

# Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Costa Rica

**Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10124

**Countries**

Costa Rica

**Project Name**

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Costa Rica

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

3/23/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/2/2020

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

NA.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

The following co-financing letters are only in Spanish: (i) UNA; (ii) MAG; (iii) MINAE-SINAC; (iv) CADETI; and (v) AyA. Please translate them to English and include them in the re-submission.

The source of grant co-financing from GIZ is should be “donor agency” and not “others”.

4/9/2020

Revision is adequate. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

4/9/2020

Co-financing letters from (i) UNA; (ii) MAG; (iii) MINAE-SINAC; (iv) CADETI; and (v) AyA have been translated into English, and included in the re-submission.

Source of grant co-financing from GIZ has been revised to “donor agency”.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Project Preparation Grant**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

### **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

### **Agency Response**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

### **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**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.



**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

NA.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

Risks

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

## **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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

## **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Project Results Framework**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**GEF Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

**Council comments**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

STAP comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

NA.

**Agency Response**

Convention Secretariat comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

NA.

**Agency Response**

Other Agencies comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

NA.

**Agency Response**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

NA

**Agency Response**

Status of PPG utilization

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

NA.

**Agency Response**

Project maps and coordinates



**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

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**

4/2/2020

NA

**Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/2/2020

Please address the issues under cofinancing and resubmit.

4/9/2020

CEO endorsement is recommended.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

**Response to Secretariat comments**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The Seventh Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Costa Rica, to be financed through this project, will be implemented in five landscapes: The i) Jesus Maria and ii) Barranca river basins; iii) the Montes de Aguacate Biological Corridor (MACB), iv) lower Grande de Tarcoles river basin and the v) Paso Las Lapas Biological Corridor. The total area covered by these landscapes is approximately 199,627 hectares. The project aims to enable communities and organizations in these target landscapes to take collective action, through a participatory landscape planning and management approach, to enhance socio-ecological resilience by producing local

and global environmental and sustainable development benefits. SGP will support specific community-based actions in each landscape by financing small-scale projects run by local community organizations and coordinating them within the priority landscapes to achieve landscape-scale impacts.

The project will address a series of development challenges in an intervention area home to over 420,000 people, where human settlements are combined with substantial forest patches and varied ecosystems, agricultural production, grazing pastures, protected areas (PA) and other land uses. The main threats to be overcome and which are causing the rapid deterioration of socio-ecological resilience in the target landscapes are: Changes in land use and the progressive degradation of natural resources (biodiversity, habitat, soil, water, etc.) from over-exploitation, pollution, introduction of exotic invasive species and climate change; habitat loss, caused by land use changes in production landscapes, threatens biodiversity and ecosystem connectivity; traditional activities, such as extensive cattle ranching and coffee farming, historically, have heavily impacted forest cover in these landscapes, causing the fragmentation of continuous forest blocks, the propensity for forest fires and reduction in the quality and quantity of water resources for human and agricultural consumption. All these effects have impacted on agricultural productivity, income-generating options and the well-being of rural and peri-urban populations, especially affecting more marginalized groups with more limited access to land, ecosystem services, goods and benefits and reduced participation in decision-making bodies.