

Strengthening management and governance for the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in coastal marine ecosystems in Chile

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project

Basic Information

GEF ID
10075

Countries
Chile

Project Title
Strengthening management and governance for the conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in coastal marine ecosystems in Chile

GEF Agency(ies)
FAO

Agency ID
FAO: 644609

GEF Focal Area(s)
Biodiversity

Program Manager
Mark Zimsky

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes, project is a combination of PA management and BD mainstreaming investments.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes, this is a very targeted and realistic intervention with focused components on a small set of actions to achieve discrete and focused outcomes that are clearly linked to the core indicators.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

No. In Table C for each source of cofinancing please identify the type of cofinancing clearly. Please also explain how the cofinancing listed as investment mobilized was identified and how it meets the definition.

10/24/2018

Yes. Table C now identifies each source of cofinancing as recurrent expenditures FAO will work closely with Government and private sector partners to confirm investment mobilized cofinancing during the PPG phase.

Agency Response

Cofinancing has been updated.

We have checked with the government and the cofinancing will most likely be recurrent expenditures. Chile recently went through national elections and the new government endorsed this proposal in part because of the support it itself will be giving to coastal fisheries.

Also the new government will be prioritizing private sector investment in these areas.

Because of these elections, new government and private sector investments have not yet been clarified. FAO will work closely with Government and private sector partners to confirm investment mobilized cofinancing during the PPG phase.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

NA.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes.

Agency Response

No response required

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes in the paper PIF provided by the agency, but it is not in the Portal. Please include in the revised submission.

10/24/2018

Cleared.

Agency Response

Updated in the portal

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes in the paper PIF provide by the agency, but it is not in the portal. Please include in a revised submission.

10/24/2018

The portal submission is not clear as to what is being tagged. Please resolve this and resubmit.

Please apply, in the Taxonomy, Rio Markers for Climate Change Adaptation and Climate Change Mitigation. Each project needs to select one marker (0,1 or 2) for adaptation AND one

marker (0,1 or 2) for mitigation. For further details, please refer to the hover tip that links to the complete Taxonomy, including definitions of the Rio Markers.

10/27/2018

The portal submission is not clear in terms of what is being tagged. With regards to the CCA and CCM Rio Markers it is not clear how each marker has been ranked (0,1,2).

10/30/2018

Cleared.

Agency Response

Addressed in the portal

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes. An adequate description of the problem has been provided including a detailed barrier analysis.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes an adequate description of the baseline situation and investments is provided.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes and the alternative is clearly described within each component and their respective outcomes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes. Clear alignment with GEF-7 strategy on protected areas and biodiversity mainstreaming.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes. Incremental cost and reasoning presented clearly by components and outcomes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes the projected targets are reasonable and achievable with an investment of this type and size.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

This section is missing in the submission. Please include in a revised submission.

10/24/2018

Cleared.

Agency Response

Section 1.7 included in the PIF

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

No map or geo-reference is provided and the portal submission says "falta" or lacking. Please include in a revised submission.

10/24/2018

Cleared.

10/27/2018

By the time of CEO endorsement, please provide a series of clearer, more detailed and granular maps for the project intervention sites.

Agency Response

Updated in the portal

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes this is adequate.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Please include in the section on gender your plans to conduct a gender analysis prior to CEO endorsement.

10/24/2018

Cleared.

Agency Response

Text included in the portal submission and highlighted in yellow

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes. PIF provides a clear rationale and logical approach for work with the private sector. Aims of project are particularly relevant to many in the fisheries sector.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes, risks are identified, honestly assessed, and proposed mitigation measures adequate.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/18/2018

A number of other very relevant and critical GEF projects are identified and opportunities for coordination, technical exchanges and sharing of lessons are described. By the time of CEO endorsement, please elaborate on how this coordination will occur, what the mechanism will be for technical exchanges and lesson learning, and please also cost this out and identify the resources necessary to realize this kind of coordination and knowledge sharing.

Agency Response

We will take into consideration during PPG phase.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes, the project is fully aligned with the NBSAP and many other national policy and planning documents.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes, the proposed plan is adequate.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please amplify this plan and/or explain how it will coordinate with the other GEF initiatives to share knowledge about this thematic area as part of the coordination strategy with other GEF initiatives referenced above under "Coordination".

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Yes in a letter dated September 12, 2018.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/27/2018

No, please resolve the issue with the project taxonomy and the Rio Markers and resubmit.

10/30/2018

Yes, the PIF is being recommended for technical clearance.

Additional Comments

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/16/2018

Please take note of the numerous areas above where recommendations are made regarding what is required by CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>