

Safeguarding the biodiversity of ISLA DEL COCO National Park by enhancing biosecurity

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10752

Countries

Costa Rica

Project Name

Safeguarding the biodiversity of ISLA DEL COCO National Park by enhancing biosecurity

Agencies

CAF

Date received by PM

1/6/2021

Review completed by PM

8/4/2021

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I ? Project Information

1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response

4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-

financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

The letters from SINAC and FAICO note that the cofinancing is only guaranteed if project is approved by December 2020. Please submit new letters without this text if each agency can still contribute. If not, remove the cofinancing and adjust the project design considering the reduced cofinance.

Within the letters themselves, it is not clear whether they are considered in-kind or cash cofinancing. Please ensure that all letters are clear in this regards, particularly the letters from SINAC and FAICO.

Please then ensure that the cofinancing portal entries are correct.

For the project management costs, please revise and ensure that the amount GEF is paying and the amount cofinancers are paying are consistent with the overall project cofinance ratio. in terms of the proportion each is contributing to this cost.

3/10/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response

6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response

7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response

8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Please provide the baseline METT score for the park.

3/31/2021

While the baseline METT is provided in the table that was submitted showing the responses to the GEFSEC review, the METT score is NOT entered in the portal via the core indicators. Please enter the METT score. Both sub-indicators 1.2 and 2.2 have a specific field for METT score at CEO endorsement/approval.

5/18/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

05/07/2021

The baseline METT score has been entered in the portal via the core indicators.

9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

It appears that the sustainability of the project intervention is dependent on securing funding from the Adaptation Fund and there is no contingency strategy presented if this funding does not materialize. Will the Government of Costa Rica fund the implementation of the other eradication strategies that the GEF project will develop after project closure if the project does not secure funding from the Adaptation Fund? Please clarify this element of the project's sustainability strategy.

3/10/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Please provide a map of the actual park and identify areas where the pilot deer eradication and other key project activities will take place.

3/10/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response

10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/31/2021

The project states that a gender analysis was not conducted because there are no permanent inhabitants on the island and that given the nature of the project, opportunities for gender mainstreaming are limited. In the section on stakeholder engagement, however, it mentions that "stakeholder consultations have taken place with stakeholders in San Jose who have an interest in Cocos Island" and that a "stakeholder engagement process will provide additional opportunities for stakeholders to provide input and voice concerns". Please elaborate on how the project expects to ensure a gender sensitive stakeholder engagement process. In addition, it states, in the section on gender that the Results Framework has been modified to indicate the specific number of women and men directly benefitting from the project. This is however not reflected in the section of core indicators and if there are any direct beneficiaries additional sex-disaggregated information is required. Please provide further information on direct beneficiaries as well as consider updating core indicator 11.

5/18/2021

Can you please provide the gender analysis or gender mainstreaming plan and the associated action plan.

10/22/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

07/02/2021

A gender analysis and mainstreaming plan has been added as Annex 7 to the CAF project document, and as a separate document in the GEF Portal (Road Map-Documents section).

05/07/2021

- The following has been added to the descriptions of the stakeholder consultation process to be undertaken by CAF during the project: "CAF will ensure a gender-sensitive stakeholder engagement process, ensuring that women are well represented in the process and that their views are fully taken on board." (see Prodoc, p.40, 81
- The Core indicators worksheet has been amended to correctly reflect the gender-disaggregated number of direct project beneficiaries (324 women and 792 men). (See CEO document, Annex F).

The above figures have been added as an objective level indicator to Project Results Framework as An objective-level indicator / target (see CEO Endorsement document, Annex A).

12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Please clarify how the risk of not receiving additional financing for implementing eradication strategies from the Adaptation Fund or other donors will be mitigated such that the project intervention will be sustainable.

3/10/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Please clarify the budget allocation for the KM activities, i.e., what will this allocation of resources pay for exactly.

3/10/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/22/2021

Cleared.

8/11/2021

We note problems in the budget and the allocation of project management costs. See screenshot below.

Why is the Project Management Cost charged to the project components (\$23,632 to each of the three components) *and* to PMC (\$9,117).

It is not clear what is meant by the budget line "Project Management?": is it costs associated with the administration of the project? Or is it the cost of the Project Manager? Regardless, per Guidelines, costs associated with the execution of the project need to be charged to the GEF and Co-financing portions allocated to the PMC. please revise accordingly and resubmit.

2. We have also found and reviewed the detailed budget table in the Prodoc and would like to have the following comments:

(i) Please explain why Project management cost is charged across all components and PMC instead of only to PMC:

ANNEX 4: Budget breakdowns, by activity and year

Annex 4a: Budget details

Comments/Justification	C 1	C 2	C 3	Project Management Costs		YR1	YR2	TOTAL
					Total			
IC High level supervision				18,167	18,167	9,084	9,084	18,167
Project management	23,632	23,632	23,632	9,117	80,012	40,006	40,006	80,012
Eradication Manager		93,114			93,114	46,557	46,557	93,114
Eradication Expert Advisor		29,387			29,387	20,571	8,816	29,387
Data-systems manager		17,808			17,808	12,466	5,343	17,808
Logistics support		10,224			10,224	10,224		10,224
Total Personnel Salaries and benefits	23,632	174,164	23,632	27,284	248,712	138,907	109,805	248,712

2. We have also found and reviewed the detailed budget table in the Prodoc and would like to have the following comments:

(i) Please explain why Project management cost is charged across all components and PMC instead of only to PMC:

ANNEX 4: Budget breakdowns, by activity and year

Annex 4a: Budget details

Comments/Justification	C 1	C 2	C 3	Project Management Costs		YR1	YR2	TOTAL
					Total			
IC High level supervision				18,167	18,167	9,084	9,084	18,167
Project management	23,632	23,632	23,632	9,117	80,012	40,006	40,006	80,012
Eradication Manager		93,114			93,114	46,557	46,557	93,114
Eradication Expert Advisor		29,387			29,387	20,571	8,816	29,387
Data-systems manager		17,808			17,808	12,466	5,343	17,808
Logistics support		10,224			10,224	10,224		10,224
Total Personnel Salaries and benefits	23,632	174,164	23,632	27,284	248,712	138,907	109,805	248,712

Agency Response

10/15/2021

The budget has been reviewed and updated in the GEF portal & the file has been uploaded Roadmap

20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

Please reload results framework in the portal. Currently it is illegible.

3/10/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

Please include a more detailed map of the Cocos Island identifying where key project activities will take place in the park.

3/10/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2021

Please include a complete OFP endorsement letter. Currently there is only a signature.

3/10/2021

The agency clicked the CBIT box in the portal. Please unclick and send back so project can be processed.

3/31/2021

In the Letter of Endorsement the OFP allocates \$624,330 without specifying the Focal Area. When adding the GEF Financing (\$572,435) to the Agency Fee (\$51,903), the amount is higher (\$624,338) than the allocated amount in the LoE. As a new LoE is required to specify the Focal Area, please ask the Agency to use the usual template with the table that breaks down the amount for the GEF Financing and the Agency Fee ? otherwise, one cannot know how much the OFP allocated to each one.

5/18/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

05/07/2021

A revised letter has been uploaded

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA.

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
1/26/2021

No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.

Please note that Costa Rica has \$24,338 remaining in their STAR and should consider using all of it for this last project of GEF-7.

Also, please shorten the title of the project to something simpler such as: ?Safeguarding the biodiversity of Isla de Coco National Park by enhancing biosecurity?.

Please identify the lessons learned from the previous GEF investments in Cocos Island and the baseline these investments created and how the current project intervention strategy incorporates this learning.

Please explicitly state that the project will adhere to international best practice for IAS eradication including the humane treatment and disposal of species that will be eradicated.

3/31/2021

Please address comments above on the core indicators entered into the portal and the comments on gender and the OFP letter.

Please also address this observation on the budget:

Budget: : the budget does not provide detailed information on what some costs include. As an example please see below: only ?Components? are mentioned but there is no information on what that entails. We cannot assess the budget as it is: we need to understand what type of costs are charged to which part of the budget, including PMC, M&E and the Project?s components.

5/18/2021

Please address the comments on the gender action plan per comments above.

7/14/2021

We have two final comments on the budget that require explanation and revision.

(i) Please explain why Project management costs are charged across all components and PMC instead of only to PMC as presented in Table 4A in the pro doc.

(ii) There are differences in budget allocation between the budget table in the Prodoc and table B in Portal, please revise to make them match:

	Budget table in Prodoc	Table B in Portal	Difference
Component 1	84,460	83,769.10	690.90
Component 2	409,214	417,722.30	(8,508.30)
Component 3	31,632	21,275.00	10,357.00
PMC	47,130	49,668.60	(2,538.60)
Total	572,436	572,435	1.00

	Budget table in Prodoc	Table B in Portal	Difference
Component 1	84,460	83,769.10	690.90
Component 2	409,214	417,722.30	(8,508.30)
Component 3	31,632	21,275.00	10,357.00
PMC	47,130	49,668.60	(2,538.60)
Total	572,436	572,435	1.00

2. Please revise the Expected Implementation Start date which already past now.

8/11/2021

Please see comments above on question 19 regarding the project budget and how project managements costs are presented. Please make the appropriate revisions and resubmit.

8/18/2021

The issues raised in question 19 above and the way PMC are presented has not been addressed yet. Please revise the presentation of PMC as requested.

10/22/2021

All issues have been addressed. MSP is recommended for CEO approval.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/26/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/10/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/31/2021	

**1SMSP CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/22/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The objective of the project is to safeguard the biodiversity of Isla del Coco National Park by enhancing biosecurity and preparing for a series of invasive mammal eradications. The project has three main outcomes:

Outcome 1: A comprehensive IAS prevention system for Isla del Coco National Park (203,483 ha), based on development and implementation of biosecurity protocols reducing risks of IAS introductions and establishment.

Outcome 2: Approved operational plan and ESIA for the eradication of invasive deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), pigs (*Sus scrofa*), rats (*Rattus rattus*, *R. norvegicus*) and cats (*Felis catus*) setting the stage for follow-up phases of ecosystem restoration.

Outcome 3: Sustainability and knowledge are enhanced through capture of lessons learned, monitoring and evaluation

The project will contribute to improve the sustainability and protect the biodiversity of PNIC (2,330 terrestrial ha, 201,153 ha marine). It will reduce pressures and extinction risks facing a number of globally significant island-endemic species, though the most significant improvements in this regard will depend on the implementation of the Operating Plan and series of targeted eradications for which the project lays the groundwork in important ways. The park's management effectiveness will be increased due to enhanced capacities to prevent the introduction of IAS and to undertake eradications. The comprehensive IAS prevention system being supported under Component 1 will help to prevent IAS introductions from the only pathway, i.e. vessels, which would potentially affect both marine and terrestrial areas of the park.

As of 24th October 2020, Costa Rica has had over 100,000 confirmed cases of COVID-19. At the time of writing, it appears possible that Coronavirus-related travel restrictions will continue into 2021. Operations may need to be postponed, delaying project but not impacting its expected results. No full-time hires are envisaged for the project; thus, the expense associated with keeping staff employed for longer periods due to delayed implementation will be avoided.

