



# Integrated Collaborative Approaches for Sustainable Tourism (iCOAST)

[Edit and Submit PIF](#)

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11729

**Countries**

Global (Belize, Dominican Republic, Egypt, Honduras, Jamaica, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Maldives, Trinidad and Tobago, Tanzania, T?rkiye, Vanuatu, Seychelles)

**Project Name**

Integrated Collaborative Approaches for Sustainable Tourism (iCOAST)

**Agencies**

UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, FAO, IADB, EBRD, WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

9/20/2024

**Review completed by PM**

9/25/2024

**Program Manager**

Anil Sookdeo

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

PFD

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

#### Secretariat's Comments

Please clarify why the executing agencies for the child projects are not listed. Please include all anticipated executing entities from each child project in this General Program Information section of the PFD entry:

Tables throughout PFD are introduced as "Table X", Please revise for clarity.

October 28, 2024 - The program commitment date is missing. Please include.

#### Agency's Comments

The following executing agencies have been added:

Belize: Ministry of Tourism and Diaspora Relations (Belize)

Dominican Republic: Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (Dominican Republic)

Egypt, Morocco and Türkiye: TBD

Honduras: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (Honduras). Honduran Institute of Tourism -IHT (Honduras)

Indonesia: Ministry of Tourism and Creative Economy (Indonesia). Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Indonesia).

Jamaica: Ministry of Tourism (Jamaica)

Maldives: Ministry of Tourism of Maldives (Maldives)

Mexico, PRONATURA NOROESTE (Mexico). Conservación del Territorio Insular Mexicano, A.C. (Mexico)

Seychelles: Ministry of Agriculture Climate Change and Environment (Seychelles). Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Tourism

Tanzania: Ministry of Tourism and Heritage Zanzibar (Tanzania). Ministry of Trade and Industrial Development of Zanzibar

Natural Resources and Livestock of Zanzibar (Tanzania). Zanzibar Economic Empowerment Agency (ZEEA) (Tanzania).

Trinidad and Tobago: Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and the Arts of Trinidad and Tobago (Trinidad and Tobago). Environment and Natural Resources (Trinidad and Tobago).

Vanuatu: Ministry of Climate Change Adaptation, Meteorology, Geo-Hazards, Environment, Energy and Disaster Management, Commerce, and Ni-Vanuatu Business (Vanuatu).

--

Table numbering has been corrected

28 Oct, 2024: The program commitment date (19 June 2026) has been inserted.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

## Agency's Comments

### 2. Program Summary

- a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?
- b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

### Secretariat's Comments

The program summary of the iCOAST program, is clear and concise and provides an overview of its problem statement, objectives, and strategies. Please summarize the targeted GEBs and elaborate on the innovative aspects of the program.

October 28, 2024 - Comments cleared.

## Agency's Comments

The following text has been added to the project summary:

"iCOAST will achieve the following impact (main Global Environmental Benefits): Core Indicator 6 (CI6): 6,101,580 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e. Additionally, 66,074 MT of POPs/Hg containing waste (9.6) and 269.267 MT of plastic waste (9.8) will be eliminated during the PPG phase. Adaptation will be added during the PPG phase.

The most innovative aspects of iCOAST is the strong focus on sustainable finance and the tourism sector approach where multiple sectors are addressed simultaneously. This will be combined with a global coordination on private sector partnerships and a strong communications strategy for iCOAST."

### 3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

### Secretariat's Comments

The Indicative Program Overview presents a well-structured and comprehensive outline of the iCOAST program. It effectively articulates the program's objectives, components, and expected outcomes, demonstrating a clear alignment with the Theory of Change. The inclusion of gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E further strengthens the program's design. However, there is room for improvement in terms of making the program objective more measurable, elaborating on innovative elements, and providing a more robust justification for the

slightly higher PMC percentage. PMC and co-financing contributions to PMC are not proportional. Please revise.

On gender, please ensure that women's groups/networks and gender experts are meaningfully engaged in developing policies, regulations and standards (e.g., Output 1.1), going beyond just informing them; in assessing existing financial instruments and ensuring that women's needs are considered, and that they are among the beneficiaries of finance mechanisms to be introduced (Output 2.1 and 2.2). Please consider possible linkages with World Bank's Women Entrepreneurs Finance Initiative (We-Fi) [www.we-fi.org](http://www.we-fi.org) for relevant interlinkages in Output 2.2. In Component 4, please ensure that KM products capture good practices and lessons learned from a gender perspective and ensure their wide dissemination between the child projects. Please include in section 10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency: In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please budget related activities and ensure that in developing the monitoring and reporting plan / framework, that gender-specific results are monitored and reported on regularly.

Please ensure that gender-related indicators are integrated into the RF.

October 28, 2024 - Comments cleared except gender, please include / capture in the PFD, under Program Description, last paragraph, the following elements:

Ensure that representatives of women and gender groups / gender experts are represented and meaningfully participate in consultations to assess policies, financial mechanisms;

Gender considerations are taken into account in assessing and ensuring access by women to value chains, information systems, technologies, equipment and supplies;

Best practices and lessons learned in empowering women and promoting social inclusion are featured and widely disseminated

In the development of the Gender Action Plan, activities will be budgeted, and subsequently monitored and reported on.

Agency's Comments

The **Programme objective** is broad as the tourism sector and the associated local supply chains cover a broad range of economic activities. It is important to develop clear Key Performance Indicators during the PPG phase to be able to properly measure the progress towards the programme objectives.

**Innovation: (short text included in programme summary). The text below is included in ?Program Description?**

iCOAST is the first GEF-funded programme that has the Tourism Sector as the entry point to improve the sustainability of the sector and promote the future avoidance of harmful chemicals that are currently being used. Multiple Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) will be achieved through the programme. An important aspect of iCOAST is the strong focus on developing and adapting innovative finance models for sustainable tourism. There will be an active collaboration with the Private sector through the development of national and global partnerships to ensure coherence in partner countries to align and integrate different policies to ensure they work towards a common goal. There is a reluctance in many countries to enact legislation that could endanger the competitiveness of the sector. There is a need for a more competitive, unless they are assured that they will actually benefit from the introduction of more sustainable policies. Therefore, a clear management strategy is a key component of the programme. There is awareness about sustainable tourism, but actual investments are much smaller than expected. The challenge and success will be to change that trend.

**PMC and co-finance**

PMC figures in child projects have been adjusted to align with GEF policies (up to 5 % of sub-total) and co-finance ratios for the programme.

**The Gender Actions plan(s)** will be developed during the PPG phase, and a budget will be allocated to ensure that gender-related indicators will be integrated into the reporting plan / Framework. Gender-related indicators will be integrated into the Results Framework.

28 Oct. 2024: the suggested text on Gender has been added as the last paragraph of the Program Description section.

#### 4 Program Outline

##### A. Program Rationale

- a) **Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?**
- b) **Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**
- c) **Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?**
- d) **Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?**
- e) **For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.**

##### Secretariat's Comments

The program outline presents a strong rationale for the iCOAST program, effectively describing the current situation, the role of stakeholders, and the baseline context. It demonstrates a clear understanding of the systemic challenges facing the tourism sector and proposes a well-designed approach to address these challenges and achieve the desired transformation towards sustainability. However, it could be further strengthened by explicitly incorporating lessons

learned from previous efforts, such as ISLANDS and UNDP lead projects in tourism as well as other agencies and highlighting the innovative aspects of the program design.

October 28, 2024 - comments cleared.

### Agency's Comments

The lessons learned from the ISLANDS programme and existing UNDP projects on sustainable tourism can be summarized

? The tourism sector is very important for GDP in many SIDS. Governments can be reluctant to take actions that can end there will be a benefit. A perceived risk is that sustainability requirements could add costs to the tourism sector and thereby countries not applying similar commitments. Governments will not pass legislation unless they are assured it will make the importance of a clear communication strategy.

? It is important to make sure that all countries move at the same pace (within a region) or ensure countries will benefit clearly.

? The ISLANDS programme is working very closely with private sector and with large international hotel chains, etc. to pr be the focus of iCOAST.

? Ensuring policy coherence towards sustainable tourism is essential.

? The importance of setting up a coordination mechanism with ISLANDS to ensure that iCOAST initiatives are clearly co help to improve the coordination and avoid overlaps.

? It is essential to have a clear focus on innovative finance.

? Sustainable tourism is one of the entry points in the ISLANDS programme, but the main activity is on Waste Management having a more focused approach on sustainable tourism and its local supply chains. The Ministry of Tourism will be the key

? To enhance the project's impact, it's important to seek the integration of strategic actors from the private sector and var sustainable tourism as a viable alternative to the traditional sun and beach model.

? The design, approval and implementation processes are very long, so the initial diagnosis and designs sometimes lose th environment. The application of adaptive management is necessary.

The following text has been added to the Portal:

"The iCOAST programme has benefitted from the knowledge generated in the ISLANDS programme and other GEF-funded a focus on access to innovative finance models, the importance of policy coherence, to have a strong focus on generating pa private sector both at the national and global levels.

The tourism sector is vital for GDP in many SIDS, making governments hesitant to introduce sustainability measures that m communication and coordination among countries and stakeholders are essential to ensure and make visible the benefits fro mechanism will be set up with the ISLANDS programme to promote synergies and avoid overlaps.

Finally, it is important to use adaptive management in the programme given the speed of change that is currently happening

### 5 B. Program Description

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**

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

**c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?**

**e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?**

**f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?**

**g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?**

**h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?**

**i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

The program is well described. During the PPG, please ensure the following are addressed:

**Core Indicators:** The methodological approach and underlying logic for justifying target levels for core and sub-indicators could be further refined during the PPG phase, ensuring accuracy and reliability.

**Data Collection:** The project could benefit from more comprehensive data collection and analysis during the PPG phase to strengthen the evidence base for its interventions and impact assessment.

**Private Sector Engagement:** While the project mentions engaging with local suppliers and commercial banks, it could further explore opportunities for collaboration with larger tourism enterprises and international investors to leverage their resources and expertise in promoting sustainable tourism.

**Community Participation:** The project could further emphasize the active involvement of local communities in decision-making processes and benefit-sharing mechanisms, ensuring that tourism development is inclusive and equitable.

Agency's Comments Noted. The recommendations will be taken into account during the PPG phase.

#### **5.2 Program coherence and consistency**

**a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?**

**b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

**c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?**

**d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?**

**e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?**

Secretariat's Comments The iCOAST program demonstrates a well-structured and coherent design, with clear objectives, appropriate child project selection, and adequate financing. The program's focus on resilience, transformative change, and scaling up opportunities further strengthens its potential for achieving significant global environmental benefits and promoting sustainable tourism practices worldwide.

#### Agency's Comments

Noted with thanks.

#### **5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs**

**a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**

**b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).**

#### Secretariat's Comments

The iCOAST program outlines a clear governance and coordination structure, although it lacks a visual organogram/diagram.

Global Level: UNDP, as the lead agency, will establish a dedicated iCOAST team to oversee program implementation and coordinate with child project teams. This team will receive guidance



from various UNDP hubs (Chemicals and Waste, Nature, Sustainable Finance, Insurance and Risk Finance, and Climate) and report to the Director of UNDP's Chemicals and Waste Hub. The program also mentions potential executing partners like UNEP, UN Tourism, GSTC, IW:LEARN, and FAO, but their specific roles and responsibilities are not fully elaborated.

National/Local Levels: The Implementing Agencies (IAs) responsible for each child project will ensure coordination with relevant government ministries, regulatory agencies, and other stakeholders at the national and local levels. The document mentions the establishment of multi-sectoral coordination committees or task forces in some child projects, but a consistent approach across all projects is not explicitly stated.

The rationale for these arrangements is to ensure effective program management, collaboration among implementing agencies, and alignment with national and local priorities. However, a visual representation of the governance structure and a more detailed description of roles and responsibilities, particularly for potential executing partners, would enhance clarity and understanding of the decision-making processes.

Coordination with other projects and initiatives. Please note that the program will coordinate with existing Strategic Action Programs developed and implemented with GEF support. Please also note collaboration/synergies with specific ongoing GEF IW investments in the five LMEs targeted under iCOAST.

Child project ID11742 ? Regional (Egypt, Morocco, & T?rkiye): please remove EBRD as Anticipated Executing Entity. GEF policies, further explained in the Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle, require that ?the separation of implementation functions performed by GEF Agencies and execution functions performed by Project Executing Entities is a key feature of the governance of the GEF Partnership and an important aspect of the GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards.?

See

[https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF\\_Guidelines\\_Project\\_Program\\_Cycle\\_Policy\\_20200731.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/GEF_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy_20200731.pdf). (pages 44-45)

At PIF/PFD stage, Agency (?dual?) execution should not be included in the Agency's proposal. Once the Agency has sufficiently progressed in project preparation and if it anticipates a need for Agency execution, the Agency would submit full information and justification for a request for policy exception.

October 28, 2024 - comments cleared

### Agency's Comments

A diagram has been included for the governance and coordination structure.

Global Level: The potential roles and responsibilities of the potential partners of the global component will be further developed during the PPG phase. Initial discussions have taken place with the partners listed in the table.

National Local Level: it has been agreed to set up multi-sectoral coordination committees or task forces in all of the participating countries. This is reflected in the child concepts.

iCOAST will have Project Steering Committees for the global component as well as for each of the child projects with clear TORs that will be established during the PPG phase to ensure effective programme management, and collaboration among the implementing agencies.

There will be a close coordination with the ongoing GEF IW investments in the five LMEs targeted under iCOAST. This element will be further developed during the PPG phase.

The reference to EBRD as executing agency has been removed and left in blank.

Dual execution has been removed from the portal. Any potential discussion of such an arrangement will take place during the PPG phase.

#### **5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting**

**a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?**

**b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**c) Are the program's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

**d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptive management?**

## Secretariat's Comments

The PFD demonstrates a strong focus on achieving global environmental benefits and socioeconomic outcomes. The identified core indicators and the program's M&E approach are well-aligned with GEF requirements and support adaptive management. However, there is room for improvement in terms of refining the GEB targets and incorporating climate change adaptation indicators for LDCF and SCCF. Additionally, a more detailed breakdown of the budget and expenditure plans for each child project would enhance transparency and accountability in achieving the program's objectives.

Core Indicator 7: The targets are inconsistent across LMEs. Please aggregate/explain the calculations for the four sub-indicators and ensure they are uniform across the group of child projects with IW funds. Please convene a meeting with the child projects utilizing GEF IW funds and GEF Sec to discuss the approach.

Belize is not accounted for in the aggregated program-level indicators table. Please revise.

GCP section of PFD. Ideally, the GCP is the liaison with IW:LEARN and will dedicate 1% of GCP activities to IW:LEARN activities for the national child projects with an IW focus. Please consider this approach in consultation with GEF Sec.

October 28, 2024 - comments cleared.

## Agency's Comments

The GEBs will be further revised during the PPG phase. There are some methodological challenges with the way that GEBs mentioned by the GEF Secretariat in the section on Programme Description). A methodology will be developed during the PPG phase within the programme and to ensure that similar approaches are taken in all child projects. The Adaptation indicators for LDCF phase. The detailed budget and expenditure plans will also be developed during the PPG phase.

Discussions have taken place with the GEF Sec regarding Core Indicator 7. CI 7.1, the Red Sea has been set at level 1 and the remaining four at level 4. CI 7.2 have been removed. CI 7.3 have all been listed at level 1. CI 7.4 will only be addressed at the global level at level 1.

GEBs for Belize are included in the child as well as in the global program level indicators? table. Under 9.1 (POPs), the quantities are so small that they cannot be captured in the table. Dioxins and Furans in the air are included under CI 10.

References to IW:LEARN have been removed from the child projects. Reference has been made to IW:LEARN under the global program. USD have been allocated for such activities (Participate in one global IW coordination event, and to prepare 1 experience note).

### 5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**

**c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments The iCOAST program presents a comprehensive and well-structured risk assessment that identifies potential risks to its outcomes and proposes realistic mitigation measures. The risk ratings reflect the residual risk after considering the implementation of these measures. The program also adequately screens and rates environmental and social risks, providing guidance on assessment and mitigation.

Agency's Comments Noted.

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

**6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

**\*For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

The iCOAST program demonstrates a clear and deliberate effort to align its objectives and interventions with the relevant Focal Area and IP programs. The program's focus on reducing the environmental impact of the tourism sector and promoting sustainable practices is consistent with the GEF's strategic priorities. However, the alignment with the LDCF/SCCF strategy could be further strengthened by explicitly identifying and tracking relevant adaptation indicators and sub-indicators.

October 28, 2024 - comments cleared

Agency's Comments Adaptation indicators and targets will be identified and included during the PPG phase. A note has been included in the Portal.

**b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments N. A.

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Noted

#### 7 D. Policy Requirements

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Noted

**7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards**

**Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Noted

**8 Other Requirements**

**Knowledge Management**

**8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?**

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

Ideally, the GCP is the liaison with IW:LEARN and will dedicate 1% of GCP activities to IW:LEARN activities for the national child projects with an IW focus. Please consider this approach in consultation with GEF Sec.

October 28, 2024 - comment cleared

Agency's Comments Consultations have taken place with the GEF Secretariat. It was agreed to remove references to IW:LEARN in country child projects. All IW: learn activities will be pursued through the global component and a budget will be set aside for it.

**9 Annexes**

**Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)**

**9.1 GEF Financing Table:**

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

**Country STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Funding Source: IW funding under this program should be split equally among IW-1 and IW-3 objectives. In the PFD, please revise the funding tables accordingly, as both IW objectives are targeted according to the Alignment with GEF Strategies section of PFD.

October 28, 2024 - comments cleared.

Agency's Comments IW funding has been split equally between IW-1 and IW-3.  
**Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.  
**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.  
**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.  
**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.  
**IP Set Aside**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.  
**IP Contribution**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.

**For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)**

**b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?**

**c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?**

**d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?**

**e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?**

**f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?**

**g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.

**9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Noted.

### **9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation**

**Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Noted

### **9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements**

#### **For non-IP Programs**

**Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments Noted

### **9.5 Indicative Co-financing**

**Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?**

#### **Secretariat's Comments**

Co-financing: Please check all co-financing sources for specificity and appropriate classification.

In-kind cannot be investment mobilized. Please revise TNC classification in co-financing table.

Please ensure co-financing sources include name of country and not just "Ministry of Tourism"

"Government Departments" etc.

"ADB/UNDP/World Bank" source must be disaggregated. Likewise for IFAD/FAO

and EU/AFD etc.

Spell out all acronyms under funding source.

"Commercial Banks" and "Branded Hotel Chains/Banks" and "NGOs and Local Associations"

are not specific sources and should be removed from co-financing table

"GEF Agency" as funding source is not classified properly. Please revise.

- In-kind is ?recurrent expenditure? normally. Please revise the where in-kind is classified as ?investment mobilized? to ?recurrent expenditures.

- Please correct the source of financing for IADB as ?GEF Agency? since it is one of the implementing agencies for this PFD.



- please spell out the name of cofinancier for the "GEF Agency" for amount of USD 50,000.

October 28, 2024 - comments cleared

#### Agency's Comments

Noted, all comments have been updated in the Portal

Total cofinance figures have been adjusted. Further refinement of cofinance will be conducted during the PPG phase.

#### Annex B: Endorsements

**9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

OctoberThe LOE for Seychelles notes "International" and "Chemicals" as Focal Area source in the funding table. A new LOE is required, which includes the full focal area names in the source column.

Missing LOEs: Jamaica, Indonesia, Mexico, Morocco, Turkiye.

Title of child project differs between LOEs and Portal's child project entries, please either obtain revised LOEs or correct child projects' title to match with LOE: Dominican Republic, Vanuatu, Belize, Seychelles,

Executing Entity name differs between LOEs and Portal's child project entries, please either obtain revised LOEs or correct child projects' entry to match with LOE: Dominican Republic, Vanuatu, Belize, Seychelles, Maldives, Trinidad and Tobago, Honduras.

LOE from Belize is for the PFD but not for the child project, also there is no financing amount nor financing table endorsed by the OFP. Please obtain a revised LOE for the Belize child project and with allocated financing amounts accordingly.

October 28, 2024 - Comments cleared, however the letters are not displaying. Please re-upload.

#### Agency's Comments

The LoE for Seychelles has been updated.

The correct version of the LoE for Belize has been uploaded to the Portal.

LoEs for Indonesia, Jamaica, Mexico, Morocco and T?rkiye have been uploaded to the Portal.

All countries have submitted their LoEs.

The titles of the child projects have been updated on the Portal to match the name in the LoE.

The name of the Executing Agencies has been updated in the Portal to match the LoE.

28 oct 2024: there seemed to have been an issue with one of the LoE for which the upload did not work (Turkiye). This was uploaded again and they should now all be visible.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N.A.

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N. A.

**Annex C: Program Locations**

**9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?**

Secretariat's Comments

Please include the maps into the main portal template.

October 28, 2024 - Please note that the maps are not displaying.

Agency's Comments

There is a recurrent problem with uploading the maps on the portal and technical support of the GEF portal has been sought.

28 Oct. 2024: there were several attempts and request for support, the maps could not be all uploaded yet, but this is being worked on.

**Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes\* (\*only for non IP programs)**

**9.9 a) Does the program provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments N.A.

**Additional Annexes**

**10 GEFSEC Decision**

**10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the program recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments Please address remaining comments.

Agency's Comments

**10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

**10.3 Review Dates**

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	<b>10/3/2024</b>	<b>10/28/2024</b>

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/28/2024</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	