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

GEF ID:	**5634**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Cook Islands, Fiji, Micronesia, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Niue, Papua New Guinea, Palau, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Vanuatu, Samoa)**		
Project Title:	**Ratification and Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol in the Countries of the Pacific Region**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-5;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$1,762,557**
Co-financing:	**$1,234,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,996,557**
PIF Approval:	**December 11, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Greg Sherley**

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**?	11-19-13 Yes. All participating countries are elegible for GEF funding (Cook Islands, Fiji Islands, Republic of Marshall Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Niue, Palau, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu, Kiribati, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu). Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	11-19-13 The LoE from PNG is missing.	4-11-16 All LoE provided by CEO Endorsement. Cleared
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark		

*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)
	all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	NA	NA
	• the focal area allocation?	NA	NA
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	11-20-13 Yes. There are funds available for this project as of today. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
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).*	11-20-13 BD-4 and Aichi Target 16. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	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?	11-20-13 Yes. See pages 6-8 and 11-2 of PIF. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	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	11-20-13 Yes. See pages 5-6 of PIF. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	assumptions?		
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	11-20-13 Yes. This project has the following components and outcomes Component 1. Baseline analysis to identify common assets (particularly relating to traditional knowledge), issues and needs between countries: i) Systematic analysis of common assets/values, issues and needs of the participarting countries, ii) New policy directions for individual countries and the region identified and disseminated, iii) Communication mechanisms are established which provide the means for technical support on an ongoing basis. Component 2. Ratification of the Nagoya Protocol; i) Scoping study of the existing laws and regulations related to ABS, ii) Analysis of the implications of ratification of the protocol, iii) Draft document for ratification by the relevant authority, iv) Public awareness among parliamentarians and other decisions makers. Component 3. Implementation of basic provisions of the Nagoya Protocol; i) Stocktaking and assessment of capacities and systems to implement basic provisions of the NP, ii) Strategy and action plan for the implementation of ABS measures, iii) Building capacity among stakeholders with particular emphasis in the Government agencies in	4-11-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		charge of making the protocol operational. Component 4. Regional coordination, technical support and capacity development: i) Countries share information and gain from the experiences of the other members of the Commision, ii) Countries are capable of meeting basic provisions of the NP, iii) Effective management and delivery of projects and regional activities. Cleared	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	11-20-13 This is a capacity building project. The associated GEBs would become visible with the full implementation of the NP. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	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?		4-11-16 Cleared
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	11-20-13 Communities will engage during project preparation as their input is critical to design a system that makes the NP operational. Reference to local communities is made in relevant portions of the PIF. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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)	11-20-13 Yes. See page 10 of PIF. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	11-20-13 Yes. See details on page 7-8 and 10-11 of PIF. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, 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.	11-20-13 INNOVATION: This is the second regional project in support of the ratiification and implementation of the Nagoya Protocol funded by the NPIF. This is an innovative project at the global level, as only more region (Central Africa) has emnarked in the difficult task of moving forward and as a group the agenda of the NP. The project will closely work with two country based projects also funded by the NPIF (Fiji and Cook Islands) and ongoing efforts by the ABS Capacity Development Initiative. These coordination activities will take in a workshop to be held in Fiji, November 2013 already. SUSTAINABILITY: The participating countries will need to fully engage in building the human and institutional capacity customizing it for their unique circumstances to carry on the work beyond the life of this project. That should be achieved by Central Governments developing and putting in practice the legal framework, and	4-11-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		determining the institutional arrangements and administrative measures required to process requests to access genetic resources under the principles of the Nagoya Protocol. During the project preparation, each and all of the participating countries, will provide detailed information on the Government's plans to sustain the efforts initiated with this project. At the regional level, SPREP Secretariat will continue to provide policy and technical support, which will contribute to the sustainability of the investments beyond the life of this project. At the national level, the sustainability of this investment will heavily rely on the capacity of the ABS Focal Points to mobilize financial resources, including from GEF-6, to implement the Nagoya Protocol provisions and developing further projects on ABS. SCALING UP: The lessons derived from the development and implementation of this regional project will be used in other regions, most likely the Caribbean. Cleared	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		4-11-16 Yes. Changes properly justified Cleared
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative		4-11-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	11-20-13 Yes. Assuming all the co-financing becomes effective during project implementation. Governments will be requested to increase their contributions from $50K to $100K. Cleared	4-11-16 Please check co-financing. The Total Co-financing on Table B ($1,684,000) is different from the co-finance provided in other parts of the CEO Endorsement ($1,634,000). Please fix and ensure all numbers add-up correctly. 5-10-16 Cleared
	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?	11-20-13 Governments and other participating entities will be requested to increase their contributions to reach a 1:2 co-financing ratio. Cleared	4-11-16 No. Co-financing letters of Cook Islands, Fiji Islands, Micronesia, and Solomon Islands are missing. 5-10-16 Clarifications made on foot notes of p.1 of CEO Endorsement. Cleared
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	11-20-13 Yes. It is 10%. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared
	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?	11-20-13 Yes. PPG request in in the amount of $70K including Agency Fees. Cleared	4-11-16 Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		NA
	22. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		4-11-16 Cleared
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?**	11-20-13 Yes. The PIF is recommended.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	**26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?**		4-11-16 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 16 and 17. Thanks. 5-10-16 Yes. This project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 20, 2013	April 11, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		May 10, 2016
	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.**