



Expanding blue economy benefits and the conservation of critical biodiversity and ecosystem services by managing surf ecosystems

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10931

Countries

Regional (Costa Rica, Peru, Panama)

Project Name

Expanding blue economy benefits and the conservation of critical biodiversity and ecosystem services by managing surf ecosystems

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

2/14/2023

Review completed by PM

11/30/2023

Program Manager

Steffen Hansen

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part 1 ? 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

3/3/2023 (ahume): No.

1) The justification for IW-1.2 on sustainable fisheries management is weak. The proposed activity (Output 2.2.1) supporting fisheries is tangential to improved fisheries management and much more focused on blue economy under IW 1.1. It is also highly unlikely that the allocation to this IW 1.2 in Table A (\$680,000) represents nearly all the funding listed for Project Component 2 (\$685,318). Given fisheries is only identified in Output 2.2.1, this would suggest that the total allocation to all other activities in Component 2 is \$5,318. Please see the below comments in this review and either greatly strengthen the role of sustainable fisheries management in this project or realign the project to only IW-1.1.

2) Please also update the country list in Part 1 of CER and the list of countries in the Portal to include Panama.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) We agree that the project is focused on strengthening surf ecosystem management and the blue economy with fisheries being just one element of the blue economy. As a result, we have removed IW 1.2. on sustainable fisheries from Table A.

2) Section updated with the kind support of the Portal IT team.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Please take note of the following:

1) Component 1 title notes only Peru and Costa Rica, but Output 1.1.1 notes activities in Panama too. Please correct this inconsistency

2) Why is Output 1.1.2 not also happening in Panama? And is Panama part of Output 1.1.5, and if no, why not?

3) On Component 2, how is the blue economic activities here different than what CR and Peru are already doing at a national level?

4) Outcome 3.1 in the Work Program annex mentions Chile which is not part of the project.

5) The activities listed in the Work Plan under Output 3.2.2 are not aligned with the required activities under IW:LEARN. Please see below comment on KM.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

3) Addressed

4) Addressed

5) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) The project only has sufficient budget to conduct in-field management and blue economy work in Costa Rica and Peru; however, it will set the foundation for surf ecosystem management in Panama by conducting foundational assessments that are part of the standard procedure by CI and our partners when preparing to support surf ecosystem management. These include: a Surf Conservation Index for Panama to identify the overlap between biodiversity/priority ecosystems and surf breaks, a legal assessment to understand the legal options for surf ecosystem management.

See section "Geographic scope" for an updated explanation of the distinction of the project intervention in Costa Rica and Peru, versus in Panama.

2) Output 1.1.2 is gender responsive awareness programs to advocate for the effective protection of surf ecosystems. This is to support field management action in Costa Rica and Peru. This is not being done in Panama because we do not have sufficient budget to do field work in Panama. This could be pursued in a subsequent phase in Panama, but the budget for this project is only sufficient for us to do field interventions in Costa Rica and Peru.

Output 1.1.5. is also not included in Panama for the same reasons as described above. This Output is intended to support financing for field conservation action and the budget is only sufficient to do so in Costa Rica and Peru. See section "Project description summary

3) Clarification on how the project will contribute to the blue economy in the context of national blue economic activities already in place and supported by the governments has been provided under section - The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components ? please see section "Component 2?".

4) Mentions of Chile have been removed throughout the document and in Outcome 3.1

5) The GEF IW:LEARN required activities have been added into the project narrative under section -The proposed alternative scenario, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components ? please see section "Component 3 and 4?".

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): 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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Please address the following:

1) The total project cofinancing at CER is \$6.9m, which is less than the \$9.2m proposed at PIF. Given that there are other comments in this review requesting improvement on baseline, stronger connection to national blue economy efforts, and private sector engagement, and more, it is strongly encouraged that additional cofinancing is secured as proposed in the approved PIF.

2) The portal is missing letters of cofinancing from:

- o Servicio Nacional de Areas Protegidas de Peru
- o Municipalidad Distrital de Huanchacho, Peru
- o Ministerio de Medio Ambiente de Peru
- o Direccion regional de Recursos Naturales del Gobierno Rengional de la Libertad de Peru
- o The Nature Conservancy
- o Ministry of Environment of Panama

3) While trivial, the cofinancing stated for SINAC in the Portal is \$1 off from the cofinancing letter.

4) In Table C, for CI and SPDA, please revise the "recurrent expenditure" to "investment mobilized".

5) For Costa Rica Ministerio de Ambiente y Energia - please provide the co-financing letter in English.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Agency response says cofinancing table has been update but the cofinancing appears unchanged at \$6.9 million in uploaded documents. Further, the cofinancing Table C in Portal CEO Endorsement shows \$4.6 million. Please correct this so that all documents are consistent. Please continue to secure additional cofinancing while project is further revised.

13 Oct (shansen): Not addressed. While cofinancing has been updated, please also ensure that there is alignment between the portal table C and text in the "describe how any "investment mobilized" was identified? section. Per previous guidance, please work to ensure additional co-financing during project implementation, including from gov. of Panama.

•Nov 29, 2023 (shansen):
Addressed.

2) Not all above mentioned cofinancing letters have been included. Please secure and upload ALL cofinancing letters before resubmitting.

13 Oct (shansen):
Addressed.

3) Addressed

4) Partly addressed. The letter of co-financing support from conservation international foundation indicates ?cash? not in-kind. Please revise accordingly and revise ?recurrent expenditures? to ?investment mobilized?.

13 Oct (shansen):

Partly addressed. Please:

- Replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for 386,628.

- Replace ?GEF Agency? to ?Donor Agency? for 386,628.

•- Replace ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures? for 341,218.

•

•Nov 29, 2023 (shansen):

•

•Addressed.

•

•5) For those letters not in English, please consider including an English translation of the letter of co-financing.

13 Oct (shansen):

Addressed.

Agency Response

5/18/2023

- 1) The table has been updated since the last submission. Efforts will be made to mobilize additional sources of co-financing during project implementation and will be reported in the yearly PIR.
- 2) The letters from the Ministry of Panama and Ministry of Peru are in the process of being signed and are anticipated any moment. As soon as we have them, we will upload them to the Portal.
- 3) Amount adjusted
- 4) Recurrent expenditures revised as requested
- 5) A translated version of the letter has been produced and is uploaded to the portal. This is in the co-finance folder.

7/20/2023

- 1) Co-financing has been updated in the document
- 2) The missing co-financing letters are Included and uploaded. Please note that there are duplications of some of the letters, due to the difficulties experienced with the uploads in the GEF Portal and inability to delete them with our user account. The GEF Portal IT team can delete the duplicated letters.
- 3) n/a
- 4) Conservation International co-financing letter is updated and included
- 5) Translations have been included

28/11/2023

1) co-financing has been updated so that there is alignment between Table C and text. All co-financing letters so far secured amount to a total of US\$ 3,786,575.77. The description of how any investment is mobilised includes a narrative on the overall mobilization of co-financing which includes investment mobilised from UNIDO amounting to US\$ 53000 and the remaining co-financing is recurrent expenditures.

4) The letter of co-financing from Conservation International foundation is updated as "Recurrent expenditures" from "donor agency" amounting to US\$ 386,628. The letter of co-financing from SPDA amounting to US\$ 341,218 is updated to being 'recurrent expenditures'

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 3/3/2023 (ahume): Yes.

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 3/3/2023 (ahume): Yes.

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
3/3/2023 (ahume): See the following:

- 1) The project claims to be supporting sustainable fisheries yet no data is provided for Core Indicator 8 related to fisheries. Either alignment with IW 1.2 on fisheries should be removed or the project needs to document the amount of fisheries moved to more sustainable levels.
- 2) The projects claims improved management of 36,550.70 ha of the Illescas Protected Area. Please explain the rationale, including identification of the specific project Output and Activities, that will directly improve management of a terrestrial protected area.
- 3) While it's helpful to identify the MPA METT score for protected areas, as an IW project and not part of BD nor CBD COP related activities or not overtly supporting the national government with implementation of an NBSAP, it is not recommended to track METT scores in this project.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

- 1) Addressed

2) Addressed

3) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) As per our response on comment 1. a) above where we removed the project's link to Focal Area Outcomes IW 1.2 (Strengthen blue economy opportunities through catalyzing sustainable fisheries management) the Project Core Indicator 8 related to globally over-exploited marine fisheries remains with no specific data and will not be monitored in this project.

2) Clarifications on the geographical scope of the intervention and the rationale behind the inclusion of the whole surface area of the Illescas National Reserve was included in the CEO document. Additional explanation are located under the section and subsections: Part II / Geographic scope / Peru

3) We have removed the METT scores from the narrative.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Yes.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. The majority of baseline projects listed are GEF funding, including projects that have since ended. Baseline in the GEF context refers to the specific initiatives that will be underway during the life of the project that this GEF project's funding will be building on top of. These baseline initiatives, thus, comprise the cofinancing identified by the project. Please revise the description of the baseline for only the relevant initiatives that are a) current/planned during the project duration, and b) are part of the project cofinancing. GEF projects cannot be counted as cofinancing and should be presented as either context and/or as initiatives this project will coordinate with.

Further, given the importance of blue economy in this project, the baseline also fails to present the national baseline efforts for national blue economic development in all three countries. Each of the countries has already started national blue economy strategies. How is this project integrating its efforts into these at a national and regionally across all three countries? Please revise to address these key issues.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) Table of associated baseline projects (relevant initiatives that are current/planned during the project duration and/or part of project co-financing) has been added to the CEO, Table 2.1: Ongoing baseline projects

2) See section 2: The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects, for additional text clarifying the status of efforts in the three countries in relation to the current development of blue economy strategies or action plans.

Currently, while each country has policies (see added text mentioned above) that relate to sectors of the blue economy (e.g., fisheries, maritime transport, tourism, etc.) none of the countries possess formal strategies. While surfing is an important economic activity for the project countries, it is not part of a deliberate blue economy strategy. This project is thus extremely relevant in developing a proof of concept around the surf sector and surf ecosystem as a means to generate specific management and protection measures for the ecosystems that provide these economic ?services?.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. Please address/respond to the following:

1) Output 1.1.2 on Gender does not actually describe anything related to gender nor does it seem to be at all informed by a gender analysis and the recommendations from that. What problem and/or barrier is this proposed activity trying to address?

2) For Output 2.2.1 ? This activity proposes to engagement of artisanal fishers, who will be supported to adopt sustainable fishing practices in the pilot sites that will help expand markets

for their catch with among local businesses related to the surf economy. It is unclear what exactly this activity is trying to address with respect to the project barriers that are identified in the Theory of Change. Are there unsustainable fishing practices in the project sites? How does expanding market access for fishermen relate to the project's Theory of Change?

3) Outcome 3.1 proposes global best practices are shared. Why are these only being shared with the three project countries and not made available online for global dissemination?

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed. Text in Output 1.1.2 has been updated to clarify what will be done to ensure that the awareness raising programs are gender responsive

2) Addressed. Additional justification added to narrative.

3) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) Output 1.1.2 is not a gender output but instead an awareness raising activity that will be designed to be gender responsive. This output addresses the challenge of a lack of awareness of the environmental and economic benefits that surf breaks provide. The project has sought to mainstream gender throughout its activities, therefore, awareness raising programs must be gender-responsive. Text has been added to the description of Output 1.1.2 to clarify what will be done to ensure that the awareness raising programs are gender responsive.

2) See under subsection "Output 2.2.1" for additional text that clarifies how this activity aligns to the project's theory of change and what current barriers this will address.

3) See sections "Outcome 3.1" and "Output 3.1.2" for adjusted descriptions to include wider dissemination of lessons through online tools and platforms.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. Please take note of the following:

1) As also noted during PIF review, the project's design is still weak on alignment with regional or multicountry cooperation on marine resources. It would be beneficial to strengthen

opportunities for cross-learning, policy coherence, and cooperation among the three countries to make it more in line with GEF IW projects.

2) There should also be better integration of the local blue economy activities proposed by the project into the larger national blue economy efforts in all three countries. See specific comments on this point in the comments below.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) In regard to cross-learning we have integrated recommendations about including standard and required IW:Learn activities (sharing of experience notes, contribution to newsletters, and attendance and participation to IW:Learn workshop), which we believe will ensure a stronger cross-learning approach to the project and one that goes beyond the project's countries. This adds to the existing activities under Outputs 3.1.2-3.2.2 which already focus on sharing key lessons, best- practices, guidelines and knowledge from the project with participating governments and other government or interested parties through a wider used of the IW:Learn and Panorama platforms.

Regarding stronger cooperation between project countries, the project plans to support cooperation among the three countries through the mechanism provided by the execution arrangement and as well through Component 3. On the former mechanism, the Project Steering Committee will provide a high-level platform for bringing together representatives of each country which include political and technical staff of each government. As a decision-making body and given the vested responsibilities assigned to it, this should create a space where the project can encourage a tangible cooperation, ensure coordination between various government agencies and key stakeholders, maintain continuous exchange of information among PSC members, and promote policy dialogue and advocacy on issues identified in the project. Additionally, by channeling resources toward learning, training and webinars (mostly virtual), Component 3 will provide a space for representatives of each country to participate and interact with each other.

In addition, there are well-established regional bodies and initiatives in the region the project will engage with and coordinate. Added text to that effect can be found in the Stakeholder engagement section of the CEO ER document

2) See response to comment #9.b) below, as well as #2.c) and #5.b). These response point to new text added in the CEO ER document which respond to this comment.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. Please see comments above about baseline and co-financing.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) See new comments above about co-financing.

Oct 13 (shansen): See new comments above about co-financing.

•

•Nov 29, 2023 (shansen): Addressed.

Agency Response

7/20/2023

1) Co-financing has been updated in the document

2) The missing co-financing letters are Included and uploaded

3) n/a

4) Conservation International co-financing letter is updated and included

5) Translations have been included

28/11/2023

New comment above on co-financing has been addressed . please refer to 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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Yes.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Yes.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. The maps on the Portal only show the large marine ecosystems and general location of the countries. One of the maps incorrectly suggests Chile is part of the project. Other figure titles suggest additional maps were meant to be included but are missing. Please provide accurate maps that identify the specific protected areas and surf breaks that will be targeted by the project.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed.

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) New maps have been created including the correction on the insertion of Chile as project focus country and more accurate representation of potential targeted surf breaks. Maps have been updated in the CEO document as well as in Annex E.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): N/A

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. Please address the following as part of the agency response and revise the text accordingly.

1) There is no table on stakeholder engagement has been provided for Panama. Please include which stakeholders were consulted in Panama in this table.

2) It is also seems that no national government stakeholders in charge of development and implementation of national blue economy plans were consulted. Please explain why this is the case and/or highlight the national blue economy government agencies that were consulted.

3) It also appears no regional organization consultations were conducted, which is an important part of IW projects. Please explain why this is the case and/or highlight regional organizations that were consulted

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

3) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) A Stakeholder Engagement Plan for Panama was completed and a table showing the detail can be found in CEO document's section "Stakeholder Engagement during PPG Phase (as well as in Appendix # 5.

2) It should be noted that neither Costa Rica nor Peru have an official national blue economy strategy/policy or a specific/central agency/ministry in charge of leading this as mentioned in responses to comments #2.c) and 5.b) and in additional text provided on pages 28 (?Lack of

well-defined and tested tactics and practices for Blue Economy development? section), and(?Component 2" section). This said, during the engagement phases, various agencies of the Costa Rican and Peruvian government whose sphere of activities relate to blue economy were consulted and include:

- For Costa Rica: Ministry of Environment (MINAE), National Conservation Areas System (SINAC), Ministry of National Planning and Economic Policy (Mideplan).

- For Peru: Ministry of Environment, National Service of Protected Areas, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Tourism, Regional Direction of Production, and National Navy.

3) The project has engaged with the regional body, CMAR through the Government of Panama head of the Coasts and Ocean Direction at the Ministry of Environment (M. Jos? Julio) who is also the host secretariat Pro Tempore of the CMAR. The CMAR?s scope includes both Costa Rica and Panama. These consultations are captured in the Panama SEP (see response to a) above)

Engagement with other potential regional partners (CPPS or regional civil society organization/NGOs) will take place in the project implementation phase.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Partly.

1) While the project does propose a Gender Action Plan linked to a Gender Analysis with specific activities and indicators, Panama is missing from the Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan. Please update accordingly.

2) Please summarize in the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment section of the Portal the gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities (as detailed in their gender analysis/assessment conducted).

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed. Panama has been incorporated into the Gender Analysis

2) Addressed. A summary has been added to the GAP.

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) Given that there are no field activities planned for Panama, the Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan did not include Panama. However, information on the general state of gender in Panama has now been added to the Gender Analysis in order to provide gender context. As indicated throughout the ER (and in the new text in Knowledge Management), all knowledge products and knowledge-sharing activities will be gender-responsive in their design and implementation.

2) Summary uploaded to the portal - summary has also been incorporated into the Gender Action Plan. We revised the Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Partly.

There are references to the importance of the private sector, especially tourism based companies. However, no specific companies, industry platforms, or similar are identified. Only two companies are mentioned in the stakeholder table, and only in Costa Rica. Please elaborate on the engagement with specific organizations/platforms and the specific activities/role the private sector will have in the project.

Further, there was a specific mention of the World Surf League (WSL) providing cofinancing but they are not listed in the cofinancing totals in Table C nor have has a letter of cofinancing been provided. Please remove this and other inaccurate references throughout the text.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed.

Agency Response

5/18/2023

- 1) Names of some potential private sector companies that the project may work with have been added to the narrative under Component 2 on page 79 under 4. Private Sector Engagements.
- 2) CI and Save The Waves have formed a strong collaborative relationship with the World Surf League, which provided financial support for the dedication of the Playa Hermosa World Surfing Reserve. However, that grant funding will be fully expended by the time this project starts. As a result, we removed mention of co-financing from the World Surf League.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Partly. The table is generic and not useful. It seems to be mostly a copy from the project safeguards review with little thought into actual risks to the project's design/Theory of Change that could impact .

- 1) Please provide a specific column using the normal GEF risk categories of low (L), medium (M), high (H).
- 2) The mitigation measures in the table are vague. Please identify specific actions that will be taken by the PMU, PSU, government, and as possible, identifying specific project Outputs and Activities.
- 3) Given the importance of tourism to surf recreation as part of a blue economy, why is there no mention of the risk to tourism impacts due to COVID?
- 4) Please move the narrative text under the Risk Table in the portal into the table.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

All risk comments fully addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

- 1) The table resulted from multiple group discussions, and input from gender/stakeholder engagement staff. It has now been further edited for clarity and completeness, trying to ensure inclusion of key factors that relate to project design/Theory of Change: project enabling environment (pandemics, security, political will/government commitment), climate change, stakeholder participation and benefit distribution, gender equity and market conditions. The nature of the listed risks and mitigation measures and the way they are captured are consistent with the treatment of risk and mitigation measures in other approved GEF endorsement packages. The updated Risk section starts on page 79.
- 2) The analysis columns have been replaced with a risk category column as requested.
- 3) The mitigation measures have been edited and refined to be less vague.
- 4) The risks to tourism from COVID or similar events has been added to the Risk table.
- 5) All narrative moved to the table.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. Please take note of the following:

- 1) The PSC states membership from only Costa Rica and Peru. Why is Panama not a member?
- 2) It is noted that the PSC may contain members that could potentially be the recipient of subgrants from the project. How will conflicts of interest be avoid when it comes to the approval of workplans, budgets, and taking decisions on project execution?
- 3) Ten staff for a PMU is very large, especially for a GEF medium sized project. Please provide Terms of Reference for each of these positions as an annex to the project document.
- 4) Looking at the budget, it appears that the vast majority of the project activities will be completed by the PMU (CI). This is especially true for Outcome 1. Please explain why local communities, NGOs, and other groups are not involved in the execution of project activities?

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

3) Noted the PMU has been reduced to six CI staff. Please ensure the project budget (Annex E) is adjusted appropriately. Please also be sure to delete the actual TORs from the updated Appendix 1 (not just the titles from the PMU Composition list on page 7)

Oct 13 (shansen): not addressed. Please upload an updated appendix 1 and as part of which the actual TORs (not just the titles from the PMU Composition list) are deleted. Also make sure to update the page 3 "summary overview which currently lists 5 PMU staff.

Nov 27 (shansen): An updated appendix has been uploaded. Addressed.

4) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) The project will include Panama in the PSC and has made adjustments to CEO document's section "Execution Arrangements and Partners (p.85), as well as in the Terms of References (Appendix 1).

2) PSC members who will approve reports, ToRs, annual workplan and budget, and terminal evaluation and report are only the PSC's 8 voting members. The 2 subgrant recipients, i.e., SPDA and STW, are not full (i.e. voting members of the PSC), and will participate in PSC meeting as needed, mostly to discuss or provide insights on technical matters, and will do so as observers as indicated in the "Project Steering Committee" section, p.87.

3) The PMU has been reduced to 6 individuals; all are CI staff. This has been updated in the CEO ER as well as in the TORs for PMU positions which corresponds to Appendix 1.

4) Several of the local people that will be hired are contracted by the project are local people from the communities where the project will take place. Local NGOs, government, community members, community associations and other stakeholder groups will be involved in the project but these groups are primarily engaged without compensation as they are motivated to contribute to the project activities on a voluntary basis or as part of their ongoing efforts. The project is designed to avoid creating dependency on compensation for local stakeholder groups to participate in project activities.

20 July 2023

The PMU has not changed from our original submission

28/11/2023

3) Appendix 1 and related TORs has been updated. Surf Ecosystems Specialist has a percentage amount dedicated towards technical role. Please find appendix 1 in Roadmap & Documents section.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Partly. There is currently just a long list of all possible relevant conventions and other national priorities. Please revise to only identify those national priorities the project is actually supporting. For example, UNFCCC NDCs are identified but the project reports no CO2 mitigation in the Core Indicator Table and thus should be removed. Please revise to identify the actual priorities the project is directly supporting for all three countries. Please identify specific project outcomes/outputs and other evidence from the project's design

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

Agency Response

5/18/2023

The section has been updated. It starts with a list of possibly relevant conventions, which is part of the GEF template/guidance. After that, the section discusses particular relevant conventions, strategies, etc. for each country. We have identified project Outputs and Components aligned with/related to the various policies.

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): No. Address the following:

1) What is described in the KM section does not reflect what is described in Component 3. The KM section needs to be revised with specific references to what is proposed as outputs under Component 3.

2) Please also explain what is meant by the following sentence in the KM section: "The CI Project Lead currently serves as the Capacity Development and Learning lead for the Blue Nature Alliance (which is also supported with GEF IW funds)". What CI Project Lead is this referring to? Is this proposed project sharing staffing with the GEF Blue Nature Alliance?

3) Output 3.2.2 suggests it will disseminate via [IW:LEARN](#) however no additional information is provided for how. The project needs to be revised to fully participate in IW:LEARN activities, including the specific mention of allocating 1% of the project budget to IW:LEARN. Please seek the guidance from the GEF Implementing Agency on these specific activities required by all IW projects.

4) Lastly, please also indicate the budget allocated for implementing knowledge management and communication activities/products (preferably as a summary table in the KM section) and clarify when a comprehensive Communications Strategy will be developed and what its implementation timeline/budget/deliverables will be.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed

2) Addressed

3) Addressed

4) Addressed, but please be sure to fix the table margins during next round of revisions

Oct 13 2023 (shansen):

Addressed.

Agency Response

5/18/2023

1) We have added key elements from the outcome and outputs of Component 3 to the Knowledge Management section.

2) This sentence was intended just to show CI's capacity when it comes to Knowledge Management, but we can see how it is confusing. We took it out and provided a more generic statement about CI's capacity in this area.

3) A summary of how the project will participate in the IW:LEARN activities has been added to the Knowledge Management section

4) A summary table showing the budget for the knowledge management and communications activities has been added and a summary of when a comprehensive communications strategy will be developed with timeline/budget/deliverables.

7/20/2023

1) n/a

2) n/a

3) n/a

4) The margins have been adjusted

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): A ESS has been completed and uploaded to the Portal

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

3/3/2023 (ahume):

1) In Section 9 (M&E), the first sentence references tables 10 and 11 but no Table 10 is included and Table 11 is empty.

2) Table 12 PMC: The budget for this table matches exactly the amount of the PMC (\$181,818), but it includes M&E activities that are not part of PMC. Please revise this PMC Table 12 to only include PMC activities.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

- 1) Addressed, but please be sure to fix the table margins during next round of revisions
- 2) Addressed

Oct 13 2023 (shansen): Addressed.

Agency Response

5/18/2023

- 1) The sentence has been revised to refer to tables 11 and 12.
- 2) The numbering has been updated.

7/20/2023

- 1) The margins have been adjusted
- 2) n/a

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/3/2023 (ahume):

Annex A (RF): The RF table in the Portal is void of project level results. It is only a description of GEF Core Indicators. Please include the full RF table into the Portal

Annex B: (Responses to Comments); A table showing how the project has addressed comments during PPG is missing. This includes comments made by the GEF Sec at PIF that must be addressed during the PPG Phase.

Annex C (PPG): No comments

Annex D (Maps): Please see comment on maps above

Annex E (budget): The budget needs to use or follow the GEF budget template that presents the total budget, not budget separated by year. Please be sure to the amounts match between budget table and Table B. Further comments may follow in subsequent reviews once the budget is readable.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Addressed. A revised RF has been included with output level results tracking.

2) Annex B: (Responses to GEF PIF Comments); Not addressed. Please revise table to only include the GEF Comments that requested action taken during PPG phase. Please then respond to these GEF PIF comments based on how the CEO Endorsement document accounts for the comment made at PIF.

Oct 13 2023 (shansen): Not addressed. Please revise the annex B following the above guidance. Note that this entails describing how PIF stage comments has been addressed during PPG, including the reasoning behind the final selection of countries etc.

Nov 29 2023 (shansen): Not addressed. No changes made to table B, which continues to be a copy paste of the PIF stage review sheet. Please revise the table to only include the GEF Comments that requested specific action taken during PPG phase. Further, in this amended table please also provide an explanation as to how pIF stage comments specific to Chile has been dealt with during PPG.

3) Annex E (Project Budget): Not addressed. The submitted project budget table still does not use the template that could allow us to assess the reasonability of the different expenditures / activities being charged to the three sources of funds (components, M&E and PMC) ? the re no information about the detail of these expenditures / activities. Neither does it include the column of the Responsible Executing Entity. As already requested, please use correct GEF budget template (accessible in Guidelines) with complete information. Please also upload as

separate Portal document. Per the resubmission, we will re-assess and provide comments as appropriate.

Oct 13, 2023 (shansen): Not addressed. While the project budget table does use the GEF template, the level of detail does not allow us to assess the reasonability of the different expenditures / activities being charged to the three sources of funds (components, M&E and PMC) ? there is no detailed information about of these expenditures / activities. Even if the Agency explained that the detailed budget is in the documents section, the same budget needs to be included in Portal for transparency purposes. Per the resubmission, we will re-assess and provide comments as appropriate.

Nov 29 2023 (shansen): Not addressed. While a revised budget has been presented, the below comments should be addressed:

- The co-financing comment was addressed, However, with the itemized budget, we have the following observations:

A) After reading the the explanation in the comments section ?The project two (2) subgrantees, Save The Waves and Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental, will support PMC related activities and have assigned resources for staff responsible for operational and financial functions as well as office operations costs.? The item Grants / Subgrants does not make sense to (not even partially) being charged to PMC ? please revise.

B) After reading the TORs, it is unclear the need of having two positions as Project Management Director / Project Manager ? same comment for the positions Costa Rica Project Lead and Costa Rica Project Field Manager ? please revise.

C) The PMC budget cannot surpass \$1,818,182 as listed in the portal table B. Please adjust the budget along with all other relevant documents to fall within the limits of the allowable PMC. Currently the budget shows a PMC budget of \$181,819.

- Dec 12, 2023 (shansen): all comments addressed.

Agency Response

5/18/2023

- 1) RF corrected in portal.
- 2) A table showing how the project addressed comments during PPG has been introduced.
- 3) The budget has been updated to follow the GEF template.

7/20/2023

- 1) n/a

2) The margins have been adjusted in addition a separate document has been uploaded to make sure that the responses to the GEF Comments that requested action to be taken during the PPG phase are fully visible and legible. The responses indicate how the CEO Endorsement Request document has taken the comments made at the PIF stage into account.

3) The comments have been addressed both in the attached Annex E, as well as through a separate summary table that has been uploaded directly into the related Portal window, following the previously accepted and endorsed budget template formats.

28/11/2023

2) Response to GEF PIF comments is included as annex (uploaded as a separate document)

3) table Budget on how funds are executed is revised to include GEF template. please note that there is a separate budget table which reflects UNIDO output based budget which is used for reporting the GEF. the revised budget is included in the narrative (Portal) and included as a separate annex E.

22/12/2023

a) Financial resources under item grants/subgrants reassigned to component 1 so it is no longer part of PMC

Summary of the budget changes with a total budget increase of US\$ 117,011 and saving of 117,318 US\$ which means that small alignment was required:

? Moved the budget allocation for STW and SPDA from PMC to component 1 with no change in total budget

? Added 3 posts to the budget with increase of budget by 103,505 US\$

? Role of project manager increased by 13,506 US\$

? Removed staff cost of gender specialist (saving of 25,668 US\$).

? Salary benefits for Peru land use planning manager removed (saving of 12,669 US\$)

b) We have removed the Project Management Director position and made the Project Manager position a 50% time position.

The overall staffing has been reduced from 14 to 10 that will be project funded.

The Costa Rica Project Lead and Costa Rica Field Coordinator (previously titled Costa Rica Field Manager) are both essential positions with very distinct roles.

The Field Coordinator is distinct from the Project Lead in that they will focus on executing project activities in the field sites with local partners including the provincial government and local stakeholders while the Project Lead will focus on project oversight and guidance and coordination with national level stakeholders.

We have significantly reduced project staffing numbers and costs but have determined that retaining these two positions is essential to project success.

The Costa Rica Project Lead is a part time position that will lead the development and implementation of the workplan at the national and subnational level in Costa Rica and be the official point of contact with institutional stakeholders and other partners at the national level.

The Costa Rica Field Coordinator is a full-time position that will lead implementation with communities and local stakeholders in the project sites. This position will be directly responsible for successful field delivery in both project locations in Costa Rica. They will directly lead field implementation in Nosara, while collaborating with the Community Liaison/Site Coordinator to ensure successful field implementation in Playa Hermosa.

? Project management director removed (saving 78,981 US\$)

c c) PMC budget adjusted

b)

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/3/2023 (ahume): As noted above, please copy the full RF into the Portal CEO Endorsement submission.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/3/2023 (ahume): As noted in comment above, please include a table showing how the project include GEF Sec comments at PIF to be addressed during PPG.

May 31 2023 (ahume):

1) Not addressed. See above comment still requesting this table.

Oct 13, 2023 (shansen): Not addressed. See above comment specific to this point.

Nov 29, 2023 (shansen): No changes made to table B, which continues to be a copy paste of the PIF stage review sheet.

Dec 12, 2023 (shansen): Cleared.

Agency Response

7/20/2023

All remaining comments have been addressed and a table showing how the final CEO Endorsement Document incorporates the responses to the GEF Sec comments that had been made at the time of PIF clearance.

28/11/2023

please refer to agency response above. a separate document is included in the annex to show how the PIF comemnts have been addressed

12/12/2023

table B reflecting GEF comments under PIF stage that required specific action during PPG

The majority of the comments from the GEF during the PIF stage related to Chile circled around the GEF's concern about the project's lack of a transboundary element. We had stated in the PIF that there would be lesson sharing in one or two additional countries (Panama and/or Chile). As we made further progress with the budget we realized that we could be more effective within the limited amount of funding we're pursuing if we kept it to just Panama, which answered the GEF's concerns about a Transboundary element as it shares an LME with Costa Rica. Additionally, between the two CI and its partners are far more established in Panama and thus felt we could more effectively engage the government and other stakeholders there.

Additional concerns related to Chile were that it be removed from the Project Information countries? (it has been), and a number of comments regarding what needed to be done if we

were going to keep it in the project: that we upload an LoE if it was to be a project benefitting country, that we include core indicator figures for it, that we include a write up on why it was included in the project, a baseline scenario, maps, stakeholders, references to gender mainstreaming, private sector engagement ? given we have removed Chile from the project, these are no longer pertinent.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): As an MSP, no council comments were received

Agency Response n/a

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): As an MSP, no STAP comments were received

Agency Response n/a

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): No Convention Sec comments were received

Agency Response n/a

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): No other Agency comments were received

Agency Response n/a

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): No CSO comments were received

Agency Response n/a

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): The PPG has been fully utilized.

Agency Response n/a

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/3/2023 (ahume): See comments on maps above

Agency Response Addressed

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

3/3/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response

n/a

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 3/3/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response n/a

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 3/3/2023 (ahume): N/A

Agency Response n/a

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/16/2023 (ahume): No. The project is incomplete in many areas. Please address the above initial comments and resubmit so that a full project review can be conducted.

May 31 2023 (ahume): No. Please address the above comments. Please ensure the resubmission contains all the required documents to facilitate a full project review, including all cofinancing letters and correct budget template.

Oct 13, 2023 (shansen): please address comments and resubmit.

Nov 27, 2023 (shansen): The review sheet does not contain agency responses to the latest round of GEF SEC comments. Please address comments and resubmit.

Nov 29, 2023 (shansen): Please address comments and resubmit.

Dec 12, 2023 (shansen): PM recommends for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/16/2023	5/18/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/6/2023	7/20/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		11/28/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations