



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*  
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	5749		
Country/Region:	El Salvador		
Project Title:	Conservation, Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, and Maintenance of Ecosystem Services in Protected Wetlands of International Importance		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5257 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$2,191,781
Co-financing:	\$8,914,667	Total Project Cost:	\$11,106,448
PIF Approval:	April 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	May 27, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carrizosa,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	March 20, 2014 Yes.	December 15, 2015 Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	March 20, 2014  Yes. But please send the revised LOE as indicated in the email sent by UNDP.  March 26, 2014  Thank you.	December 15, 2015  Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the STAR allocation?	March 20, 2014 Yes.	December 15, 2015 Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	March 20, 2014 Yes.	December 15, 2015 Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	March 20, 2014 NA.	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	March 20, 2014 NA.	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	March 20, 2014 NA.	
	• focal area set-aside?	March 20, 2014 NA.	
	<b>Strategic Alignment</b>	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b> ? <i>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 progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i>	March 20, 2014  Yes it is aligned with the GEF BD strategy objective one, please specify clear links to the relevant Aichi Targets.  March 26, 2014  Adequate revisions.
5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports		March 20, 2014  Yes.	December 15, 2015  Yes.

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?		
Project Design	6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b> , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>No.</p> <p>First, please define the MCC accurately.</p> <p>Second, please specify in clear terms the relationship between the GEF grant and the MCC grant and the IADB loan with regards to the activities these resources are supporting and the proposed activities of the GEF grant. If the MCC and IADB loan are the baseline, the GEF grant should complement their activities, and this relationship must be better explained in the PIF.</p> <p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Under outcome 1.2, we expect that the project will respond to the threats not just assess them in the seven PWII. Please clarify this and commit to developing threat reduction responses and indicators to measure success as part of the project design and during project implementation.</p> <p>Under outcome 1.4, please explain what is meant by "financial capacity". If the</p>	<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project means increased revenue by a certain percent then please simply use that language. We will not accept a simple increase in the UNDP Sustainable Finance Scorecard of the structural framework for PA sustainability.</p> <p>Under outputs 1.4.3, the project is making very large assumptions about revenue generation for wetland visitation that is not supported by any data or evidence that visitation is high enough to generate any significant revenue. Please provide supporting data that visitor entry fees will be significant based on the number of visitor per year to wetlands in El Salvador as wetlands are not high visitation areas. The project notes that one site in particular is "commonly visited". By whom and how many visitors per year? If capturing revenue from these visitors is the basis of the sustainable finance strategy for the project, the PIF should include a summary of how many visitors, foreign and national per year come to these sites, and how much revenue could be generated from charging them fair market value.</p> <p>Finally, the project also places a great deal of faith in PES schemes as another revenue generation mechanism, but this too is supported only by aspirational thinking and no real analysis. Furthermore, the project has not considered or incorporated guidance from STAP in the design and development of PES schemes.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>PES schemes have generated very little revenue for PA management costs globally, hence, the project must present some kind of supporting rationale why the project proponents believe that it has any chance to do so in these wetland sites. For a start, can the project identify who will be selling the ecosystem services and who will be buying them? Please revise this element of the PIF, and review the STAP guidance and elucidate how the PIF has incorporated this guidance.</p> <p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>Adequate, but improve this considerably by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Considerably more detailed description provided and satisfactory for CEO endorsement.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Yes. Fully developed and responsive to Council comments on this point.</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Please expand upon the role of women and how gender considerations will be assessed during the PPG and incorporated into the project design.</p> <p>March 26, 2014</p>	<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Yes. Fully developed and responsive to Council comments on this point.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Adequate revisions.	
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Yes and a more developed risk assessment presented, as requested during the PIF review process.</p>
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>No. As noted above, the PIF needs to explain more clearly the relationship of the GEF project to the MCC and IADB baseline projects that have been identified.</p> <p>In addition, the relationship of this project and the biodiversity mainstreaming project on tourism and fisheries also implemented by UNDP is not properly explained. Please improve.</p> <p>Finally, the PIF does not include what has been learned from the tourism/fisheries mainstreaming project and how these lessons are being incorporated into the project's design. Please include.</p> <p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b>	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>With improved design elements as suggested in this review, the project's</p>	<p>12/15/2015</p> <p>Project has adequate plans for sustainability. At the country level, the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	sustainability and potential for scaling up will be enhanced.	project will be replicated in other PWII around the country where biodiversity, including species and ecosystems of global importance, are also under pressure. The project will also have the potential to be replicated and provide lessons learned at the regional level where similar initiatives are underway (e.g., Costa Rica and Nicaragua).
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		December 15, 2015  Adequate explanations provided on the changes undertaken during PPG stage, but fully consistent with the original PIF structure.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		December 15, 2015  Yes.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	March 20, 2014  Yes.	December 15, 2015  Yes.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	March 20, 2014  Yes cofinance is adequate. Will UNDP bring any cofinance to the project? Please clarify.  March 26, 2014	December 15, 2015  Yes, letters confirm cofinancing.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Thank you for the clarification.	
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	March 20, 2014 Yes.	December 15, 2015 Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	March 20, 2014 Yes. Within norms.	December 15, 2015 PPG report provided.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	March 20, 2014 NA.	12/15/2015 NA.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		December 15, 2015 Comprehensive and accurate completion of tracking tools.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		December 15, 2015 Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		December 15, 2015 Adequate and comprehensive response to STAP.
	• Convention Secretariat?		December 15, 2015 NA.
	• The Council?		December 15, 2015



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			Adequate and comprehensive response to Canada, Germany and USA council member comments.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>March 20, 2014</p> <p>No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.</p> <p>Also please use the term biodiversity, instead of the made-up acronym "BD".</p> <p>March 26, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions. PIF is being recommended for approval.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>Yes. All issues raised at PIF stage by GEFSEC have been addressed.</p>
	First review*	March 21, 2014	December 15, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 26, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**