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

GEF ID:	**9088**		
Country/Region:	**Costa Rica**		
Project Title:	**Sixth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Costa Rica**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5625 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-4 Program 9; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-3 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$91,324**	Project Grant:	**$2,319,635**
Co-financing:	**$3,157,500**	Total Project Cost:	**$5,568,459**
PIF Approval:	**April 28, 2015**	Council Approval/Expected:	**June 01, 2015**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Maria Del Pilar Barrera Rey**	Agency Contact Person:	**Nick Remple**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	The proposed project is aligned with the GEF-6 strategic objectives approved for the GEF SGP, particularly with the following: (a) Community Landscape and Seascape Conservation; (b) Climate Smart Innovative Agro-ecology; and (c)Low-Carbon Energy Access Co-benefits However, while we welcome the decision to focus the resources of SGP on a targeted geographic area to achieve greater impact, not enough information is provided on the importance of this area for globally significant biodiversity and how these interventions will provide benefits for biodiversity. The GEF-6 biodiversity strategy for mainstreaming is focused on places and issues that impact globally significant biodiversity, such as Key Biodiversity Areas (places

[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 Comment
		home to threatened or endemic species) or vital corridors for connectivity between high priority sites. Given the description in the PIF of the current state of the landscape and the planned interventions, it does not appear that this area meets these criteria. Please provide more information about the biodiversity significance of the area and what interventions can be made to improve this status. Additional Information is requested. 03/20/2015 Thank you for the additional information provided that adds significantly to the case for this project. During PPG, please focus on activities and places that will provide global environmental benefits for biodiversity, land degradation, and climate change mitigation. However, the funds are not for the support of projects with a primary objective of water, though projects for biodiversity, land degradation, and climate change mitigation may provide co-benefits for water. The targeted areas for intervention based on connectivity within the corridor will be elaborated during the PPG process and based on previous science. It would also be very helpful to include a map showing the relevant areas. Cleared 03/26/2015
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes. SGP in Costa Rica is consistent with the countryÂ´s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), the Fifth National Report from Costa Rica to the CBD, National Biodiversity Policy Drafts (currently being drafted), the National Climate Change Stratety, among others. The programme is also aligned with a number of GEF projects under implementation.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Cleared 03/20/2015
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Somewhat. However, please link the explanation on drivers of degradation to the biodiversity significance of the areas as per comment # 1 above Additional information is requested. 03/20/2015 Cleared 03/26/2015
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	Once #1 and #3 have been addressed, please review the incremental reasoning. Additional information is requested. 03/20/2015 Cleared 03/26/2015
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	Somewhat. Output 1.2.2 â€“ These activities mention the use of non-native species for reforestation and hedgerows. GEF resources cannot be used to support the use of non-native species for reforestation. Please revise the plans for this output. Please provide a more full explanation about the alternative livelihoods proposed, their feasibility, and how these activities will benefit biodiversity. Additional information is requested. 03/20/2015 Thank you for making this change and including helpful information about alternative livelihood interventions. Cleared 03/26/2015

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

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes. Cleared 03/20/2015
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):	
	• The STAR allocation?	Yes. $2,640,000 million from Costa Rica's STAR allocation for GEF-6 as follows: BD: $1,330,000 CC: $640,000 LD: $670,000 All inclusive of agency fees. However, the proposed project leaves $3,822 in LD funds in the Costa Rican STAR allocation. It will likely be difficult to add this small amount of remaining funds to another project. We suggest that these funds be included as part of this project. Additional information is requested. 03/20/2015 Explanation provided. LD resources may be added to the CEO Endorsement request with accompanying LoE. Cleared 03/26/2015
	• The focal area allocation?	N/A
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A
	• Focal area set-aside?	N/A
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	Not yet. Please address the questions and comments above. 03/20/2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment
		Yes. The PIF is being recommended for clearance and WP inclusion. 03/26/2015
Review Date	Review	March 20, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 26, 2015
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	
	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)	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:	
	• GEFSEC	
	• STAP	
	• GEF Council	
	• Convention Secretariat	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	
Review Date	Review	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	

[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.