



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9215		
Country/Region:	Djibouti		
Project Title:	Mitigating Key Sector Pressures on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity and Further Strengthening the National System of Marine Protected Areas in Djibouti		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5560 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,822,374
Co-financing:	\$11,640,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,462,374
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Yves de Soye

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>10th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed activities are aligned with the BD strategies.</p> <p>However, the project does not specifically articulate with Aichi Targets that the project will help achieve, nor which SMART indicators will be used to track contribution. Please include.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		3rd of September 2015: Addressed	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	10th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project is consistent with the recipient country's national strategy.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	10th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes, the PIF outlines the lack of management of the marine areas, as being one of the main drivers of environmental degradation of the marine resources of Djibouti.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>10th of August 2015 (cseverin): The incremental reasoning is well argued, however, there seem to be a tendency to mix baseline investment with project co-financing. Please address that.</p> <p>In this regard, the GEF suggest removing the \$6.5 million from the Government of Djibouti from the co-financing table (Table C, p. 4) and use it as part of the Baseline. It is funding already in place, indeed.</p> <p>Please make sure that the project does not count ongoing GEF projects as cofinancing for this proposed project (as seems to be the case for the project named "Red Sea and Gulf of Aden Strategic Ecosystem Management" project).</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		3rd of September 2015: Addressed	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>10th of August 2015 (cseverin and JC): Yes, the components, their outcomes and output indicators seem clear enough to achieve the project's objective. Although the components, outcomes and outputs are well aligned to deliver the objective of the project, the project is over-ambitious considering the available financial resources.</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <p>It is very unlikely that Outcome 1.2 (the avoidance, reduction or compensation of adverse impacts on marine and coastal biodiversity related to port developments and operations) can be delivered with the series of soft outputs as currently stated (i.e. a monitoring system, priority setting, consultations, engagement). No reference to enforcement or any kind. Budget allocation utterly inadequate, not even considering that there is outcome 1.2.</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>It is very unlikely that the project can deliver the proposed outputs under this component with the financial</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>resources allocated to this part of the project. It is unrealistic to think that it is possible to expand the MPA system and improve the management effectiveness of the MPAs when the project proposes to: 1) equip the existing and newly created MPAs (PA management staff and guards, infrastructure and equipment for transport, communication, surveillance, boat landings and mooring buoys, environmental and biodiversity monitoring), develop/update 5-year management and financing plans, annual work plans and budgets, elaborate a tourism development plan across the MPA system, develop a fisheries management plan across the MPA system, the updating/development and implementation of a MPA surveillance plans, and the identification and assessment of Biodiversity-friendly sustainable livelihood options). Please reduce the scope of this component to increase the chances of delivering tangible and measurable results. The risk of overpromising and under-delivering is very high as currently structured.</p> <p>Component 3:</p> <p>1) Is it realistic to think that the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>proposed outcome (reduction in the funding gap for the management of the marine BD and MPAs by 50%) can be achieved with the proposed outputs? The outputs are hitting soft targets like producing an assessment of the financial needs, the development of a strategy, "Operationalization of the National Environment Fund" an pilot projects?.</p> <p>2) Please elaborate on the "Operationalization of the National Environment Fund". What is the status of the Fund and what activities are actually being proposed?</p> <p>3) Is it realistic to think that funding can be obtained from the proposed sources? Each of those potential revenue sources will require massive work to get funding out of them.</p> <p>All in all, this project needs to downsize significantly. It is nearly an MSP and the proposed Outcomes would require a large FSP.</p> <p>After refocusing the project proposal (maybe narrowing both geographical scope as well as issues to be dealt with) the GEF Secretariat suggest preparing a Table with the list of target MPAs, with the status of the different items to be invested in and expected results.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>14th of September 2015:</p> <p>Component 2: Please remove reference to the PAs not targeted by the project: Sept-Freres, Moucha-Masksli Islands, Douda-Haramous and Arta. The GEF suggests concentrating on the PAs listed under 2.1. Other MPAs may be considered during PPG, but should not listed in the PIF.</p> <p>There is only one output for Outcome 2.3. It is only rephrasing the outcome, Please add some outputs leading to this outcome.</p> <p>Component 3: The idea was not simply to reduce the gap from 50% to 25%. The point was that the soft targets described in the outputs are unlikely to result in much reduction in the gap. This is aggravated by the level of investments in all TA. The GEF suggest resizing the outcome to make it doable.</p> <p>11-30-15 Cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements,	10th of August 2015 (cseverin):A rather comprehensive stakeholder	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>analysis have been included in the proposal, identifying a range of stakeholders, including their potential role.</p> <p>Please make sure to include the fact that the project will be reporting on GENDER aspects, using the GEF 6 GENDER indicators. this seems to be missing at the moment in section 3 "Gender Considerations".</p> <p>3rd of September 2015: Addressed</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	10th of August 2015 (cseverin): Yes. None of the GEF-6 STAR resources have been used as of today.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>10th of August 2015 (cseverin): No, please address above comment and resubmit.</p> <p>14th of September: No please address above comments and resubmit.</p> <p>11-30-15</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	August 11, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 14, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 30, 2015	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes		



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

## CEO endorsement Review

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