

Enhancing jaguar corridors and strongholds through improved management and threat reduction

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10241

Countries

Belize

Project Name

Enhancing jaguar corridors and strongholds through improved management and threat reduction

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/8/2020

Review completed by PM

3/16/2021

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF □
CEO Endorsement □

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: The proposed project is well aligned with the BD Focal Area strategy.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. 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 3-15-21 AM: Proposed project design is technically sound. PMC costs are adequate.

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 N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected 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, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-9-20: The levels of co-financing are satisfactory. The letters of co-financing indicated in Table C need to be attached for review.

3-18-21 AM: Co-financing levels remain satisfactory and co-financing letters are attached. Please revise the following comments:

- Government co-financing, as stated in the letter from Ministry of Fisheries, Forestry, the Environment and Sustainable Development is 'in-kind', and not partly grant as entered in table C.
- Co-financing letter from University of Belize Environmental Research Institute (ERI) indicates that the US\$300k co-financing is 'in-kind', and not grant as indicated in table C.
-
- 3-30-21 AM: Thanks for the response. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP Response to GEF Sec comments from 3-18-21 (03/24/21)

Table C in the CEO ER and Table 3 in the ProDoc (page 38) have been adjusted accordingly

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Yes, proposed financing is adequate.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: PPG utilization status is reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: The proposed indicators are technically sound and adequate.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a 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 3-15-21 AM: Project has a robust Theory of Change with clear identification of causal impact, baseline and barrier types.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Project identification of baseline is satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 3-15-21 AM: Project design is technically sound with adequate description of components and proposed outcomes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Project is well aligned with BD focal area strategy and GWP framework.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Incremental analysis is technically sound.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: GEBs and adaptation benefits are well described.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Project includes innovative solutions and good potential for scaling up.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: Maps and coordinates are satisfactory.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Project is well aligned with GWP Framework.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: Stakeholder analysis and engagement plan is technically sound.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: Yes, gender analysis and Gender action plan were developed and proposal includes gender-responsive activities and gender sensitive indicators.

Agency Response

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

??3-15-21 AM: Yes, the private sector identified as an important stakeholder and the proposed engagement strategy is adequate.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

, ??3-15-21 AM: Yes, the risk analysis is technically sound and includes realistic mitigation measures.

Agency Response

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

??3-15-21 AM: Yes, institutional arrangements are well described with clear definition of roles and responsibilities among agencies and partners.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

??3-15-21 AM: Project is fully aligned with national priorities.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: Yes, proposal presents technically sound knowledge management plan.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: Yes, proposed M&E plan is adequate.

Agency Response

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

3-15-21 AM: GEBs and adaptation benefits are well described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-15-21 AM: Required annexes are attached and budget is consistent with project design and proposed activities. Audit checklist is satisfactory.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Proposed project results framework is adequate.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3-22-21 AM: Project is technically sound. Please, address the minor comments above on co-financing table and resubmit. Thanks!

3-30-21 AM: Project is cleared and recommended for endorsement.

Agency Response

UNDP Response to GEF Sec comments from 3-18-21 (03/24/21)

Table C in the CEO ER and Table 3 in the ProDoc (page 38) have been adjusted accordingly

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Status of PPG utilization presented in Annex C is satisfactory.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3-15-21 AM: Maps and coordinates are satisfactory.

Agency Response
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?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
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.

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project. Thanks!

3-22-21 AM: Project is technically sound. Please, address the minor comments above on co-financing table and resubmit. Thanks!

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations