GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW SHEET FOR MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECT

GEF ID:	**9678**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Colombia, Mexico, Peru)**		
Project Title:	**Generating Enhanced Political Will for Natural Resource Management and Conservation**		
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 9; BD-4 Program 10;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,995,000**
Co-financing:	**$2,200,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$4,195,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Jaime Cavelier**	Agency Contact Person:	**Marianela Araya**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	11-16-16 Yes. BD-4 program 9 and BD-4 Program 10. Cleared	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	11-16-16 While the structure of the project appears to be appropriate to deliver the political process (Component 1) and Tourism in PAs (Component 2), it is not clear how it is going to tackle other issues listed in the MSP (i.e. illegal gold mining, "the adoption of a comprehensive sustainable development plan for the Orinoco region integrating valuation of biodiversity and	

[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)?

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
		ecosystems services", the work with the commission for Andean-Amazonian-Afro Peruvian People, Environment and Ecology"). These items are mentioned only once (or a few times) without proper elaboration.	
	3. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	11-16-16 Yes. Pages 11-13. Cleared	
Project Design	4. Does the project sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	11-16-16 For Part II, Project Description, a) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed (p.4-10), the GEF suggests to present all the relevant information for each of the three countries under individual and separate headings (one for each country). It is not clear why after the presentation of the country, the threats, and the current state of conservation management in Colombia (and "Political will" for Mexico and Peru), there are separate headings for; i) Parks, Protected Areas, and Tourism (p.7), ii) Barriers to progress.....(p.8) iii) Main pressures....(p.9), and iv) National Strategies and Plans (p11). Use the same headings for all three countries as appropriate.	
	5. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	11-16-16 Yes. Cleared	
	6. Are the components in Table	11-16-16	

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	1. For Component 2, the GEF suggests removing outcome 2.2 and output 2.1.2. List all outputs towards delivering outcome 2.1. 2. The list of "Target Goals for each Country", is disconnected from the rest of the project. The political processes associated with the Conservation Caucuses have very little meaning unless focusing on the resolution of environmental issues like illegal gold mining, planning in the Orinoco River and valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services. While Sustainable Tourism is front and center in Component 3, the other environmental issues are listed but unrelated to specific interventions. 2. The list of Stakeholders should only include those that have already agreed on participating in the execution of the project. This is a one-step MSP, and thus, there is no time to further evaluate the capacities and opportunities to use all stakeholders listed (p. 22-23). Prepare one list for each of the countries. The GEF suggest removing all the "stakeholders" associated with Parks Management/ConsCorps Experts, unless they have a clear and agreed role in selected activities related to Tourism and PAs (The target countries have high capacity on PA Planning and Management).	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	7. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	11-16-16 Yes Cleared	
	8. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	11-16-16 Yes Cleared	
	9. 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)	11-16-16 Please include the risks associated with interventions on the thematic areas, like tourism, PAs, etc.	
	10. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	11-16-16 Yes Cleared	
	11. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	11-16-16 Yes Cleared	
	12. *Only for Non-grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	13. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	11-16-16 Yes. Cleared	
	14. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	11-16-16 Yes Cleared	
	15. Does the project have	11-16-16	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
	description of knowledge management plan?	Cleared	
Availability of Resources	16. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	11-16-16 Yes Cleared	
Recommendations	17. Is the MSP being recommended for approval?	11-16-16 No. Please address outstanding issues listed under items 2,4,6 and 9. Thanks. 12-06-16 This MSP is recommended for approval.	
Review Dates	First Review	November 16, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 06, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		