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

GEF ID:	**9804**		
Country/Region:	**Panama**		
Project Title:	**Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in Coastal Marine Production Landscapes**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5750 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4 Program 9;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$45,662**	Project Grant:	**$1,780,822**
Co-financing:	**$5,603,208**	Total Project Cost:	**$7,429,692**
PIF Approval:	**March 20, 2017**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Santiago Carrizosa,**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	March 13, 2017 Yes, clear alignment with BD Program 9.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	March 13, 2017 Yes, aligned with NBSAP and other relevant national planning documents.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	March 13, 2017 The PIF provides a comprehensive	

[1] 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)?
[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	problem analysis of the drivers of biodiversity loss in the coastal and marine environment, and adequately addresses issues of sustainability, scaling and innovation.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	March 13, 2017 Well articulated description of the baseline and sound incremental reasoning provided.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	March 13, 2017 Table B is excellent and measured in terms of what the project will deliver from a modest and targeted investment. Clear outcomes and outputs following from a logical problem analysis and proposed interventions.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	March 13, 2017 Yes, all of these issues adequately addressed.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	March 13, 2017 Yes.	
	• The focal area allocation?	March 13, 2017 Yes.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	March 13, 2017	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		NA.	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	March 13, 2017 NA.	
	• Focal area set-aside?	March 13, 2017 NA.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	March 13, 2017 No. The cofinance numbers in Table B and Table C are different. Please revise and resubmit. March 16, 2017 Yes. The PIF is recommended for CEO clearance. By the time of CEO approval of the MSP, please develop an objective and measurable indicator of "sustainable and biodiversity-friendly fishing practices" for use in the project monitoring system.	
Review Date	Review	March 13, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 16, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	April 2, 2018 Minor adjustments have been made since the PIF stage and these are fully acceptable.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	April 2, 2018 As at PIF stage, this is a very targeted investments and the design is appropriate to deliver a focused set of deliverables.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	April 2, 2018 Yes, financing is adequate with $4.2 million in cash cofinancing to complement the GEF investment.	
	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)	April 2, 2018 UNDP risk log in annex provides comprehensive review of the risks to project success	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	April 2, 2018 Yes.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	April 2, 2018 Yes.	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	April 2, 2018 NA.	
	8. Is the project coordinated with	April 2, 2018	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	Yes, three key national projects are identified and coordination and use of lessons from these projects is adequately elaborated.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	April 2, 2018 Yes, with clear and measurable biodiversity outcome targets.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	April 2, 2018 Yes, this is fully elaborated as part of component three.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	April 2, 2018 Yes, an indicator of the minimum size for harvested adult fish is presented for two key species following FAO best practice guidance for monitoring sustainable fisheries. One will be determined at project inception workshop which is deemed acceptable.	
	• STAP	April 2, 2018 NA	
	• GEF Council	April 2, 2018 NA	

[3] 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.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	• Convention Secretariat	April 2, 2018 NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	April 2, 2018 Yes. MSP is recommended for CEO endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	April 02, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		