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

GEF ID:	**9592**		
Country/Region:	**Regional (Chile, Peru)**		
Project Title:	**Catalysing Implementation of a Strategic Action Programme for the Sustainable Management of Shared Living Marine Resources in the Humboldt Current System (HCS)**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5697 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**International Waters**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**IW-3 Program 6; IW-3 Program 7;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$200,000**	Project Grant:	**$8,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$91,639,027**	Total Project Cost:	**$99,839,027**
PIF Approval:	**September 28, 2016**	Council Approval/Expected:	**October 27, 2016**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Christian Severin**	Agency Contact Person:	**José Vicente Troya,**

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]	8th of August 2016 (cseverin):Yes, the proposal is fully aligned with the IW focal area.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	8th of August 2016 (cseverin): It seems so. When we have received the endorsement letters and the SAP signed by both countries it will be easier to identify the consistency. 29th of august 2016(cseverin): Yes, the project is fully aligned with the	

[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)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		countries national strategies. This is among others evident from the buy-inn and support across multiple ministries to the SAP.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	8th of August 2016 (cseverin): Partly. Please make sure to include more detailed information on the Strategic Action Program that is to be implemented. The document presented have a strong focus on the TDA and its findings, but less so on the SAP and its priorities. 29th of august 2016(cseverin): Addressed.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?		
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	8th of August 2016 (cseverin): No, please address below comments - One of the starting points for the HCLME TDA/SAP process and this potential SAP implementation project has been the shared stock of Anchovies. Please ensure that this SAP implementation project will be dealing with the shared stock of Anchovies. in the component description this key shared stock is not specifically mentioned. Please include, as the shared anchovy stock	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		is essential to develop a transboundary management framework for, and further may provide a segway for addressing some of the other transboundary issues identified in the TDA/SAP. - The budget to the proposed activities seems to have been distributed based on some kind of equal share arrangement. Please adjust, so that the cost of the proposed activities inform the distribution of funding. - The PIF includes substantial information on the TDA findings. However, the PIF misses relevant information on the transboundary agreed SAP. Please include information on the SAP and its priorities to the same level of detail as what has been done for the TDA. (some of those main deliveries listed in the Terminal Evaluation would be great to see reflected upon in the PIF too). Further, it would strengthen the proposition if it becomes more evident how the suggested activities are linked to the SAP priorities, supported by the TDA findings. - Please include, as an annex, in the submission the transboundary agreed SAP. Please note that the official	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		language of GEF is English. - Component 2.3 mentions Waste treatment, please confirm that it is wastewater treatment and non point sources of land based pollution that is referred to. - Please ensure that the section on GENDER considerations reflects upon the fact that the project will be reporting on the GEF 6 GENDER indicators. - Please explain why the co-financing only consists of national cofinancing (the private sector is unfortunately absent), and further, what the thinking is behind the planned equally sized national co-financing. The major share of the shared fisheries is being harvested by private operators and larger commercial fleets, for long term sustainability of the shared stocks, a strong cooperation with the private sector will be essential. 29th of august 2016(cseverin):Addressed	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements,	8th of August 2016 (cseverin):Yes, however, please make sure to	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	specifically insert, in the relevant section, mentioning that the project will be delivering on the GEF6 gender indicators. 29th of august 2016(cseverin):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?		
	• The focal area allocation?	8th of August 2016 (cseverin):Yes, the suggested funding envelope is available under the GEF IW FA.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	8th of August 2016 (cseverin):No, please address above comments. 29th of august 2016(cseverin):Yes, the project is recommended for technical clearance.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Only minor changes, for which justifications have been provided. However, as the time of PIF approval it was clearly stated by GEFSEC that the project should work closely together with the private sector. please elaborate on this as part of the deliverables/outputs. 14th of June 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	4th of May 2018 (cseverin): Partly: 1) Please make sure to feature the amounts of protected area hectares that will be delivered by the project into Table E. 2) Please elaborate on how the in kind cofinancing will be funding infrastructure investments as proposed under component 2.3. 2a) further, if the project will be outlining different investment opportunities, please ensure to include the formulation of a financial exit strategy and as part of this work towards identifying potential	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		investors, from both IFIs as well as commercial banks, pension funds and potentially the insurance sector. 3) the need for strong public/private partnerships to deliver successfully, was identified in the reviewsheet, however the project document lack information on this. Please include a plan towards establishing a public/private coalition to address the identified SAP priorities, and ensure that the activities on private sector engagement is happening within the initial part of the project implementation period. 4) please make sure that the list of confirmed cofinancing (table C) and the annexed co-financing letters correspond. As is, it seems that the amount entered for FONDEPES is different from what cofinancing letter lists. 5) Please elaborate on how the large quantity of data will be stored in a shared location that will enable access to all stakeholders to the data. One solution may be to create a data sharing agreement and mechanism to all for optimal access and storage of data. This issue has already been highlighted in the Risk matrix and hence needs to be part of the outcome/outputs of the project. 6) What process is envisioned for	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		political adoption of the fisheries management plans to be developed?? please elaborate on how the project will be working with regional fisheries organisations as well as national fisheries organisations towards ensuring the fisheries management plans will catalyze change processes. 14th of June 2018 (cseverin): partly addressed. All points except point five have been properly addressed. The documents still do not elaborate on how a data sharing mechanisms will be developed, operationalized and hosted to enable optimal management of the shared natural resources, including fisheries and in particular anchovy stocks. Please include both in Table B as well as in the project component description section.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Partly. The project co-financing is solely consisting of in-kind sources of financing. Please elaborate on how the Activities under component 2.3, on solid waste treatment will be financed by in-kind financing, as NO GEF financing can be used for this	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		purpose. 14th of June 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	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)	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Yes, the project includes a detailed risk analysis.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Yes, cofinancing confirmed, but please ensure that there is consistency between amounts in letters and amounts listed in table C 14th of June 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Yes, however the tracking tool mention delivery of protected areas hectares, as does the results framework. Please make sure to have the hectares also featuring in table E. 14th of June 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Yes, but please make sure to attach the ministerial endorsed SAP to the	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	country or in the region?	submission, as this is a central document informing implementation. 14th of June 2018 (cseverin): Addressed	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Yes	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	4th of May 2018 (cseverin):Yes, the project will among others use the modalities within IWLEARN.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	4th of May 2018 (cseverin): Partly, please see comments under question 2 14th of June 2018 (cseverin): Partly addressed, please address the one remaining point described under question 2.	
	• STAP	4th of May 2018 (cseverin): Please include a matrix/document that outlines how the agency have taken onboard or considered the multiple proposals and suggestions from STAP.	
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		

[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
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	8th of May 2018 (cseverin):No Please address the above comments	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		