



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

GEF ID:	<b>5201</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global (Brazil, Chile, Madagascar)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE): Conserving Earth's Most Irreplaceable Sites for Endangered Biodiversity</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-1; BD-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,922,813</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$4,400,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$6,322,813</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Mark Zimsky</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Edoardo Zandri</b>

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 country eligible?	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>The project is presented as a global project and no countries have expressed interest in the project through submission of endorsement letters or allocation of resources from their biodiversity resources.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>The three participating countries, Brazil, Madagascar and Chile are all eligible.</p>	
	2. Has the operational focal point	December 3, 2012	

\*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 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>endorsed the project?</p>	<p>The project is listed as "global", thus no endorsement letters are required.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>The three participating countries, Brazil, Madagascar and Chile have all submitted endorsement letters from the GEF OFPs.</p> <p>March 27, 2014</p> <p>We note revised Chile OFP endorsement letter increasing contribution.</p>	
<p>Agency's Comparative Advantage</p>	<p>3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>Please explain the comparative advantage that UNEP possesses regarding the implementation of activities under Component Two in which the project proposes to mainstream the protection of AZE sites into MDB and private sector safeguard policies.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>No. Please delete the entire text in the first paragraph after the second sentence and delete the last sentence in section C.2 as they add no value.</p> <p>Please add descriptions of UNEP's comparative advantage with regards to: 1) how UNEP will follow up</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>implementation in the three participating countries;            2) how, in the context of component two, UNEP proposes to facilitate the work of the project with the MDBs and the private sector and through what mechanism to mainstream AZE considerations within safeguard policies of these institutions.            3) how UNEP will facilitate integration of AZE priorities within NBSAPs through the NBSAP forum and through the specific NBSAP revision projects for which UNEP currently serves as the GEF Implementing Agency.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<p>5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>	<p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>The PIF does not address this issue adequately for the three participating countries. See comment above on question three.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>6. Is the proposed Grant (including the</p>		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>No resources are being provided from the STAR as no countries have endorsed the proposal.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Three countries have endorsed the proposal and all have adequate star amounts.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p>	<p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Yes, reosurces are still available.</p>	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>Under BD-1, please use the proper outcome language from the BD strategy and reduce the outcomes to one</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>outcome and edit accordingly. Under FA outputs for BD-1, please use the right output descriptions.</p> <p>Under BD-2, the GEF strategy is focused on mainstreaming biodiversity into Government policies and regulations that govern activities in the productive sectors. The proposal as presented focuses on integrating AZE site considerations into policies and regulatory frameworks, which is a very narrow approach vis a vis the GEF strategy and thus is not actually properly aligned. The likelihood of success for this kind of activity which requires Government leadership and commitment is extremely limited given that no countries have expressed an interest in participating in this project by allocating their biodiversity resources to the project.</p> <p>Furthermore, the approach of mainstreaming AZE considerations into the safeguard policies of development banks is not GEF-eligible and should be entirely paid for by cofinance. This kind of mainstreaming is actually part of the mandate of these institutions and is their responsibility. Please adjust text, budget and framework accordingly in the revised PIF.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>The project is aligned with BD-1 and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>BD-2. However, the focal area strategy framework in Table A is not well-aligned with the actual content of the project framework thus undermining the presented alignment. Please see comments on the project framework and the project design.</p> <p>With regards to Table A, the hectare coverage should be identical to the size of the sites in Brazil and Chile. Please estimate the site size for the potential intervention in Madagascar.</p> <p>In section A.1.1, please delete the last sentence that begins with "This proposal also...." as it is not relevant to this section which requests the consistency of the project with the GEF BD strategy.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>NA</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the relevant objectives are identified.</p>	
	<p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>Project is linked to the Aichi Targets 11 and 12; however, no countries are formally participating in the project at this time nor is it clear where the project</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>proposes to work at national level, thus it is impossible to assess whether the project is consistent with the NBSAPs.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>In addition to referencing the national reports of the three countries, please identify within each country's NBSAP how the country has prioritized species conservation and in particular the conservation of Endangered and Critically Endgangered species.</p> <p>Please delete the text in A.2 that describes the two MoUs as this does not answer the purpose of this section nor is it particularly germane to the proposal itself.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>The capacities of the AZE partnership will be developed, but it remains unclear how capacities of national agencies, both Government and NGOs, will be built and sustained. Please clarify.</p> <p>Most of this aspect of the project is covered in Component three. Please delete the second part of output 3.2.3 as the project will not support AZE as a programmatic approach. Therefore end the output 3.2.3 statement after the</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>word sustainability. GEF funding is not to be used to develop future proposals as is indicated in this output statement.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Adequate improvement, but the relevant outcomes and outputs for this component of the project (Component three) require editing so that outcomes and outputs are properly and precisely written. See question 14 below which provides a review of the entire project framework and design.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>At a global level, the baseline description covers the AZE initiative and describes it in general terms. No assessment is provided on resources invested to actually managed AZE sites either globally or in the specific countries mentioned. Please address this gap.</p> <p>The baseline description for countries that are mentioned in the text and the focal area frameworks as having advanced the AZE work is not presented. Please provide.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>In section B.1, please delete all the paragraphs beginning from the paragraph that begins with "AZE Scientists" until the end of that section as they do not describe the baseline.</p> <p>Please include the following descriptions in the baseline section:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Describe the baseline project and/or situation for the project sites and activities to be implemented in Brazil, Chile and Madagascar through component one.</li> <li>2) Describe the baseline project and/or situation with regards to the policies in each country within which the project proposes to insert AZE considerations through component two.</li> <li>3) Describe the baseline project and/or situation with regards to the safeguard policies of each MDB and private sector entity that will be the focus of component two AZE mainstreaming into safeguard policies.</li> <li>4) Describe the baseline situation with regards to the appearance of AZE sites with NBSAPs. Please delete reference to integrating AZE sites into CC strategies in Table B.</li> <li>5) Describe the baseline project and/or situation with regards to capacity development and awareness of AZE that the project proposes to build upon as expressed in the project framework.</li> </ol> <p>March 24, 2014</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.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>Many of the activities and outputs are actually plans, reports etc for the CBD COP and mainly information products with very little being invested in actual site conservation of AZE sites. The incrementality of these activities are minimal at best. Please see comments under question 14.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Given that the baseline projects and the baseline situation is so poorly described for each component of the project, one is not able to assess the incremental reasoning of the proposed actions. Once the project proponents adequately describe the baseline situation, please rewrite the entire section B.2 from scratch.</p> <p>The only section that can be salvaged from B.2 is the description of Component One, which still needs editing. The rest of the text should be deleted and replaced with new text.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>The project framework is not specific enough.</p> <p>Component one of the project should be focused on the management of AZE sites in identified countries that will allocate some of their biodiversity resources towards the management of these sites. The component costs \$4.87 million and is mostly geared towards paper outputs which have marginal global benefit and that are focused on publicizing and documenting the entire concept of AZE sites.</p> <p>Under Component One please clarify the "emergency opportunity fund", how much money will be allocated to the fund (GEF and non-GEF), and how these investments will complement the three protected areas that the project proposes to support. Please also distinguish these investments from the Save-our-Species rapid action grant funding window.</p> <p>Please identify the countries and the protected areas where the project will invest under component one.</p> <p>Component one should focus on national AZE site management that can</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>demonstrate good practice to other countries around the world on how AZE sites can be cost-efficiently managed as opposed to gap-filling exercises, data collection etc.</p> <p>Component two also focuses mainly on the production of paper documents to inform and influence the decisions that others will take vis a vis AZE site management without any evidence in the conservation literature that this kind of approach will reduce threats to biodiversity. This component will cost \$600,000 to basically produce two sets of guidance documents which will not create new knowledge but simply package and synthesize existing knowledge. This is a very expensive product, therefore, please clarify and provide better justification for the GEF investment and the cost.</p> <p>Component two proposes that as an outcome MDBs, private sector, and UN agencies will mainstream AZE site protection into their policies, but this should be the work of these agencies themselves, and not be funded through a GEF project. Furthermore, as mentioned earlier in the review, it not clear how UNEP as the GEF agency has a comparative advantage to do this activity.</p> <p>Component three is focused mainly on building capacity of the AZE network</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and Secretariat. We find this component lacking any appeal for GEF support, particularly given its cost, as we see minimal global benefits being generated by these activities.</p> <p>In revising the PIF, the following changes would be required for the PIF to be reconsidered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Interested countries who desire to advance AZE site management in their countries will have to dedicate resources from their biodiversity allocation for the project. Only with this contribution would resources from the Focal Area Set Aside be available.</li> <li>2) The components should be structured around improving the management of AZE sites and their sustainable finance in a select group of AZE sites in a select group of countries. Management activities could include a wide range of activities, including biodiversity mainstreaming withing Government policy and regulatory frameworks consistent with the GEF strategy.</li> <li>3) The establishment of a small grants funds for "emergencies" is not justified and the rationale provided for its necessity is weak thus this would not be included in the revised PIF. Money originally allocated to that fund should simply be spent on national level management activities for the AZE sites</li> </ol>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>of the participating countries.</p> <p>4) One component could be dedicated to global level activities that would be funded by the FAS, however, this would only make sense if the project was rooted in national level activities. Global level activities would focus on sharing lessons learned from the national-level actions, and developing a feasible plan for helping guide the work of MDBs and their safeguard policies to be AZE-friendly but this would require more careful thought in terms of its design, implementation and justification for GEF support. We would expect that the cost of these global activities and the production of guidance documents and the like to be quite small in proportion to the finance provided by GEF for the site- and national-level activities.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>In the 14 months that have passed since the first PIF was submitted, the entire proposal has not improved in any meaningful manner, the design is still imprecise and poorly articulated, and the project framework also is very weak and not supported by germane text in the PIF. Please see comments below.</p> <p>The project framework confuses outcomes and outputs, includes activities and irrelevant and prodigious explanatory text which offers no added</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>value. The project framework needs entirely rewritten and the edits are so extensive they can not be accommodated in the review sheet. We will meet with UNEP and the project proponents to explain.</p> <p>However, the text of the PIF must also be rewritten so that there is coherence in the problem statement, the baseline description, the proposed response, the incremental reasoning and the project framework and the outcomes and outputs of the project.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>The assumptions supporting the description of incremental benefits of the current design are untenable. The project requires a re-design as noted above in #14 and the incremental benefits described accordingly.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>No. The project has to provide a better analysis of the baseline, description of the problem statement, the proposed solution and only then can incremental benefits be assessed, described, and presented.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</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.	
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, 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>December 3, 2012</p> <p>A clear description is not provided, therefore, please improve section B.3.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>This section remains of unacceptable quality. Please delete all text and rewrite.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>December 3, 2102</p> <p>The PIF is simply generic text cut and pasted from all the AZE organizations about what they do, there is no added value in this section of the PIF. Please improve accordingly with specific text once the PIF is revised.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>This section takes up two pages of the PIF, but could easily be presented in half the length if not less than a page and be more focused. Please edit this text significantly and focus only on germane information. Much of what is included is irrelevant to the actual project.</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Please avoid inconsistencies such as noting that the project plans to explore working with the private sector while on the other hand the private sector is included in a critical outcome and is identified in the project framework.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>The PIF discusses AZE sites and country situations in a generic way, thus, there is limited added value in this section of the PIF. Please improve accordingly with specific text once the PIF is revised.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>The mitigation measure for Risk 4 can not be seeking more GEF funding. Please delete and rethink the project strategy for this risk.</p> <p>Do not cite examples in your mitigation measures, simply state what the project will do.</p> <p>Now that the project has actually identified sites where the project will work, and has three participating countries, the mitigation measures must reflect the specific nature of risks in each country and at each site. This is</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>particularly critical for risk 1, 3, 6, and 7.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>The PIF presents a generic description of the AZE network and how it functions. Once a more site-based proposal is presented, refine this section to be national-specific and coordinate the AZE site work with other GEF investments in protected areas.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>No. Please focus on the issue that is to be addressed in this section: outline the coordination with other related initiatives to the focus of the activities within the three project components. This section is not a place to discuss implementation plans but rather how the work undertaken in each country and in the thematic components of two and three will coordinate--in precise and specific terms--with other related initiatives.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>December 3, 2012</p> <p>The project implementation</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>arrangements presented are generic and top-down based on the institutional structures of the AZE network partners. Once a revised PIF is developed, please complement this implementation description with national-level descriptions of implementation arrangements.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>No. Please improve the description of the project implementation arrangement and precisely identify how the project will be implemented in the three countries, who are the key government line agencies and NGO partners that will be involved, etc. This section remains too generic and could be applied to a conservation project anywhere in the world.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>December 4, 2012</p> <p>Project management costs are appropriate.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing		<p>February 6, 2013</p> <p>Project management costs remain appropriate.</p>	
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>December 4, 2012</p> <p>Please revise these costs once project is redesigned per review sheet suggestions.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Please clarify, once the components are more clearly articulated and presented, how much STAR and how much of the focal area set aside is being directed towards each component.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>December 4, 2012</p> <p>Revise cofinancing presentation once project design is revised per review sheet suggestions.</p> <p>February 6, 2014</p> <p>Cash cofinancing remains very weak. Please try and improve this amount.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Adequate cofinancing in current draft.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in</p>	<p>December 4, 2012</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	line with its role?	Yes.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?	December 4, 2012 NA.	
	• Convention Secretariat?	December 4, 2012 NA.	
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?	December 4, 2012 NA.	
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	December 4, 2012  No. Please address all comments above in a revised PIF and resubmit.  February 6, 2014  No. The only significant advance the PIF has made in 14 months is the identification of two sites in Brazil and Chile and the support of the three participating countries. The design and rationale of the project is still weakly presented and numerous weaknesses	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>have been identified in the existing version of the PIF from a content, substance, and presentatin standpoint, therefore, the PIF requires a major revision to improve content and substance, precision, logic, and presentation. Any information that is germane to the implementation of component one and that is in Annex 1, should be incorporated into the actual text of the PIF and not be added as an Annex.</p> <p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>The revised PIF is a vast improvement over the previous draft and all comments by GEFSEC have been adequately addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	<p>31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>By the time of the submission of the MSP, please identify the funding and replication strategy for the 10 additional sites covering 40,000 hectares. The replication strategy should include the elements of AZE site conservation that are unique to managing these small sites and that distinguish the interventions from standard conservation practice, if there are clear distinctions and activities that are "AZE-specific". Within the replication strategy, please consider including opportunities for catalyzing conservation action beyond AZE sites and in broader landscapes using AZE</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>sites as a stepping-stone for site-based action, as appropriate within each participating country.</p> <p>This stepping-stone approach should also be considered within the context of advancing AZE site conservation in the safeguard policies of the MDBs and commercial banks. That is, AZE site prioritization within safeguard policies might provide opportunities for a more expansive conservation dialogue and broader integration of biodiversity priorities within safeguard policies. During the project design process, we encourage the proponents to consider this possibility within Component Two as it is further developed.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	December 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	February 06, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 27, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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.**

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	March 27, 2014 Yes.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	March 27, 2014 Yes.
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	March 27, 2014 Yes.
	4. Other comments	March 27, 2014 Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 27, 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.