



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

GEF ID:	9416		
Country/Region:	Costa Rica		
Project Title:	Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Management in Production landscapes in Costa Rica		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5842 (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; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$150,000	Project Grant:	\$6,699,315
Co-financing:	\$25,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$31,899,315
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Santiago Carrizosa,

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	March 16, 2016 Yes, clear alignment with BD, LD and SFM objectives and programs.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	March 16, 2016 Yes, responds to national priorities and the National BD policy and UNCCD commitments.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	March 16, 2016	

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)?

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Project seeks to address drivers of forest loss through a multi-sectoral approach that uses an innovative combination of forest loss monitoring tied to tenancy, and sustainable agriculture and forestry production practices that have been tested elsewhere.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	March 16, 2016 Yes, GEF investment builds on solid baseline and justification for GEF engagement and generation of GEBs with GEF incremental funding is solidly justified.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	March 16, 2016 Very robust project framework for the PIF stage. By the time of CEO endorsement please include any additional biological variables that will be measured to assess the condition of biodiversity beyond the Environmental Service Index based on mammals for ACLAP and birds for MAIBC.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	March 16, 2016 Adequate at PIF stage.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	March 16, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Cost Rica has adequate funds to support this project.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	March 16, 2016 Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	March 16, 2016 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	March 16, 2016 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	March 16, 2016 NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	March 16, 2016 Not. The maps and graphics on page 9 are of poor quality and do not add value to the submission. Please provide higher resolution graphics or a different set of maps to allow for better visualization of the project area. March 28, 2016 The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 28, 2016	
	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?		
	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?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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.