

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

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10931

Countries

Regional (Costa Rica, Peru)

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

3/3/2022

Review completed by PM

6/9/2022

Program Manager

Taylor Henshaw

Focal Area

International Waters

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information**Focal area elements****1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) The countries identified in the Project Information section are Chile, Costa Rica, Panama and Peru. This project will be implemented in Costa Rica in the Nicoya Gulf and Peninsula and in Peru in the Piura region and La Libertad region only, with lesson sharing with "one or two additional countries (Panama and/or Chile)". In order for the GEF to finance this project under the IW Focal Area, there must be a transboundary element. The Illescas National Reserve in Peru falls outside the Pacific Central-American Coastal LME, in which the Ostional Wildlife Shelter and Playa Hermosa-Punta Mala Wildlife Shelter sit. Please concretely explain how this project is transboundary in nature (referencing how countries will work together to put shared ecosystems under improved management for conservation and sustainable use).

(2) Because this project will be implemented in Costa Rica and Peru only (pending the transboundary in nature justification), please remove Chile and Panama from the Project Information "Countries" section.

(3) Only one LoE is present in the portal (Costa Rica). Please upload the LoE for Peru. If Chile and Panama are to be listed as benefiting countries under this project please upload respective LoEs to the portal.

(4) Conservation International is labeled "Conservation International Foundation" in the Project Information section and elsewhere in the PIF. Please confirm this is correct.

(5) The listed Programming Directions are IW-1-1 and IW-1-2, and the current GEF Amount allocated to each is equal at \$1,000,000. Please consider whether this funding allocation should be re-allocated across the two Programming Directions. The proposal seems more calibrated toward IW-1-1 than IW-1-2.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw)

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed. LOEs for Costa Rica and Peru secured and uploaded to portal. LOEs for Panama and Chile, countries which do not have on-the-ground activities under the project, to be secured in PPG phase.

(4) Addressed.

(5) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) The project will work in two LMEs: the Humboldt Current Large Marine Ecosystem (HCLME) and the Pacific Central-American Coastal LME. Pilot sites will be anchored in Costa Rica and Peru (Component 2) and lessons learned will be shared with Panama and Chile (Component 3). Initial information gathering and reporting to begin this conversation work in Panama and Chile will also be accomplished (Component 1). Engagements and exchanges will occur under Component 3 that will enhance the shared management of the two LMEs.

(2) The project will be implemented in all four countries.

(3) Letter for Peru uploaded.

(4) Conservation International Foundation is the legal name of the organization. CI is the acronym and thus, sometimes Conservation International is used in shortened form.

(5) The funding allocation has been reassessed and redistributed. It will be further assessed during the PPG phase.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. This project will be implemented in Costa Rica and Peru only, and these countries do not share a common water body. Panama and Chile, which share common water bodies with Costa Rica and Chile respectively, do not feature in Table B outside of recipients of key lessons learned and possibly participants in some training. A full assessment of Table B cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

(2) Project Outcome 1.1 is too vague. Please expand on "their management will be strengthened". Please clarify what the corresponding indicator "strengthened management" refers to.

(3) Project Outputs are not consistently phrased. Please reconsider and revise accordingly.

(4) Please remove cents from all amounts in Table B (and throughout the document)

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile have been more fully incorporated into the project (see note on comment 1)

(2) Revised to be that the ten surf ecosystems will be provided with recommendations to improve their management and protection.

(3) Done

(4) Done

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

Please address the following:

(1) In the section below Table C, please describe the investment mobilized for the UNIDO grant /investment mobilized of \$53,000.

(2) "Beneficiaries in Costa Rica and Peru" is listed as a co-financier. Please clarify what this refers to and how \$28,000 was identified.

(3) "Ministry of Environment of Panama and/or Chile" is listed as a co-financier. Given the project is implemented in Costa Rica and Peru, please clarify what this refers to and how \$741,000 was identified.

(4) Please upload co-financing letters to the portal, if available. In lieu, please provide a short write up on each co-financing line to demonstrate that the indicative information reflects a realistic expectation of the co-financing that would be available to support the achievement of the project objective.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) "Beneficiaries in Costa Rica and Peru" is a target. Please remove from Table C in PIF and identify during PPG and include in the CEO Endorsement Request Table C.

(3) "Ministry of the Environment of Panama and/or Chile" is a target. Please remove from Table C in PIF and identify during PPG and include in the CEO Endorsement Request Table C.

(4) Addressed. The reviewer notes the expanded description below Table C. But please note that Annex 1 is not in the portal.

With the new co-financing total, please then ensure the GEF financing and co-financing contributions to PMC are proportional.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 8 June 22

(2) Done.

(3) Done.

(4) The text from Annex 1 had been introduced under Table C at the time of the previous resubmission (please ignore the reference to Annex 1). The information will be updated at CEO stage when the co-financing letters have been obtained.

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

Co-finance amounts are based off of conversations with officials as well as the anticipated budgets of the respective organizations and ministries. Final amounts will be confirmed and letters will be secured during the PPG phase.

See Annex 1 of this document for breakdown of co-finance.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 17th of March 2022

(thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 17th of March 2022
(thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) If Panama and Chile are added to the target countries, please include Core Indicator figures for those countries accordingly.

(2) Please include Core Indicator 7 figure for level of engagement in [IW:LEARN](#).

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Because on-the-ground activities are not planned for Panama at PIF stage, please remove the direct beneficiaries figure for Panama. This can be added back in during PPG, once LOE is secured.

(2) For Core Indicator 7.4, the PIF target should be "1" and the end of project target should be "4". Please revise accordingly.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 8 June 22

(1) Done.

(2) Done.

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Additional beneficiaries were added for Panama. The figure for Chile (as well as confirmation of the figures for the other three countries) will be determined during the PPG phase.

(2) Done in core indicator worksheet and added as 7.4 in PIF.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 17th of March 2022
(thenshaw): Yes.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please make clear and sufficiently detail (using separate headings, if possible) what the global environmental problems, root causes and barriers are that this project seeks to address.

(2) If Chile and Panama are included as project countries, please include reasons why, similar to the write up on Peru and Costa Rica.

(3) If Chile and Panama are included as project countries, please also frame the description as the global environmental problems, root cases and barriers this project seeks to address in the Humboldt Current LME (Peru and Chile) and the Pacific Central-American Coastal LME (Costa Rica and Panama).

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

(3) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Done

(2) Done

(3) Done

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please include the baseline scenario in Chile and Panama, if these two countries are included as project countries.

As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of the baseline scenario cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Done

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Please add a bit more detailed to each project output. For example, "The government of Peru, who already has a law of the breakers, will be provided with support to legally protect 10 surf breaks". It is unclear what the project will do as part of this support. This lack of clarity is present throughout this section.

(2) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. This project will be implemented in Costa Rica and Peru only, and these countries do not share a common water body. Panama and Chile, which share common water bodies with Costa Rica and Chile respectively, do not feature in this section outside of recipients of key lessons learned and possibly participants in some training. A full assessment of the proposed alternative scenario cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Additional details pertaining to what work will occur under each output has been included in the narrative.

(2) Panama and Chile have been more fully integrated into the project and the necessary information has been added on both countries.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Yes.

(1) However, as noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of alignment cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

Panama and Chile have been added to be a concrete transboundary project.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw) Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of the incremental cost reasoning cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile have been added to be a concrete transboundary project.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw) Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of the GEBs cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile have been added to be a concrete transboundary project.
7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of Innovation, Sustainability and Scaling Up cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Please expand on innovation and scaling up in this project. Through which activities will the scaling up occur? Please be more specific on how the project is innovative (detail the approaches).

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 8 June 22

This has been done, please refer to the revised sections in the PIF document (highlighted in yellow for easy reference).

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile have been added to be a concrete transboundary project.
Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) If Panama and Chile are added as project countries, please include maps of the locations within the two wider LMEs.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Partly addressed. Figures 5 and 6 are missing in the portal submission. Please include (as well as coordinates) on resubmission.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 8 June 22

Unfortunately, Figures 5 and 6 cannot be uploaded, as the Portal crashes with each try. Would it be possible to upload them from the backend to the section? The figures are available here: <https://xfiles.unido.org/index.php/s/wrjPLWC3E5a5sBq>

If not, we will contact the WB IT colleagues to ask for support.

As to the coordinates, they have been provided and highlighted.

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

Maps have been included of the two wider LMEs.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Only stakeholders from Costa and Peru are listed (with no stakeholders listed from Panama and Chile). As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of stakeholders cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

10th of June 2022 (thenshaw): The project has ticked the boxes that consultations have been carried out with indigenous Peoples and Local Communities and with Civil Society Organizations. It then explains that ? Due to Covid-19 restrictions, project proponents determined that direct consultations with local communities are better deferred to the PPG phase? As there seem to be contradictions in the information provided, please ask agency clarify further.

13th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 13 June 22

We have unticked the boxes that consultations with indigenous people & local communities and CSOs have been carried out. While some general consultations have

been done, these were not extensive and more will be conducted during the PPG phase. We will keep track of those and report accordingly at CEO stage.

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Additional Stakeholders for Panama and Chile have been added. Details will be determined during the PPG phase.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) Only references to gender mainstreaming in Costa Rica and Peru are described. As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of gender equality and women's empowerment cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Partly. Please include some gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women.

10th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Gender: It is duly noted that the project will complete a full gender mainstreaming plan in the PPG phase. Agency is requested to particularly take into account the incorporation of gender perspectives in management policies and mechanisms, guidance and training and awareness-raising documents. This is in addition to having women as beneficiaries to training and capacity building activities. It is also recommended, when possible, to have women-men representation closer to parity.

The first question: "Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures?" is an umbrella question to the three subsequent items where the Agency ticked Yes to all three points. Agency is thus requested to answer Yes to the first question.

13th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 13 June 22

We confirm that we will take into account the incorporation of gender perspectives in management policies and mechanisms, guidance and training and awareness-raising document.

The question about 'Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures?' has been answered with 'Yes'.

Agency Response 8 June 22

Please refer to updated section in the PIF.

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile were added.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of private sector engagement cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

Panama and Chile were added.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of risks to achieving project objectives cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

(2) Please expand on the opportunity analysis for how this project can help the countries build back better from the pandemic (Covid-19 responsiveness).

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw):

(1) Addressed.

(2) Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile were added.

(2) Expansion is provided. Additional analysis and actions will be explored during the PPG phase.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of Coordination cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile were added.
Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of Consistency with National Priorities cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response
Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile were added.
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of Knowledge Management cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed

Agency Response
Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile were added.
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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): Partly.

(1) As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of ESS cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 14 Apr 22

(1) Panama and Chile were added.

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022: No

(1) Only one LoE is present in the portal (Costa Rica). Please upload the LoE for Peru. If Chile and Panama will be listed as project countries please upload respective LoEs to the portal.

As noted above, this project must have a concrete transboundary element. A full assessment of Country Endorsements cannot be done until this issue is clarified.

10th of June 2022 (thenshaw): 1. Letters of Endorsement (LoEs): LoEs from Chile and Panama were not found. Please remove these two countries from the project information section as well as any other mention to these countries throughout the text (79 times for Chile, 76 times for Panama).

13th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Addressed.

Agency Response

Agency Response 13 June 22

All reference to Panama have been removed from the PIF. As to Chile, the country name remained five more times in the document, i.e. twice in the description of the HCLME, and as part of three regional baseline projects.

Agency Response 30 May 22

The letter for Peru has been uploaded

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

17th of March 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address comments and resubmit. Thank you.

5th of June 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

8th of June 2022 (thenshaw): No, please address above comments and resubmit. Thank you.

13th of June 2022 (thenshaw): Yes

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval