



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

GEF ID:	5552		
Country/Region:	Niue		
Project Title:	Application of Ridge to Reef Concept for Biodiversity Conservation, and for the Enhancement of Ecosystem Service and Cultural Heritage in Niue		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5258 (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; BD-2; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$140,000	Project Grant:	\$4,194,862
Co-financing:	\$11,068,600	Total Project Cost:	\$15,543,462
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 21, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Erez Padilla

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	08/26: Yes	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08/26: Yes, in a letter dated August 7, 2013.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/26: Yes. The STAR remaining to be allocated is \$4,550,000. Cleared.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): The overall GEF budget has not changed since WP entry.
	• the focal area allocation?	08/26: Yes, the project will use the flexibility mechanism to develop a BD project.	

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		10/02: The project is now an MFA project, soliciting allocation from BD, LD, CC, and IW. 01/21/2014: The project is soliciting allocation from BD and IW. Cleared.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	08/26: N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	08/26: N/A	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	08/26: N/A	
	• focal area set-aside?	08/26: Yes, the request fits with the agreement reached at the PFD stage; which was US\$175,000 from IW. 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". 10/02: Cleared.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin):The IW funding requested is \$155,365 for project activities, primarily related to harnessing results and lessons learned from national and local multifocal area activities, and sharing these 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".
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results	08/26: Yes, the project is well aligned with BD and IW objectives. The project explicitly articulated which Aichi targets	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): It is not clear which activities (if any) , on top of harnessing and sharing lessons learned

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>framework and strategic objectives? <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>the project will help achieve. Please develop SMART indicators for each expected outcomes.</p> <p>02/10: The project is well aligned with BD and IW objectives. Please add IW-3 objective into Table A. SMART indicators have been well developed. METT and quantified indicators will have to be provided at CEO endorsement. The reasoning to target LD and CC objectives is weak. Moreover, with regard to capacities issues and transaction costs, the cost effectiveness to develop an MFA project is arguable. For all these reasons, it is recommended to pursue with the initial idea: to develop a project focused on BD and IW objectives.</p> <p>01/21/2014: Cleared.</p>	<p>with the regional Umbrella project, that will be undertaken under IW Objective 3. Please clarify.</p> <p>8th of October 2015 (cseverin): Cleared</p>
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>08/26: Yes, the projet is consistent with the country's national strategies, including NBSAP. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>08/26: The baseline is well prepared. Major threats and barriers are well described. Please provide further details of scale or magnitude regarding water quality, threatened species, and land degradation. For example, how much species/habitat is lost due to unsustainable fishing practices, harvesting; what is the level of threat to species of global importance? Please provide further information on the level of protection, funding and</p>	<p>4th of August 2015 (cseverin):The document package provides a lot of background information but is not very specific on what the baseline project will be targeting and what impacts are expected.</p> <p>Further, it is not possible to understand from reading the document what impacts the current practices have on the environment in Niue. Please explain.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		<p>governance of existing PA. Please provide a better overview of related initiatives in Nuie, including programs led by SPREP, FAO, and international NGOs.</p> <p>10/02: It is noted that further information will be provided at CEO endorsement. Cleared.</p>	<p>8th of October 2015 (cseverin):It is still not clear what the baseline investments are (hence what increment the GEF financing will be delivering upon). It seems that this may be due to the "baseline" in the project being described as also being the co-financing for the project (under section 1.4.3 in the main project document). This confuses the issue. Please make sure that there is a distinction between the cofinancing toward the project to support the proposed project activities and what funding/activities that creates the baseline that the project will be building on.</p> <p>25th of November 2015 (cseverin): Cleared</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>08/26: The project design is clear and focused on few FA outcomes. However, the number of activities identified appear to be too many and is confusing what the project is proposing to do: (i) water quality management, (ii) education awareness, (iii) sectoral and legal framework development, (iv) sustainable livelihood development, (vi) PA creation. Please consider either reducing the number of activities or further explain their interrelation and how they will help achieving the expected objectives. Please develop SMART indicators for each of the expected outcomes, as mentioned in Item 4.</p> <p>Component 1: At CEO endorsement, METT will have to be provided for each PA.</p>	<p>4th of August 2015 (cseverin):Table B (project framework) does not provide much detail on expected outcomes not quantifiable outputs. Please work on making the project framework clearer and apply these details throughout the document.</p> <p>The activities in this project is still primarily focusing on capacity building, it is hard to understand what direct investments will be made to support the PAs and the clean-up activities towards securing a cleaner freshwater supply and minimized pollution of the coastal waters.</p> <p>Considering the size of the investment the suggested impacts/results are not</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please clarify on which criteria the new PA will be established. Please further explain the expected outputs for new and existing PA in term of management effectiveness, enforcement, and sustainable financing.</p> <p>GEF BD framework doesn't support habitat restoration. Please, update accordingly output 1.2.</p> <p>Component2: This component aims to address sustainable management around PA areas and to develop a national legal framework; which is fine. However, the activities identified seem too many and lack of coherence/complementarity among themselves.(environmental education programs, community capacities, promotion of fishing and farming sustainable use, sector plan development, , small scale water management, enforcement capacities, legal and institutional frameworks). Please consider reducing and refocusing the project activities for this component. P10, a financial framework is mentioned, please clarify its purpose, governance.</p> <p>10/02: All the activities presented in the text have to be well reflected into Table B e.g: support to sustainable activities, legal framework development.</p> <p>Component 1: We understand the importance of strengthening the capacities of local communities and</p>	<p>very tangible. Please refocus and reformulate.</p> <p>Please expand on the details regarding the investments that will lead to a cleaner freshwater lens and the pollution of coastal areas. The document only mentions a move towards new chemicals and treating septic tank effluent, there is no mentioning of what techniques will be invested in, nor what impact is expected.</p> <p>The results framework, does not mention Beveridge Reef specifically, only mentions an area of similar proportions. please include the name of the area in the results framework. Further, what impact is expected on the biodiversity resources as a direct effect of the creation of the PAs???</p> <p>The PIF specifically mentioned that at the end of the project, there would be an increase in the sectoral operational budgets for the R2R relevant actions by 20% over the present baseline. Please elaborate on this in the project document, to ensure long-term financial sustainability of the investment.</p> <p>8th of October 2015 (cseverin): The documents mention "concrete actions" will be undertaken and 60% of the funding will be directed towards these, but does not describe what they will be and what impacts are expected. more specificity, in both RF and in the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>government, but component 1 should much more focus on "field activities" than capacity building (3 of the 5 outputs are capacity building oriented). For example, support to sustainable activities beyond PA; strengthen of the PA legal framework at national level should be clearly developed into this component. The integrative management approach will be then more evident. Please provide more detailed information on sustainable activities that the project will support (criteria, kind of support, targetted communities).</p> <p>The creation of new PA is relevant however with regard to the current constraints (budget, capacities), emphasize should be put on securing the existing PAs.</p> <p>Please clarify the difference between output 2.4 and 1.5.</p> <p>Component 2: Education, awareness are crucial however it is not listed as key priority activities funded by GEF, therefore it is recommended to focus Component 2 on knowledge, policy, legal, financial framework development. The rationale to develop activity on waste management is weak, therefore please better justify or remove it.</p> <p>01/21/2014: At CEO endorsement, comprehensive information related to component 2 activities (capacity building, development of legal framework) will have to be provided. Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	<p>description, is needed. This pertains both to the concrete actions planned towards addressing coastal and freshwater pollution as well as the actions on Beveridge Reef.</p> <p>25th of November 2015 (cseverin): The project will primarily deliver towards the GEBs through Component 1, output 1.1. The activities that are included as part of output 1.3 (described in Annex 8) includes a number of suggested activities that will not be eligible for GEF funding, eg. Proposal 3, subproject 5, upgrading of community hall, proposal 5, Niue High School Senior students project, Proposal 8 (it is a bit hard to understand how increased motor vehicle access to a conservation site will increase protection of an endangered species), proposal 20 (it is hard to see the link to between biodiversity conservation and protection of the Beveridge reef and the construction of roads for agricultural purposes) and proposal 21 (articulation between the retaining wall and the foreseen impacts are minimal and hence it is hard to justify. Please note that this list of non eligible activities outlined above is not exhaustive, so please go through Annex 8 and ONLY include eligible activities.</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, please note that the IW funding towards this investment, is primarily to fund connectively with the larger regional R2R project and less to be funding national activities.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			5th of February 2016 (cseverin): Cleared
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	08/26: The GEB will be reached through the creation and management's improvement of marine and terrestrial protected areas and the development of integrated land and coastal use management. Cleared.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): The GEBs have been identified, but the document is not outlining direct impacts on the GEBs as an effect of the GEF investments. Please elaborate. 8th of October 2015 (cseverin): when point outlined in question seven has been addressed, this will also be easier to make a clearer mentioning of the delivery of GEBs. 25th of November 2015 (cseverin): Yes, addressed
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , 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?		4th of August 2015 (cseverin): YES, the socio economic benefits are described, including the gender dimension, however, a description of how the socio economic factors will help the project deliver the project outcomes is weak. Please strengthen.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	08/26: A list of partners, key stakeholders is presented p11. Local communities, including fisherman and landowner are key partners of this project. Please include them to the list. At CEO endorsement, further information is expected of how these groups will be engaged in the preparation and implementation of the project. Cleared.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): The Request for CEO Endorsement includes a matrix outlining stakeholders, their roles and which components they probably will be engaged with. Under the description of the different outputs, the stakeholder groups have been mentioned again.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	08/26: Sufficient information is provided at PIF stage. At CEO endorsement, please provide a fuller consideration of the mitigation measures with regards to local communities, as well as land owners. Cleared.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Please make sure that the risk matrix, includes all elements identified by STAP. It is noticeable, that during the Document preparation phase, no additional risks have been identified on top of what was identified at time of WP inclusion. Please reconsider the risks that the project may phase and if additional risks exists, please include along with appropriate mitigation measures. 8th of October 2015 (cseverin): Cleared
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/26: The project lists the major national and regional related initiatives. However, please provide further inputs on how the project will link with programs developed by FAO (including FAO-EU partnership), SPREP. Fuller details of how the coordination will be achieved are expected at CEO endorsement. 10/02: Cleared at PIF stage.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): A substantial list of national and regional investments have been identified, however, the document does not describe how the coordination is expected to take place. Please elaborate on this. 8th of October 2015 (cseverin):Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's 	08/26: Although the development of national system of protected areas is widespread, the establishment of such network that includes both marine and terrestrial areas is innovative in Nuie. The network is based on community protected areas and other heritage areas; which will ensure the sustainability of the approach and its scaling-up to other Pacific islands. Cleared.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): There is good scope for replication of the suggested activities on other pacific islands, which is one of the reasons that it is crucial that lessons learned is harnessed and shared through the Regional R2R investment.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	intervention.		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes
	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>4th of August 2015 (cseverin): No, it is hard to establish the cost effectiveness, based on the submitted documentation. When the document package has been revised to better describe the activities to be undertaken, along with impacts of these investments, it will be easier to answer this question.</p> <p>8th of October 2015 (cseverin):As confusion still persists as to what is Baseline and what is co-financing to the proposed investment, coupled with the lack of description of the "concrete actions" and what impact they are foreseen to have, it is not possible to answer this question. Please elaborate on points mention to enable an analysis of the cost effectiveness.</p> <p>25th of November 2015 (cseverin):Addressed</p>
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?	<p>08/26: This item will be considered once the issue raised in Item 17 has been addressed.</p> <p>10/02: This item will be considered once the remaining issues raised in Item 17 have been addressed.</p> <p>01/22/2014: Cleared.</p>	<p>4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Hard to assess, as Table B does not include much information on tangible deliverables.</p> <p>8th of October 2015 (cseverin):Issue persists, the document packages indicated that 60% of the GEF funding will go towards delivering under output 1.3, however, output 1.3, mentions that</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>the implementation of conservation and management activities will be concrete actions, but not mentioning of what they will be. Please elaborate.</p> <p>25th of November 2015 (cseverin):Addressed, however, please note that the elaborate descriptions of activities in Annex 8 of the foreseen activities makes it clear that a number of these are not eligible for GEF funding, please make sure that Annex 8 only includes activities eligible for GEF funding.</p> <p>5th of February 2016 (cseverin): Cleared</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><u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>08/26: The cofinancing ratio is about 1: 2.4. Further consultations have to be done to reach an adequate cofinancing ratio. UNDP is bringing 100,000; please specify if it is either in cash or in kind. Please consider improving UNDP cofinancing for this project.</p> <p>02/10: The cofinancing ratio has increased. It is now at 1:2.9. More than 90% of the co-financing is in-kind; at CEO endorsement the co-financing will have to be more balanced (included grant funding). UNDP is now bringing US\$200,000; please specify if it is either in cash or in kind.</p> <p>01/22/2014: Cleared at PIF stage.</p>	<p>4th of August 2015 (cseverin): 100% of the co-financing is in-kind, however, for an investment in a small SIDS like Nuie the cofinancing level is considered fine.</p>
	<p>18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>08/26: The project management cost is about 5%; which is fine. Cleared.</p>	<p>4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	08/26: Yes, the requested amount is under the norm. Cleared.	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the submission includes a report on the spendings.
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	08/26: N/A	4th of August 2015 (cseverin): NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		4th of August 2015 (cseverin): No, Please provide an METT for each of the Planned PA investments, as well as fill in the IW TT too. 8th of October 2015 (cseverin):Cleared
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		4th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STAP? 		4th of August 2015 (cseverin): NO, Coral bleaching, as mentioned by the STAP, have not been included in the Risk Matrix and hence therefore no mitigation strategy have been identified. Please address. 8th of October 2015 (cseverin): Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council? 		4th of August 2015 (cseverin): No, as the Risk analysis exercise seem to have

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>been less than thorough during project preparation, the second Comment from the USA, have not been properly dealt with. Therefore, please include a more thorough risk analysis, including mitigation measures in order to also address all council comments satisfactory.</p> <p>8th of October 2015 (cseverin): Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>08/26: The project cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the issues raised in items above.</p> <p>02/10: The project cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address the remaining issues raised in items above.</p> <p>01/23: The project is technically cleared and recommended for work program inclusion.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - co-financing ratio no less than 1:2.9 - co-financing composition including a significant part of co-financing in grant. - SMART indicators with targets - clear outputs for capacity building 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>4th of August 2015 (cseverin): No</p> <p>8th of October 2015 (cseverin):No, please address comments.</p> <p>30th of November 2015 (cseverin): No, please address comment regarding</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			annex 8 and eligibility of activities. 5th of February 2016 (Cseverin): Yes, the project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	August 26, 2013	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	October 02, 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.**