

Towards Joint Integrated, Ecosystem-based Management of the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem (PACA)

GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project

Basic Information

GEF ID

10076

Countries

Regional (Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Panama)

Project Title

Towards Joint Integrated, Ecosystem-based Management of the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem (PACA)

GEF Agency(ies)

UNDP

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)

International Waters

Program Manager

Christian Severin

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Partly, please elaborate on the importance of establishing execution arrangements with a regional institution towards ensuring long term sustainability of the interventions and in particular the SAP implementation. Further, the project should work towards establishing a mechanism to share data to be collected and analyzed through the TDA/SAP process. Such data sharing mechanism should preferably be hosted in a place that will ensure easy and equal access for all parties.

The proposal should include reference to the collaboration that is envisioned with another potential investment in the LME of Gulf of California, due to the clear linkages between marine life in the two adjacent LMEs.

Component 3 mentions a number of potential demonstration activities. Please consider to include MPAs and Mangrove investments too, as these both carry important weight towards ensuring Marine Ecosystem health.

13th of November: Addressed.

Agency Response

Given the absence of any single regional organization mandated to support all the countries bordering this LME, in parallel with the presence of several fisheries and other organizations with membership of selected PaCA LME countries, an important component of the SAP development process will be to explore initial options and alternatives for a regional SAP Policy Coordination Mechanism. Given PaCA's "sister" CLME+ project faces the same challenge (and involves many of the same countries) but is much more advanced, PaCA will liaise closely with CLME+ to benefit from CLME's experience towards establishing a permanent SAP policy coordination mechanism. This text is included in paragraph 67 (see highlighted text).

The coordination mechanism will be a key part of the project. Barrier 4 highlights the lack of collaborative arrangements that encompass all the countries. Regarding a data sharing mechanism, this is already included in output 4.1 to confront barrier 1.

There is no public information about a GEF project in the Gulf of California, but possible collaboration has been included. See new paragraph 57.

Regarding demonstration activities on MPAs and mangrove areas, the proposed pilot interventions were proposed, prioritized and agreed by the participating countries. During the PPG phase, the two topics can be suggested for discussion of the countries.

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes, however, please work towards benefitting from the large economic value sports and commercial fishing has in the region, towards attracting cofinancing from the private sector. The current estimated cofinancing solely seems to be coming from public sources.

13th of November 2018: Addressed

19th of November 2018: Please address following: The column for investment mobilized for CSO was not filled up in portal– need to include the name of co-financer and type (investment mobilized or recurrent expenditures)

Agency Response

The comment is correct. At the moment we do not have upfront commitments from the sport fishing industry. However, it has been identified as a potential contributor. The proposed pilot intervention to develop a regional strategy for billfishes (a priority for central American countries) will be a main opportunity to engage the industry during the PPG phase. An indicative amount of USD 100,000 has been included in the co-financing table (Table D).

UNDP Response, 19 Nov 2018

The USD 1,953,977 is to be identified during the PPG phase. Since at this stage this information is not yet available, the co-financing is proposed to be reduced by this amount, which keeps the co-financing ratio still above 5:1. (i.e. 5.3 to 1).

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):Yes

Agency Response

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Please include target values for all core indicators where to the project will be delivering. Such indicators can always be finetuned during PPG, but we do need to have a value inserted at the time of PIF.

Further, the target for inclusion of women/men is extremely low for the proposed delivery in Core Indicator. for a project like the proposed that will engage across atleast 7 countries, interactions with 144, out of which 44 is estimated to be women is simply to low. Please reconsider the delivery towards core indicator 11.

Please ensure to include a target under core indicator 5, both in portal and in PIF annexed

13th of November 2018: Addressed

19th of November: Please address the following: In the PIF uploaded the project reports on core indicators 5 (180,965,900 hectare), please remove this number of the uploaded PIF and resubmit the document. In this way there is consistency between the portal information and what has been uploaded.

Agency Response

Target values included in Core Indicators table F and Core Indicators Annex B.

Regarding targets for core indicator 11. The number included is a conservative estimation of the people that will directly participate in the TDA / SAP process. At the moment there is no solid information about the number of direct beneficiaries from the other activities. A rough number has been included based on a coarse estimation. The numbers will have to be updated during the PPG phase.

Regarding targets for core indicator 5, included for 5.2. At the moment it is not possible to set targets for 5.1. There are a number of fisheries implementing “fisheries improvement projects”, but these will not be a direct target of the project. It is possible that the sport fisheries will engage in improved practices, but there is no third-party sustainability certification. This matter will be analysed during the PPG phase.

UNDP Response, 19 November 2018

Addressed by removing this number.

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):No, all projects need to apply Rio Markers for Climate Change Adaptation and Climate Change Mitigation. 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.”

13th of November 2018: Addressed

Agency Response

Rio scores included in section G. Also marked in the GEF 7 taxonomy (Annex C)

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):Yes, however, please ensure to include reference to the cooperation that will be established with the Gulf of California national LME and any potential projects in that LME.

Agency Response

Included, see para. 57.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):The baseline investments included are fine, but please during PPG work towards a more full picture including the national investments from the participating countries.

13th of November 2018: Addressed

Agency Response

Indeed, this will be developed during the PPG phase.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes, Fully aligned with IW FA strategies.

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Partly, please ensure to include numeric target values for all core indicators target by the proposed interventions.

13th of November 2018: Addressed

Agency Response

Included, please see taxonomy including Rio Markers targets.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes, however it is puzzling that the section on innovation only highlights marine debris and not other sources of land based sources of pollution, as such other sources may indeed have an equal and potentially larger impact on the health of the PACA LME.

Agency Response

This reflects the priority given by the participating countries. Other direct and diffuse land-based sources have been identified as problematic. But, the countries have prioritized marine litter as a common main interest. This will be further analysed during the PPG phase.

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes, the proposal identified the Pacific Central American Coastal Large Marine Ecosystem as the area of intervention.

Agency Response

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes, some stakeholder consultations have been taking place, but more will be undertaken during project preparation.

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes in PIF, but in online entry more information could be included. Please ensure to re evaluate the impact of the project towards delivering on GEF 7 Core Indicator 11

13th of November 2018: Addressed

Agency Response

Core indicator 11 was revised, see Table F.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes, of particular importance will be the inclusion of the private sector in the early stages of the TDA/SAP process, which it believed to ensure long term buy in to the entire process, including the implementation of the SAP.

Agency Response

Concur with the comment.

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes a matrix identifying major risks have been included in the PIF

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Yes

Agency Response

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin): Partly, There is mentioning of countries in the "alignment with national priorities" from countries that have not endorsed the project, please ensure that the list of information only includes countries that have endorsed the project.

Agency Response

Addressed.

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
22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):Yes

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

22nd of October 2018 (cseverin):Partly, please ensure to only include countries that have endorsed the PIF through submitting an endorsement letter. Please include wording pertaining to the process of including any remaining countries within the boundaries of the LME during the PPG. The value of the TDA and in particular the SAP will be increased by having all countries participating in the process.

13th of November 2018: Addressed

19th of November 2018: Please address below two points

1.

1. OFP of Ecuador as entered in the Portal is different from what is in the website. Mr. Roberto Davila (in web) while in Portal and endorsement letter is signed by Maria Duran Flores - please clarify if Ms. Duran Flores was the OFP by the time when the PIF was submitted.
2. Please also confirm Walter Gonzales was OFP for El Salvador up until 26th of October 2018, at which point this position was taken over by the current OFP Mr Davila

Agency Response

Two countries that are part of PACA have not endorsed the PIF: Colombia and Nicaragua. During the PPG phase a main task will be to motivate their participation in the project.

UNDP Response, 19 Nov 2018

The Focal point for Ecuador was Maria Belen Duran Flores from the 17th of September 2018 to 26th of October 2018 i.e. when project was already submitted.

The focal point for El Salvador was Walter Gonzales until the 22nd of October 2018, i.e. on the days when project was being submitted.

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

20th of November 2018 (cseverin): Yes the PIF is recommended for technical clearance, ditto for the PPG.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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"/>