



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

GEF ID:	5542		
Country/Region:	Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Brazil, Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Mexico, Panama, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Catalysing Implementation of the Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Caribbean and North Brazil Shelf Large Marine Ecosystems (CMLE+)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5247 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$12,500,000
Co-financing:	\$110,854,059	Total Project Cost:	\$123,654,059
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Vicente

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 ?	22 of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the 23 countries listed are all eligible.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	22 of August 2013 (cseverin): 17 OFPs have already been submitted. It is understood that more will be received prior to a potential WP inclusion.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		

*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)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	22 of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the funds are available under the IW focal area.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? 		
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>	<p>22 of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project has been fully aligned with the IW Results Framework. However, please do consider to make a slight change to the project objective to have it reflect that the project will indeed implement the approved Strategic Action Programme. Maybe something along following lines: "facilitating EBM/EAF in the CLME+ for the Sustainable and Climate resilient provision of goods and services from shared living marine resources, in line with endorsed CLME+ SAP".</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	
	<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>	<p>26th of August 2013 (cseverin): The proposed project is fully aligned with the national strategies of the participating nations, as a direct consequence of the project building on a number of regional TDAs that incorporates national, sub regional and regional shared living marine resources plans and strategies.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	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?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the baseline projects are sufficiently described and based on sound assumptions.	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the components and associated outcomes and outputs are appropriately detailed at this stage. However, do at time of CEO endorsement make sure that the long list of output indicators will be quantifiable. Especially the sustainability and investment plans that will be developed during the project implementation will need to be focused on, to ensure long term sustainability and a healthy marine environment in the region.</p> <p>During the PPG phase, make sure the activities in the agreed upon SAP, especially the demo activities are better reflected upon in the components and associated outcomes and outputs.</p> <p>Please do insert specific mention that the project will be allocating 1% of the GEF grant towards IWLEARN activities, such as participation in IWCs and other learning exchanges, website, Results Notes, Experience Notes, etc.</p> <p>29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes the GEBs have been identified and the INcremental reasoning is sound.	
	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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF outlines a number of key stakeholders, CSO etc. However, as noted this list and proper consultations are to be developed and undertaken during the PPG phase. One of the key corner stones for a successful project as well as long term sustainability of project activities and a healthy marine ecosystem will be to what extent the project will be able to mobilize and utilize public participation.	
	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)	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF includes a risk matrix with associated mitigation measures, including climate change.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF outlines a large number of project and initiatives that will be coordinated with in the region.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects ,	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): The project will be applying the Ecosystems	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <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 likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project’s intervention. 	<p>Approach to Fisheries which is considered innovative, especially as it will be applied to a wide spanning region. The nature of this proposed SAP Implementation project will hold great opportunities for upscaling both on a local, national as well as regional level. Working on multiple levels will be a key part of achieving sustainable outcomes and outputs.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>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?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the suggested GEF funding and associated co-financing seems appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and output</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the co-financing and its composition seems to be adequate to be able to deliver the outcomes and outputs from the proposed components. However, as noted in the footnote, please do during PPG process work towards attracting more private sector financing, not only from</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		global players, but also from the small holders and local businesses.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): No the PM budget is too high (5% is the maximum). If project proposals request above this thresholds, then additional details have to be provided. Please adjust and resubmit. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Addressed a solid argumentation for an increased project management fee have been included. With that in mind, the suggested PM budget seems appropriate.	
	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 with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes PPG funds have been requested and is inline with the norm. PPG request is being recommended for CEO Approval.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin):NA	
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		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?	26th of August 2013 (cseverin): No please do address above comment and resubmit urgently. 29th of August 2013 (cseverin): Yes, the above comments have been adequately addressed and hence the PIF is recommended for CEO Approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*		
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.**