



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

GEF ID:	5771		
Country/Region:	Regional (Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama)		
Project Title:	Improving Mangrove Conservation across the Eastern Tropical Pacific Seascape (ETPS) through Coordinated Regional and National Strategy Development and Implementation		
GEF Agency:	WWF-US	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-2; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,000	Project Grant:	\$1,900,810
Co-financing:	\$4,516,858	Total Project Cost:	\$6,599,668
PIF Approval:	June 11, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Leah Karrer	Agency Contact Person:	Andrew Hume

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 ?	April 4, 2014: Yes, the four countries are eligible.	April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes, the four countries are eligible.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	<p>April 4, 2014: No, the letters of endorsement have not been received.</p> <p>May 1, 2014: Yes, all letters have been submitted (with translation). The letters note a total of \$2M for the project, which is actually about \$70K more, but fine. Also, the letters note that UNESCO and CI are co-EAs, but actually is only UNESCO, but also fine. Thank you.</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.</p> <p>9th of June 2016 (cseverin): Signed endorsement letter from Ecuador missing.</p> <p>July 7, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes. Provided.</p>
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

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 STAR allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	<p>April 4, 2014: Yes, funds are available within IW. However, please correct the following financial discrepancies:</p> <p>1) because this is a MSP the Project Agency Fee can be up to 9.5% of the total GEF Grant. Since the total is \$1,735,164, then the agency fee could be up to \$164,840.</p> <p>2) The total for Table A needs to be the same as the total for Table B (\$1,735,164).</p> <p>Please ensure all the numbers match based on these two points.</p> <p>April 17, 2014: All fine.</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes, the four countries are eligible.</p> <p>9th of June 2016 (cseverin):Funding is still available.</p>
	<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</i></p>	<p>April 4, 2014: Yes, it is aligned with IW focal area IW-3 and IW-2. IW-1 is focused on surface and groundwater, which are not really the focus of this project. Please revise to note IW-2 and IW-3.</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>

*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)
	<p><i>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>April 17, 2014: All fine.</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>April 4, 2014: Yes, however we have discussed with you various options for the Implementing Agency and Executing Agency and need to clarify and confirm these plans.</p> <p>April 17, 2014: Thank you for addressing by identifying UNESCO as the EA.</p>	<p>June 25, 2015: No, the identificaton of appropriate Executing Agencies needs to be resolved.</p> <p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Point addressed.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<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>	<p>April 4, 2014: The baseline projects section includes a wealth of information, but is largely focused on marine protected areas and Conservation International's experience. This project is not focused on MPAs, it's focused on addressing the various threats to mangroves. Consequently, the baseline projects section need to include all relevant projects that are working on mangroves and/or those threats, which include urban expansion, aquaculture, charcoal production and agricultural expansion. In addition, this section should not be limited to CI projects, but include projects conducted by other organizations. For all projects please explain briefly (to be elaborated in the Pro Doc) how this project will collaborate and build on those other projects, not duplicate.</p> <p>Please revise the table based on these</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes. The baseline is well articulated.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>points and consider moving to an annex.</p> <p>April 17, 2014: Yes. The description was revised to reflect the various organizations responsible for the projects. This is sufficient for the PIF. However, during PPG, consideration needs to be given to collaborating with projects that are not "mangrove" projects but relate to the threats, including urban expansion, aquaculture, charcoal production and agricultural expansion.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>April 4, 2014: The following issues need to be addressed:</p> <p>1) Output 1.3 needs to note it will be signed at the ministerial level, which is required for future IW funding. Also, the completion date is noted as Y2Q3, which is quite late in the process considering this strategy will influence other activities. Can this be completed earlier?</p> <p>2) Component 1, Output 3.2 notes communication products, which will be an important output. We look forward to more detail about this output in the Pro Doc. Meanwhile, can this be completed earlier given this information will influence other activities?</p> <p>3) Component 2, Output 2.2 says "draft" but the Outcome says "passed". Please edit so same.</p> <p>4) Component 2, Output 2.1 notes a national assessment will be conducted for each country, but only focuses on policy</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (Ikarrer): No. Please address the following few points:</p> <p>1) The project activities are developed with a conservation perspective, which is appropriate; however, the threats and subsequently needed behavioral changes involve urban development, planning and forestry, oil and gas exploration and mining among other sectors. Working with these sectors, their key players and their initiatives is critical for the project to be successful. More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In terms of relevant initiatives in which this project will coordinate and collaborate, the noted projects are specifically mangrove, marine protected areas and/or marine biodiversity conservation focused projects (p27, 57). Given the major threats (according to the SECC section) relate to deforestation for charcoal/firewood/tannins, urban development, oil and gas exploration and mining, in order to instigate change in those practices, projects and plans for

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>gaps and outreach needs. Have assessments of threats already been conducted? Since economic valuations will be conducted as part of this project, the missing analysis is the ecological context, particularly threats.</p> <p>5) Component 2, Outcome 2 provides examples of types of regulations and incentives, but does not mention pollution-related efforts.</p> <p>6) Component 2 (which focuses on national-level activities) notes the economic valuation studies will be conducted in two countries; however, Component 3 (which focuses on the local level) notes the economic valuation results will be produced in a report (output 1.2). Please put the outcome with the output in the same component. Are the economic valuations going to be at a national level or specific to a mangrove area? We had discussed the demo sites would be particular mangrove watersheds, which suggests local level/Component 3.</p> <p>7) The regional nature of this project is important to funding approval for this project. It needs to be clear that there will be sharing of experiences and expertise among the countries. Component 2, Output 3.2, is the focus of such knowledge sharing. We agree on the importance of a communicating outcomes through communication materials and a knowledge-sharing</p>	<p>those activities need to be targeted, such as, urban and community development plans, forestry development plans, and oil and gas development plans. Please discuss how this project will coordinate with these sectors and particularly their relevant initiatives. For example, upstream city pollution is noted as a problem in a couple of sites – how will the project influence city planning?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an impressive list of stakeholders in the Stakeholder Participation section (p72). The stakeholders are primarily from the environment government agencies, conservation NGOs and user groups/benefactors (e.g. community groups, fisher associations). A key group is missing - the upstream stakeholders (who are impacting, but not ‘using’ or ‘benefiting’) and, consequently, the most difficult to influence. This includes upstream inland city planners and developers, upstream farmers and aquaculture farmers. Please discuss how they will be part of project plans. <p>2) Please address discrepancies within the text describing the 4 sites (as discussed in Socio-Economic and Cultural Context (SECC) section, p13), Table 7 and PRF plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Table 7 p52 lists the threats to mangroves at the sites; however, these are not consistent with the SECC section descriptions. For example, Gulf of Nicoya notes over-extraction of timber

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>platform. Please consider including regional meetings focused on mangrove conservation hosted by this project to share experiences. This would be useful at the beginning, middle and end of the project.</p> <p>8) Component 3, Output 1.2 - we discussed that the economic valuations would include cost-benefit analysis of management options, which is particularly critical to demonstrate to policy-makers the economic impacts of their decisions. Also, are there plans for disseminating and discussing the report to influence policies?</p> <p>9) Any IW project is required to allocate 1% of its budget to participating in IWLearn. May be most appropriate to note in Component 2, Output 3.2.</p> <p>10) Unclear what Component 3, Outcome 4 means - if these are demonstration projects, then they are by their nature new so participation would start at 0%. Do you mean 20% of the local population adjacent to the mangroves engaged in mangrove conservation activities? Please clarify.</p> <p>11) some of the components and outcomes are written too long, particularly Component 1; Component 1, Outcome 3; Component 3, Outcome 2 (cut "has begun...". It's better to keep short so not obligating beyond the true component or outcome.</p>	<p>and encroaching shrimp ponds in Table 7, but not in the SECC section. Please ensure consistency, especially as this affects which stakeholders need to be engaged.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall, for the selected 4 sites the PRF notes there will be 2 management plans developed and 2 economic valuations conducted; however, based on the description in the Executive Summary only one management plan is noted for Panama and one economic assessment for Costa Rica. For the Gulf of Guayaquil, Ecuador, for example, it notes the feasibility of an integrated spatial management plan will explored "needs strengthening to developing and approving a plan. <p>3) A few minor points:</p> <p>a) How will the economic assessment for Gulf of Nicoya, CR be different from the economic valuation already conducted through the Swedish lottery?</p> <p>b) Under Output 3.2.3 and Output 1.3.2 please note IWC9, which is a key global meeting for sharing experiences.</p> <p>c) Also, related to above, rather than limiting interactions to meetings of conservationists, who already recognize the value of mangrove conservation, efforts need to extend to the key audiences whose behavior need to change "foresters, urban planner and developers, farmers, etc. as discussed above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Finally, Section 3 in the narrative of the PIF, needs to complement Table B. There seems to be a strong emphasis on international cooperation. This is a regional project and to justify IW funding the emphasis needs to be on regional sharing and exchanges.</p> <p>April 17, 2014: All addressed with the following for consideration during PPG: 1)more detail on the communication products (Component 1, Outcome 3.2); 2) addition of regional workshops (Component 2, Output 3.2); 3) the actual economic valuation needs to include a cost-benefit analysis (Component 3, Outcome 2)</p>	<p>9th of June 2016 (cseverin): Addressed</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>April 4, 2014: Yes, the project will have important GEBs, including ensuring the sustainability of valuable marine habitats that have traditionally received limited political or regulatory attention. By demonstrating the value of mangroves and mechanisms for their conservation, this project will be a leader for global mangrove conservation.</p> <p>Section 4. Incremental/additional cost reasoning heavily emphasizes MPAs. As this is not a MPA project, please rewrite to focus on mangrove conservation. Also in terms of incremental reasoning for this project, emphasis needs to be on the regional nature of this project - how working in the 4 countries and sharing experiences provides benefits, leads to change far greater than individual</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>national efforts.</p> <p>April 17, 2014: Revised to address points. Thank you.</p>	
	<p>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?</p>		<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): Yes.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>April 4, 2014: There is a good explanation of stakeholders from a conservation standpoint, but the explanation of who the relevant users are and how they will be engaged is weak. Based on the threats, this would include coastal developers, farmers, shrimp farmers, tourism planers and city planners to start. Please strengthen this section.</p> <p>April 17, 2014: Revised to address points. Thank you.</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer): No. In addition to expanding the stakeholder list noted in #7, the means of engaging needs strengthening at the local level. There is an 8 page table (Table 15) of stakeholder engagements during PPG. Yet within this extensive list, almost all discussions were with government agencies, global NGOs (CI, WWF, Ramsar, UNESCO) and national NGOs. There were virtually no meetings or discussions with community and user groups even at the national level much less in the 4 sites. Within the engagement list for Panama, there is one row noting interviews, presentations and negotiations with local actors and authorities. And within the list for Colombia, in the last row 2 Bocana Community leaders are noted as been consulted related to Safeguard requirements. Please discuss how these groups will be engaged early in the project.</p> <p>9th of June 2016 (cseverin):Addressed</p>

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)	April 4, 2014: Yes, the PIF identifies several risks at the medium to low ranking and how they will be mitigated.	April 27, 2016 (Ikarrer): Yes.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	April 4, 2014: Yes, sufficient consideration has been given to the context for this project and how this project will support existing national and regional efforts.	April 27, 2016 (Ikarrer): No. Please see point in #7 regarding need to consider plans and initiatives that are outside 'conservation' and relevant to the sectors whose behavior the project aims to affect. 9th of June 2016 (cseverin):Addressed
	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 likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>April 4, 2014: The project is innovative in that it is, for the first time in this region, developing regional standards and protocols for mangrove conservation, conducting national mangrove policy assessments, calculating and communicating the economic value of the mangroves, using this information to draft and pass mangrove protection legislation in at least 2 of the countries, and providing outreach, capacity building and knowledge sharing.</p> <p>Given the breadth of participants, the financial commitments and the draft Regional Action Plan, this project is expected to be sustainable long-term.</p> <p>This project has strong potential for scaling up as it addresses mangrove conservation at the regional, national and local scales. The various strategies employed in the 4 countries will not only</p>	<p>July, 2016 (Ikarrer).The project is innovative in that it is, for the first time in this region, developing regional standards and protocols for mangrove conservation, conducting national mangrove policy assessments, calculating and communicating the economic value of the mangroves, using this information to draft and pass mangrove protection legislation in at least 2 of the countries, and providing outreach, capacity building and knowledge sharing.</p> <p>Given the breadth of participants, the financial commitments and the draft Regional Action Plan, this project is expected to be sustainable long-term.</p> <p>This project has strong potential for scaling up as it addresses mangrove conservation at the regional, national and local scales. The various strategies</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		provide insight among the countries, but also will be valuable to mangrove conservationists worldwide as will the approaches used to build a regional effort.	employed in the 4 countries will not only provide insight among the countries, but also will be valuable to mangrove conservationists worldwide as will the approaches used to build a regional effort.
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). No. Please address a few financial points:</p> <p>1) Please clarify why Component #1 was reduced by nearly half and meanwhile Component #2 went up by \$200K;</p> <p>2) Please clarify why the anticipated co-financing did not come through from IADB (\$2M) and from Swedish lottery (\$500K). Also CI commitment was reduced by \$1.5M. That said, it is great to see the increased country investments. Please explain how the resulting net decrease of \$2M will affect the project outcomes.</p> <p>In addition, in terms of changes from the PIF plans:</p> <p>3) Component 2 previously noted in the PIF that at least 736,000 ha of priority mangroves would be within an improved conservation policy. This is no longer noted. Please clarify why or add back.</p> <p>4) Output 3.4.2 was previously Component 3 Outcome 5. Odd to have under Outcome 3.4 when it is its own outcome referencing increased local stakeholder engagement across all 4 sites.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			July 7, 2016 (lkarrer). Addressed.
	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?		April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.
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?	<p>April 4, 2014: Yes, including significant cash co-financing.</p> <p>Please note that the total GEF grant amount can be a total of \$2,000,000 and the agency fee is then in addition to the grant. Apologies we may have misinformed you on this previously.</p>	<p>April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). No. Please note that the subtotal for Table B needs correcting for co-financing. It is currently noted as same as the GEF Grant Amount in the CEO Request for Endorsement.</p> <p>9th of June 2016 (cseverin):Addressed</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?	April 4, 2014: Yes.	April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes except see questions about changes since PIF in #14 above.
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	April 4, 2014: Yes.	April 27, 2016 (lkarrer).Yes.
	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	April 4, 2014: Yes, PPG request is reasonable.	April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	April 4, 2014: NA	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). Yes; however, given that upstream urban pollution is noted as a major concern in sites, this needs to be considered in the tracking tool Local Investment section. 9th of June 2016 (cseverin):Addressed
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		April 27, 2016 (lkarrer).Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). NA
	• Convention Secretariat?		April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). NA
	• The Council?		April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). NA.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	April 4, 2014: No, Please see comments above. May 1, 2014: Yes, the project is recommended for approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	April 17, 2014: Please see points to consider during PPG noted in #6 and #7 above. April 27, 2016 (lkarrer). No. Please consider points above.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		July 7, 2016 (Ikarrer). Addressed.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>June 25, 2015 (Ikarrer): No. The issue of EA identificaiton needs to be resolved as well as co-financing letters need to be received at which point the full review of all questions above will be completed.</p> <p>April 27, 2016 (Ikarrer). No. Please address points above.</p> <p>9th of June 2016 (cseverin):No, Signed endorsement letter missing from Ecuador</p> <p>July 7, 2016 (Ikarrer). Yes. Recommended for CEO endorsement.</p>
	First review*		
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		April 27, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		June 15, 2016

* **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.**