



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

GEF ID:	5552		
Country/Region:	Niue		
Project Title:	R2R Application of Ridge to Reef Concept for Biodiversity Conservation, and for the Enhancement of Ecosystem Service and Cultural Heritage		
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:	\$12,430,000	Total Project Cost:	\$16,764,862
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	March 03, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose 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	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08/26: Yes, in a letter dated August 7, 2013.	
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.	
	• the focal area allocation?	08/26: Yes, the project will use the flexibility mechanism to develop a BD project. 10/02: The project is now an MFA	

*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)
		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.	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic	08/26: Yes, the project is well aligned with BD and IW objectives. The project explicitly articulated which Aichi targets the project will help achieve. Please	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	<p>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>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>	
	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?	08/26: Yes, the projet is consistent with the country's national strategies, including NBSAP. Cleared.	
	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?	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 governance of existing PA.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>	
	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. 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. GEF BD framework doesn't support habitat restoration. Please, update accordingly output 1.2.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<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 wate 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 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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>more detailed information on sustainable activities that the project will support (criteria, kind of support, targeted 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 rational 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>	
	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.	
	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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	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.	
	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.	
	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.	
	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. 	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	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 intervention. 	ensure the sustainability of the approach and its scaling-up to other Pacific islands. Cleared.	
	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?	<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>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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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. 01/22/2014: Cleared at PIF stage.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/26: The project management cost is about 5%; which is fine. 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?	08/26: Yes, the requested amount is under the norm. Cleared.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	08/26: N/A	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Council? 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?		
	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.