



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

GEF ID:	5663		
Country/Region:	Tonga		
Project Title:	R2R Integrated Environmental Management of the Fanga'uta Lagoon Catchment		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5219 (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; LD-1; LD-3; IW-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$1,756,880
Co-financing:	\$6,650,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,406,880
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	

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 ?		09/01: Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		09/01: Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		09/01: Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?		09/01: Yes, however the breakdown by Focal Areas in Table A and D is not consistent. Table D reflects the breakdown mentioned in the letter of endorsement. It is probably a difficulty of application of the flexibility scheme

*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)
			but please make the tables consistent. 03/27/2014: Table A's figure updated. Cleared.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		N/A
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		N/A
	• focal area set-aside?		01/09: Yes, the request fits with the agreement reached at the PFD stage; which was US\$175,000 from IW. It is noted that 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. However, please clearly mention 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". 03/27/2014: Cleared.
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help</i>		01/09: The project is aligned with BD result framework and strategic objectives. The use of LD resources under LD3 and LD1 are potentially welcome in an integrated land, water, and coastal management approach. The LD1 objective is about sustainable

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<i>achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>		<p>agriculture. Here we understand that under the outcome 1.3 "Sustainable flows of services in agro-systems", SLWM activities will take place to increase the vegetation cover in agro-ecosystem. However, the consistency from the table A to the table B is not easy. Are these activities included in the output 2.1.4 (sustainable forestry interventions on 50 ha, fruit tree plantations)? Please, clarify the nature of activities and benefits that will be financed under LD1. The kind of activity mentioned in the para 59 is not eligible under LD1 ("implementation of landscape approaches for protected area management"). The LD1 does not finance activities in protected areas. The LD1 focus is on productive landscapes to maintain and enhance flows of services in agro-ecosystems. Thanks to clarify.</p> <p>The project mentions the Aichi targets, but please further develop how it will help to achieve them and how the progress will be tracked.</p> <p>03/28/2014: 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?		<p>01/09: Yes, the project is consistent with the national priorities defined in the Tonga Strategic Development Framework 2011-2014 and NBSAP. Cleared.</p>
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and		<p>09/01: The baseline should better highlight the importance of the marine and coastal biodiversity (richness, diversity...). The baseline describes well</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	based on sound data and assumptions?		<p>the key drivers of biodiversity loss and damage; which are over-fishing, urbanization, development of commercial agriculture, lack of institutional framework, and lack of staffing and financial resources for operations. Support to staff salary is not eligible as GEF activity, so please confirm that GEF money will not be used to pay wages. The on-going related initiatives are well described.</p> <p>03/28/2014: Cleared.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?		<p>01/09: The consistency with a ridge-to-reef approach is clear.</p> <p>Result Framework: We appreciate that the result framework is simple. However there is confusion between outcomes and outputs. Therefore, the consistency and the logical path from outcomes, outputs and the activities are difficult to follow at the end. Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2.1.1., 2.1.2., 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5. are typically more outcomes (reflecting the consequences or the impacts of outputs and activities). To take the first output as an example: "effective governance in place" is a consequence of activities. We would like to see in the outputs how the project will reach effective governance, with the expression of a result of these activities, if possible, quantified.</p> <p>Actually, the details given in the project document clarify the outputs (creation of a multi-stakeholder committee, X trainings conducted on IEM). Please, revise the formulation and the coherence between outcomes, outputs, and</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>activities. Finally, as initiated in Annex A, for each component, please develop SMART indicators (e.g. METT for PA effectiveness or % increase of X fish stock, % increase of household income).</p> <p>General comment on components: The project should better describe how it will build on the baseline initiatives (its complementarity and value added).</p> <p>Component 1: There is several mentions in the text on the scarcity of financial resources for FLC-IEMP implementation. Based on on-going program on ecosystem services valuation, the project will gain to look at option for long term sustainable financial mechanisms, such as taxes, PES.</p> <p>Component 2: It is noted that the implementation of the FLC-IEMP will only start in year 3. Does that means that all activities listed under component 2 will start only on Year 3; please clarify. 2.1.2: as mentioned in the project document, the outcome is to foster more sustainable fisheries and not necessarily increase fish harvest. Please update accordingly the output 2.1.2 of Table B. based on the project document, lack of enforcement is a major driver of biodiversity degradation; however it is barely addressed by the project; please explain why.</p> <p>Component 3: It is noted that lack of</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>capacity is a major constraint; therefore please further describe which stakeholder will be targeted, which kind of capacity building will be developed.</p> <p>03/28/2014: Table B updated and SMART indicators developed into the project result framework. It is noted that activities under component 2 will start in Year 1. Cleared.</p>
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		<p>01/09: Para 26 and following, we understand that this MSP is multi-focal and integrated, but we would like to see better explained the multiple benefits of this approach. When it is possible, explain how the GEB will be measured. For example, please make reference to the enhancement of services in the agro-ecosystems, the increase of species population, the number of ha restored in the watershed, the improvement of capacities (institutions, people, mechanisms, tools), and the multiple social, economic and environment benefits.</p> <p>03/28/2014: Cleared.</p>
	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?		<p>01/09: Socio-economic benefits including gender dimension are mentioned but at a very generic level, please provide some specifics that will arise from this project including gender dimensions, and how these will support the sustainability of outcomes post-project.</p> <p>Beyond, the issues related to equity, it is somehow the strategic choices in terms of development that the GEF will</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			choose to support that need to be described. 03/28/2014: Cleared.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		09/01: A range of stakeholder is listed para 53 and in the project document but the level of information is too generic. Please be more specific on how they will be involved in the project implementation, especially regarding the business community/ corporate sector and the local communities. 03/28/2014: 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)		09/01: Yes.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		09/01: There is an effort to present all projects with partners on related issues (adaptation, protected areas, food security, governance). However, we regret to not find more activities and propositions to make the coordination operational (shared steering committees, shared websites, common procedures, etc). Please explain how did you get in contact with these projects and if concrete measures were discussed and are planned? 03/28/2014: Cleared.
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects,		09/01: The project supports the implementation of an integrative

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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 intervention. 		management approach at basin level; which is innovative and has the potential to be replicate at the national level and capitalize at the regional level through the R2R program. Cleared.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		N/A
	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?		09/01: By supporting a more integrated and coordinated management at the basin level, the project promotes a cost-efficient approach. Cleared.
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?		09/01: Yes, the GEF funding and co-financing in Table B is appropriate. More than 70% of the GEF funding is dedicated to activities on the ground. 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?		01/09: The co-financing ratio is about 1:3.7; which is acceptable. The co-financing is in-kind and comes from existing projects led by national government. UNDP provides US\$500,000 of in-kind co-financing. Cleared.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?		01/09: The project management cost should not exceed the threshold of 5%, please adjust accordingly. 03/28/2014: 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?		01/09: No PPG requested (MSP 1 step procedure).
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		01/09: Please provide the Tracking Tools under Excel sheet. As raised in above items, indicators have to be further defined to comply with SMART criteria. 03/28/2014: Please send GEF TT under Excel sheet format.
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		01/09: Yes. Cleared.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		09/01: The project cannot be recommended at this stage, please respond to the points raised in above items. 03/28/2014: The project is technical cleared and recommended for CEO approval.
	First review*		January 14, 2014
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		March 28, 2014
	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.