



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

GEF ID:	4716		
Country/Region:	Guatemala		
Project Title:	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Coastal and Marine Protected Areas (MPAs)		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4639 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$90,909	Project Grant:	\$5,354,545
Co-financing:	\$16,190,534	Total Project Cost:	\$21,635,988
PIF Approval:	November 23, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
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	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes - Guatemala ratified the CBD in 1995.	10/7/2013 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes, the OFP endorsed the project in a letter dated 11 Sept 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	AWV 11/21/11 Conservation and management of PAs has been a core UNDP program within its biodiversity portfolio. UNDP is supporting PA projects in 15 countries in the Latin America and Caribbean region. UNDP has staff in country and at its regional hub in Panama who will supervise the project and provide	10/7/2013 Yes.

	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	AWV 11/21/11 NA	10/7/2013 NA.
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes, it fits both into the United Nation's program framework in Guatemala and UNDP's country program document. Specifically, the UNDAF for Guatemala recognizes conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as a priority for UN support to Guatemala. UNDP's country program document highlights actions to improve environmental governance. This project is consistent with these objectives. The UNDP country office will have the lead in supervising and managing this project, with support from seven assigned core staff, being led by a program analyst with an MSc in Conservation and Resource Management and 9 years of field experience.	10/7/2013 NA.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	AWV 11/21/11 This project will utilize \$5.445 million of Guatemala's STAR allocation for BD, which totals \$7.99 million, of which none has been used to date.	10/7/2013 Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	AWV 11/21/11 See above	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	AWV 11/21/11 NA	10/7/2013 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	AWV 11/21/11 NA	10/7/2013 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 	AWV 11/21/11 NA	10/7/2013 NA.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	AWV 11/21/11 NA	10/7/2013 NA.
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes - it is fully aligned with BD Objective 1. Although not emphasized, the Component 3 will contribute to sustainable use of biodiversity by improving the regulation of fish caught in the multiple-use protected areas.	10/7/2013 Yes.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes - under BD Objective 1, it will contribute to BD Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 and outputs 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3.	10/7/2013 Yes. In future, please complete Table A under FA outcomes and FA outputs with actual text.
	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?	AWV 11/21/11 The project will help Guatemala meet its commitment to reach the Target 11 under the CBD's Aichi Targets - conserving at least 10% of its coastal and marine areas through effective protected areas by 2020. The areas to be protected were identified through a gap analysis conducted in 2009 that resulted from the CBD's program of work on PAs. The project should also be seen as a measure to implement	10/7/2013 Yes.

		Management of Marine-Coastal Zones.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>AWV 11/21/11</p> <p>The project proposes to establish three new multiple use MPAs and expand two existing MPAs, in a sustainable manner, through a combination of institutional and policy reform, measures to enhance financial sustainability, capacity building, and actions to minimize and/or better manage threats to the health of the ecosystems to be protected. Sustainability will be enhanced by: (1) early and continued stakeholder consultation and engagement; (2) development of mechanisms to generate revenue for MPA management - both compulsory and voluntary mechanisms; (3) training and capacity building of institutions and individuals who will have a primary role in PA management, including the government, local government, the private sector, and PA-level staff; and (4) improved monitoring and management of fishing effort inside the PA.</p>	<p>10/7/2013</p> <p>Yes.</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>AWV 11/21/11</p> <p>Yes - the proposal clearly describes the baseline situation in the country, and projects that are supporting this baseline of activities. Sound data and assumptions are provided - such as the annual level of national government investment in Guatemala's PA system.</p>	<p>10/7/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>

	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?		10/7/2013 Yes.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	AWV 11/21/11 This proposal is very strong in this regard. The project will create and expand Guatemala's MPAs, and only on the Pacific Coast, which is clearly incremental to present efforts. Guatemala has protected only 1.1% of its only coastal and marine seascapes and landscapes (covering 194,000 ha out of 16 ha million total). Of the area protected, only 3% (6,080 ha) is found on the Pacific Coast. Through this project, the marine and coastal zone under protection will increase by 116% to 408,000 ha.	10/7/2013 Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes, it is clear, reinforcing and sound. As noted below, we have some comments to be followed up on as part of the request for CEO endorsement.	10/7/2013 Yes.
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	AWV 11/21/11 The applied methodology is mostly sound, but with regard to financial sustainability, the following questions should be answered at CEO endorsement: 1. Outcome 1.3 is to increase funding from "government and non-government sources" for MPAs by 10%. Why was this figure chosen? Will it be sufficient	10/7/2013 This issues have been adequately addressed.

		<p>coverage?</p> <p>2. Please describe how the adjustment of coastal land lease rates will be accomplished and estimates of increased revenue.</p> <p>3. The proposal also mentions the project will develop and implement an "action plan to encourage voluntary financial contributions from the private sector." At CEO endorsement please provide justification as to whether such voluntary schemes are likely to work in Guatemala, based on experience with other cases.</p>	
	<p>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>	<p>AWV 11/21/11</p> <p>This is an area where we would like to see further improvement for CEO endorsement. The PIF emphasizes participation and skills strengthening as socioeconomic benefits, almost as an end in themselves, but it seems more appropriate to count these as a means to and end of securing benefits. Benefits mentioned are rather general in nature and hard to measure, such as improved ecological services. Gender is mentioned only in the context of "empowerment of men and women," but we see in the PPG that an action plan will be developed to include specific activities to benefit women. Still, the PIF and PPG are too focused on "involvement" and not provision of benefits.</p> <p>We would like the document for CEO endorsement to include at least one</p>	<p>10/7/2013</p> <p>This issues have been adequately addressed.</p>

		<p>related target, relevant to the socioeconomic benefits to be provided by the project. If feasible, an indicator that is gender disaggregate-able would be welcomed.</p> <p>The CEO endorsement document should also describe how the proponent has involved men and women in different ways during the preparation of the project.</p>	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<p>AWV 11/21/11</p> <p>Yes, it is. It is clear that local communities will be properly consultant. But, there is little mention of CSOs. The final project document should list local CSOs and local industry groups (e.g. fishing cooperatives) that were consulted during project design.</p>	<p>10/7/2013</p> <p>This issues have been adequately addressed.</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>AWV 11/21/11</p> <p>Yes. In addition to mangrove protection, the project will train national and municipal-level authorities to better understand the impacts of climate change and to adapt conservation and management strategies in response to CC effects. The proposition that this project will be coordinated with an AF funded project could yield further benefits in terms of mainstreaming the building of adaptation capacity.</p>	<p>10/7/2013</p> <p>Yes.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>AWV 11/21/11</p> <p>The project is sound in this regard as it will seek to establish protected areas on the Pacific Coast. Current efforts in country supporting MPAs are on the Caribbean coast (through GEF-funded</p>	<p>10/7/2013</p> <p>Yes, coordination has been detailed and further advanced.</p>

		IADB, as well as separate USAID and KfW projects.)	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes - UNDP will supervise activities to be executed through the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN), the National Council of Protected Areas (CONAP), and the Nature Conservancy (TNC).	10/7/2013 Yes.
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		10/7/2013 Some minor changes, not changing the substantive direction presented at PIF.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		10/7/2013 NA.
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes - project management costs total \$267,000, or 5% of the total project costs.	10/7/2013 Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes - the allocation of GEF funding and co-financing per objective seems appropriate.	10/7/2013 Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	AWV 11/21/11 The proposed co-financing ratio is healthy - at a ratio of 1:3. Good amounts of co-financing are provided by national government authorities (a 1:1 ratio of of in cash and in kind), and funding is provided from bilateral aid agencies, an NGO (TNC), and local foundations, universities, and research	10/7/2013 Adaptation fund resources are not being presented as cofinance.

		For final CEO endorsement: Please explain how the expected \$5 million grant from the Adaptation Fund (which is presently at concept stage) relates to this project. While the executing agency will be the same, the AF will fund efforts in a different region with different stakeholders. If there is an overlap, please explain and only count as co-financing the funding that is related to the baseline or increment of the GEF project.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	AWV 11/21/11 UNDP will provide \$607,000 in grant co-financing for this project. At CEO endorsement: please explain what this will support.	10/7/2013 UNDP is providing \$2.7 million through a number of grants, the applicabilty of each is adequately explained.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		10/7/2013 Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		10/7/2013 Yes.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		10/7/2013 Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		10/7/2013 NA.
	• Council comments?		10/7/2013 Yes.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		10/7/2013

Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>As noted in other sections, we request the following to be addressed in the document for CEO endorsement.</p> <p>1. On financial sustainability, please address three questions:</p> <p>A. Outcome 1.3 is to increase funding from "government and non-government sources" for MPAs by 10%. Why was this figure chosen? Will it be sufficient to manage a 116% increase in MPA coverage?</p> <p>B. Please describe how the adjustment of coastal land lease rates will be accomplished and estimates of increased revenue.</p> <p>C. The proposal mentions that the project will develop and implement an "action plan to encourage voluntary financial contributions from the private sector." At CEO endorsement please provide justification as to whether such voluntary schemes are likely to work in Guatemala, based on experience with other cases.</p> <p>2. On socioeconomic benefits, the document should include at least one tangible socioeconomic indicator, and related target, relevant to the socioeconomic benefits to be provided by the project. If feasible, an indicator</p>	

		<p>be welcomed.</p> <p>3. Participation: Please list the local CSOs and local industry groups (e.g. fishing cooperatives) that were consulted during project design. The CEO endorsement document should also describe how the proponent has involved men and women in different ways during the preparation of the project.</p> <p>4. Adaptation & Cofinancing: Please explain how the expected \$5 million grant from the Adaptation Fund (which is presently at concept stage) relates to this project. While the executing agency will be the same, the AF will fund efforts in a different region with different stakeholders. If there is an overlap, please explain and only count as co-financing the funding that is related to the baseline or increment of the GEF project.</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?		10/7/2013 Yes.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		10/7/2013 Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 21, 2011	October 07, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	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?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes. UNDP is seeking \$90,909 for the PPG, to support (1) assessment of the existing legal and financial framework, (2) setting the baseline conservation targets, (3) assessments of socio-economic assessments, and (4) final preparation of the project documents and budget.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes the amounts for each of the budget items seems appropriate. The consultant costs and allotted time per item seem reasonable for each of the items.
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	AWV 11/21/11 Yes.
	4. Other comments	AWV 11/21/11 As remarked in the PIF review, the proposal seems to have confused means and ends in terms of socio-economic benefits. We are pleased that the PPG activity will have a plan to include specific activities to benefit women, other than this, the PPG's focus on socio-economic issues is capacity building and "stakeholder involvement plan." The expert should also create a socioeconomic baseline for the project, with at least one indicator that will be tracked during the project to assess whether benefits are maintained, or even increase.
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 21, 2011
	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.