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

GEF ID:	**5550**		
Country/Region:	**Tuvalu**		
Project Title:	**R2R Implementing a Ridge to Reef Approach to Protect Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functions**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5220 (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-3; IW-3;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$3,762,844**
Co-financing:	**$15,680,591**	Total Project Cost:	**$19,443,435**
PIF Approval:	**September 12, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**November 07, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jean-Marc Sinnassamy**	Agency Contact Person:	**Shoko Takemoto**

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**?	UNCCD: Date of Ratification: September 14 1998; Effective Date: December 13 1998 CBD: signed on 1992-06-08; Tuvalu became a party on 2002-12-20	Addressed.
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	Yes	Addressed.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	The proposed grant is compatible with what was planned at PFD level.	Addressed.
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes	Addressed.
	• the LDCF under the principle of	NA	NA

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	- The project includes IW resources ($154,396 + $13,896 of fees). 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" . September 9, 2013 Thanks for the improvements, but there is still some confusion to clarify. The linkages to the regional IW project are reflected. Outputs 3.2.2 and 4.1.3 reflect IW activities that fit with the IW objective 3. - Please correct the table A: This PIF is developed under the IW3 objective, not the IW1.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		- In the same way, please correct the information in the section B.2: Do not refer to the IW1 objective, but the IW3. Under the R2R program, only the regional IW project is developed under the IW1 objective. - We can understand the need for the output 2.1.5 as a threat for the coastal and marine biodiversity (and then under BD financing). However, we suggest to remove the output 2.1.4 that do not fit with the reasoning and the elibility under the GEF5 focal area strategies. September 12, 2013 Addressed.	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *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).*	The project result framework is well aligned with BD1 and BD2 objectives. The project will help to achieve Aichi Targets; please develop SMART indicators for each of the outcomes. The project is also announced under the LD3 objective (reduce pressures on natural resources from competing uses in the wider landscape). Some efforts are needed to better align the result framework with LD3 outcomes and outputs (see cell 7). September 9, 2013 Addressed. However, in the section B.2, please refer to the LD3 and not the LD2 objective. September 12, 2013 Addressed. Thanks.	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	The project is consistent with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Action Plan (NBSAP 2009) and the recent National Strategic Action Plan for Climate Change and disaster risk management (NSAP 2012). These two key documents are mentioned, but some deeper analysis will probably be needed to better explain the current situation and justify the strategic choices. September 9, 2013 Ok at PIF level. Please, fine-tune the analysis of these national documents and strategies at CEO endorsement to well anchor the project in the country context.	Addressed.
Project Design	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?	The baseline is not clear and doesn't contain sufficient detail to measure the challenges. The key drivers of biodiversity degradation, loss are not clear e.g what is the scale of importance of loss through unsustainable fishing practices, sewage mismanagement, and agriculture development? It is mentioned that LMMA have been developed since 1996, please provide more information about their governance, their financial support, and their success/ challenges. Finally, climate change is listed as one of the top threat, why the project doesn't directly address it? Regarding the on-going initiatives, please further detail the initiatives supported by donors and NGOs. September 9, 2013 Addressed. At CEO endorsement, please	See CEO endorsement, p8-9. Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		provide clear baselines/benchmarks for the Monitoring Plan.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	- General comment: we understand that a PIF is a concept, should be short, and some elements will be clarified at CEO endorsement. However, the main elements of the incremental reasoning must be available at PIF level. We have to understand the current situation, the role of cofinancing and the incremental/additional use of GEF resources. It is not the case with the current submission. - The consistency with a ridge-to-reef approach is not clear within the proposal. Although there is marine and terrestrial focus, the project as described does not explain enough how the R2R approach will be developed. For example, please further explain how the extension of LMMA to terrestrial part will be developed and for which expected outcomes. Please provide the criteria in which the new sites for LMMA will be chosen. - It is difficult to figure out the coherence between the table A and the table B: for instance, the first component of the project focuses on BD1 (protected area network) while the table A mentions $350,000. Please, make the two tables consistent. - With the information provided in the table D and in the section B.2., we understand that the flexibility option is applied and the CCM allocation is used for LD objectives. - Please remind that only $154,396 are	The result framework is coherent and very detailed. All changes and adjustments with the PIF are justified. Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		used for IW: as agreed with the IW cluster during the preparation of the program, it is recommended 1) to focus these resources on activities consistent with the IW objective 3 and 2) link these activities with the regional IW project that will complete the Program "R2R. Revise the text in the section B.3., the project can reasonably not achieve activities related to the IW Objective 1 and the outcome 1.3 within the available budget. Component 1: A component supporting the management effectiveness and the extension of the network of Locally Managed Marine Areas is welcome. - Explain better the current situation of the network, what is financed with other donors and how the GEF activities are incremental. For instance, the output 1.1.1 sounds as a business as usual activity and might not be financed by the GEF. - It is not clear how the GIS will be used, at national and local level, please provide further information on how this activities will be developed and how the project will ensure its sustainability. Component 2: A component on Integrated Land and water management is welcome, but please describe what is done by the cofinancing (baseline scenario) and justify LD activities with outputs and activities compatible under the GEF5 strategy. - Most of the outputs related to water	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		(2.1.3., 2.14., 2.15, 2.1.6, 3.2.1, 3.2.2) are not welcome per se. We can understand the interest for these activities, but they should be taken by the cofinancing or other projects. - We would like to invite the Agency to focus this component under the LD3 objective and reformulate the outcomes and outputs around the outcome 3.2. "integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities" and the outputs 3.1 (integrated land management plans) and 3.2 (integrated NRM tools and methodologies). cf. GEF5 LD strategy for further details. - Please explain the nature of activities under the outcome 2.2 and the output 2.2.1. - A component 3 on "mainstreaming" is acceptable, but revise the reasoning and check the eligibility of activities in the GEF5 strategy. Please, explain the baseline scenario and what is done by the cofinancing, and develop activities either "to increase sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity" or "to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and frameworks" (See outcomes 1 and 2 under the GEF5 BD strategy). - A component 4 on KM is possible (under 5% of the budget), please justify the coherence and the non-duplication of these activities with the outputs 1.1.1 and 2.1.1 that are also related to GIS development.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		September 9, 2013 Thanks for the improvements. The result framework is simpler and much better to address GEF requirements. However, we still think there is a confusion between BD1 and BD2, and potential misunderstanding about what is eligible under BD 2. It is exact that the strenghtening of the governance and institutions are eligible under BD2, but the window of activities is relatively specific, based on the comparative advantage of the GEF, either to produce a national framework for mainstreaming or to implement environmental certification systems. Based on the information available in the PIF and notably in the result framework, the BD investments seem mainly focused on BD1. This is for this reason that $1,6 million are planned for the component 1 for the conservation of Island and Marine Biodiversity. There is a single outcome for this component related to the improvement of management effectiveness of the PA system. We think that the breakdown given in the table A does not reflect your intents (BD1: $550,000; BD2: $1,165,000). Please, revise or justify. September 12, 2013 Addressed.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning	No, this needs some additional information throughout. It is not necessary to repeat in the section A.1.5 the descriptive elements provided	The GEB and the indicators are strictly those from the GEF5 strategy. Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	sound and appropriate?	elsewhere (number of endemic species, etc), just focus on the Global Environment Benefits that the project will help to achieve. Please further describe how the GEF project will help the on-going initiatives to achieve GEB and what methodology will be applied. Expected outcomes 1.1 states the management effectiveness of existing and expanded LMMAs is improved, this provides some information but what will be the metric for assess, the METT? If yes, what is the current score and the expected one? If the component 2 is confirmed under the LD3 objective, describe how the project will reduce pressures on NR in the landscape (tree coverage, soil improvement, zoning, plan, etc). September 9, 2013 Addressed.	
	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?		Socio-economic benefits are mentioned but at a very generic level, please provide some specifics that will arise from this project including gender dimensions, and how this will support the improvement of LMMA management and their sustainability post-project. September 9, 2013 Please, provide more information on socio-economic benefits at CEO endorsement.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			May 12, 2015 Section B2, p16. Addressed.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	In the section A.2, please include the local communities. During the PPG, include an analysis of local stakeholders. NGOs will be key partners for implementation. Traditional authorities are mentioned. At CEO endorsement, confirm how they were identified and involved. September 9, 2013 Addressed - to be improved at CEO endorsement.	An analysis of stakeholders is proposed. NGOs will be partners for project implementation. 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)	Yes. Include a comprehensive risk assessment during the PPG.	There is a comprehensive risk analysis, with mitigation measures. Addressed.
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	- A deeper analysis of other related initiatives in the country and in the region is necessary: first, at PIF level to improve the baseline scenario and the cofinancing, and second at CEO endorsement to ensure synergy. September 9, 2013 Addressed at PIF level. This point will be checked at CEO endorsement.	Many elements of coordination with other UNDP and GEF projects are provided. However, the level of coordination and cooperation with other partners is not addressed. Please, clarify (see also cell 14). June 8, 2015 Addressed.
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects,**	As a child project of the R2R, this project aims to develop a landscape management	This project is at the crossroads of various integrated approaches (Locally

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. • 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.	approach, by extending existing LMMA to terrestrial areas. Please further detail the methodology applied and the expected governance arrangement. More detail is required to evaluate the sustainability of this approach and its potential for scaling-up. In the section A.1.6., three demonstration sites are mentioned to develop "better energy and water management to sustain food supplies". We are not sure to capture these elements in the result framework. Please revise or explain. September 9, 2013 Addressed. See at CEO endorsement.	Managed Marine Areas, Integrated Water Management, Integrated Coastal Area Management) and anchored into the existing institutional framework for sustainability. The project will directly benefit to more than 70% of the population, and indirectly to the entire population of Tuvalu through the long term benefits of the R2R approach, the enhanced management of inland and coastal resources, and the new Locally Managed Marine Areas. Addressed.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		Most of the changes are explained and justified. However, at PIF stage, most of the cofinancing was expected from the Australian Agency for International Development, European Union, and Japan International Cooperation Agency. Even the Tuvalu Association of NGOs (TANGO) was pre-identified as a potential cofinancing partner: - Can you confirm that this serious change of cofinancing does not significantly affect the result framework and the achievement of outcomes? - Can you explain if and how this project will work with these partners, if these initiatives are still active in the country? June 8, 2015 Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		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?	- For the time being, it is difficult to understand what the cofinancing is used for. When you will revise the incremental reasoning, please explain how the cofinancing is employed (describe the baseline activities). - $1.1 million are proposed for the component 1. Please, revise the table A to reflect the right use of BD1 resources. - Half of the project resources (51%) are proposed for the component 2. It is very welcome if this component focuses on activities on the ground 1) to restore "degraded forest, cropped and shoreline areas" with native species and 2) develop agroforestry activities to improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain livelihood". Please, confirm. - We suggest to take into account the IW activites in the component 4 (Knowledge Management). Please, revise the phrasing to define activities compatible with the IW3 objective. September 9, 2013 Points taken. See cell. 7 (BD1 vs. BD2). September 12, 2013	Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Addressed.	
	17. At PIF: 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? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	- The cofinancing is relatively weak. See if it is possible to increase it. - The cofinancing brought up by the agency is very low ($100,000 in kind). Please explore opportunities to improve it. September 9, 2013 We take note that the cofinancing will be confirmed at CEO endorsement, and if possible increased.	Cofinancing has increased up to $15.68 million.
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	The management costs are very low for such project (under 5%).	The management costs have been reduced under 5%. Addressed.
	19. At PIF, 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? At CEO endorsement/ approval, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	A $150,000 PPG is requested. It is acceptable for a $3.7 million project. Addressed.	Addressed.
	20. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	NA	NA
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		Please, check the BD tracking tools, and fill in the table related to the threats (BD objective 1, section 2). June 8, 2015 Addressed.
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that		Addressed.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		Please, check the comments made by the STAP at PFD level. STAP comments have been taken into account and responded.
	• Convention Secretariat?		NA
	• The Council?		Comments from Germany have been responded.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		NA
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	The PIF cannot be recommended yet. September 9, 2013 The PIF has significantly improved. Please address the remaining comments in the cell 3, 4, 7, and 16. Upon receipt of a revised document responding these concerns, the PIF will be recommended. September 12, 2013 All comments have promptly been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	- Please, fine-tune the analysis of the national documents and strategies at CEO endorsement to well anchor the project in the country context. - Please provide clear baselines/benchmarks for the Monitoring Plan. - Confirm the breakdownd between BD1 (protected area management effectiveness) and BD2 (mainstreaming).	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		- Include an analysis of local stakeholders. Explain how the traditional authorities were identified and involved. - Please provide some specifics about socio-economic aspects, and how this will support the improvement of LMMA management and their post-project sustainability. - Include a comprehensive risk assessment during the PPG. - A deeper analysis of other related initiatives in the country and in the region will be necessary at CEO endorsement to ensure synergy and avoid duplication. - Detail the LMMA framework during the PPG. - Confirm the cofinancing, and if possible, increase it.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		We thank the Agency for the high quality standard of this project document. Please, respond the items 12, 14 and 21. Upon receipt of the satisfactory clarifications, the project will be recommended for CEO endorsement. June 8, 2015 All points have been responded. The project is recommended for CEO endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 27, 2013	May 12, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 09, 2013	June 08, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 12, 2013	

* **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.**