



Ecosystem Restoration and Sustainable Land Management to improve livelihoods and protect biodiversity in Nauru

Basic Information

GEF ID

10161

Countries

Nauru

Project Title

Ecosystem Restoration and Sustainable Land Management to improve livelihoods and protect biodiversity in Nauru

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP

Agency ID

UNEP: 01661

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

PIF

Part I – Project Informatics

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Most aspects of the project are aligned, with the LD and BD focal areas. However we do note that the rehabilitation will take place on mined lands that were previously productive (forest) landscapes.

4/30/2019:

After further assessment of the project and the PIF review responses, we have determined that only the BD elements of the project and the LD elements related to the enabling environment (Component 1) are suitable for GEF investment. We encourage Nauru to explore co-financing to cover the funding for the rehabilitation activities.

5/3/2019:

Noted.

7/12/2019:

As indicated in the Agency response under Question 2, we note that the PIF has been revised back to the original version with greater clarity on the approach and details on the interventions.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

Thank you for the very useful comments and suggestions.

Before mining, the Topside of Nauru was dominated by productive landscapes where subsistence agriculture was practiced as an agroforestry system with coconut, pandanus and other food crops blending with the native vegetation. The proposed project will not be used to rehabilitate the entire Topside but rather to test techniques and demonstrate incentives for sustainable land management. The project will create the conditions for scaling up the rehabilitation of the Topside towards LDN.

05/03/2019

We very much appreciate the thorough consideration that was given to the project proposal. The draft PIF was revised in accordance with the advice given. In Part I, we kept the original components 1, 3 and 4 (i.e. removed the original component 2 on land restoration). The allocation of GEF funding and co-financing was adjusted.

From the original component 2, we moved the output on landscape survey to the enabling environment (component 1), noting that the survey may be conducted during the PPG, and financial incentives were moved to the KM/communication component (new 3) with the necessary adjustments.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please see specific comments below:

Overall, we need to see proposed indicators for the project outcomes as well as an indication of which Outcomes link to the GEF Core Indicators selected. These can be modified during PPG if necessary. Specifically, we would like SMART indicators that link project activities to the Aichi Targets.

1. Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 can be conducted during the PPG phase so as to inform the design of the project and the most suitable SLM techniques to be implemented.

2. Output 2.4- how many potential farmers and private landowners will be targeted? The improvement of their livelihoods should be measured by a specific indicator such as increase in income/earning.

3. In order to, streamline Table B, we have recommendations for a few adjustments:

-Output 4.3 should be included in Component 1 which looks at the enabling environment

-Output 4.5 on training can be looked at in Component 2. The specific result of the training is not very clear. Who is being trained? Is it only for promotion purposes?

4. Output 4.4- the section that looks at sustainable financial incentives and the connection to public awareness is not clear. What is the expected result? If the project is addressing sustainable financial incentives to assist with livelihoods, this should be included in Component 2.

5. Output 4.6- Upscaling strategy should be aligned to Component 1

6. Monitoring and Evaluation needs to be included in the project framework. This can be included in Component 3.

7. Gender considerations should to be included here in Table B in particular for field-based interventions and those related training and access to finance.

4/30/2019:

Most responses cleared. Please see additional comments below.

-As indicated in Question 1 above, please exclude the land rehabilitation on mined lands interventions of the project.

- There is no component that includes monitoring and evaluation of the entire project. Please include in the KM and Communications component
- Component 1 is missing the financing type
- Please provide specific indicators for the project components which can be linked to the Aichi Targets. These can be changed during PPG.

•
5/3/2019:

The Financing type is still missing from Component 1. Please indicate if it is Technical Assistance or Investment

We also recommend that the Financing type under Component 1 is adjusted to include Investment as well as there are site based activities included -Outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.3.

7/12/2019:

Thank you for the re submission of the PIF.

Please clarify the target numbers. Indicator 3.1 makes reference to 500ha, however the description for component 2 makes reference to 200ha. We recommend that the project includes the target that can be expected at this stage and make a note that it has the potential to increase at CEO Endorsement.

-We note that Outcome 3 has been aligned with Indicator 1 and 4. Please indicate whether or not Output 3.2 is being undertaken within or outside of the Protected Area boundary. For any restoration that is taking place within the boundary, those hectares would already be considered under Indicator 1 and so would not be counted again under Indicator 4.

9/24/2019: Cleared

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

Specific indicators have been added for the project outcomes and will be further refined during the PPG. Reference to relevant GEF Core Indicators and Aichi Targets have also been added under each outcome. Furthermore, a table was added as annex F showing potential generic and specific indicators for the Aichi Targets, as adopted by the CBD COP, that are relevant to the project activities.

1. A note indicating that outputs 2.1 and 2.2 will be initiated during the PPG phase was added to Table B.
2. The expected number of men and women who received training and accessed financial incentives was added under Component 2. Increase in income/earning capacity was included as an indicator.
3. The following adjustments were made to streamline Table B:
 - (a) Output 4.3 was included in Component 1 as suggested.
 - (b) Output 4.5 moved under to Component 2 as suggested and details on who will be trained and purpose of the training added.

4. Output 4.4 (now 4.3): The text of the output was revised to remove the mention to financial incentives and clarify the expected results. Sustainable financial incentives to assist with livelihoods was included under Component 2.

5. The upscaling strategy was aligned to Component 1 as requested.

6. Monitoring and Evaluation needs were added to component 3 as requested.

7. Considerations of the different needs, roles and priorities of men and women were included in Table B interventions related training and access to finance.

05/03/2019

- Rehabilitation of mined lands was removed.
- An output on Monitoring and Evaluation was added to the KM and communications component
- Financing type added to component 1
- Specific indicators for the project components linked to Aichi Targets were added under each component.

6/25/2019

Thank you for the thorough consideration of the PIF and several very useful exchanges with UNEP and Nauru. The PIF was revised to reinsert some elements of LD and further clarify that land rehabilitation will only take place on land where secondary mining has been completed, and to explain what measures will be taken to prevent adverse impact from mining on adjacent lands or future developments and ensure sustainability.

The expected number of hectares "Areas under testing of innovative SLM methodologies" was reduced from 100ha to 50ha, whereas the expected number of hectares "Revegetated areas" was revised from 400ha to 450ha (table F and Annex B). Based on information that is currently available, this estimate is on the conservative side and we believe that an even larger area of restored land may be achieved by the end of the project.

Further information was added to the PIF to strengthen the BD components of the proposed project. Part II of the PIF was amended along the same lines.

We hope that these changes fully address the concerns.

7/12/2019

Thank you for the thorough review and comments.

The text was revised to provide further clarification. The 200 ha referred in the description of component 2 are expected to be available at the start of the project. During the first three years of project implementation, additional 100 hectares per year are expected to be released from mining, totalling of 500 hectares.

An explanation was added to table B to clarify that outcome 3.2 will be undertaken within the Anibare Bay protected area as well as in the priority areas outside of the protected area as described in annex A.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

-Please provide additional details on how the investment mobilized was identified and the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures"?

-Are there any conditions attached to the contribution from Republic of Nauru Phosphate?

4/30/2019:

Noted.

10/31/2019:

After further internal review please we note that there are some fields that have no funds allocated. Please either fill out the missing information adjusting all the Tables where co-financing amounts are requested (Tables A, B and C) accordingly or to remove these co-

financers.

11/1/2019:

Cleared

1.

Agency Response

10/31/2019:

The co-financers where no figure is currently available have been removed.

4/23/2019:

- A footnote was added to Table C to explain how the "investment mobilized" was identified and the approach used to differentiate it from "recurrent expenditures".

- There are no conditions attached to the contribution from Nauru Phosphate because they must flatten the landscape and cover it with topsoil as part of their mandate to do secondary mining. The project will aim to ensure that the use of the stocked topsoil is done in the most effective way so as to enable further restoration.

10/31/2019:

The co-financers where no figure is currently available have been removed.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

Nauru is utilizing the flexibility option for this project.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

4/30/2019:

Please make the necessary adjustments given the comments in Question 1.

5/3/2019:

Noted

7/12/2019:

We note the revisions to the STAR allocation.

Agency Response

05/03/2019

The necessary adjustments were made.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

4/30/2019:

Please make the necessary adjustments given the comments in Question 1.

5/3/2019:

Noted.

7/12/2019:

We note the revisions to the focal area allocations. However, the focal area allocations do not match the OFP Endorsement Letter. Please update the letter and resubmit.

9/24/2019: Cleared

Agency Response

05/03/2019

The necessary adjustments were made to the allocation.

7/12/2019

With the PIF being revised back to the original version, the project will be using the original OFP letter of 13 March 2019.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/14/2019:

Yes

4/30/2019:

Please make the necessary adjustments given the comments in Question 1.

5/3/2019:

Noted.

7/12/2019:

We note the revisions in line with the revised focal area allocation. Please also see the point above under re the OFP Endorsement Letter

9/24/2019: Cleared

Agency Response

05/03/2019

The necessary adjustments were made to the PPG funding.

7/12/2019

Please see comment above regarding using the original OFP letter of 13 March 2019.

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

Although the project is not utilizing CCM funding, please include an estimated target for emissions avoided benefits for the project. This can be finalized at PPG stage.

4/30/2019:

Please make the necessary adjustments given the comments in Question 1.

5/3/2019:

Cleared.

7/12/2019:

Please see core indicator related questions under Question 2.

9/24/2019: Cleared

10/31/2019:

After further internal review, we note that carbon sequestration benefits are reported under indicator 6.2 but they belong under indicator 6.1 (for AFOLU sector) Please revise.

11/1/2019:

Cleared

Agency Response

10/31/2019

We have moved the carbon emissions estimate to indicator 6.1 and calculated over a 20-year period.

4/23/2019

An estimate of the carbon emission to be avoided by the project was calculated with FAO's EX-ACT tool and added to Table F.

05/03/2019

The indicators were adjusted.

7/12/2019

Thank you. Please see explanation in the response to Question 2.

10/31/2019

We have moved the carbon emissions estimate to indicator 6.1 and calculated over a 20-year period.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

4/30/2019:

Please make the necessary adjustments given the comments in Question 1.

5/3/2019:

Cleared

Agency Response

05/03/2019

Adjustments were made to table G in light of the comments in Question 1.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

-Gender considerations have not been sufficiently covered in this section. Please provide brief information as it relates to this specific context.

4/30/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

Thank you for this comment. A section on gender considerations focusing on issues that are directly relevant to the project was added to the background context.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

We note with concern that secondary mining is expected to take place. Given the request for funding to rehabilitate the landscape, please clarify the need to engage in secondary mining in order to rehabilitate and we recommend exploring other options to level the landscape.

4/30/2019:

Please see comments above in Part I – Project Information, Focal area elements, Question 1.

5/3/2019:

Noted.

7/12/2019:

As indicated in the Agency response under Question 2, we note that the PIF has been revised back to the original version with greater clarity on the approach and details on the interventions.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

This is a very important issue. It is noted that secondary mining by Nauru Phosphate is already happening and is likely to continue because unfortunately mining still represents the main significant source of income for land owners and the government and is likely the only economically viable solution for large-scale flattening of the Topside. The Rehabilitation Corporation (NRC) will also perform levelling of the landscape, but in this case, without secondary mining. However, NRC's budget is very small and their contribution to the project will likely be limited. The actual area to be levelled by NRC is expected to be known during the PPG phase. To the extent possible, the project's interventions will take place on land that was not subject to secondary mining (this clarification was added to the PIF).

It is important to emphasise that the proposed project will NOT engage in secondary mining, even if interventions are done on areas that were secondary mined. This is because the project's interventions to test SLM techniques and demonstrate incentives will only begin after the landscape has been flattened. Among the interventions, the proposed project will test options to maximize the use of stocked topsoil (for example, by adding organic matter from compostable materials and preventing soil erosion/loss of topsoil). This will create the necessary conditions for scaling up land restoration towards LDN beyond the life of the project. Without the proposed project ("business as usual" scenario), secondary mining followed by flattening of the landscape will still take place. However, without the project, the resulting soil may not be of sufficient quality to support SLM and could result in the loss of the stocked topsoil, which is available in limited quantity and an extremely valuable resource to the rehabilitation of Nauru.

The project will also lead to the identification of areas of biodiversity and cultural significance in the Land Use and Restoration Plan for improved management through SFM (components 1 and 3). These areas will not be subjected to secondary mining.

05/03/2019

Thank you. Amendments were made throughout Part II to remove restoration on mined land and to focus more on BD. LD was only retained when it refers to the enabling environment and KM.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019 ABS & SW:

Not fully.

In addition to the comments under Question 2- Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements please consider the following:

-Once again, we note with concern the need for secondary mining on the same site for rehabilitation/restoration. Please explore and indicate alternative means of leveling the landscape.

-Please indicate how the barrier related a central data management system for information on natural resources including biodiversity and land will be addressed. Specifically, who will maintain and update the data?

- How will the project ensure that all relevant stakeholders are included/involved and consulted during implementation. This is given the limited inclusion of many stakeholder groups in initiatives of this nature, as outlined in the context.

-Please include further details on the sustainable financing incentives to be developed? How will the private sector be involved?

-For the training on SLM techniques, will government extension services also be trained to ensure continuity?

-Gender considerations need to be included in this section

-Please provide additional details on how the private sector is included in the project.

- Please mention that Anibare Bay is also a Key Biodiversity Area (not all IBAs are necessarily KBAs) and note that the Nauru reed-warbler is endemic and Vulnerable. We very much welcome the protection of the only known KBA in Nauru. Please also specifically the IUCN Red List status for each of the species mentioned.

-Component 3 –

3.1 – Please clarify - will the PA actually be declared as part of the project? Will a management plan be drafted? Given the small community, how will the project build support for the good management and lack of encroachment/hunting in the PA?

3.3 - Nauru's only endemic bird, the Nauru reed-warbler (VU), is not listed among the species for monitoring in component 3 in the log frame. Please clarify this.

- At CEO Endorsement:

- IAS planning – Please make sure that sustainability and long term resources are a key piece of this plan. Coordination with the regional GEF-6 project has been mentioned. The regional hub of expertise being developed as part of the project could be helpful in supporting Nauru, given limited capacity, while this project could be a helpful trial of the model.

4/30/2019:

Most of the above comments are cleared.

Please see additional comments above in Part I – Project Information, Focal area elements, Question 1 on the land rehabilitation on mined sites.

3/2019

Noted

7/12/2019:

As indicated in the Agency response under Question 2, we note that the PIF has been revised back to the original version with greater clarity on the approach and details on the interventions.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

- We take note of the concern and hope that the explanation provided in response to Part II – Question 2 above is helpful.

- Resources to maintain and update the data management system will likely come from the Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment in cooperation with the Department for Lands Management. The latter already has a database for land registration and leases that could be expanded and made public. The details of how this will be done in practice will be clarified during the PPG phase. The text under the Proposed Alternative Scenario was revised slightly to reflect this.

- The project will rely and build upon the experience of past and ongoing programmes, including the Twain Technical Mission, to ensure wide participation of all relevant stakeholders. Communication means which are well established in Nauru will be used for reaching out to the stakeholders and small incentives (for example, lottery prizes) may also be considered. Text was added to the "Stakeholders" section of the PIF.

- The private sector will contribute to the identification of new financial support mechanisms and incentives that will support the adoption of SLM practices on mined sites. The text under component 2 was amended to provide further details.

- Yes, government extension services will also be trained to ensure continuity of SLM training. An explicit mention to this was added to component 2.

- Gender considerations were added to the proposed alternative scenario.

- Targeting the limited private sector of Nauru will be a key element of the project. The text under component 2 was amended to explain how the private sector will be included in the project.

- Thank you. The text was corrected to reflect that Anibare Bay is also a Key Biodiversity Area and the IUCN Red List status was added for each of the species mentioned.

-Component 3 –

3.1 – The actual adoption of legislation for the creation of a protected area may take longer than the life of the project, but the project can deliver draft legislation for this purpose. Management plans based on SFM approaches developed and implemented for Anibare Bay and other areas of biodiversity and cultural significance. Building support from the community to avoid encroachment and hunting will be done through a combination of environmental education and awareness campaigns (component 4) and enforcement (component 1). The text of the PIF was revised to clarify these points.

3.3 – Apologies, monitoring of the endemic Nauru reed-warbler under Output 3.3 was lost somewhere along the development of the draft PIF. The text was corrected.

- At CEO Endorsement –

- Thanks. It is indeed very important that sustainability and long resources are a key piece of the IAS plan. The timing is very good for Nauru to tap on the expertise being developed under the regional GEF-6 project.

05/03/2019

Amendments were made throughout Part II to remove restoration on mined land and to focus more on BD. LD was only retained when it refers to the enabling environment and KM.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019.

Yes. However there is a reference to Lebanon in the table. Please clarify/correct.

4/30/2019:

Cleared

Agency Response**4/23/2019:**

Apologies for the error. The text in the table has been corrected.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

4/30/2019:

Please make the necessary adjustments given the comments under Question 1- Part I – Project Information Focal area elements.

5/3/2019:

Noted

7/12/2019:

Please see question 2 for comments related to the Targets.

9/24/2019: Cleared

Agency Response**05/03/2019**

Amendments were made throughout Part II to remove restoration on mined land and to focus more on BD. LD was only retained when it refers to the enabling environment and KM.

7/12/2019

Please see explanation in the response to Question 2.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully

The details on how the project could be scaled up should be included.

4/30/2019:

Noted

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

Details of the upscaling strategy towards LDN have been added.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes.

Agency Response**Stakeholders**

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Landowners are not listed. Please include given their influence on the endorsement and support of land use planning frameworks as outlined in the context.

4/30/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

The text under “stakeholders” has been amended to further detail the role and engagement of land owners.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please include available data on the gender context as it relates to land issues, sustainable agriculture.

At the PIF stage in addition to any plans to collect sex-disaggregated data, we expect indicative information on Gender, any measures that will be implemented that consider gender related issues.

4/30/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

The text under "Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment" has been amended to include information on the gender context and to detail measures that will be implemented to consider gender related issues.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

We expect private sector cooperation and involvement beyond access to financing. Please provide details on other areas in which they will be incorporated into the project including project design. This is also to feature in the project description section and referenced in Table B where appropriate.

4/30/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

The private sector in Nauru is very limited but it will play a key role in ensuring sustainability beyond the life of the project. The text under private sector engagement, project description and Table B have been revised to detail areas where the private sector will be involved including during the project design.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please include information on the Pacific Ridge to Reef program here.

4/30/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

Thanks for the comment. The Pacific Ridge to Reef program was included.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/14/2019:

Not fully.

Please also include the text on the LDN target setting process and how the project can contribute to same.

4/30/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response

4/23/2019:

Text has been added to explain that the project will develop an upscaling strategy, which will facilitate the engagement of decision makers and stakeholders involved in land management and will enable Nauru to seek support from UNCCD's Global Mechanism and take part in the LDN Target Setting Programme.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Not fully

We note that the project has provided an indicative KM approach, however please provide details on how the project will incorporate learning from previous experiences.

4/30/2019:

Cleared.

Agency Response4/23/2019:

Details on how the project will incorporate learning from previous experience was included in the text.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/15/2019:

Yes

Agency Response**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/13/2019:

Not at this time. Following further discussions with UNEP and Nauru, we are returning the project so that revisions/updates can be made and finalized on the number of hectares to be targeted and also to consider long term planning and sustainability in terms of the land rehabilitation to be conducted and considering that the secondary mining will be ongoing on the landscape adjacent to the rehabilitated areas. We also want to stress the importance of country ownership of the project.

8/22/2019:

Not at this time. Please address the questions above.

9/24/2019:

The PIF and PPG are recommended for clearance.

10/31/2019:

Please make the minor adjustments related to Questions 3 and 6 prior to final clearance.

11/1/2019:

The PIF and PPG are recommended for clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

/view Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/15/2019	5/3/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2019	7/12/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2019	11/1/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/13/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/22/2019	