



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

GEF ID:	9208		
Country/Region:	Palau		
Project Title:	Integrating Biodiversity Safeguards and Conservation into Planning and Development		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5645 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$4,233,562
Co-financing:	\$22,671,306	Total Project Cost:	\$27,054,868
PIF Approval:	March 15, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Michael Green

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	August 7, 2015  Yes.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	August 7, 2015  Yes, the project is in line with national priorities.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	August 10, 2015  Yes. This project will set up systems,	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response	
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	including invasive species management and land use planning, that will address the drivers of environmental degradation in Palau.		
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	August 10, 2015  Yes. This project has sound incremental reasoning.		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	August 10, 2015  Yes.  During PPG development, please elaborate on the strategies for the development, implementation, and enforcement of minimum standards for the tourism industry and other sectors included in the mainstreaming work as minimum standards will be crucial in protecting the endemic and vulnerable biodiversity of Palau.		
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	August 10, 2015  Yes. This project includes gender elements, IPs, and CSOs.		
	<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	August 10, 2015  Yes.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		August 10, 2015  Yes. This project takes advantage of		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Palau's full flexibility.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	August 10, 2015  Yes. This project is being recommended for technical clearance along with the requested PPG.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 10, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	Dec 7, 2017  No, please address the following:  Component 1:	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- Achieving 15% compliance is hardly ambitious, particularly due to the irreparable harm that can be caused by such projects. Please justify this low target.</p> <p>April 11, 2018</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for that important clarification and revisions.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>Please provide additional information or clarifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cross-state collaboration - One of the issues in enforcement of environmental rules identified at Palau's NDI was problems with cross-state collaboration in enforcement as rule-breakers simply need to cross a state line to avoid enforcement. How will this project address this issue?</li> <li>- Learning from R2R investments - How has or will this project learn from initiatives in other countries, such as the R2R program?</li> <li>- Private sector - How was the private sector involved in consultations on project development thus far? UNDP's GEF-6 project in Fiji provides a good example of how engaging private sector actors from the beginning can help shape the</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>project and find resources. The private sector is obviously not a monolith, but can even mean small enterprises. Leadership and champions can also be important in this field.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enforcement - The statistic that 7.5% of large earth moving permits had required EIAs is very concerning and significant risks remain. Will this project address those?</li> <li>- Hunting - Beyond enforcement, how will the project address hunting?</li> <li>- Coordination - This project is covering a wide variety of sectors, states, and ministries. How will it be ensured that sufficiently high attention will be given to the project?</li> </ul> <p>A note on the gender plan - thank you for an in-depth examination of these issues that raises important issues to be considered during the project. This is an example of the importance of undertaking such studies.</p> <p>April 11, 2018</p> <p>No. Can you please address the following?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Cross state collaboration and coordination - particularly in addressing environmental crimes.</li> </ul>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>- Compliance on environmental safeguards indicator: It difficult to say that the GEF's goal is anything less than 100% compliance. Could it simply be an increase in compliance from 85%?</p> <p>May 17, 2018</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the revisions.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>Yes, the project has ambitious goals but also buy-in from a number of parts of government.</p>	
	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)	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for providing the letters in an organized manner. However, what is the asterisk after Island Conservation for?</p>	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>No, the LD tool includes some confusing numbers around income from forest products (they don't match across tabs). It might be good to note</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>the number of households included for the agriculture question given that it's not their primary source of income.</p> <p>April 11, 2018</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the revisions.</p>	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>Yes, however coordination will need to be a focus throughout the project, particularly with other IAS initiatives as well as learning from and sharing the activities piloted.</p>	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>Dec 7, 2017</p> <p>Not sufficient. While this project does a good job in elaborating a communications plan, the knowledge management is weak particularly as it relates to documenting and sharing the lessons learned not for the general public but for future implementers including with other Pacific islands.</p> <p>April 11, 2018</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Yes.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>	Dec 7, 2017	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>	Dec 7, 2017	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>	Yes. Dec 7, 2017  No, please provide more information in response to Germany's comments.  April 11, 2018  Yes, thank you for the extensive responses.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	Dec 7, 2017  NA	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	Dec 7, 2017  Not at this time. Please revise and resubmit.  April 11, 2018  No, please address the few remaining issues.	

<sup>3</sup> 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.



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		May 17, 2018  Yes, this project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 11, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 17, 2018	