



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

GEF ID:	5578		
Country/Region:	Tonga		
Project Title:	R2R Integrated Land and Agro-ecosystem Management Systems		
GEF Agency:	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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-1; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,344,954
Co-financing:	\$7,170,000	Total Project Cost:	\$9,714,954
PIF Approval:	February 05, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	March 21, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Pascal Martinez	Agency Contact Person:	Naoko Nakagawa

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> ?	yes	22 March 2016: Yes
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	yes. The funding figures will need to be reconciled  9/20/2013 JS CCM No. Now the project intends to reallocate CCM funds for LD activities. Please submit a LoE that states this intention.  11/19 Please re-submit a LOE from Tonga clearly indicating the amount of STAR & IW funding Tonga is allocating to THIS Tonga project (versus the program) and how they are using their	22 March 2016: Addressed. The letter of endorsement has been correctly adjusted regarding the total amount of each FA.

\*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)
		<p>flexibility mechanism: e.g amount of CC STAR transferred to other FAs.</p> <p>12/30/13 Please re-submit a LOE from Tonga clearly indicating the amount of STAR funding Tonga is allocating to THIS Tonga project (versus the program) and how they are using their flexibility mechanism: e.g amount of CC STAR transferred to other FAs. The current LOE is not in line with GEF guidelines. Please contact Ms Quynh Phan Xuan from OBS for a country specific LOE model using the flexibility mechanism or assistance.</p>	
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>	<p>Please note that the funding in Table D of the Program Document identified for Tonga funding BD, LD , CC ,SFM is different from the amounts requested in the PIF. Please refer to the latest version of the PFD and contact the UNDP coordinators (Messrs Hudson &amp; Padilla) for clarification. IW funding and purpose are lacking. Please reconcile accordingly in ALL PIF tables.</p> <p>Please also note following errors: "ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ"</p> <p>9/26 please address the following system errors: ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants /</p>	22 March 2016: Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Fees differ ERROR in PIF / PFD - Total Fee exceeds 9 percent (limit for this type of project or PFD)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Please see comments above and reconcile all numbers in all tables accordingly</p> <p>Please reflect the IW funding</p> <p>9/20 The IW funding is still not reflected in the tables</p> <p>11/19. Please include the IW Togo portion in consultation w/ UNDP for consistence purpose. Cook Island example is attached. Others are available in GEF system.</p> <p>A. INDICATIVE FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK2 :</p> <p>Focal Area Objectives Trust Fund Indicative Grant Amount (\$)</p> <p>Indicative Co-Financing (\$)</p> <p>BD-1 GEFTF 3,159,164 10,500,000 B2 GEFTF 944,940 3,000,000 IW-1 GEFTF 163,327 793,673 Total Project Cost 4,267,431 14,293,673</p>	<p>At CEO endorsement, please ensure: (a) that activities are included in the PIF re, the Small IW increment, consistent with IW Objective 3 under GEF 5; (b)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; (c) 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"</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	SFM: please reconcile the numbers	22 March 2016:

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		between PFD and PIF (access to the SFM/REDD+ is conditional on a minimum spend of \$2 million from the country's STAR allocations).	Addressed.
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>Please reconcile with funding comments above</p> <p>9/4/2013 JS CCM The project aims to contribute towards CCM-5 and CCM-3.</p> <p>9/20/2013 JS CCM No. The project has reallocated CCM funds for LD activities. However, all the CCM related previous activities are still included in the project. Please clarify.</p>	<p>Re. IW: please ensure that: (a) activities, consistent with IW Objective 3 under GEF 5, are included in the CEO endorsement; (b) 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; and (c) 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"</p> <p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</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>yes</p> <p>9/4/2013 JS CCM Yes. The Joint National Action Plan includes goals to reduce GHG emission reduction by 10%. Also Tonga's Energy Road map puts emphasis on renewable energy.</p>	<p>22 March 2016: Addressed.</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 assumptions?</p>	<p>Overall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Table B lacks the project objective</li> <li>2. While the R2R theme is referenced, the clear links to the theme and consolidate resulted expected in R2R are totally lacking. Please address and coordinate</li> </ol>	<p>Cpt 3 Restoration: please provide what is being planned and where</p> <p>22 March 2016: 2. Addressed 5a. Partially addressed. The component</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		<p>accordingly with the program's coordinating agency: UNDP</p> <p>3. The PIF refers frequently to lack of capacity. In that light, the project will highly benefit from reduction and concentration of activities. The project as presented is complex, small amounts are ventilated to many FAs and unlikely to produce tangible results. Please consolidate allocation of funding to maximise the impact on the ground versus low impact from too many small activities. Has the flexibility option been discussed? Also, Kiribati could be used as a model.</p> <p>4. Baseline projects identified on p.8 appear to be the same as the co-finance.</p> <p>5. Component 3 seems to be a mix of monitoring, protecting remaining natural resources, restoring degraded forest and improving the policy framework:</p> <p>a. Monitoring “ please provide baseline. Please clearly indicate that inventories will be carried out through co-financing without use of GEF funds. The baseline is not clear.</p> <p>b. Protecting remaining natural resources “ what this means is not clear. Is it avoiding deforestation. If so how will it be done and what is the baseline activity? Does this relate to existing PA networks?</p> <p>c. Restoration “ some additional information about existing restoration efforts “ more than the local nursery capacity is necessary. Also how this links to Component 2 needs to be clarified. The two components seem to be unrelated. How are these sites to be</p>	<p>3 has been modified and the aspects related to monitoring moved to component 1. The co-financing provided by the national authorities for the inventories is noted but it still remains unclear where and what is the baseline informed in the document.</p> <p>5b. Partially addressed. The baseline activity of the local authorities needs to be further explained to understand how the project leads to successfully avoid deforestation. In particular which actions will be prioritized thanks to the improvement of the capacities for forest monitoring?</p> <p>6. Addressed.</p> <p>7. Addressed.</p> <p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>selected for BD/LD/CC benefit?  d.Policy “ should this not be included in the policy work in Component 1?  6. Land tenure is mentioned in the incremental cost reasoning but not in the descriptions of the components or the project framework. What is being proposed for this needs to be clear in Component 1.  7. Forest carbon estimates are very basic. It would be unlikely restoration areas would start with 0 tC so a bit of refinement is necessary. What about other elements of Component 3 e.g. avoiding deforestation (if this is what protecting remaining natural resources means)?</p> <p>9/4/2013 JS CCM  No. Livestock based agriculture has been identified as the major cause of degradation. The project has identified need for land use planning, systematic data for monitoring and decision making, and integrated agro-ecosystem management. Activities currently being undertaken under each is presented. Please provide baseline information on biogas systems in the country.</p> <p>9/20  Re. Ct 2 While the R2R theme is referenced a little more, the clear links to the theme and consolidate results expected in R2R are still lacking. Please address and coordinate accordingly with the program's coordinating agency:  UNDP. The GEF Ridge to Reef</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>publication may also be a good source to consult towards the producing of a strong para. on this project reef to reef rationale, input and results expected</p> <p>Re ct5a:there is no additional information on page 10</p> <p>Re 5b: A few general words have been added to the PIF but no real detail. if a claim on avoided deforestation is being made, some rationale behind this is needed</p> <p>Re Ct 6 land tenure: an explanation of what will be done is needed versus a few general words that tenure affects livelihoods. FAO just published guidance on improving governance of forest tenure: are these the sort of activities being planned?</p> <p>Re CT 7 forest carbon estimates are still extremely simplistic. Please use FAO's ex-act tool as a means of making this calculation more robust.</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>Please adjust to address above comments</p> <p>9/4/2013 JS CCM</p> <p>No. Please see below.</p> <p>Component 2: Please clarify the economic viability of the proposed biogas systems. Please revise the project indicator to align them with the GEF priorities, for example hectares prevented from livestock related degradation etc, amount of energy supplied to a number of households. It is not clear how the component achieves CCM-5 objective, please make this linkage clear using appropriate outputs and indicators.</p> <p>Component 3: To justify CCM-5 funding</p>	<p>22 March 2016:</p> <p>Component 2: partially addressed. GEF notes the projections of the economic viability of the piggery/biogester systems shown in Figure 6. Nevertheless, while the detailed explanation of the basis of the calculations is announced in Appendix 7, the Appendix 7 refers to "Project environmental and social (E&amp;S) screening checklist". Please clarify where this detailed explanation is.</p> <p>24 June 2016:</p> <p>Addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		for the component please add forest carbon assessment and monitoring to the component activities. Please clarify what sustainable forest management including agro-forestry will entail and relate them to the identified drivers of forest degradation.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	9/4/2013 JS CCM Please clarify the added value of GEF funded activities for household level biogas activities under component 2 and please provide an estimate of CO2e emissions that would be reduced as a result of the project.	Please specify, quantify, and refine the GEB at CEO endorsement stage  22 March 2016: Partially addressed. Some GEBs aren't clearly quantified (BD, LD).  24 June 2016: Addressed.
	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?		22 March 2016: Addressed.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	yes	22 March 2016: Addressed.
	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)	Please add the climate change dimension.	22 March 2016: Addressed.



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Please provide in text all relevant projects and programs and how they will be coordinated with.	22 March 2016: Addressed.
	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 based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	Vague at this stage.	Please specify, quantify, and refine all these aspects at CEO endorsement stage  22 March 2016: Addressed.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		22 March 2016: There is no significant change from the PIF. Addressed.
	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?		22 March 2016: Addressed.
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?	Please see comments above.	22 March 2016: Addressed.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing	72% of the co-financing is from the government in kind and is presented as a	Please strengthen co-financing plan, including sources and project

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	risk. How realistic is this? Less than 1% of the co-financing is in cash  9/20 A COUPLE OF ADDITIONAL CO-FINANCE SOURCES HAVE BEEN ADDED BUT IS THIS NOT STILL MAINLY THE SAME?	management, at CEO endorsement stage  22 March 2016: Addressed.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	OK. Please specify co-financing component	22 March 2016: Addressed.
	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?	yes  please revise figures as necessary in the light of the revised figures to be provided	22 March 2016: Addressed.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		22 March 2016: LD and SFM tracking tools are missing. Not addressed.  6 April 2016: Addressed.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		22 March 2016: Addressed.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>STAP?</li> </ul>		25 March 2016: Partially addressed. - The response to comment 5 doesn't

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>explain how social barriers to adoption of the alternative approach to raising pigs will be overcome. Please address this comment too.</p> <p>- Please ensure that STAP comments be reflected in the project document and not only in the Annex B (see in particular the comment on rainwater harvesting techniques).</p> <p>24 June 2016: Addressed.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		<p>6 July 2016: Please provide a table showing that all council comments have been addressed and indicate where is the information in the project document.</p> <p>27 July 2016: Addressed</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>Please address above comments</p> <p>9/26 Please address above comments</p> <p>11/19. The PIF will be recommended for clearance upon inclusion of IW funding and receiving of specific country LOE as clearly described above</p> <p>12/30. In line with GEF OBS guidelines, PIF will be recommended for clearance upon receiving a specific country LOE, including specific use of flexibility mechanisms for relevant FAs.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval		1/15/14 The LoE has been submitted and PIF is recommended for clearance	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>6 April 2016: Not yet. Some comments above still need to be addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Furthermore, regarding the co-financing letters: the activity financed by the GIZ under 3.1.2 is not the same as the one in the project document and the letter from the Asian Development Bank does not correspond to any co-financing resources in table C. Please explain.</li> <li>- Regarding the tracking tools: 1/BD: the date of submission is missing. The area directly covered by the project of 6,180 ha is not reflected in the project document. 2/ LD: The surfaces of the areas focus of the intervention do not appear clearly in the project document. Please establish a clear relation between the TTs and the project document. In particular, but not only, to which concrete activity and the 350 ha SFM correspond in the document? 3/ Again the figures in the table (areas and tCO<sub>2</sub>eq) are not always reflected in the project document. Please establish the consistence between the TT and the project document.</li> </ul> <p>6 July 2016: Not yet. The project document is nearly ready. Nevertheless, it remains unclear</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>how it considers the concerns expressed by the Council members during the PFD approval phase. Considering that this project has do be circulated to the Council for its approval, please provide a clear information addressing the Council comments.</p> <p>27 July 2016: Yes, the project proposal can now be recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
	First review*		April 06, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		June 24, 2016
	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.**