



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

GEF ID:	4847		
Country/Region:	Bahamas		
Project Title:	Pine Islands - Forest/Mangrove Innovation and Integration (Grand Bahama, New Providence, Abaco and Andros)		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; LD-3; BD-1; BD-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$100,000	Project Grant:	\$2,853,425
Co-financing:	\$7,695,258	Total Project Cost:	\$10,648,683
PIF Approval:	February 21, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	April 12, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Kristin McLaughlin

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	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.	July 21, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	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.	July 21, 2015 As at PIF stage.

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

¹ 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 ¹	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.	July 21, 2015 As at PIF stage, there is no NGI.
	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.	July 21, 2015 As at PIF stage.
Resource Availability	6. 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 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.	July 21, 2015 Overall grant request is as at PIF stage. Please check the following data issues ERROR in CEO: CEO FASF and Finance Overview total cofinance amounts differ ERROR in CEO: FASF and Project Framework total cofinance amounts differ ERROR in CEO: FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ. ERROR in CEO: Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ ERROR in CEO: The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance 08/18/2015 Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	July 21, 2015 FA grant requests are as at PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		1/3 of the FA allocation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	<p>March 19, 2012 Generally aligned.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed.</p>	<p>July 21, 2015 Yes project design remains aligned with FA RFs.</p>
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	<p>March 19, 2012 Yes BD-1, BD-2, LD-3 and SFM-1.</p>	<p>July 21, 2015 FA objectives remain unchanged.</p>
	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?	<p>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.</p>	<p>July 21, 2015 Additional details of 2010 Forestry Act, SPAW and the 2014 Ecological Gap Assessment have been provided.</p>
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any,	<p>March 19, 2012 Technical capacity is identified as a key</p>	<p>July 21, 2015 Technical capacity deficiencies as</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed.</p>	<p>identified as key barriers, project components include specific capacity development elements particularly cross sector processes.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>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>	<p>March 19, 2012 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>July 21, 2015 ProDoc includes detail on GoB baseline initiatives plus related work such as IADB Andros Development Plan.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed.	
	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?		July 21, 2015 The project utilizes an approach based on improved integration and cross sector collaboration to use existing local structures and processes rather than developing additional or new ones.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	March 19, 2012 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 management; and pilot PES. April 2, 2012 UA: Addressed under response to #11.	July 21, 2015 Incremental reasoning in ProDoc focuses on building on existing framework of the 2010 Forestry Act.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	March 19, 2012 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? 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. c) Please give an estimate of the extent of Component 3, how it will be executed on the ground, and clarify the GEBs that	July 21, 2015 The RF has been amended through PPG but remains sound.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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. 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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<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>	<p>July 21, 2015 GEBs are identified as including improved forest management information system, two sub-national land use plans which incorporate biodiversity, SLM, SFM and ecosystem values, establishment of the forest estate and development of 171 kha Conservation Forests and restoration of 50 ha mangrove.</p>
	<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>July 21, 2015 Socio-economic benefits and gender are weakly addressed. Please provide a clear description of how the project will promote socio-economic benefits and address gender issues, and explain how these contribute to the achievement of incremental benefits.</p> <p>08/18/2015 Addressed</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	<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>	July 21, 2015 Local communities' involvement is described within Components 2 and 3 particularly.
	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 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>	July 21, 2015 Key risks and mitigation measures identified.
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 19, 2012 Key projects are identified. The role of the National Implementation Strategic Partnership would appear important in ensuring collaboration with ongoing and new initiatives.</p>	July 21, 2015 Key initiatives identified such as Bahamas Protected Areas Fund and protected areas management within IUCN/TNC BIOPAMA project.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 19, 2012 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</p>	July 21, 2015 Implementation arrangements for the components described.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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?		July 21, 2015 Component 2 amended but justified and remains within objective of component and project as a whole.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		July 21, 2015 There is no NGI.
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</p>	July 21, 2015 PMC remains at 7%. Please provide the information that was noted would be necessary at CEO Endorsement in the PIF review on 04/19/12, also give justification for grant PMC at 7% and co-finance at 5%.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		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.	
	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>	<p>July 21, 2015 Resources appear adequate.</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>March 19, 2012 Co-finance is 1:1.27 which is extremely 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 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</p>	<p>July 21, 2015 Co-finance has increased to \$7,655,258 overall, conformation available for all sources.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>	
	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>	<p>July 21, 2015 Co-finance from UNEP has been reduced from \$400,000 in-kind and \$200,000 cash to \$40,000 in-kind. Please expand on the UNEP regional activities mentioned in the review responses attached to the CEO Endorsement Request and how these contribute.</p> <p>08/18/2015 Addressed.</p>
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		<p>July 21, 2015 TTs available.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>July 21, 2015 Budgeted M&E plan available.</p>
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 	STAP Comments included:	July 21, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		1. BD baselines 2. Blue Carbon estimates 3. Selection of Little Abaco Mangrove as demo site 4. How is management effectiveness to be measured 5. Selection process for models 6. Indicators and timelines	1. Addressed 2. Addressed. Estimates made using Ex-Act, with follow up with project on Blue Carbon accounting. 3. Addressed. Davis Creek selected. 4. Addressed. Commitment to use METT. 5. Please comment on how the model selection was carried out. 6. Addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>2/2013. PIF has been cleared for the April 2013 Work Program.</p> <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>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?		July 21, 2015 PPG status included.
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		July 21, 2015 Not at this stage please see issues above. 08/18/2015 Recommended for CEO Endorsement.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 19, 2012	July 21, 2015
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 04, 2012	August 18, 2015
	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	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	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.