GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**10041**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Marshall Islands, Palau, Tuvalu)**		
Project Title:	**Managing Coastal Aquifers in Selected Pacific SIDS**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**6196 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IW-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$230,000**	Project Grant:	**$5,261,356**
Co-financing:	**$14,438,216**	Total Project Cost:	**$19,699,572**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Christian Severin**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jose Padilla**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed set of activities is fully in line with the countries strategies towards improving national and local resilience of existing shallow coastal aquifers.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):Yes, however, please at time of CEO endorsement elaborate on how the projects activities will be supported by mainstreaming the management into the National IWRM plans	

[1] 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(formulated through UNDP/GEF investments in the Pacific Region) and their subsequent implementation. Please clarify with Marshalls Islands and Palau, what TBD refers to under Focal Area in the Endorsement Letters.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):Yes	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):Yes,	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):No please address below points: 1) Include reference to how the proposed set of activities will be incorporated into the local and national IWRM plans (that were formulated under the Pacific IWRM GEF funded project) 2) This is a the first project in the GEF SIDS portfolio to address the issue of shallow coastal aquifers in the, therefore please ensure that component 3 have activities that will support sharing of lessons learned not only with the Pacific SIDS, but other	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		SIDS regions as well. 16th of April 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):Please ensure that the GEF gender action plan is reflected upon and that the project will be including activities to deliver towards the GEF gender action plan.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):No, please adjust the Tuvalu amount requested in the PIF, so that it is in coherency with the endorsed and available amount. 16th of April 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	• The focal area allocation?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):The proposed IW grant is available under the adjusted allocation.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin):Due to funding constraints under LDCF, the project will be sitting in the pipeline of approved projects, if LDCF funding is requested. Please consider, if it makes more sense to move ahead without the LDCF funding request at this time. 16th of April 2018 (cseverin):	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Addressed	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	2nd of April 2018 (cseverin): No, please address above points and resubmit. 16th of April 2018 (cseverin): Project is recommended for clearance and for inclusion into a work program	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.