



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

GEF ID:	5062		
Country/Region:	Comoros		
Project Title:	Development of a National Network of Terrestrial and Marine Protected Areas Representative of the Comoros' Unique Natural Heritage and Co-managed With Local Village Communities		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4950 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$4,246,000
Co-financing:	\$19,985,000	Total Project Cost:	\$24,231,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Fabiana Issler,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	8-16-12 Yes. Comoros is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	8-16-12 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP dated August 1, 2012, for a total of \$4,779,984 including PPG and Agency fees. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	8-16-12 Yes. The establishment of the national network of protected areas was initiated under a UNDP project resulting in the creation of Moheli's Marine Park, the one and only MPA in Comoros. The creation of the national network of protected areas was initiated	

		commitment in 2007 through the implementation of the UNDP Programme "Capacity development and promotion of CBO volunteering as a model for involvement of village communities in achieving the MDGs in the Comoros". See further detail on p.15 of PIF. Cleared	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	NA	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	8-16-12 Yes. The UNDP Country Office (with a team of an Eco-Advisor, a program analyst specialist in democratic governance and decentralization, and three program associates) is supported by a French speaking Regional Technical Advisor based at the UNDP-GEF Regional Coordination Unit for Africa, in Pretoria. Cleared	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	8-15-12 Yes. The Union of Comoros is requesting the entire STAR allocation for this project and it is using the GEF V flexible mechanism. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	8-15-12 Yes. The Union of Comoros is requesting the entire STAR allocation for this project and it is using the GEF V flexible mechanism	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	NA	NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	8-15-12 Yes. Cleared	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	8-15-12 Yes. BD-2 (Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems). Cleared	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	8-15 Yes. As stated in the PIF, "Conservation and valuing of marine and terrestrial ecosystems is a priority declared by the Government of the Union of Comoros in the Strategic Program Framework for 2011-2016. The creation of the national network of protected areas is a process initiated since the 90's. The Government renewed its commitment in 2007 through the implementation of the project "Capacity development and promotion of CBO volunteering as a model for involvement of village communities in achieving the MDGs in the Comoros". Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	8-15-12 Yes. The project includes activities that will contribute to the financial and institutional sustainability of project. These include: i) A new legal framework and institutional structure for the management of the PA system, ii) Building capacity of PA agency staff at	

		<p>communities and associations involved in PA co-management, and iii) updating the PA system finance, iv) a realistic plan/strategy for developing high-end eco-tourism activities in PAs/MPAs, and v) development of a livelihoods programme.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. 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>8-16-12 Yes. The baseline project (technical and financial) is described at length on p.9-10 and in Table 1 (p.8).</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p>	<p>8-16-12 Yes. Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>8-16-12 Yes. The project has the following components and associated outputs:</p> <p>1) PA system strengthened through expansion and capacity building: (i) improving the legal and institutional frameworks for PA management; (ii)</p>	

		<p>management at the system's level; (iii) engineering the PA expansion and codifying a strategy for the PA system; and (iv) improving the financial sustainability of the PA system. Impact Results: An increase in the PA State from 40,000 to 81,000 ha (38,000 terrestrial and 3,000 marine).</p> <p>2) Site level PA operationalization: 1) PA management strengthening at the site level; (2) improving resource use governance on sites and around them; (3) exploring the contribution of tourism to conservation also at site level; and (4) coalescing support for a PA-friendly livelihoods programme and rolling it out. Impact Results: Increased management effectiveness in approx. 81,000 ha of protected land/seascapes.</p> <p>For CEO Endorsement, please seriously reconsider using sea turtles and coelacanth as indicator species. That will consume significant resources and not necessarily yield the expected results. Please refer to the GEF learning Mission reports for Zambia and India for suggestions.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>8-15-12  Yes. For CEO Endorsement, please reconsider how far this project can go with the proposed outputs 2.3 (Tourism) and 2.4 (Livelihoods). Are the "livelihoods programmes" for real? If these "livelihoods programmes" existed for real, isn't like it that the local people would have make use of them already?</p>	

		a big change of over committing and under delivering with this output. Cleared	
	16. 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?	8-15-12 Are the "Changes in income levels for local community households attributable to the development of biodiversity-friendly income generating activities" (Outcome under Component 2), really viable? See also item 15. Clear	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	8-15-12 Yes. See p.14 of PIF. For CEO Endorsement, please refer to those actually taken part in the project. Cleared	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	8-15-12 Yes. See p.13-14 of PIF. Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	8-15-12 Yes. A clear and detailed explanation was provided on how this FSP fits with other GEF projects in Comoros, including the GEF-IFAD BD LD MSP (Integrated Ecological Planning and SLM in Coastal Ecosystems in the Comoros). See list of other related projects on p. 14-15. Cleared	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	8-15-12 Yes. The project will be executed by General Directorate of Environment and Forests (DGEFF) of the Ministry of Production, Energy, Environment, Industry and Handicraft (MPEEIH). Cleared	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	8-15-12 Project Management is 4.7% of the GEF grant. Co-financing for Project Management is 5.4% of indicative co-financing. Cleared	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	8-15-12 Yes. Cleared	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	8-15-12 Co-financing is in the amount of \$19,985,000 (all cash). Co-financing ratio is 1:4.7 Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	8-15-12 UNDP is contributing \$500,000. Cleared	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		

Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	8-15-12 This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming work program.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	8-15-12  1) For CEO Endorsement, please seriously reconsider using sea turtles and coelacanth as indicator species. That will consume significant resources and not necessarily yield the expected results. Please refer to the GEF learning Mission reports for Zambia and India for suggestions.  2) Please reconsider how far this project can go with the proposed outputs 2.3 (Tourism) and 2.4 (Livelihoods). Are the "livelihoods programmes" for real? If these "livelihoods programmes" existed for real, isn't like it that the local people would have make use of them already? Please provide specifics because there is a big change of over committing and under delivering with this output.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 15, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
<b>PPG Budget</b>	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
<b>Review Date (s)</b>	First review*	
	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.