



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

GEF ID:	5656		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Parks, People, Planet: Protected Areas as Solutions to Global Challenges		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5230 (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:	\$1,826,484
Co-financing:	\$4,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$6,326,484
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Yoko Watanabe	Agency Contact Person:	Fabiana Issler

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> ?		This is a global project which does not target specific countries.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?		This is a global project does not target specific countries, thus OFP endorsement is not required.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?		n/a
	• the focal area allocation?		Yes, it is within the BD focal area allocation.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		n/a
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		n/a

\*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)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		Yes, the project requests total of \$2m, which will be financed from the BD FA set-aside.
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><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></p>		Yes, the project aligns with the GEF-5 BD1.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>		This project is a global project and consistent with the CBD Strategic Plan on Biodiversity (Target 11) and guidance on Protected Areas, particularly PoWPA.
Project Design	<p>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>		Yes, the baseline projects are sufficiently described.
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>		<p>Yes, the project design is sufficiently clear and results framework includes detailed information.</p> <p>On the institutional arrangement, considering that the project would be useful for GEF knowledge management and learning on BD1, it is suggested that</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			GEFSEC is also involved in the Project Advisory Group.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?		Yes, GEB and incremental reasoning are sufficiently clarified in the document.
	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?		Sufficient information is provided for CEO approval, however, it is expected that further details on socio-economic benefits and gender elements to be clarified during project inception and reported through PIRs.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?		The project will be implemented by IUCN, which is a CSO. Sufficient information provided on other stakeholders, including potential private sector and government partners.
	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)		Yes, sufficiently described.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?		Yes, coordination with relevant initiatives and projects are described. It is required that the project will clearly identify relevant GEF and other projects on PAs that would be participate in the learning and knowledge platform and other project activities.
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects</b> ,		Innovative aspects of the project is sufficiently described, however, the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><b>sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <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>		<p>section on sustainability is rather weak and requires additional information on IUCN, UNDP, and other partners plan to sustain the knowledge platform and other initiatives under the project.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>N/a. PIF has not been prepared for this MSP project as it pursues an one step approval process.</p>
	<p>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?</p>		<p>Yes, sufficient information provided.</p>
<p><b>Project Financing</b></p>	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>		<p>Yes, the cofinancing ratio is 1 to 2.25. it is expected that further cofinancing is mobilized during project implementation and improve this ratio.</p> <p>Budget information provided under table A and B does not match. Please revise table A and ensure consistency.</p>
	<p>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</p>		<p>Cofinancing letters have been provided from IUCN (\$4m) and UNDP (\$0.5m) and considered appropriate.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?		
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?		The PMC is within 10% of the project cost. However, more than half of this PMC is identified to be utilized by UNDP. While most of the project finance is expected to be managed by IUCN, reason for larger PMC allocation to UNDP is unclear. Please clarify and revise as appropriate.
	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?		No PPG has been requested.
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		No tracking tool has been prepared as the project is not focused on specific PAs.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, appropriate budgeted M&E table has been provided. However, the project lacks the standard M&E description that are found and applied to regular UNDP managed project. Please provide further information.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		Please provide adequate response if

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			comments are provided.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		Please provide adequate response if comments are provided.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		n/a
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		Please provide adequate response if comments are provided.
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
<b>Recommendation at PIF Stage</b>	<b>24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>		
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
<b>Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval</b>	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		<p>No at this point. Need to clarify, revise, and/or provide addition information on:</p> <p>1) Budget: Revise table A to be consistent with table B 2) Sustainability: Provide additional information/plan on how to sustain the knowledge sharing platform and other activities. 3) M&amp;E: provide standard text/description on M&amp;E requirement, in addition to the table. 4) Project Mgmt Cost: why is UNDP allocation higher than IUCN? 5) Institutional arrangement: include GEFSEC in the project advisory group or other relevant arrangement.</p> <p>16 Dec 2013 The GEFSEC received a revised CEO approval document that adequately addresses the earlier comment. The issue on sustainability could be further strategized and clarified during project implementation. The PM recommends the project for CEO approval.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	First review*		December 13, 2013
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		December 16, 2013
	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.