



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9668		
Country/Region:	Maldives		
Project Title:	Enhancing National Development through Environmentally Resilient Islands (ENDhERI)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-4 Program 10; BD-3 Program 6;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$120,000	Project Grant:	\$3,532,968
Co-financing:	\$12,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$15,532,968
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jean-Marc Sinnassamy	Agency Contact Person:	Max Zieren

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	Not fully. We support the idea to develop a BD stand alone project, applying the flexibility option for Maldives STAR resources. However, the three proposed BD programs have their own requirements and further clarification is needed: - The BD4 Program 9 (Human/Biodiversity interface) can be used in the vicinity of a Key Biodiversity Area, KBA, or the	

<sup>1</sup> 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 the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>demonstration of benefits for global important biodiversity should be made using the KBA criteria. Actually, there is no KBA in the Laamu Atoll, and the demonstration has not been made for this pilot area. Either make the demonstration using KBA criteria (not only the presence of red list species), or remove this program and focus on the programs 6 and 10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The BD4 Program 10 (natural capital accounting): this objective should clearly finance the application of methods and tools to link natural capital valuations to development policy and finance planning. You should clearly include outputs to reflect these aspects.</li> <li>- The PIF is 23 page long (it should be 10 page long). The information to explain the additional role of GEF resources on the top of baseline and cofinancing resources is too diluted (section 1.3). Please, revise.</li> </ul> <p>February 1, 2017</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-The manner in which the project seeks to develop natural capital accounts is still not clear. Please specify what natural capital accounts will be created and what methodology will be used. We assume it will be based on UN SEEA, but if it is not</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>please specify the methodology that will be used, what accounts will be created, and what institution in government will maintain the accounts (we assume the national statistics division). Please clarify what valuation methodology will be used as well. Finally, clarify the process whereby this information will be applied in decision making and policy development. Currently the PIF is simply too vague on the details of Component three where most of the investment is from Program 10. Please also clarify where the other Program 10 resources are being invested (about \$0.5 million) and what activities these resources will support.</p> <p>March 29, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>Yes.</p>	
<p><b>Project Design</b></p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>Problems and barriers are described along 4.5 pages: We recommend to reduce the text and provide a more structured and focused problem analysis to identify the specific drivers this project wants to address.</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		February 1, 2017 Addressed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could you please confirm the existing level of dialogue with the different partners mentioned in the table C on cofinancing.</li> <li>- Please, make the distinction between cofinancing in-kind and in cash.</li> <li>- The table C mentions 15 different partners. It seems a lot and may contribute to the lack of project focus. Please, justify or revise.</li> </ul> <p>February 1, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The result framework proposed 7 outcomes and 15 outputs, reflecting a possible dilution of efforts and lack of focus. Please, revise the project reasoning (see item 1 on the section 1.3) and revise the result framework.</li> <li>- All outcomes and outputs related to integrated coastal management (including participative plans, governance), addressing pressures on coral reefs (fishing, pollutions, tourism), implementing Marine Management Areas are welcome.</li> <li>- Some outputs (2.1.1, 2.1.3) do not seem additional and raise questions about the role of cofinancing, sustainability, and country ownership. A national biodiversity center should</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>be financed by the cofinancing and the government, but not by the GEF. Same comment for the curricula.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The formulation of outputs should follow OECD guidance and be specific, quantified, and reflect the results of activities. Please, revise the formulation and include quantified outputs (probably merge 1.1.1 and 1.1.2, revise the formulation of 1.2.1, 1.2.2; revise or merge 3.2.1, 3.2.2, and 3.2.3).</li> <li>- There are many indicators proposed in the table B (too many?). Do you think it will be feasible to develop appropriate baseline data during PPG to develop a robust monitoring and assessment/evaluation system? Would the resources be available to measure all these variables?</li> </ul> <p>February 1, 2017</p> <p>-Per the note above, the entire body of work the project will support on natural capital accounting is not clearly explained in Table B particularly at the output and outcome level in components two and three. Please clarify the natural capital accounts that will be created as outputs along with what valuations will be produced as outputs as it is these outputs which will then be incorporated into sector plans and</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>spatial planning etc. Currently, the document is simply too vague on these outputs and the steps that will be undertaken to produce this information.</p> <p>March 29, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>- There is an output related to a gender plan. However, we would like more information about the nature of this social marketing and outreach plan.</p> <p>- In the PPG, we would like to see a study on inequities between male and female, and a plan to reduce them, if any.</p> <p>February 1, 2017 Addressed.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>- The Republic of the Maldives is a country with flexible STAR allocations</p> <p>- Indicative STAR Allocation:\$6,656,850</p> <p>- STAR Allocations remaining to be programmed:\$6,437,850 (LD: \$1 million, BD:\$2,656,850; CCM:\$2,781,000).</p> <p>No objection to develop a \$4 million</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		BD project (Project grant: \$3,532,968; fees: \$335,635; PPG and PPG fees: 131,400). Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	Yes	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please, address the comments above.</p> <p>February 1, 2017</p> <p>We sincerely thank the Agency for this revised PIF showing major improvements; however, the PIF is simply too vague about the critical elements of natural capital accounting and valuation, how these exercises will be undertaken in the project, what government agency will be responsible for this work, and then how these outputs will be included in policy and planning process, therefore, the PIF cannot be recommended yet. Please provide more details within the PIF about these elements of the project and resubmit. Within the revision, please provide a better baseline description of the natural capital accounting capacity and institutional</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		<p>infrastructure upon which the GEF investment will build.</p> <p>March 29, 2017            Many thanks to the Agency for the revisions: All the points have been addressed. The PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	November 14, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 29, 2017	

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		



## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEFSEC</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GEF Council</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.