



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

GEF ID:	5810		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Protected Areas Planning in the Era of Climate Change PAPEC		
GEF Agency:	WWF-US	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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:	\$30,000	Project Grant:	\$1,804,862
Co-financing:	\$2,467,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,301,862
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Herve Lefevre

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible ?	April 28, 2014 Global project, not applicable.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	April 28, 2014 Global project, not applicable.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	April 28, 2014 Global project, not applicable.	
	• the focal area allocation?	April 28, 2014 Yes.	

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

¹ 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 ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>NA.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>Yes, resources are available.</p>	
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</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>	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>By the time of CEO approval of the MSP, please indicate hectare coverage and ecosystem coverage for implementation of regional and country-level actions.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>Yes, linked to global priorities within CBD.</p>	
	<p>6. 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>April 28, 2014</p> <p>Yes, this is sufficient for the PIF. By the time of CEO approval, please expand and deepen for particular regions and countries where the project will work.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	April 28, 2014 Yes.	
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	April 28, 2014 Yes.	
	9. 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?		
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	April 28, 2014 Yes.	
	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)	April 28, 2014 Yes this is the project's entire focus.	
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	April 28, 2014 Yes. By the time of CEO approval, please provide further details as regional and country-level actions are identified and designed.	
	13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for	April 28, 2014 This project is innovative and will help	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>GEF's clients to better incorporate climate change considerations in their protected area management activities.</p> <p>By the time of CEO approval, please provide a more complete plan on the project's sustainability strategy post-project and how the participating executing agencies will promote uptake and use of the information produced by the project and its ongoing refinement and application.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	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?		
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?	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>Yes.</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 with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement:</u> Has co-financing been confirmed?	<p>April 28, 2014</p> <p>Yes. Please seek to increase cash cofinancing by the time of CEO approval of the MSP.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	April 28, 2014 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?	April 28, 2014 Yes.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	April 28, 2014 NA.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	April 28, 2014 No. The PIF has benefitted from considerable	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>upstream dialogue between GEFSEC and the GEF agency, however, please note the following data issues and correct them and submit a revised PIF:</p> <p>1) Total cofinance amounts in the focal area strategy framework (FASF) and Project Framework differ. 2) FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ. 3) FASF and Finance Overview total cofinance amounts differ. 4) The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance.</p> <p>April 29, 2014</p> <p>Yes, all issues resolved.</p>	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	First review*	April 28, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	April 29, 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.