



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

GEF ID:	9406		
Country/Region:	St. Lucia		
Project Title:	Integrated Ecosystem Management on the South East Coast of St Lucia		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 2; BD-1 Program 2; LD-2 Program 3; SFM-3; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,988	Project Grant:	\$4,428,145
Co-financing:	\$25,800,000	Total Project Cost:	\$30,228,145
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Kristin McLaughlin

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	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No, please address the following issues -</p> <p>- Too many outcomes - With approximately \$4 million in GEF resources, this project is attempting to work in 8 different GEF programs. The result is too many different activities without the potential to</p>	

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
		<p>make a significant impact in those areas. The project would benefit from focusing on a more limited set of outcomes. While the project can involve different areas of activity, there needs to be coherence among the different project activities. For instance, what is the relationship of the livelihood activities to achieving GEBs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not enough information - The description of actual project activities is very short. Thus, we cannot provide a response to whether the activities of this project are aligned with GEF approaches in these areas. - Indicators - the project lacks SMART indicators for biodiversity. - Biodiversity - This project appears to target a Key Biodiversity Area for conservation activities, which is welcome. - Biodiversity language - Please define terms such as hotspot (as the common usage of Biodiversity Hotspot is the entirety of the Caribbean). <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>No. Thank you for this re-submission. While this project is significantly improved from the version first received by the Secretariat, there are</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>still a number of issues that remain.</p> <p>GHG/CCM (related to Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use - AFOLU):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please including GHG Benefits under Table F for corporate results. - Please add one paragraph on GHG emissions and energy use in the country to justify in the CCM component under section 1 of the PIF. (this could include moving the first paragraph under depletion of carbon stocks from page 8) - Data is needed on the tonnes of CO2 that can be saved through AFOLU, a simple total based on a carbon calculator can go under depletion of carbon stocks based on AFOLU potential in the country. <p>Renewable energy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If this project is going to include a subcomponent on renewable energy development, Table A and other part of PIF need to show more detailed and relevant information on the subject. This includes the current energy mix and on-going renewables activities within the country - Please consider using co-financing only to cover the work of this subcomponent and specifically note this to avoid the requirements to 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>include an additional area of work.</p> <p>Corporate results: - Table F (corporate results) includes 5,000 ha of SLM. We understand that these 5000 ha are agroforestry parklands mentioned in the component 3. We are not sure if the project should be developed under the LD3/Program 4. The LD3/Program 4 support efforts to scale-up policies, practices, and incentives for improving production landscapes with environmental benefits. We are not seeing the strategy to develop results at scale.</p> <p>Either the set of activities should be revised to propose a logical path to scale up results obtained with the SGP and other projects (policies, financing incentive mechanisms, extension services, training, etc.), or the project should be clearly field result oriented and developed under program 1 (Agroecology), program 2 (climate smart agriculture), or program 3 (forests).</p> <p>Again for Table F, please add the quantity of CO2 emission reductions due to the use of CCM2 Program 4 funds and SFM.</p> <p>The SFM 2 Program 5 refers to the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>capacity development for SFM within local communities. While the project doesn't clearly show such activity (the best practices developed are for agroforestry), forest restoration activities are proposed in the component 2. Please better justify the use of SFM2 or consider using SFM3 related to forest restoration to reverse the loss of ecosystem services within degraded forest landscape.</p> <p>Project Justification Section 1: Problem to be addressed - This should include the types of ecosystems to be protected through this project.</p> <p>Preferred solution - Will this project address policy development and institution building? It doesn't seem to be included here.</p> <p>Baseline - GHG - Please include an estimate of GHE emissions from the South East Coast of St. Lucia if these baseline projects are implemented as planned. This would be the baseline for the CCM component.</p> <p>April 11, 2016</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Yes. Thank you for making the requested additions and changes.</p> <p>During PPG, please expand on the baselines requested through additional data collection.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Unclear, given the lack of information about project activities, it is difficult to assess this.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>No. As written currently this project aligned with national strategies and plans for biodiversity. As there is a CCM component, we could also ask how the project is aligned with the NDC of the country communicated to UNFCCC on 11/18/15.</p> <p>April 11, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Unclear, with major project revisions please make sure to focus on how this project will address drivers.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>No. While the justification is reasonable, it doesn't match what is currently in other sections of the PIF. By making the revisions suggested under other sections, it seems likely the PIF will align with the ambition described in this section. The drivers of the deforestation are unclear in the root causes and threats paragraph and due to the decline of the banana production, the rate of net deforestation have probably changed. Please provide more information to explain the current situation of the deforestation including mangroves, especially in the project area, and its drivers.</p> <p>April 11, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for addressing these issues and we look forward to greater analysis of drivers of environmental degradation and a theory of change at PPG.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No, there are two existing projects mentioned but the coherence with project activities is lacking. How much engagement has happened with those projects?</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>No, it still quite hard to see the relationship between the baseline projects and the GEF activities. It is still unclear how much, if anything, those projects know about the proposed GEF project. With the WB project, it's also important to remember that GEF STAR resources are not for climate change adaptation even though many of the activities undertaken also have adaptation benefits. Please show the added benefit of the GEF under each component and linkages to co-finance.</p> <p>Please, also consider integrate the other related projects in the baselines, such as the CCD project, the GEF funded Sustainable Financing and Management of Eastern Caribbean Marine ecosystems and the SFM-EC project, as they are linked with the project proposal.</p> <p>April 11, 2016</p> <p>Yes. We look forward to more information about how this project will build on baseline interventions during PPG.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound	March 17, 2016	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>No, please see the response for question 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In the risk table, there appear to be quotes from the PIF. However, these quotations are not actually in the PIF. - In the risk table, the establishment of a private-public fund for conservation is discussed, which is found nowhere else. The GEF has already supported the establishment of a conservation fund in St. Lucia through the Caribbean Challenge Initiative. This fund should serve this purpose. Activities to generate funds for the existing GEF-supported mechanism could potentially be supported. However, a strong justification would be needed to create an additional fund. - While concision is valued, the very short description of project activities makes it hard to provide a response to this question. <p>Overall, the lack of focus of this project makes it hard to see how significant GEBs will be achieved.</p> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>No, please address the following -</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Private sector and private landholders - These efforts have the potential to do something really innovative that could be a model for other countries in the region. However, the thinking in this area needs to be disentangled. It seems as though there are 3 groups that the project wants to engage - private non-commercial landowners (mostly foreigners), private sector commercial landowners, and other private sector (as a source of financing). The strategies for engagement and needs for these groups are quite different and thus likely necessitate different approaches. - Payments for Ecosystem Services - The GEF welcomes the suggestion of PES. However, based on past experience in systems being suggested at PIF but not materializing, more information is needed. For the GEF to support PES, at PIF there must be a developed concept including sellers, buyers, and a mechanism for payment. Please refer to the GEF STAP publication PES for guidance on developing PES activities. - Conservation easements - Conservation easements are a tool that has been used successfully in the 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>US and other countries to promote conservation on private lands and this seems like an interesting possibility. However, easements can represent a significant cost to the government in the form of lost tax revenue. How would this be funded? Also, in order to be truly effective easements require robust enforcement and penalty systems. How will those be developed?</p> <p>- What will be undertaken through the GEF project? - It may be a linguistic issue, but on page 12 the activities are described as "This proposed initiative will identify the most feasible private sector oriented tools..." However, Table B discusses the establishment of these tools not just their identification. There have been studies of possible tools for St. Lucia already completed, so will this project build on those?</p> <p>- As mentioned previously under #1, the use of terminology such as hotspot and corridor remains confused. In particular, what types of corridor activities are envisioned as part of this project?</p> <p>Component 2: - Please add the GHG emissions reduction benefits from land use change. You can use FAO's EX-ACT</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>tool to make these calculations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The numbers of ha mentioned in Table F, the result framework, and the text describing the components do not seem coherent (2500 ha under agroforestry or 5000 ha?). To clarify in the corporate results table - target 1 is directed towards Biodiversity interventions including protected areas as well as areas of biodiversity-friendly management while target 2 is for land degradation related activities. - Please provide more information about restoration efforts and previous successes, in particular in relation to sea grass beds. - The forest restoration need to be further explained, including the kind of land and trees and the modalities used. The measures envisaged to engage smallholder agricultural producers in reforestation also need more clarification. <p>April 11, 2016</p> <p>Yes. We will look for much more detail at PPG as different ideas are discussed with stakeholders and developed.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No. The non-project specific paragraphs in this section are</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>unnecessary. The inclusion of gender during the PPG is welcome. There is little discussion of CSOs.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This section is improved. However, during PPG please discuss who women were involved in the development of the project design and structure as well as throughout the project as well as how local CSOs will be participating.</p>	
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? 	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This project uses the entirety of St. Lucia's \$4,498,818 STAR Allocation.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Yes. St. Lucia is a fully flexible country and is using a small amount of flexibility.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Unclear. The project needs a stronger justification of the use of SFM</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>resources.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>Unclear. Please make the suggested changes to strengthen the justification for the work of this project on forestry and land use change.</p> <p>April 11, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Recommendations	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No, this project requires major revisions. The GEF Secretariat would welcome discussions with those involved in the project on steps forward.</p> <p>March 31, 2016</p> <p>No, while this project was significantly improved, there are still major issues remaining. The GEF Secretariat would still welcome discussions on how to move this project forward.</p> <p>April 11, 2016</p> <p>Yes. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 17, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 31, 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)		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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 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)		

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
	Additional Review (as necessary)		