

Beyond 30x30: Securing resilience in the Eastern Tropical Pacific through enhanced transboundary cooperation

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11267

Countries

Regional (Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Panama)

Project Name

Beyond 30x30: Securing resilience in the Eastern Tropical Pacific through enhanced transboundary cooperation

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/11/2023

Program Manager

Andrew Hume

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes, but please address the following:

1) Executing Partner: Please spell out CMAR's name and remove the rest of the text as it is redundant.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

Changed. See page 4. Acronyms have been checked.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes but please note the comments below on reducing the length of the project objective.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

a) Changed. See page 4, p. 23; p.50.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Partly:

a) The project objective is very long. Please revise to be more concise.

b.1) In the portal, the project Component/Outcome/Output table from the GEF8 PIF template (the old Table B) is missing. Please revise the propose to include this table.

b.2) The proposed activities and the \$50m of cofinancing is more appropriate for a \$7-10 million IW project. To justify the proposed amount, the project?s cofinancing will need to be increased considerably (especially with real investments mobilized), and/or also seeking GEF funding from country STAR. At least \$118 million was pledged at Our Oceans in Panama to supporting CMAR over the next four years from over a dozen organizations that do not include the four national government.

b.3) The four country ministers have supported a nine-point action plan presented at Our Oceans in Panama, that includes establishing a CMAR treaty. Additionally, the PACA LME project aims to have a SAP ministerial endorsed. Please explain why this project does not aspire to this level of ambition.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

a) Addressed

b1) Addressed

b2) Not addressed. The cofinancing is still too low for the requested amount of GEF IW funding. Please adjust the amount of GEF resources.

b3) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG it is expected that additional clarity on project's ambition is discussed with all key stakeholders, including the noted institutions beyond the Ministries of Environment that are part of CMAR.

May 15, 2023 (ahume):

b2) Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023

b2) GEF resources requested have been reduced from \$20M to \$16M. Numbers have been adjusted in portal.

b3) Project will be discussed with all key stakeholders during the PPG phase.

5/10/2023

a) Changed. See page 4, p. 23; p.50.

b.1) Uploaded to the portal

b2). Added new cofinancing from Panam?, Ecuador and IDB. Currently working on confirming new cofinancing from Wyss Foundation, US Gov, UK Gov and CAF.

b3) According to what the countries agreed at the Our Oceans conference, the project will work with CMAR to have a transboundary agreement as ambitious as possible. However, the project cannot directly commit to a CMAR treaty given that this is a decision of the four governments and the decision will involve institutions beyond the Ministries of Environment that are part of CMAR. The project will facilitate the discussions and ensure a CMAR legally binding mechanism is discussed as part of CMAR evolution, in line of what was mandated by the Ministers of Environment in their high-level meeting in March 1st, Panama City. Regarding the PACA LME project, the fact that it is aiming to produce a SAP calls for this project to not repeat the effort. Coordination with the PACA LME project has been established so that this project is able to incorporate SAP priorities into its actions.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Partly. Gender, KM, and M&E are included within the project components and funded appropriately. However, the M&E outputs and outcomes should be moved into the M&E Component.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

The following are now under the M&E Component:

- Outcome 4.1 with Indicator 4.1.a and Target 4.1.a assigned as Outcome 5.1 - Indicator 5.1.a and Target 5.1.a
- Output 4.1.1 with Indicator 4.1.1 and Target 4.1.1 assigned as Outcome 5.1.1 with Indicator 5.1.1 and Target 5.1.1

The numbering of the Outcome and Outputs under Component 4 has been revised. Lastly, midterm and terminal evaluations were also added as Outputs under the M&E component.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): The overall GEF IW funding request is too high given the level of cofinancing proposed. Please either decrease the GEF IW funding proportion or increase the cofinancing. Also consider the inclusion of country STAR to replace a decrease in available IW funding. Please also note the following:

- a) Component 2 is proportionally the most funding but it is unclear why so much is necessary for developing plans and tools. There is no information to explain what types of interventions under Output 2.2.2 are being proposed. Moreover, there is hardly any description of any of the proposed outputs. Lastly, the M&E outputs and outcomes should be moved into the M&E Component.
- b) Yes, the proportions for total project and PMC are all 1:2.78.
- c) Yes, the PMC is at or below the 5% threshold.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

- a) Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

- a. Additional description to all components has been included and stresses the implementation of plans and tools and provides examples of which interventions may be taken in 2.2.2. (see pages 24-27). It is unclear which outputs and outcomes should be moved to the M&E section.
- b. No action required.
- c. No action required.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments
April 12, 2023 (ahume):

- a) Yes the current situation is well described from a systems perspective
- b) Yes, barriers and enablers are identified

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments
April 12, 2023 (ahume):

Yes, the justification for the project approach is well described. Resilience to future changes is discussed. The description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing and previous investments, lessons and experiences is also sound. Relevant stakeholders are discussed though not well reflected in terms of project cofinancing.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume):

A concise theory of change is included though it needs improvement. Please address the following:

- 1) As presented now, the blue economy component is only related to national economic issues. What about regional blue economy coordination? The current Theory of Change logic with linear barriers aligned to specific components misses much of the rationale/importance of supporting countries with transboundary cooperation. Please revise the ToC to show a more integrated project design that improves the justification for a regional project funded by IW.
- 2) Please provide evidence to defend the assumption that the fisheries and tourism sectors are open to adopt blue economy principles proposed by this project. What baseline activities suggest these sectors are amenable to this at national and regional levels?
- 3) As noted elsewhere in the review, the M&E outputs and outcomes should be moved into the M&E Component.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG is it expected the Theory of Change will be considerably improved based on stakeholder feedback to project design and testing of assumptions.

2) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG is it expected that both fisheries and tourism sectors are directly engaged at the national and regional level so that the project leverages their baselines (including cofinancing) and addresses their specific needs to participate in a sustainable blue economy.

3) Addressed.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023

CI-GEF acknowledges these comments and confirms that it will be addressed during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

1) The revised theory of change focuses on the integration/contribution of each of the project components to address the barriers and achieve the desired outcomes to highlight regionality. These changes are reflected both in the TOC diagram as well as in the text explanation. See pages 22 and 23.

2) CMAR, through its regional thematic working groups in tourism and fisheries, will address this in fair detail once activity of these groups is fully resumed.? Both user groups were added per direct recommendation and after direct approval of CMAR and all four countries.

3) The TOC has been revised to reflect the M&E outputs and outcomes under the M&E component.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Partly. The incremental cost reasoning is sufficient but the underlying baseline efforts are not reflected as part of the project cofinancing and some cofinancing partners are not specifically reflected in the ICR. Please see cofinancing comments about the need to capture the broader partner cofinancing efforts for the ETP and update the ICR accordingly.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG it is expected that the project baseline is significantly refined to reflect the specific project partners and additional cofinancing is secured.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023 CI-GEF confirms that the project baseline will be refined during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

Currently working on confirming new cofinancing from Wyss Foundation, US Gov, UK Gov and CAF.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume):

- a) Yes, the role of CMAR as the proposed executing agency is sound.
- b) N/A
- c) While there is some information on key initiatives like the PACA LME, other key actors that, including many key donor organizations that have recently announced plans of support are missing. This is reflected in the low cofinancing that is commented elsewhere in the review.
- d) Yes, KM and strategic communication are described. However, please consult with IW:LEARN to understand what is expected of IW projects and revise proposal accordingly.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

- c) As noted above, this is considered addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG it is expected that the project baseline is significantly refined to reflect the specific project partners and additional cofinancing is secured.
- d) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG please work closer with IWLEARN to include expected activities and identify specific areas of collaboration are integrated into the project. CI has multiple GEF IW projects that currently participate in IWLEARN.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023 CI-GEF acknowledges this comment and confirms that it will be addressed during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

a) No action required.

b) No action required.

c) Information on USG investment, Enduring Earth/Connect to Protect, CAF, IADB and WildAid investments have been included. See Table 1 pages 15, 16, and 17.

d) An email to IW:Learn requesting a chat to learn more about their program was sent but no response was received. Text has been revised to strengthen the project's use of IW:Learn knowledge and contributions to the portal and program. See Component 4, pgs. 27-28, 37-38, and 41.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): No. Please note the following.

1) Indicator 2.2. Please consider listing the name of the PAs, WDPA ID, IUCN Category of the PAs covered, as available. Otherwise, please include them at the CEO endorsement as they are mandatory.

2) Indicator 11. Please ensure the beneficiaries captured are only Direct beneficiaries. Please discard any indirect beneficiaries these as they should not be captured under this indicator as per the indicator's definition available in pages 24-25 of the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework guidelines.

3) In the Portal submission, the project proposes alignment with Core Indicators 2.2: 31,250,000 ha of marine protected areas under improved management effectiveness; and Core Indicator Indicator 11: 200,000 people (60,000 female and 140,000 male) benefiting from GEF-financed investments. The methodology refers to also alignment with Core Indicator 7 but it is not included in the Core Indicator table. Further, given the specific focus on supporting fisheries, please explain why no Core Indicator 8 is not completed? Please include the full table so the Core Indicators can properly be assessed.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

3) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG please work with fisheries stakeholders at the national and regional level for Core Indicator 8. Also during PPG please present a significantly improved methodology for Core Indicator 11.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023 CI-GEF confirms that methodologies for Core Indicator 8 and 11 will be refined during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

- 1) See revised Table 3 on page 23 and reference to this table has been included in Component 2 page 25 and in the Core Indicator Table 4, pgs. 30-37. Georeferenced coordinates for each MPA have been included in Annex C.
- 2) Indicator 11 has been changed to 150,000 direct beneficiaries. This change has been made on pages 4, 22, in Table 4: Core Indicator, and p. 38.
- 3) The full GEF Core Indicator table has been included (see Table 4). Contributions to subindicator 7 and its subindicators at PIF have been included. No contribution to component 8 has been included, however, an explanation for this has been included in the section titled: Methodological Approach and Underlying Logic to Justify Target Levels for Core and Sub-Indicators along with an explanation of other Core Indicator contributions. (see pgs. 37-38).

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**
- b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): No, the risks are poorly presented. Please update the table with actual risks specific to the project, not just listing general concerns. Also note the following:

- a) The presented climate risks are weak and include non-climate natural hazards like earthquakes. Given that the project is proposing to develop climate plans, this risk should be better articulated. What about the impacts of ocean warming on fish migrations, or acidification, or possible changes to currents?
- b) Please provide an agency response to the following question and reflect the answer into the risk table. Question: Are there key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases?
- c) No, the only environmental and social risk provided is covid. Please give more thought to this section.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

a) Addressed

b) Addressed. The Agency has replied as follows: "The biggest risk to project preparation and implementation revolves around a potential inability of the four governments to agree on and empower CMAR with the organizational mandate required to be a GEF Executing Agency. This risk seems unlikely given consultations and updates provided by GEF Country Focal Points during PIF development and resent statements by the four countries at the Our Oceans conference in Panama in March 2023."

c) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG it is expected that further thought is given to mitigating the presented and other Environmental and Social risks as reflected in safeguards assessments and integrated into the project's design.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023 CI-GEF acknowledges this comment and confirms that it will be addressed during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

a) The risks in Table 5 (pgs 38-40) have been edited to better reflect any direct impact on the project. The overall risk rating has been reduced from ?Moderate? to ?Low?.

b) An agency response to the question, ?Are there key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases?? is included on page 38 in the introduction to Table 5.

c) Environmental and Social risks outline in Table 5 have been revised to focus on ?Negative impacts on indigenous people or other marginalized groups? and ?Negative impacts on women including additional work and/or physical activities?.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Partly. Please address the following

a) Please note earlier comments about the project's role in supporting countries meet their goal stated at Panama 2023 Our Ocean on establishing a regional ETP treaty. Please also discuss here how the project will ensure durability with the PACA LME TDA-SAP and the cofinancing from Enduring Earth.

b) The innovation section is generic. Please provide a more thoughtful response, such as highlighting innovation in the sustainable long-term financing, potential sustainable blue economy activities, and/or what the 11 interventions under Component 2 might entail.

c) Please revise Table 5 (National laws relevant to this project) to make it easier to understand by grouping by country.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

a) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG it is expected that additional clarity on project's ambition is discussed with all key stakeholders, especially including the noted institutions beyond the Ministries of Environment that are part of CMAR.

b) Addressed

c) Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023 CI-GEF confirms that project ambition will be discussed with all key stakeholders during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

a) According to what the countries agreed at the Our Oceans conference. The project will work with CMAR to have a transboundary agreement as ambitious as possible, however the project cannot commit to a CMAR treaty given that this is a decision of the four governments and the decision will involve institutions beyond the Ministries of Environment that are part of CMAR. The project will facilitate the discussions and ensure a CMAR legally binding mechanism is also discussed as part of CMAR involvement, in line of what was mandated by the Ministers in their high level meeting on March 1st, Panama City.

Clarifying text on the TDA/SAP is included on p. 17. Reference to Enduring Earth/Connect to Protect has been included in Table 1, p. 15.

b) The section on transformative and innovation aspects of the project (see pgs. 29 and 30).

c) Table 5 is now Table 2 as GEF word limits do not allow for its inclusion in section C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming strategies and country/regional priorities. And can be found on pgs. 17-19. Laws are now grouped by country.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Partly. As discussed in the Theory of Change comment, please revise the proposal to better present all the components as supporting the four countries with transboundary cooperation. Please also strengthen the evidence base to show the fisheries and tourism sectors in all four countries are willing to engage in the proposed project.

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

a) Addressed for PIF stage, but as noted elsewhere in review, it is expected during PPG that the transboundary rationale is strengthened further and the specific baselines (and cofinancing) of the fisheries and tourism sectors are improved based on stakeholder engagement.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023

CI-GEF acknowledges this comment and confirms that it will be addressed during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

The theory of change and component description has been modified to better reflect support for the four countries and transboundary cooperation. (see Project Description, pgs. 21-28. Text indicating that broader stakeholder engagement?including with the fisheries and tourism sectors will occur during the PPG phase has been added on page 42 under Stakeholder Engagement.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): See above comment.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes, the project identifies supporting 30x30 and references to GBF Target 3. However, please ensure this is presented in Table 5 on national priorities, as appropriate, as national level ambitions. Please include each countries alignment with Target 3.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

Table 5 is now Table 2 (pgs. 17-19) as GEF word limits do not allow for its inclusion in section C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming strategies and country/regional priorities. Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3 Contribution as of April 2023 have been included for each country.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): No.

1) The Agency states that it has consulted civil society organization, then highlights due to limited time that it was unable to engage these stakeholders in PIF design. As the PIF prompt states, please provide a list of names and dates of consultations. Please also elaborate further on activities to consult/engage these stakeholders as part of the development of the CEO endorsement and the stakeholder engagement plan.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed, though it is titled Table 6 in the PIF.

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

Please see Table 7: Summary of stakeholder meetings leading to PIF submission, pgs. 42-44.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A. Currently presented as only IW funding though encouraged to seek STAR.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Please see comments above on proposed amount of IW funding being requested.

May 15, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments 5/15/2023 IW funding reduced to \$16M
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments
8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes

Agency's Comments
8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments
April 12, 2023 (ahume): In addition the above cofinancing comments, including the low level relative to the requested GEF IW resources, please address the following:

1) Enduring Earth is noted as a cofinancing partner but this is a GEF project and cannot count as cofinancing

2) Only Colombia is providing cofinancing. Why are the other participating countries not providing cofinancing?

May 11, 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed for PIF stage, but during PPG it is expected that significant additional cofinancing will be secured.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023

CI-GEF acknowledges this comment and confirms that it will be addressed during the PPG phase

5/10/2023

1) Enduring Earth assured the resources compromised to the project are not related to GEF.

2) We are currently working on assuring cofinancing from other countries.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?s(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes the OFPs have endorsed the project for the proposed amount, which may need to be adjusted if additional cofinancing cannot be secured.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Currently in Colombia's LoE, CMAR is presented as the institution that would prepare the project, but not as the executing partner (see below) ? however, in Portal CMAR is presented as the executing partner. Instead of requesting a new LoE, please request an email from the OFP's office in which they support CMAR as the (potential) executing partner ? please upload such email in the documents' section in Portal. All OFP letters may need to be adjusted if additional cofinancing cannot be secured. Lastly, please also combine all letters into a single file and upload (as the above prompt states).

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed, though the letter is in Spanish.

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

Answer from Colombia attached.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes, though the amounts may need to be adjusted per the above comments

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Please be sure OFP letters reflect the correct amount of requested GEF resources if changes are made.

May 15, 2023 (ahume): Addressed for technical clearance. GEF Agency (CI) commits to securing revised LOEs before GEF Council approval.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023

All four countries have submitted LOEs with the initial amount ? USD 20M. CI will work to obtain the updated LOEs before the project before it is Council approved and start PPG phase.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Partly, please include the coordinates for the specific MPAs where the proposed interventions will take place.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

Received and included in Annex C.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): Please tick the appropriate Level 1 boxes where subsequent level boxes are ticked.

Please also tick Level 3 & 4 fisheries and Level 4 tourism boxes, as well as appropriate biomes.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): Addressed

Agency's Comments

5/10/2023

A revised table has been inserted on pgs. 54-56.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments April 12, 2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

April 12, 2023 (ahume): No. Please address the above comments and resubmit.

May 11, 2023 (ahume): No. The cofinancing is still too low for the requested amount of GEF IW funding. Please adjust the amount of GEF resources and resubmit.

May 15, 2023 (ahume): Yes. The PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance. Please be sure to address the above comments identified during PPG phase.

Agency's Comments

5/15/2023

The project amount requested has been adjusted to \$16M. Additional co-financing is expected to be identified at PPG phase.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

May 15, 2023 (ahume): Please take note of GEF comments included in this review to be addressed during PPG. These include but may not be limited to the following:

- Please continue to seek additional cofinancing.
- Please provide additional clarity on project's ambition is discussed with all key stakeholders, including the noted institutions beyond the Ministries of Environment that are part of CMAR.
- Please improve the project theory of change based on stakeholder feedback to project design and testing of assumptions.
- Please ensure that fisheries and tourism sectors are directly engaged at the national and regional level so that the project leverages their baselines (including cofinancing) and addresses their specific needs to participate in a sustainable blue economy.
- Please significantly improve the project baseline to reflect the specific project partners and additional cofinancing is secured.
- Please ensure the project works closer with IWLEARN to include expected activities and identify specific areas of collaboration are integrated into the project . CI has multiple GEF IW projects that currently participate in IWLEARN.
- Please be sure to work with fisheries stakeholders at the national and regional level for Core Indicator 8. Also during PPG please present a significantly improved methodology for Core Indicator 11.
- Please give further thought to mitigating the presented and other Environmental and Social risks as reflected in safeguards assessments and integrated into the project's design.

- Please ensure the transboundary rationale is strengthened further and the specific baselines (and cofinancing) of the fisheries and tourism sectors are improved based on stakeholder engagement.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/26/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		