



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

GEF ID:	<b>9416</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Costa Rica</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Conserving Biodiversity through Sustainable Management in Production Landscapes in Costa Rica</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5842 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,699,315</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$26,098,314</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$32,947,629</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>May 04, 2016</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 09, 2016</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Mark Zimsky</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Santiago Carrizosa</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	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.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental	March 16, 2016	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> 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.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	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"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	March 16, 2016  Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	March 16, 2016  NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	March 16, 2016  NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	March 16, 2016  NA	
<b>Recommendations</b>	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.	
<b>Review Date</b>	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
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	<p>December 11, 2017</p> <p>A number of changes have been included in the project design as a result of the design phase and these are all acceptable and the justifications adequate. Cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>December 11, 2017</p> <p>Please clarify the following issues related to the global environmental benefits presented in the logframe of the project document and the results framework of the CEO endorsement document.</p> <p>1. Table E presents the same amount of hectares for 2 different kind of corporate results. Please specify which area of land is being attributed to which corporate result to avoid double counting.</p> <p>2. In table B/component 2/ Region 2: MAIBC. Currently, the outcome is stated "X ha of avoided loss in forest cover by project end". After a lengthy design phase at CEO endorsement we expect that the</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>project proponent will be able to estimate all targets. While it understandable for targets to be further confirmed during year one, we need an estimated target at project start up for all outcomes that are related to the global environmental benefits.</p> <p>3. The estimate of the climate benefits needs to be more clearly explained and presented. For instance, it is not clear in the footnote 10 page 8 why the avoided emissions used to calculate the total carbon benefits (14,232.5 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year) are the half of the result we find using the numbers provided in the explanation (28,465.0 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year). Instead of the proposed long footnote, we suggest to add an annex presenting clearly the calculation of the climate mitigation benefits. In addition, please be consistent in table B where some expected outcomes are presented on a yearly basis while others are for the total duration of the project.</p> <p>4. In table E, it is not necessary to provide climate benefits estimate with 2 digit precision. Please round the result to the least unit of tCO<sub>2</sub>e.</p> <p>January 8, 2018</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Thank you for addressing clearly and fully the comments. Cleared.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	December 11, 2017  Yes, with increased levels of cofinancing compared to the PIF stage. Cleared.	
	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)	December 11, 2017  Adequate elaboration of risks and mitigation measures are presented in the project document. Cleared.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	December 11, 2017  Presentation of the cofinancing in the letter from FONAFIFO/MINAE is not clear and we are not sure what is being added up to come up with the total amount in Table C of \$10,693,000. Please clarify.  January 8, 2018  Adequate explanation. Cleared.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	December 11, 2017  In SFM Tracking Tool, please include also the climate mitigation benefits from the carbon sequestration and indicate the source (Increase of forest cover and avoided emissions).	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		January 8, 2018  The SFM Tracking Tool includes all the projected climate mitigation benefits. Cleared.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	December 11, 2017  NA.	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	December 11, 2017  Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	December 11, 2017  Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	December 11, 2017  Yes, fully developed KM plan. Cleared.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	December 11, 2017  Adequate responses to GEFSEC comments. Cleared.	
	• STAP	December 11, 2017  Elaborate and comprehensive consideration and incorporation of all	

<sup>3</sup> 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
		STAP comments. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GEF Council</li> </ul>	December 11, 2017  All Council comments addressed. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Convention Secretariat</li> </ul>	December 11, 2017  NA.	
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	December 11, 2017  Please address all issues above and resubmit.  January 8, 2018  Yes as all issues have been adequately addressed.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	December 11, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 08, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		