



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4452		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Standardized Methodologies for Carbon Accounting and Ecosystem Services Valuation of Blue Forests		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	International Waters
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3; Others; Project Mana; IW-3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$75,000	Project Grant:	\$4,500,000
Co-financing:	\$23,268,215	Total Project Cost:	\$27,843,215
PIF Approval:	September 19, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	November 09, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Nicole Glineur	Agency Contact Person:	Isabelle

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	[AH:2/7/11] NA	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	[AH:2/7/11] Global, No letters of endorsement needed.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	[AH:2/7/11] Yes. UNEP already has a strong blue forest baseline, including the Blue Carbon Initiative and two key publications on the topic. UNEP is also instrumental at bridging science and policy with platforms like the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).	1/7/14 yes
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	[AH:2/7/11] NA	

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	[AH:2/7/11] Global project. Addressed.	1/7/14 yes
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
	• the focal area allocation?	[AH:2/7/11] Yes.	1/7/14 yes
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	[AH 2/23/11] NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Blue forests have been identified as a GEF 5 priority under the IW focal area Objective 3. However, PIF is very focused on C sequestration methodology for financial mechanisms more suitable with the CC focal area. To make project more in line with IW strategy, please consider other ecosystem services as financial incentives for protection of coastal and marine habitats.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. Revised PIR now considers broader ecosystem services in addition to C sequestration.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Outcome 3 mentions "research and peer-reviewed literature" - to be more in line with the Focal Area strategy this should read targeted research.</p>	1/7/14 yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	[AH:2/7/11] NA	
	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?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Addressed for C sequestration. Global international standards, framework, methodology and financing mechanisms.</p> <p>[AH 2/10/11] Please address for other ecosystem services.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	1/7/14 yes
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] No. Issue of institutional sustainability not addressed clearly in PIF.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	1/7/14 yes
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] The baseline investments need further explanation. Please elaborate on the Blue Carbon Initiative's role and the current synthesis it has produced. Also explain role Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services plays into the project's baseline.</p> <p>[AH 2/10/11] Please elaborate on baseline projects of other ecosystem service valuation.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. However, at time of CEO Endorsement please note that ecosystem services baseline is still</p>	1/7/14 yes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>weak relative to C sequestration. Please elaborate on ecosystem services baseline projects like payment for ecosystem services (PES) progress made by Forest Trend's Marine Katoomba meetings and TNC's marine conservation agreements (MCAs).</p> <p>[AH:3/28/11] Addressed.</p>	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		1/7/14 yes
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	[AH:2/7/11] Yes. Incremental GEF activities will serve as much needed catalyst for mainstreaming blue forest services into conservation management.	1/7/14 yes
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Project's expected outcomes are not quantitative enough, especially for components 1, 2, and 4. Please be more specific and identify tangible outputs for each expected outcome.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed, however there are still a few issues that need to be addressed at CEO Endorsement:</p> <p>(i) Component 2 - Expected Output 1: Please specify the number of small-scale interventions that will focus on C sequestration versus ecosystem valuation.</p> <p>(ii) Component 2 - Expected Output 2:</p>	<p>7/14 Main comments are: (some are detailed in other sections):</p> <p>1. Outputs of component 1 focus uniquely on process versus process leading to specific product outputs. Please add following resulting outputs:</p> <p>1. X best practices in carbon accounting and ecosystem service valuation methodologies and X exploration of their application in ecosystem management. 2.) Published standardized methodologies for at least 3 coastal ecosystems with user friendly guidance book for their use by year 3 of the project.</p> <p>2. Component 5 Outcome 5.1 should be substantiated with leading to expected results and impacts.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>As of now there could potentially be only two meetings over two years per working group would be held to "reach consensus for best practice..." - will two meetings will be sufficient to reach this output?</p> <p>(iii) Component 3 - Expected Output 3: While I recognize it is impossible to identify scope of research papers at PIF stage, it would be reassuring to know that there is equal attention given to both C sequestration and ecosystem services valuation. It would be to the project's detriment if all six papers only focused on one aspect or another.</p> <p>(iv) Component 4 - Expected Output 1: Wording is very similar to Output 1.2. Are these outputs meant to produce the same methodologies or different? Output 1.2 suggests methodologies for 3 ecosystems by project's 3rd year, while Output 4.1 suggests methodologies for 2 ecosystems by project's 4th year. Please make more consistent and clarify if these are intended to be different Outputs and adjust requested funding if they are the same.</p> <p>[AH:3/28/11] Addressed.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Output 2.1 - It is not clear what the actual outputs will be from the small-scale interventions. The only verb in this output is applying the new methodologies. There should really be a</p>	<p>3. as regards organisational management please see details in section 20 of the review</p> <p>2. The PIF highlighted the need for international coordination and the role of this overarching project to remediate to fragmented initiatives and consolidate to lead to agreed international standards project. This document only briefly alludes to this role on p.17. Please expand on this in the text and include in project framework.</p> <p>3. Both the experience and the input of the private sector are absent. Please include involvement of the private sector as a major player. Please see section 19 for additional comments</p> <p>SHansen (1.10.2014): While IWLEARN activities are mentioned a number of times, we need to specifically see the mentioning of at least 1% of the GEF grant being allocated to support IWLEARN activities. Please include in table B and Prodoc component 5.2.</p> <p>10th of February 2014 (cseverin): all points above addressed. More specifically, point 1a, is addressed in Annex A (Results Framework). Point 1b, the rationale for the publishing the results by year four, seems valid. Point 2, description under outcome 5.2</p> <p>Point 3, addressed under review point 20.</p> <p>Point 4, The document have numerous</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>more substantial result from this application like reports, evaluations, etc. This is likely the what the second output of this component is meant to do but it is not clear in the text.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.</p>	<p>mentions of the need for International Coordination, in order for this project to become successful.</p> <p>Point 5, The private sector have been adequately mentioned throughout the document.</p> <p>Point 6, IWLEARN is properly featured throughout the documents, please note that participation in Multiple IW Conferences are expected. IW Conference has been inserted as the expected output of 5.2.1.3 in Singular.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] PIF methodology adequately presents plan to catalyze mainstream blue carbon in the international policy and financial arenas. However, it is important that ecosystem services other than C sequestration are accounted for when making valuation methodology.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	<p>1/7/14 yes</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>[AH:2/7/11] No. section needs to reflect the impact of this proposed project, not just general climate change socio-economic benefits. Please consider both immediate and long-term socio-economic impacts of project at regional and local levels, especially in developing economies.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11]: Addressed.</p>	<p>1/7/14 yes</p>
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Please expand this topic. It is unclear if this project is taking any further steps other than recognizing baseline activities.</p>	<p>1/7/14 yes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		[AH:3/22/11]: Addressed.	
	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>[AH:2/7/11] Yes, although no risks identified is higher than medium risk. Please reconsider "danger" of not actively incorporating private sector involvement into working groups.</p> <p>It is unclear how a transparent methodology process with prevent scientific dissent on standard methodology.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	<p>1/7/14 Overall OK except for "Risk 2. Methodologies and approaches to be applied in the small-scale interventions do not clearly show benefits to major partners (inter-governmental organizations, regional organizations, governments and private sector) to secure their participation in the interventions" Should the benefits not be for the countries?</p> <p>10th of February 2014 (cseverin): Addressed, reformulated risk 2.</p>
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	[AH:2/7/11] Addressed.	<p>1/7/14 This is a continuously evolving subject with plethora of players and flexibility needs to be reflected in the M&E plan for updating of coordination as required. While coordination with GEF projects is well documented, for this project a section summarizing coordination with main external players should be added;eg. IPCC, relevant initiatives from NGOs and academia, etc. Most importantly the VCM blue carbon experience of private sector initiatives, such as the Livelihoods fund, should be assessed and reflected in this section. Reference to carbon markets in the stakeholders section is not enough. There is need for more private sector participants in the project.</p> <p>CSeverin (1.10.2014): Please coordinate with GEF WIOLAB activities, as this</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>project among others have activities on the Kenyan coast with good opportunity for synergies.</p> <p>SHansen (1.10.2014): To better capture the remainder of the industry players within seaweed production and utilization please add the International Seaweed Association to the stakeholder list.</p> <p>10th of February 2014 (cseverin): All above have been addressed, specifically: Point 1, have been on pp 8 in outlining what is now included in Component 1 activities, in stakeholder table and eg on pp 14 of ProDoc. Point 2, reference to WIOLAB included. Point 3, Seaweed stakeholders included.</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	[AH:2/7/11]	<p>1/7/14 It is quite complex and will need to be fine-tuned and monitored closely during implementation. Please add the 3 panels in appendix 10 DM flowchart Please include GEFSEC in the Steering Committee. In the main text and appendix 10, please add a full para on the coordination function of the PCU as regards cross fertilization between components, the 3 panels, and the sites with clear interactions. Please also add in PCU function: advise to SC including production of decision making options for SC consideration.</p> <p>10th of February 2014 (cseverin):</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Addressed, more specifically Point 1, the three panels have been added.</p> <p>Point 2, described clearly in component 1.1.1.4 on pp 37 of prodoc</p> <p>Point 3, included as part of the standard work of the PCU, see e.g. description in para 219, on pp 62</p>
	<p>21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>1/7/14 Clear justification for changes, resulting from PPG findings, has been provided.</p>
	<p>22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] Current PM funding is exactly 10% of GEF funds. Please lower to 8.5% or less as per new GEF practices unless PM budget can clearly identify need for additional funds up to 10%.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p>	<p>1/7/14 Project management costs have been adjusted to 5% of project costs in line w/ GEF guidelines</p>
	<p>24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] No. is unclear why Component 2 will utilize so much of GEF funds (almost 60% of total GEF resources) when building upon existing GEF projects. Please elaborate significantly these activities in text.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. Thank you for the clarification.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Table A has a budget line named "Others" for \$100,000 without a Focal Area Objective. This is not</p>	<p>1/7/14: yes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>acceptable and needs to be incorporated into the proper Objective or removed.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.</p>	
	<p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] All co-financing is pledged in-kind. Please strengthen agency co-financing in text (C.1) as well as actual amount of agency co-financing pledged with cash.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] P. 23 - Blue Carbon Initiative staff time (\$200,000) is listed as grant co-financing when should be in-kind.</p> <p>Also, UNEP-WCMC is listed as separate co-financing but is part of UNEP and needs to be included in Part C.1. Still reflected as parallel financing.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed.</p>	<p>1/7/14 Co-financing has significantly increased by a factor of 2.8</p>
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>[AH:2/7/11] UNEP is providing a total of \$1,575,000 (26% of total co-financing) that comes from its Blue Carbon Initiative, however it is noted that all co-financing is pledged in kind. Please reevaluate and provide additional detail in C.1 as it seems some of co-financing will be cash (e.g staff time and convening and attendance of expert workshops). Please explain why the "Blue Carbon" and "Management of Natural Coastal Carbon Sinks" Publications are included as co-</p>	<p>1/7/14 yes</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>financing since they have already been published.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Addressed. Co-financing issues have been addressed and now approximately 40% of the \$8.270M comes in the form of grants.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] Addressed. Co-financing has increased to \$18,590,000</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>1/7/14 Please correct section D of the TTs which currently reflects no participation in IW event and no website. Please include project website linked to IW-learn</p> <p>10th of February 2014 (cseverin): Addressed, as the IW tracking tool has been locked to only allow for numerical values to be added according to progress.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>The process is well described and substantiated in Appendices. Please provide in the CEO Endorsement document a summary M&E table with results, indicators and targets. Please also add close monitoring of project implementation/execution arrangements. Please also allow in M&E flexibility of updating coordination as required.</p> <p>10th of February 2014 (cseverin): Addressed, and is presented in the Project Logframe on pp 35-42 of CEO Endorsement request or as Annex 4 in the ProDoc.</p>
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		10th of February 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the STAP comments have been adequately taken into consideration.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>This is a very ambitious project and should have a lasting impact on mainstreaming blue forests. Please kindly address the issues identified.</p> <p>[AH 2/23/11] To ensure creditability and accountability, it is essential that all assessments/reports/etc of C sequestration and other coastal and marine ecosystem services are taken into consideration - not just the high profile reports from large NGOs and IGOs. Accountability will be key in ensuring long-term success and needs to be addressed at PIF stage.</p> <p>Consider creating a new project component that will identify information and methodology gaps with C sequestration and other ecosystem services in environments other than mangroves, with outcomes that show progress in bringing these other environments up to the same level as what is known about C sequestration with mangroves.</p> <p>[AH:2/7/11]</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>- Please strengthen and include in budget line and project proposal text specific language that allocates "at least 1% of GEF funds" for IW:LEARN, project website, participation in IWCs and relevant conferences for project staff and government reps.</p> <p>- Please add mention of annual submission of IW tracking tool in project proposal text.</p> <p>- Please consider diversifying working groups to include private sector and other coastal/marine ecosystem experts, (e.g. coral experts).</p> <p>[AH 2/9/11]</p> <p>1) The PIF is very specific towards methodologies for C sequestration and does not do an adequate job integrating other blue forest ecosystem services (e.g. coastal protection, fish refugia, tourism, etc) that must be accounted for in valuation in the project design and framework. This also includes identifying the existing database and national strategies, plans, reports, assessments, and relevant conventions that the suite of other blue forest ecosystem services provide.</p> <p>2) Please elaborate how project's new methodology (Component 1) will be different from current methodologies</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>outlined in baseline. It seems this aspect of budget could be reduced since "new" methodology will draw significantly from existing publications and reports. Twenty percent of the budget is being allocated to to this Component, but as the PIF demonstrates, a number of methodologies have already been developed. Is there room to minimize cost with synthesis of existing information?</p> <p>3) Project's expected outcomes are not quantitative enough, especially for components 1, 2, and 4. Please be more specific and identify tangible outputs for each expected outcome.</p> <p>4) Current PM funding is exactly 10% of GEF funds. Please lower to 8.5% as per new GEF practices unless PM budget can clearly identify need for additional funds (up to 10%).</p> <p>5) It is unclear why Component 2 will utilize so much of GEF funds (almost 60% of total GEF resources) when building upon existing GEF projects. Please elaborate significantly these activities in text.</p> <p>6) All co-financing is pledged in-kind. Please strengthen agency co-financing in text (C.1) as well as actual amount of agency co-financing with cash.</p> <p>7) It would be to the project's benefit if</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>there was more private sector financial involvement to strengthen creditability as viable source if financing, both for C sequestration as well as other ecosystem services.</p> <p>[AH 3/1/11] As per new guidelines, please indicate amount of financial resources being allocated to each Expected Focal Area Outcome in Table A.</p> <p>[AH:3/22/11] Thank you for the revisions. The PIF is being recommended for the work program at this time but please note that a few issues still need to be address at CEO Endorsement stage, specifically please see cells 12, 14, and 17.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11] Issues above have been addressed, however recommendation is now not being given for the following reason from Al Duda: "The baseline project of UNEP is not clear. Section B1 has long paragraphs listing projects, but a simple list does not convey "a baseline program". The PIF should be revised to clarify how these separate projects constitute a baseline program and describe how GEF incremental cost transforms them into a coherent GEF project. Without this clarity, the PIF is not be recommended for work program inclusion."</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>[AH 6/3/11] Recommendation is still not being granted because the UNEP baseline project is still not convincing. UNEP makes the argument for a fragmented baseline and then notes that this project will address that. You include some meetings as a baseline and say some other activities could contribute to the project, but this is too obtuse.</p> <p>Additionally, the role of WCMC and its baseline activities in this proposal are not clear. There needs to be a better explanation of how consistent monitoring and reporting of ecosystem datasets will be utilized by this proposal's activities. As the proposal reads now, the \$200,000 from WCMC is parallel co-financing.</p> <p>The correct way to present this is that UNEP has a Blue Forests Initiative it is developing with a number of separate components that will be tied together. UNEP has had consultations and studies with products generated from those as well as a number of complementary activities planned that consist of ___ and ___ and ___. This constitutes the UNEP baseline program on blue forests for which GEF is being asked to add incremental cost to achieve the larger objective ___. An enhanced objective and more significant outcomes will be accomplished by combining the baseline of UNEP, the financing of partners, and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the GEF elements with agreed incremental costs.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] The PIF still needs to address key issues before it can be recommended: 1) The baseline is still unorganized and does not explain what the Blue Forest Initiative is already doing to address the problems highlighted in the PIF. This section needs to be completely rewritten in an organized manner - not just amended from the previous PIFs. Please see AI's notes in the above [6/3/11] review; 2) The Project Framework and, to some extent the PIF text, still do not demonstrate how the methodologies will be incorporated into future GEF IW projects. This needs to be made much more clear throughout the PIF.</p> <p>Additional points that should be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Table A has a budget lined titled "others" requesting \$100,000 with no associated Focal Area Objective. Please remove or incorporate into the proper focal area objective. - Output 2.1 - It is not clear what the actual outputs will be from the small-scale interventions. The only verb in this output is applying the new methodologies. There should really be a more substantial result from this application like reports, evaluations, etc. 	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>This is likely the what the second output of this component is meant to do but it is not clear in the text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outcome 3 mentions "research and peer-reviewed literature" - to be more in line with the Focal Area strategy this should read targeted research. - The co-financing for component 5 is 1:1 (not changed since last PIF). - P. 23 - Blue Carbon Initiative staff time (\$200,000) is listed as grant co-financing when should be in-kind. - UNEP-WCMC is listed as separate co-financing but is part of UNEP and needs to be included in Part C.1. Still reflected as parallel financing. - LULUCF is incorrectly identified as LULUFC in several places throughout the text. - Consideration of recent blue forest developments by PIF partners and stakeholders should be reflected/updated in the PIF where necessary. <p>[AH 8/29/11] All issues have been addressed - thank you. However, it has been requested that, "An important point was made on the need for 4:1 co-financing for GEF IW projects so that they could be seen as leveraging significant other funding and programs</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		of partners. May we ask UNEP to reconsider the "blue forests" PIF and cobble together additional co-financing amounts." [AH 9/14/11] Addressed. Co-financing has increased to \$18,590,000 and the ratio with GEF funds is now 1:4.1. The PIF is being recommended at this time.	
	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?		1/7/14 Please include overall summary of PPG results
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		1/7/14 This is an ambitious global project which is expected to have a substantive impact on mainstreaming blue forests. Please address above comments. 10th of February 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the project is being recommended for CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 01, 2011	January 07, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 23, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	March 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 02, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	August 30, 2011	

* **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?	<p>[AH 3/24/11] Proposed activities will establish a more useful baseline that will ensure the proposed activities of the PIF are most successful.</p> <p>However, PPG suggests that site selection will take place and be funded by PPG (Component 2). But PIF suggests that site selection will occur after methodologies are established (per Component 1). It might be advantageous to select sites in harmony with the outcomes of Project Component 1 to ensure success of the interventions.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p>
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>[AH 3/24/11] No, please justify \$40,000 in travel expenses - especially if site-selection for interventions is not necessary at PPG stage.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>[AH 3/24/11] Please see comments for quick fix prior before recommendation can be granted. Thank you.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p> <p>[AH 4/7/11]: Because PIF is not being recommended at this time, PPG approval is ineligible.</p> <p>[AH 8/2/11] Because PIF is not being recommended at this time, PPG approval is ineligible.</p> <p>[AH 8/30/11] Because PIF is not being recommended at this time, PPG approval is ineligible.</p> <p>[AH 9/14/11] With PIF recommendation, PPG is now also being recommended at this time.</p> <p>[AH 10/6/11] The PPG submitted with correct template. Thank you. Recommendation granted.</p>
	4. Other comments	<p>[AH 3/24/11] Please consider adding the 2nd Marine Katoomba Meeting in La Paz, MX (Nov 2010) and the CI Blue Carbon Side Event in Cancun (Dec 2010) to the list of Table B: Past Project Prep Activities.</p> <p>[AH 3/28/11]: Addressed.</p>

		<p>[AH 9/14/11] The PPG submitted is the wrong template. Please use the most recent PPG template on the GEF website and resubmit. The GEF to co-financing ratio is 1.07:1</p> <p>[AH 10/6/11] The PPG submitted with correct template. Thank you. Recommendation granted.</p>
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 14, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	October 06, 2011

* 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.