



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*

THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4746		
Country/Region:	Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Samoa)		
Project Title:	Implementation of Global and Regional Oceanic Fisheries Conventions and Related Instruments in the Pacific Small Island Developing States (SIDS)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP and FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	4607 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$10,000,000
Co-financing:	\$70,306,000	Total Project Cost:	\$80,306,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Andrew Hume	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Padill

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	<p>[AH 12/14/11] No, Tokelau is not a eligible GEF country. It cannot be included in the proposal as it stands, but can participate in the project with non-GEF funding.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Tokelau has been removed from the proposal.</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>[AH 12/14/11] GEF Operational Focal Point Letters of Endorsement are still missing for the Marshall Islands, Nauru, PNG, and Solomon Islands. In addition, the OFP for Tonga differs from who we have listed on file - Dr. Nailasikau HALATUITUIA.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] LOEs for Marshall Islands,</p>	

		<p>provided. PNG has been removed from the project at this time, but, as the PIF states, "... is expected to formally endorse the project and once the endorsement letter is provided to GEF, it will be included as a participating country at CEO endorsement"</p> <p>Further, "The Government of Tonga has advised that Dr. Halatuituia has been replaced as Head of Environment and as the GEF Operational Focal Point by Mr Asipeli Palaki, Director of Environment and Climate Change, but this change is still in the process of being communicated to the GEF."</p> <p>[AH 4/2/12] The Letter of Endorsement from the PNG OFP has been submitted. All 14 countries have now submitted Letters of Endorsement.</p>	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, UNDP successfully carried out the predecessor OFMP project and is well established in the region. FAO's comparative advantage in rights-based management fisheries will enhance this proposal's likelihood of success.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Yes, proposal is well aligned with UNDP successful predecessor OFMP project complemented by the technical expertise of FAO fisheries staff. However, please elaborate how this proposal fits into FAO's agency program in section C.2</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Addressed.</p>	

Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	• the focal area allocation?	[AH 12/14/11] A total of \$10M is being requested from IW, split evenly between UNDP (\$5M) and FAO (\$5M).	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?	[AH 12/14/11] N/A	
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal is well aligned with the GEF-5 IW results framework, specifically related to improving LME management of the WCP Warm Water Pool.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal is well aligned with Objective Two of the GEF-5 IW Strategy	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal was designed specifically to help countries meet their global and regional obligations, specifically to the Western Central Pacific Commission under the Western Central Pacific Convention. Additionally, this project was designed in harmony with the Pacific Islands Forum Fishing Agency Convention (FFA) as well as other regional agreements such as Parties to the Nauru Agreement (PNA).	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability	[AH 12/14/11] Sustainability is key to the success of this proposal and was well demonstrated in the preceding	

		<p>sustainable actions, but it would be best if concrete plans for sustaining the actions outlined are demonstrated in this PIF, especially for Component 3.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Sustainability of the project is now better addressed in the PIF.</p>	
Project Design	11. 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?	[AH 12/14/11] The overall proposal design is sound and well developed over the last three years. It takes guidance directly from the Terminal Evaluation of the UNDP OFMP project, which highlighted the outstanding issues and means for addressing them.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, incremental reasoning is sound for the proposal as the baseline from which GEF funds are providing additionality are the global and regional agreements that the SIDS have obligations to meet. The main emphasis of the project, and GEF funding, is to help individual countries meet obligations for sound stewardship of the WCP Warm Water Pool LME.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	[AH 12/14/11] Overall, the proposal's framework is sound. However, many of the Expected Outputs listed in Table B (Project Framework) are too qualitative	

		<p>outputs that are measurable, e.g. X number of meetings held, X number of country programs implemented, etc. Avoid words such as updated, strengthened, and improved as they can not be measured.</p> <p>Project components are processes versus activities, and lead to vague outputs. For example ,multiple donors have been involved in this Output 1.2.2 Assessment of fisheries jurisdictional implications of climate change and related training. Would encourage to revise structure to focus on activities rather than processes at regional/sub-regional and national level which should be part of the implementation arrangements.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] The Project Framework has been reworked and provides more specific actions yielding measurable goals.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] The proposal methodology follows the lessons learned from the UNDP OFMP project and is based on field experience and the OFMP Terminal Evaluation. Therefore the description of additionality is sound.</p>	
	<p>16. 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>	<p>[AH 12/14/11] The overall goal of this proposal, as well as the global and regional instruments it will address, is to improve the welfare of these Pacific SIDS. Because the main source of food and income to these SIDS is fish, improving the management of fish stocks will directly improve livelihoods, both socially and economically. The proposal lacks a clear focus on gender</p>	

		<p>creation will lead to significantly more land-based jobs for women.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Issues of gender have been stressed in the new PIF above a generic baseline.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	[AH 12/14/11] Public participation is being considered through two avenues. First, with the inclusion of the regional fishing industry and private business, including the Pacific Islands Tuna Industry Association (PITA). NGOs and CSOs are being included with the help of WWF.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Yes, many major risks are noted, including issues related to climate change. However, please be sure to move the Risk Matrix on page 13 under the proper section (B.4)</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Addressed.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, this proposal is well coordinated with related initiatives in the region, largely because this proposal is supported by many of the regional IGOs, including the FFA and SPC, and was developed in response to the needs identified by the Terminal Evaluation of the OFMP. It would be in the proposal's best interest to work closely with FAO	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, execution of the project will be conducted by the main regional bodies - FFA and SPC, which will ensure proper local ownership and national and regional coordination.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	[AH 12/14/11] Project management for this proposal is \$475,000 with co-financing of \$2,124,000. This is a ratio of 1:4.5 and is 4.9% of the total GEF grant, which is appropriate per current GEF policies.	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	[AH 12/14/11] The overall proposal GEF:co-financing ratio is 1:7, with components 1-4 respectively 1:10, 1:5.8, 1:7.3, and 1:4.9. Please make sure that the text states that at least 1% of the total GEF grant go towards IW:LEARN activities (p.11) instead of approximately 1%. [AH 1/4/12] Addressed.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	[AH 12/14/11] The indicated co-financing is strong at over \$70M, including over \$37M of grant funds from FFA. It would be in the proposal's best interest to see more buy-in from WWF, who has only contributed \$200,000 of in-kind support, as their efforts to work with local CSOs and NGOs will be important for the future sustainability of this proposal. [AH 1/4/12] Addressed. We look forward to seeing WWF's level of commitment to this proposal at time of CEO Endorsement.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	[AH 12/14/11] Yes, since UNDP implemented the previous OFMP and has more on-the-ground experience with this project. it is logical to see them	

		<p>\$3.0M and \$500,000, respectively. Though, it would be in the proposal's best interest to see more in-kind support from FAO as demonstration of their investment in the proposal.</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] Addressed. We look forward to seeing increased co-financing at time of CEO Endorsement.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 	<p>[AH 12/14/11] Please note that comments have been provided by the World Bank</p> <p>[AH 1/4/12] The most recently submitted PIF includes responses to the comments provided by the World Bank. The responses provided seem adequate.</p>	
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>[AH 12/14/11] No, recommendation is not being given at this stage. Please address the issues noted above, especially the missing endorsement letters, the issue of the Tonga OFP and the inclusion of Tokelau.</p> <p>Please note that proposals must be approved for the February Inter-agency</p>	

		<p>[AH 1/4/12] Yes, the proposal is being recommended at this time.</p> <p>[AH 1/17/12] This PIF will not be included in the February 2012 Intersessional Work Program. However, it may be reconsidered for a future work program.</p> <p>[AH 4/2/12] The PIF is being recommended for the June 2012 Work Program.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	[AH 1/4/12] Please be sure to work with the government of PNG to have their full support of and participating in this project by time of CEO Endorsement.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 14, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 05, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	January 17, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 02, 2012	
	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.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	[AH 4/2/12] Yes, the proposed PPG activities are limited to project preparation and are appropriate.

		<p>1) The Regional Lead Consultant is tasked with acting as, "... PPG team leader responsible for coordinating all activities and reviewing the reports of the local and other international consultants." for a duration of 13 weeks. However, the local consultant is listed with 14 weeks of duration - one longer than the lead consultant who is responsible for, "... coordinating all activities and reviewing the reports of the local and other international consultants." Please correct so that lead consultant is able to properly coordinate.</p> <p>2) The PPG cofinancing is too low. It is recommended that, at a very minimum, the PPG have GEF to cofinancing ratio of 1:3.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	[AH 4/2/12] No, the PPG is not being recommended for approval at this time. Please address the issues identified above and resubmit.
	4. Other comments	<p>[AH 4/2/12] Please note that there are 14 countries now named as participating in this project, but Section B of the PPG says 13. Please update.</p> <p>Please also remove references to the LDCF in Annex A. The proposed project is not requesting funding from LDCF.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	April 02, 2012
	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.