



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

GEF ID:	9705		
Country/Region:	Cabo Verde		
Project Title:	Managing Multiple Sector threats on Marine Ecosystems to Achieve Sustainable Blue Growth		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5880 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-2 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$3,787,864
Co-financing:	\$13,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,187,864
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Cyrille Barnerias	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	2016-12-20 - Please clarify the contribution of the project to the GEF strategic objectives. - The project has explicitly articulated which Aichi target it will help achieve (paragraph 41). We expect SMART indicators related to the Aichi targets to be defined during PPG.	

¹ 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)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>2017-02-21</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The four agreements cited in the Output 1.3 are targeted on prevention of pollution (oil, waste etc) which is normally not the kind of agreement that GEF finances. As we understand the interest of addressing them in a project addressing also the Ballast convention (relevant with regards to the IAS issue), could you please specify that the four agreements frameworks and early systems will be financed by co-financing. - Reminder: the project has explicitly articulated which Aichi target it will help achieve (paragraph 46). We expect SMART indicators related to the Aichi targets to be defined during PPG. <p>2017-02-27</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There might have been a slight misunderstanding: GEF could participate in the financing of the Ballast convention transposition into the IAS national framework preparation (as it relates to IAS), but we would prefer to see the other conventions (MARPOL, OPRC, London and Anti-fouling Conventions) national frameworks to be supported by the co-financing. Hence, the modification of the PIF 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>should be in paragraph 26.</p> <p>2017-03-02 - All comments addressed</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>2016-12-20</p> <p>Yes, it is coherent with the 2nd National Environmental Action Plan (PANA-II 2004-2014) (page 13 and 19) as well as with the NBSAP-priority 3-5 (page 90).</p>	
Project Design	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>2016-12-23</p> <p>- Yes, drivers such as habitat loss and degradation from Agriculture and urbanization, pollution, over-exploitation and harmful fishing practices as well as IAS and climate change are identified.</p> <p>- innovation: yes, the project will be innovative as it will support Marine Spatial Planning in a country where this tool as not been yet implemented (it even rare in the African context). The use of drones to support the protected areas and fisheries management is also a factor of innovation.</p> <p>-Scaling-up: yes the project could allow scaling-up in case of success for</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the use of drones for example or for Marine Spatial Planning to neighboring or related countries.</p> <p>-Sustainability: please for CEO endorsement, elaborate on the importance of up-scaling of co-management for the project sustainability.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>2016-12-23</p> <p>- Yes</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>2016-12-23</p> <p>- Yes</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>2016-12-23</p> <p>Yes. We expect in particular that the PPG will allow for a complete gender assessment and integration in the project.</p>	
	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	Availability of Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>Yes: The project requests \$4,257,211 on the BD Focal area. The difference (\$845,115) with the amount originally available for the BD Focal Area (\$3,412,096) will be taken from the LD Focal Area using the marginal adjustment rule.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of 		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	equitable access		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>2016-12-23 - No. There is one remark to be addressed.</p> <p>- Regarding KM (paragraphs 39 and 61), please clarify how the project will overcome the elements identified in Barrier4 as to the lack of capture and sharing of lessons and best-practices identified in other projects.</p> <p>2017-02-21 No, please see comment on financing source for output 1.3.</p> <p>2017-02-27 No. All comments have been addressed except the one on financing source for output 1.3.</p> <p>2017-03-02 Yes, all comments at this stage have been addressed.</p>	
Review Date	Review	December 23, 2016	January 30, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 21, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 27, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	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)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ 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.