



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

GEF ID:	<b>4847</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Bahamas</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Pine Islands - Forest/Mangrove Innovation and Integration (Grand Bahama, New Providence, Abaco and Andros)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; LD-3; BD-1; BD-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,853,425</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$5,600,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$8,453,425</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>April 01, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Ian Gray</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Kristin McLaughlin</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	March 19, 2012 Yes, CBD from 1993 and CCD from 2000.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 19, 2012 Letter from P Weech OFP dated February 23, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	March 19, 2012 UNEP comparative advantage acknowledged for BD and the development of monitoring and assessment systems. UNEP is also working on SFM and mangrove projects elsewhere in the region.	

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

<sup>1</sup> 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	March 19, 2012 There is no non-grant instrument.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	March 19, 2012 UNEP supervision from RONA office in DC with technical staff from ROLAC in Panama and CEP in Jamaica.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	March 19, 2012 As at March 19, 2012 the FA allocations still remaining to be programmed were: BD \$4.26 million, CC \$2 million and LD \$1.48 million.	
	• the focal area allocation?	March 19, 2012 Yes, funds requested are within the FA allocations.  SFM request meets the \$2 million FA allocation minimum floor and is equal to 1/3 of the FA allocation.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	• focal area set-aside?		
	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	March 19, 2012 Generally aligned.  Please amend Table A to make sure that each Outcome is on a separate row with its own Indicate Grant Amount and Indicative Co-finance.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	March 19, 2012 Yes BD-1, BD-2, LD-3 and SFM-1.	
	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?	March 19, 2012 The project was identified in the NPDF as a high priority project. The NBSAP includes the expansion of the PA network and the need for improved guidance on PA selection together with management plans for existing and new PAs. The 4th National Report also raises the issue of integration of biodiversity issues within national planning and points out that efforts to date have not addressed soil conservation within agricultural practices.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	March 19, 2012 Technical capacity is identified as a key limiting factor in B.1. Component 1 text includes technical capacity development in governmental staff and CSOs. Please include this specifically in Table B, which mentions only the intra-agency capacity building (Output 2) and not non-governmental bodies, and clarify how the awareness building modules (Output 4) are to be rolled-out to user groups. Also the Component 1 text mentions technical skills 'to be strengthened at local technical training institutes' please explain what this involves.  April 2, 2012 UA:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Addressed.	
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>March 19, 2012</p> <p>The baseline project based on the GoB projected spending on the Forestry Act and the Department of Physical Planning is very modest. The lack of up to date information, such as land use data and inventory, is clear.</p> <p>There is however a need clarify the drivers of deforestation, forest degradation and land degradation, and quantify the threats to forests. What for example is the rate of forest loss? While a number of species are mentioned in B.1 the link to their habitats and how they are being impacted without the project is not clear. The rationale for the use of the limited incentive funds has to be made clear.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: 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?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	<p>March 19, 2012</p> <p>This will benefit from clearer description of the baseline project, however the key elements are improved enabling conditions, methodologies and tools for BD and LD planning; identification of new PA and improved</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>management; and pilot PES.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed under response to #11.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>March 19, 2012</p> <p>a) Please check the figures for consistency in outputs in the Tables and the text. For example what is the area of new PAs that will be created 415,000 ha or 384,000 ha?</p> <p>b) SFM/REDD+ projects should show some carbon benefits. Please provide an estimate of the carbon benefit likely to accrue from the project, in comparison to a baseline (carbon accrual expected without the project). Using Tier 1 estimates are acceptable at this stage.</p> <p>c) Please give an estimate of the extent of Component 3, how it will be executed on the ground, and clarify the GEBs that are expected from the piloting of the PES. Also please explain how STAP guidance on PES will be incorporated.</p> <p>d) In Component 2 Protected Forests are mentioned. Given that these are non-permanent forest that can be converted to other land uses in the future please explain the sustainability of interventions in these areas and the GEBs expected.</p> <p>e) Component 2 Output 4 Little Abaco Mangrove, please explain the GEBs expected.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Clarification requests (a) to (e) have been adequately addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>HOWEVER;</p> <p>f) Estimated carbon benefits have not been entered into Table B, only into the text, see p. 13. Please include into the table B. Also please include in the text (or as an appendix) the calculations on which the estimate was based.</p> <p>g) Outputs under component 3: it is unclear what is meant by "3 of the 5 following" - does it mean that the Mangrove model might not be implemented?</p> <p>h) Please also include a brief outline on how to assess feasibility of alternative livelihood options in the PIF as GEF support for alternative livelihoods is usually only provided based on a thorough social and economic analysis of its feasibility.</p> <p>April 19, 2012  f) Additional information included. Addressed.  g) mangrove model moved to Cmpt 2. Selection will be two from remaining four. Addressed.  h) Additional detail in text. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 19, 2012  See Q14 on the need to provide clearer description of the GEBs expected.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA:  Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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>March 19, 2012 The focus on women in 2 of the 4 PES pilots is welcome however some additional detail is warranted. Please explain how the activities in Component 3 are being developed in order to support GEB delivery after the project's life.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed. But only in the Response Matrix and not sufficiently in the PIF. Please incorporate the key details into the PIF text.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Additional details incorporated into text. Addressed.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>March 19, 2012 CSOs and local communities are included in all components. How are local communities involved in the PA selection process and developing the PES pilots?</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed. But only in the Response Matrix and not sufficiently in the PIF. Please incorporate the key details into the PIF text.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Additional details incorporated into text. Addressed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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>March 19, 2012</p> <p>Risks and mitigation are generic but sufficient for this stage. A more comprehensive analysis is expected at CEO Endorsement, in particular on the establishment of PAs and the potential impact on local forest uses and livelihoods.</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 19, 2012</p> <p>Key projects are identified. The role of the National Implementation Strategic Partnership would appear important in ensuring collaboration with ongoing and new initiatives.</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 19, 2012</p> <p>Project is led by the Forest Department and co-executed by the Department of Physical Planning. Please provide explanation of the roles in Component 3 but in particular of the private sector, CSOs and NGOs in the development and implementation of the PES.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed. But only in the Response Matrix and not sufficiently in the PIF. Please incorporate the key details into the PIF text.</p> <p>April 19, 2012 Additional details incorporated into text. Addressed.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>March 19, 2012  PMC is at 10% but for projects over \$2 million this should be no more than 5%.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA:  The justification for 9% PMC is not considered appropriate. Please adjust and cover PMC out of co-financing.</p> <p>April 19, 2012  PMC now reduced to 7%. Estimated project management costs must be further detailed and explained at CEO endorsement stage. Please note that GEF only funds actual management costs and will only pay prorata our funding compared to the co-financing of management costs. At endorsement stage, GEF will thoroughly review the appropriateness of the total project management costs (GEF funding and co-finance) and its justification in relation to the overall project budget.</p>	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 19, 2012  Resources for Components 2 and 3 seem modest. Please provide some additional detail to justify this level of expense.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA:  Addressed. But please see comments to #25 below.</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing;	<p>March 19, 2012  Co-finance is 1:1.27 which is extremely</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p>	<p>low and significantly more co-finance is expected. Two bilateral agencies and TNC are identified but no co-finance is detailed for them.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Discussed in the response matrix. The difficulties are acknowledged. However, as the country is requesting additional resources out of SFM/REDD+ on top of the STAR allocation, we have to insist that every effort be made to increase the ratio of indicative co-financing.</p> <p>April 19, 2012</p> <p>Thank you for the explanation of land valuation in Bahamas. Co-finance, as described in Council Document GEF/C.20/6/Rev.1, is cash or in-kind resources that are committed as part of the financial package for the GEF project. The opportunity cost of income foregone from alternative development options, including land valuation, is not admissible as co-finance for GEF-funded projects. Please remove the opportunity cost-based co-finance from the National Government and seek alternative co-finance. In Table C co-finance amounts indicated from Spain and TNC remain unspecified.</p> <p>December 11, 2012 Co-finance has been increased to \$5.6 million giving a ratio of 1:2.0</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>March 19, 2012            UNEP is contributing \$474,000 please clarify if this is in grant or in-kind form.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA:            Clarified.</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>December 11, 2012            This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.</p> <p>April 19, 2012            Not at this stage. Please address co-finance issues.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA:            No. Please address the follow-up clarification requests.</p> <p>March 19, 2012            Not at this stage. Please address issues above.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 04, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 11, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **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?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* 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.