



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

GEF ID:	9766		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Mainstreaming Conservation of Coastal Wetlands of Chile's South Center Biodiversity Hotspot through Adaptive Management of Coastal Area Ecosystems		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 9; LD-3 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$5,146,804
Co-financing:	\$16,875,433	Total Project Cost:	\$22,022,237
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Robert Erath

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	<p>March 8, 2017</p> <p>The project is not aligned with the Land Degradation strategy at all, therefore, funding can not be provided by the focal area.</p> <p>The project seeks to align itself with BD Program 9, but the current project design does not clearly align itself with Program 9.</p>	

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>Once the PIF is revised, an evaluation will be made again of the project's alignment with GEF's biodiversity strategy.</p> <p>March 31, 2017</p> <p>Adequate revision.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 8, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 8, 2017</p> <p>The PIF adequately talks about drivers of wetland degradation at the national and site levels, but provides an inadequate design response to this analysis.</p> <p>The issues of sustainability, scaling and market transformation are not addressed. The claim that sustainable wetland management is particularly innovative is not credible, this is a fairly standard management approach.</p> <p>Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>March 31, 2017</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Adequate revision.</p> <p>March 8, 2017</p> <p>Chile currently has 13 designated Ramsar sites, which is a global designation for wetlands of international importance. Please clarify why the demonstration pilot sites selected were not Ramsar sites, as this would justify the incrementality of the GEF investment to improve their sustainable use and management. The justification of the global biodiversity importance of the four pilot sites is not satisfactory.</p> <p>Many other elements of the project are not incremental (e.g., information management platforms, GIS development, assessments, etc), and in some cases already exist in the literature and don't need reproduced (guidelines on sustainable wetland management) hence the incremental reasoning for GEF investment is weak.</p> <p>The incremental cost of the project (\$5.1 million) and the total project cost (\$21.9 million) is very expensive for the outputs produced which are knowledge, capacity development, development of regulations and policies, planning documents etc. and</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>that cover an area of wetlands totaling only 20,000 hectares or more than \$1000 per hectare. (please note that the hectare figure comes from the project results framework, Table F is very confusing in this regard as it presents different figures).</p> <p>Finally, the proposed activities--many of which are not incremental--do not address any of the threats to the wetlands themselves but rely only on the soft tools of information, planning, guidelines and policy. Within the project, there is no imperative that anything will actually change in-situ in terms of actual practices of agriculture, urban development, tourism, etc.</p> <p>Please review the design of the project in the light of the comments above and redesign and resubmit.</p> <p>March 31, 2017</p> <p>Adequate revision.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 8, 2017</p> <p>Please see comments under 4 above.</p> <p>We do not see a clear path to the generation of GEBs related to both site selection and project design</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		choices vis a vis the drivers of wetland degradation. Please revise and resubmit. March 31, 2017 Adequate revision.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	March 8, 2017 Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	March 8, 2017 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	March 8, 2017 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	March 8, 2017 Yes.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	March 8, 2017 Yes.	
	• Focal area set-aside?	March 8, 2017 Yes.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	March 8, 2017 No. Please review the comments and resubmit.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 31, 2017</p> <p>Adequate revisions have been provided in response to the first review.</p> <p>The PIF can not be approved at this time due to an adding error that must be corrected.</p> <p>Cofinancing numbers in Table A and Table C are different due to an adding error. Please correct and resubmit.</p> <p>April 19, 2017</p> <p>The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 08, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 19, 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?		
	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.