



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\*

### THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4505		
Country/Region:	Peru		
Project Title:	Strengthening Sustainable Management of the Guano Islands, Islets and Capes National Reserve System (RNSIIPG)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	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; BD-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$8,755,910
Co-financing:	\$20,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$28,755,910
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Jo Albert,

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?	April 12, 2011  Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	April 12, 2011  Yes, dated March 12, 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	April 12, 2011  Currently, the Bank is implementing a number of other PA projects in the country, however please provide more substance in Section C and see question 6 below.  August 2, 2011  Please clarify what staff in the Peru office will be in charge of this project in	

		<p>This is particularly germane as there is no Bank baseline investment in the coastal zone that the project is complementing.</p> <p>August 24, 2011 Thank you for the additional information. It would be beneficial to have new information reflected in the PIF document.</p>	
	<p>4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>There is not a non-grant instrument in the project.</p>	
	<p>5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>No details have been provided. Please clarify Agency's program staff in country with expertise in PA management and sustainable financing of PAs.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify Agency's program staff in country with expertise in PA management and sustainable financing of PAs. This is particularly germane as there is no Bank baseline investment in the coastal zone that the project is complementing.</p> <p>August 24, 2011 Thank you for the additional information - again it would be helpful to see this in the revised PIF. A full description of capacities will be expected at CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources</p>		

Resource Availability			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	April 12, 2011 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	April 12, 2011 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	April 12, 2011 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	April 12, 2011 NA.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	April 12, 2011 NA.	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	April 12, 2011  No. Table A is not correctly completed. Focal area outcomes and outputs are derived from the results framework for the biodiversity focal area. Please correct.  August 2, 2011  Adequate revision.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	April 12, 2011  Yes.	
	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?	April 12, 2011  In this section, the proponent should detail how the project meets a priority under the NBSAP. There is no need to provide "evidence in support of Peru's eligibility for this project", nor discuss previous GEF support etc. The project	

		<p>of ecosystems in the PA system, please discuss how this supports the country's priorities as identified in the NBSAP.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Adequate revision.</p>	
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>The GEF has invested a considerable amount of resources to support Peru's protected area system, mainly through the WB, dating back to 1995, including substantial investments in capacity building. The proposal does not clearly explain how, after this the 6th GEF investment through the WB alone, how PROFANAPE and SERNAP will ensure the sustainability of project outcomes. Please clarify.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Thank you for this detailed explanation.</p> <p>However, "alternative livelihoods" have rarely worked in biodiversity conservation projects and this has been documented in the literature for years. The project provides no evidence on why this is a preferred solution or how it will contribute to sustainability of project outcomes, particularly when the project cites overfishing as the biggest threat to the marine biodiversity. Please justify with stronger supporting documentation.</p> <p>August 24, 2011</p> <p>The response is welcomed however the</p>	

		<p>alternative livelihoods will be supported rather than provide a clearer justification of why this is the preferred solution. The need for additional detail remains.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>11. Is the description of the baseline project/ scenario – what is happening in the project area without GEF project – reliable?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>The baseline project is not described at all, please describe if there is one and if there are investments by the WB in this area. In addition, please describe the current annual investment to the RNSIIPG, including all Government and donor expenditure, its current management status, the threats to the biodiversity that the system aims to protect, the number of PAs that make up the system and their territorial coverage and biodiversity protected by them, and estimated management costs.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>The baseline situation is described adequately; however, it appears that no WB baseline project exists in the project area.</p> <p>Please clarify if the Bank is investing in the management of the coastal zone and the GEF project is complementing that investment to ensure the generation of global benefits OR if this is a stand-alone WB-GEF project with no finance provided by the WB.</p> <p>August 24, 2011 Please explain links to WB Project P095424 related to ongoing activities in the same area, in particular the creation of guidelines and management plans and</p>	

		<p>those WB projects now listed in B.6 and also the Humboldt Project, it would be useful to identify those elements which contribute to the baseline at RNSIIPG.</p>	
	<p>12. If GEF does not provide funding, is the rest of the project funded by other partners viable?</p>	<p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Kfw has been the first donor to work on coastal marine protected areas with SERNANP thus the project would still remain viable.</p>	
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>The baseline description is non-existent in the PIF, hence, it is hard to assess how the proposed activities are incremental and will generate global benefits and address threats to biodiversity in the RNSIIPG. The project is mainly focused on process activities, development of plans etc, and seems very costly without any resources being directed at actual management. Please clarify this description and justification.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>The description of the activities is much improved from the previous version and it is clear what the project proposes to accomplish, but it is still very much focused on processes and plans.</p> <p>Although the key threat to biodiversity is identified (overfishing), a more comprehensive analysis of this threat, what is driving it, who are the actors, what is the current level of investment to address the threat, and clear response measures is lacking.</p>	

		<p>Please provide a more detailed threat analysis with regards to overfishing and a set of response measures to this threat and clarify how the activities proposed are incremental and essential for generating global biodiversity benefits from the intervention area (RSNPIIG).</p> <p>August 24, 2011 While it is correct that at PPG stage a comprehensive analysis would be carried out; at PIF stage there is still a need to provide a basic but coherent analysis of the incremental activities - in particular in light of the ongoing WB activities identified in Q11. The need for clarification remains.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>No.</p> <p>Please address the following issues:</p> <p>COMPONENT ONE:</p> <p>1) For component one, management effectiveness can not be both an outcome and an output. 2) A target of 20% of 12 sites demonstrating improved management effectiveness is not acceptable. Project must be more ambitious and all protected areas that are being supported through this \$16.2 million investment should demonstrate an improvement in management effectiveness. 3) Include biodiversity status indicators for the 50,000 hectares as part of outcomes (assuming that the 50,000 hectare target remains).</p>	

outputs or activities. Please review and improve.

5) The project proposes to invest \$16.2 million to improve the management of 50,000 hectares and develop methodology for planning and monitoring of only 140,000 hectare. This represents an extremely expensive investment on a cost per hectare basis. However, in the project justification on page 5, the PIF states that the coverage of the RNSIIPG is 4.63 million hectares. When looking at the description of component one and the project framework, the \$16.2 million investment appears to be a very costly planning exercise as all of the investment is being directed to planning and infrastructure and equipment. Please clarify this component in its entirety and why the targets of 50,000 and 140,000 hectares have been identified.

#### COMPONENT TWO

1) As with component one, this appears to be mainly process activities and outputs, for a very expensive price. Please provide further justification for this costing.

2) If this component is successful in improving capacity for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, we would expect to see biodiversity outcomes resulting. Please include these kinds of indicators.

#### COMPONENT THREE

1) Peru established the Peruvian Trust Fund for National Parks and Protected



was supported by the first GEF project in Peru. Within the WB justification for the last GEF project funded in Peru "" it was stated that PROFONANPE has built a portfolio of \$108.5 million composed of an endowment and sinking funds. The endowment fund has increased from \$5.2 million (from the initial GEF grant ) to \$29 million, thus ensuring a steady and predictable flow of funds and financial sustainability. GEF financing (endowment and sinking funds) currently represents about 28% of the total funds channeled through PROFONANPE and has become a catalyst for generating additional resources and for devising alternative management models for PAs. Hence, we are not convinced of the necessity to create a subaccount that would be directed to the RNSIIPG given that PROFONANPE has an ample endowment already funded by GEF that is effective at leveraging resources. Please revise the component, providing substantive justification for the creation of the subaccount, including the assessment of costs for RNSIIPG, existing annual allocation, revenue gap and what a \$4 million endowment fund could hope to achieve in terms of reducing the revenue gap given that this is the objective of GEF support to financial sustainability of protected areas.

August 2, 2011

The project framework is vastly improved and clearer, but still needs

COMPONENT ONE.

The two outcomes are not outcomes, but outputs.

The outcomes should be the result of "successful implementation of management plans" and the "methodology and monitoring tools". For this project, this would be some kind of measure of biodiversity status, as protected area management plans and methodologies are geared towards improving or maintaining biodiversity status. The outcome should be a measure of the biodiversity outcome we will get for a \$28 million dollar investment in \$140,833 hectares covering 900 species.

A change in protected area management effectiveness score is also an outcome not an output.

COMPONENT TWO

If this component is successful in improving capacity for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, we would expect to see biodiversity outcomes resulting. Please include these kinds of indicators relevant for the globally significant biodiversity that is the target of the intervention.

COMPONENT THREE

For the outcome of component three,

		<p>the target of the mechanism for the recurrent management costs and what percentage of that total the mechanism will produce by the end of the project. If PROFANANPE and SERNANP are unable to make this estimation at PIF stage, please formulate the outcome with "X" for values with a commitment to assess this during project design and provide values by CEO endorsement.</p> <p>August 24, 2011 The amendments improve the framework however Components 1 and 2 appear to share an identical outcome; Component 2's original outcomes remain unchanged and still lack clear biodiversity results.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>No. The assumption is that without plans, global environmental benefits will not be generated, however, it is the rare instance where simply developing management plans resulted in major changes in status of biodiversity. The project is only committing to improving 50,000 hectares out of a more than 4 million hectare sub-system. Please revise this section with stronger reasoning and justification.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Thank you for the helpful clarifications provided.</p> <p>Please clarify the following:</p> <p>1. It appears that SERNANP is</p>	

		<p>as the baseline investment, whether GEF invests or not. Please clarify. Please also explain if there is any baseline investment from the Bank directed towards the management of the coastal zone.</p> <p>2. The PIF then proposes that \$23 million in incremental benefits are being provided through the GEF grant and the cofinance of Kfw of \$15 million. However, the project framework and other sections of the document provide very limited descriptions of the global benefits that will accrue from this large investment. Most of the investment appears to be directed towards capacity development of the SERNANP staff, setting up of frameworks for management, etc, which normally would not have this high of an expense. Much of the management activities appear to be directed towards artisanal fisheries which will generate considerable local benefits. Please improve the description and presentation of the incremental benefits.</p> <p>August 24, 2011 The additional information in B.2 on the regulating framework and environmental threats adds depth to the existing situation, however the additional information on GEBs is still weak and does not clearly articulate what those benefits are. In particular incrementality with respect to the existing WB activities requires clarification.</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>April 12, 2011</p> <p>No. Most of the argumentation here should go in other parts of the document. The part about the financial sustainability strategy for the RNSIIPG should be placed under the description for Component three in the PIF. Please edit this section and improve.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>No. Please revise and discuss the role of civil society more expansively.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	<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>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>Risks are listed. Please include the proposed risk mitigation measure for each risk and rate each risk.</p> <p>In addition, a number of threats to biodiversity related to extractive activities and infrastructure development are identified as "risks" (b and c) but these actually should be part of the focus of the project and are not risks to the project but rather direct threats to biodiversity. Please adjust project design accordingly and include this analysis in the description of the project baseline and the proposed project intervention strategy.</p>	

		<p>Adequate at PIF stage. By the time of CEO endorsement please include more concrete plans for climate resiliency measures.</p>	
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>The GEF has invested considerably in Peru's protected area system. Please present this project more clearly in this overall investment context and describe more how it will be coordinated with ongoing GEF investments.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify how the Bank proposes to collaborate with Kfw and the implementation of KfW's work on marine and coastal protected areas. This is not clear in the proposal.</p> <p>August 24, 2011</p> <p>Thank you for the additional information - please ensure this additional detail is included in the PIF document.</p>	
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>Please describe how PROFONANPE and SERNANP will coordinate the execution and implementation of this project with other GEF project it is implementing and what cost-savings will be achieved.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	

	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>No. GEF contribution to management costs can not exceed 10% of the overall GEF grant (it exceeds this amount in current draft of PIF) and also has to be in proportion to the GEF contribution to the overall project finances (GEF is currently paying 46% of project management costs and this is not in proportion to GEF contribution to overall project costs).</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Please provide full justification for the management costs as presented per latest GEF policy on management costs.</p> <p>August 24, 2011</p> <p>Thank you for your explanation - however focusing GEF-funded PMC on only the Investment components (1 and 3) makes it even more necessary for a clearer explanation. Further details are still required.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>No. Funding for components one and two seems excessive in relation to outcomes and outputs delivered, and an inadequate justification is provided for</p>	

		<p>the trust fund. Please address this through comments identified previously in the review sheet.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>According the project framework, almost \$22 million is being allocated to planning processes to manage 140,338 hectares and capacity building for 120 staff. Based on current global reviews in the literature of establishing and managing marine or terrestrial protected areas this is an exceedingly expensive investment on a per hectare or per staff basis.</p> <p>Please clarify for each component, why the production of quite limited outputs (master plans, infrastructure, regulatory frameworks, training) and outcomes will be so expensive.</p> <p>August 24, 2011</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the PPG phase would provide clarity, however, the extraordinary levels of funding per ha or per head in this proposal warrant a basic explanation at PFI stage of the process through which these costs were identified.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify if the KfW funds are new funds specifically for this subsystem of the PA system? Also, we assume that KfW has provided a letter of intent for this support. Please clarify.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p>	



		Thank you for the clarification. Please ensure complete and full cooperation with Kfw on the ongoing design of the project.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>The Bank is not bringing any cofinance to the project nor is the project complementing Bank loans or credits. See question C.1 which specifically asks for the Agency contribution to the project. Please clarify.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>The Bank is not providing any cofinance to the project as this is being provided by Kfw who have been working with Peru and SERNANP on coastal management issues. It also appears that no Bank baseline project exists either.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>April 12, 2011</p> <p>Numerous issues have been raised</p>	

		<p>accordingly and resubmit.</p> <p>August 2, 2011</p> <p>Although the revised PIF is a vast improvement, some outstanding issues remain. Please revise the PIF accordingly and resubmit.</p> <p>August 24, 2011</p> <p>The amendments have improved the PIF, however please address the remaining issues.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 03, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 24, 2011	
	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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat	<b>3. Is PPG approval being</b>	

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	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.