



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

GEF ID:	6970		
Country/Region:	Regional (Marshall Islands, Solomon Islands, Tuvalu)		
Project Title:	Pacific Islands Regional Oceanscape Program (PROP)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	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):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$6,301,370
Co-financing:	\$25,157,290	Total Project Cost:	\$31,458,660
PIF Approval:	September 23, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	October 30, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Charlotte Gobin	Agency Contact Person:	John Virdin

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 ?	08/25/2014: Yes the participating countries are eligible. Cleared.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?		
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/25/2014: The proposed grant is within the resources available from BD STAR allocation. Cleared.	
	• the focal area allocation?	08/25/2014: The proposed grant is within the resources available from BD STAR allocation. Cleared.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of	N/A	

*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)
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	08/25/2014: Yes, the IW funding requested by the project is within the resource available. Cleared.	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><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></p>	08/25/2014: Yes, the project is fully aligned with the BD and IW result framework and will contribute to the achievement of the Aichi targets. 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>	08/25/2014: Yes, the project is consistent with both regional and national strategies. Cleared.	
	<p>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?</p>	08/25/2014: The baseline project is sufficiently described at PIF stage. Cleared.	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	08/28/2014: The components, outcomes of the project framework are clear and appropriately detailed at PIF stage. Cleared.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	08/25/2014: The GEB have been identified and described. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	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?		08/25/2014: The description of the socio-economic benefits including gender dimension provides a general understanding of the project expected achievements. Cleared at PIF stage.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	08/25/2014: The role of public participation is identified and their engaged explained. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	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)	08/25/2014: Yes, the project takes into account the potential major risks. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	08/25/2014: The major related initiatives are presented. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, 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 	Projects developed in the region evolve mainly in silos; with either a strong investment in the sustainable management of fisheries or in the enhancement of marine critical habitats protection. To reverse this trend, the project will promote integrative management approaches that can help countries and the regional community to	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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"> Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	reconcile sectorial approaches by tackling underlying drivers of environmental degradation with the aim of creating synergies leading to greater and sustained impact.	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	08/25/2014: The project co-financing per component is appropriate. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	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?	08/25/2014: The co-financing indicated in Table C is adequate, however, research for new co-financing will have to be undertaken during PPG phase. Cleared at PIF stage.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/25/2014: No PMC.	
	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	08/25/2014: No PPG requested.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval,</u> if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?		
	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?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	08/25/2014: The PIF is technical cleared and ready to be included for consideration in the next work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Raise the level of co-financing to 1:4; - Fill out Table F with related the project's targets; - Provide detailed information of how the project will build on past and on-going GEF initiatives, and/or coordinate with them; - Present the legal frameworks/legislation supporting the on the ground activities? - Provide substantive analysis regarding 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the establishment of sustainable financing models and how it will "pilot" at the national level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Present the activities, specifying how they will build/ contribute to baseline activities. The role of national executing partners will be specified. - Elaborate on how the MPA sites will be identified - Submit the BD and IW tracking tools 	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		11/16/2014: The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO endorsement.
	First review*	August 25, 2014	
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.**