



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

GEF ID:	5397		
Country/Region:	Vanuatu		
Project Title:	R2R: Integrated Sustainable Land and Coastal Management		
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-1; LD-3; CCM-5; IW-3; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$135,000	Project Grant:	\$4,605,680
Co-financing:	\$14,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,740,680
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Nicole Glineur	Agency Contact Person:	Adrian Whiteman

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.  4/10/2013 CCM JS Yes. Vanuatu is a party to the UNFCCC.	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	Yes.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	yes	
	• the focal area allocation?	4/10/2013 CCM JS Not clear. Focal area amounts are incorrectly allocated in table A, B and C.	

\*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)
		Please adjust the amounts in the PIF tables to reflect the amounts agreed upon in the PFD Totals (including fees) Biodiversity: 1,871,900 LD: 601,560 CC: 1,161,193 IW: 175,000 SFM: 1,247,600	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	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>	Yes. 4/10/2013 CCM JS The project intends to contribute to CCM-5 objective of increasing carbon stocks through restoration of riparian zones.	8/26 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"
	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,	The project discusses various national action plans. However, please clarify how PA designation or other decisions about where to work align with the NBSAP.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	<p>4/10/2013 CCM JS No. Please explain how the project addresses priorities highlighted in national communication and low carbon development plan (or related strategies) of the country.</p> <p>8/22/2013 CCM JS The revised submission elaborates on the national communications, national energy policy framework and the Vanuatu forest policy, and notes the elements within that are relevant to the project.</p>	
Project Design	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>4-4-13 Biodiversity</p> <p>1. There is no baseline for the creation of new PAs, the effective management of existing ones, or revenue generating mechanisms in PAs. There are 35 PAs found in the UNEP-WCMC's World Database on Protected Areas (12 terrestrial, 23 marine). The GEF Sec expects to see in the baseline project, the investments in the associated with the proposed new PAs, the existing PAs to benefit from improved management, and a brief description of the efforts to be carried out to increase revenue generation.</p> <p>During the project preparation please provide the fraction of the \$200,000 (in-kind contribution from the MAQFF) will be used for the management of the PAs (other 4 activities are also listed under 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>baseline scenario associated with management of PAs. See p. 5.)</p> <p>There are no-baseline for investments in NWFP under Baseline scenarios (p.5).</p> <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS  No. Description of baseline problems and baseline activities is helpful/ Existing threats to the ecosystems are identified, however the information is not specific to the target project sites.</p> <p>a. Please provide tentative list of project areas and determine site specific deforestation drivers.</p> <p>b. Please provide information on the coverage of existing forests and an estimate of carbon stocks within.</p> <p>c. Please summarize the policies and regulations that are currently in place in Vanuatu that aim to decrease deforestation and protect carbon stocks.</p> <p>d. Please describe the carbon MRV system being developed in Vanuatu and draw linkages with the activities proposed in the current project.</p> <p>8/22/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>The revised submission provides a list of tentative project sites and associated drivers of deforestation. A preliminary estimate of CO2 emissions that could be reduced by the project is presented. By CEO endorsement request, a site-based estimate of status of forests in the project sites and the effect of the project intervention on the deforestation and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>degradation rates and CO2 emissions are expected.</p> <p>Relevant policies regarding land registration, agriculture extension, protected area management and carbon MRV have been identified. MAQFF (Forestry Department), supported by FAO and others, are working on the development of MRV guidelines and a national framework for REDD+.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>4-10-13</p> <p>Biodiversity</p> <p>Component 1. i) Target PAs for creation and increased management were not mentioned. Please clarify the location of the 35,000 ha of new PAs to be created. How will these sites be selected (e.g. threatened species, key biodiversity areas, endemic plant areas)? If this information is not available, please address during the PPG ii) Conservation trust funds were discussed in Table B and briefly in the PIF. Is the project planning on establishing, funding and making operational specific Trust Funds for each PA? What are the rationale and the role model for this approach? It does not appear as the most cost-effective approach for revenue generation. Why not one at the national level?</p> <p>iii) As mentioned in Table B, what biodiversity products will be marketed and to whom?</p> <p>Component 2. i) What are the target watersheds for Integrated Land and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>marine management plans (100,000 ha)? How do these watersheds relate to the existing or new PAs to be created? ii) What baseline activities are currently underway regarding adding value and marketing of these NWFP? What NWFP are being targeted through this intervention to need training on harvesting techniques, with increased value-added and marketing?</p> <p>Component 4: i) Please provide an example of the type of M&amp;E for biodiversity currently operating in the regions that would serve as role model for this output. ii) Are the landowners trained in this component in addition to the landowners trained for component 2? If so, 250 landowners does not seem sufficient to improve outcomes on 100,000 ha (as mentioned in component 2)?</p> <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS Component 3: Please see comments below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Please clarify what proportion of the total 8000 ha will be restored in riparian zone and the proportion that will be under agroforestry practice.</li> <li>b. Please include grass species in the restoration activities where possible or suitable in project areas where erosion is an issue.</li> <li>c. Please explain if the activities described under the component are linked with component 1 (PAs).</li> <li>d. It is not clear what will</li> </ol>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>incentivize or enforce the landowners and the communities to cooperate in restoration and to limit extraction of fuelwood.</p> <p>e. Please develop mechanisms through which leakage (for example unsustainable intensification of agriculture, increased logging in non-project areas) issues associated with the project activities will be addressed.</p> <p>f. More details on the activities proposed under carbon MRV system is expected by CEO endorsement and concrete estimation of the expected increase in carbon stocks is expected along with full consideration of leakage issues.</p> <p>8/22/2013 CCM JS  Thank you for the responses. It is assumed that component 2 and 3 would be implemented in the same areas. Activities in these components are expected to be complimentary and that component 2 would contribute towards reducing emissions as well.</p> <p>a) Please specify what improving agriculture, fisheries and forestry would entail, and please include measures that would increase C storage and reduce GHG emissions including NOx and CH4 from production landscapes, fisheries and livestock.</p> <p>b) It is requested to include livestock management in these components as well.</p> <p>c) Given the concern of water quality in the area, and linkages with N2O</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>emissions, please specify activities targeted to reduce runoff of nitrogenous fertilizers.</p> <p>d) The UNREDD RPP for Vanuatu is in the final stages of approval, with the World Bank as the main delivery partner. It is noted that MRV is considered in the program but not funded. Please clarify the complementarity and explain how the MRV developed through the FAO proposed project will be utilized at the national scale.</p> <p>8/29/2013 CCM JS</p> <p>7. Yes. Thank you for the clarifications. It is expected that project measures developed in component 2 and 3 will be complimentary such that activities done through one does not undermine the GHG benefits gathered through the other. The preliminary details on the MRV is helpful.</p> <p>By CEO endorsement please provide mechanisms of coordination and collaboration with the national level MRV processes.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>4-10-13 Biodiversity Since the target PAs are not yet determined, it is not possible to determine the GEBs to be derived from this project. Please provide during project preparation.</p> <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS No. A simple and direct calculation of</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>total carbon benefits through forest restoration is provided. The following items need to be considered:</p> <p>a) Emissions due to deforestation that may be shifted to a different location due to the project activities like restoration and control on logging for fuelwood needs to accounted for and addressed.</p> <p>b) More concrete estimation in tCO<sub>2</sub>e (with baseline, projections and leakage) based on site specific information is requested by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>8/22/2013. Thank you for the response.</p> <p>a) Response regarding leakage is well taken. However, to ensure that shift of activities or demand of fuelwood for other purposes do not arise, it is encouraged that a formal agreement about landuse is reached with the landowners and users.</p> <p>b) Comment provided as in the previous review.</p> <p>8/29/2013 CCM JS Requested change regarding formal agreement on land-use has been added.</p>	
	<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>While many livelihood improvement activities are mentioned, there is little discussion of connecting conservation actions to livelihood benefits which could help the sustainability of the project. There is little discussion of ensuring the participation of women.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	The role of established NGOs and some CSOs are mentioned. However, it would be helpful to assess how the capacity of these groups will be developed and supported, particularly to manage PAs and sustainable land planning, during project preparation.	
	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>Yes. The risks and mitigation measures seem reasonable.</p> <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS No. The project does not consider leakage issues that may hinder the overall carbon benefits expected from the project.</p> <p>8/22/2013 No. Please see comment for section 8.</p> <p>8/29/2013 CCM JS The risk regarding leakage has been added and explained as requested.</p>	
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>Yes.</p> <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS Yes for PIF stage.</p>	<p>Recommended Actions by CEO Endorsement:</p> <p>Please provide details and areas of cooperation between partner projects that may affect or benefit the proposed project especially the REDD+, landuse planning and MRV development.</p>
	<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</li> </ul>	<p>Innovation: This project has the potential to develop models for INRM with more expansion of the ideas presented.</p> <p>Sustainability: With a greater connection to improved livelihoods from INRM and funding and proper regulation of major industries (specifically tourism and cruises), this project could be sustainable.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>Scaling up: By focusing on watershed with important GEBs, supportive communities, and existing community managed areas, this project can help build successful models to use in other areas.</p> <p>4/10/2013 CCM JS The project attempts to tie various aspects of natural resource planning and rural development together. It will pilot carbon monitoring, reporting and verification in select areas, allowing for replication of such methods and setting up of a national level system.</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>		<p>More details are needed about project strategies, but the project costs seem reasonable.</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>Yes. 4/10/2013 CCM JS Yes.</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? <u>At CEO endorsement:</u> Has co-</p>	<p>Please confirm the cofinancing from the government, partners, and FAO.</p>	<p>8/26. FAO confirmed that co-financing details would be confirmed at CEO endorsement</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	yes	
	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.	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
<b>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The proposed PIF will be recommended upon addressing of remaining issues in sections 7,8,& 11.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please also include GEF project number.</p> <p>8/29/2013  The PIF received on 8/29 satisfactorily addresses all GEF comments. It is technically cleared and may be considered in a future work program.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**