore, to strengthen the demonstration of the global biodiversity benefits, please provide further indicators (measurable) regarding the marine biodiversity status.</p> <p>04/15/2013: Addressed. It is noted that</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		measurable indicators regarding the marine biodiversity status will be provided at CEO endorsement.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	04/10/2013: Preliminary information is provided. More detailed information is expected at CEO endorsement.	
	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)	04/10/2013: Addressed.	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	04/10/2013: Detail of initiatives are provided but by CEO endorsement further description of how the project will coordinate with these will be expected.	
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <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</li> </ul>	04/10/2013: The Ridge to Reef approach is innovative. The project will support the development of a national system of coastal and marine areas sustainably managed areas combine with the adoption of appropriate sustainable land management practices in upstream watersheds.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	based on GEF and Agency experience. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		
	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?	04/10/2013: cleared.	
	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? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	04/10/2013: UNDP is providing US\$100,000.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	04/10/2013: PMC is over 5%. Please reduce this to within 5%. This should be calculated based on the sub-total. Please, update accordingly.  04/15/2013: Addressed.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency	04/10/2013: A PPG is requested for a total amount of \$85,000.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	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:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	04/10/2012: The project cannot be recommended. Please, address the issues raised above.  04/15/2013: The project is technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	Items to consider at CEO endorsement: - Clear and measurable goals and objectives are defined - Co-financing is confirmed	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implementation arrangements and potential partnerships with other initiatives are well set-up</li> <li>- GEF Tracking tools and SMART indicators are included</li> <li>- Strong evidence of global environmental benefit</li> <li>- detail about LMMA (biological justification, objective, governance) provided</li> <li>- A mechanism for continuing to involve a broad set of stakeholders is presented</li> </ul>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	April 10, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 15, 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.**