

Jamaica Mangroves Plus: Protection and Sustainable Management of Jamaica's Mangrove Ecosystems and Biodiversity

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10653

Countries

Jamaica

Project Name

Jamaica Mangroves Plus: Protection and Sustainable Management of
Jamaica's Mangrove Ecosystems and Biodiversity

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

8/27/2020

Review completed by PM

12/1/2021

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/20/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11-2-2021

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

During PPG please include more information about connections to global/regional data platforms, ensure the continuity of these efforts after project end, and have a strong plan for the socialization and effective use of them. Also, please include private sector, Tourism Ministry, planning/infrastructure in the design and elaboration of these products to ensure that they will actually impact future decision making.

11/20/2020

No, please address the following:

- Component 1

o the policy recommendations are needed, and Output 1.2.1 at site level is necessary to test the application of possible policy recommendations. However how can the project influence/contribute to change in the short-medium at the national level. Is there an option to initiate the process of policy reform or updating? The resources are limited, but after the recommendations, what is the tangible follow up action?

o Note that the NMMP is currently being prepared. However, as the plan is not yet completed do they already have a sense of what is needed for implementation? What is informing this aspect of the project?

Component 2

o We note planned co-management with local communities. Will the local NGOs be included in this component to help to ensure continuity of local community engagement? How will the private landowners be incorporated? In particular large landowners.

Component 3

o Output 3.1.1- Where will the data be housed, how will it be maintained and what will be the data sharing protocols? Is this going to be linked to other key data management systems related to land use or biodiversity? How will there be collaboration with other data systems/repositories/etc globally and/or in the Caribbean?

o Output 3.1.2 Policies related to FDI/Investment in general should be included, as there are issues related to Infrastructure development and port development along the coast that are very important. Benefits, should also include a \$value, but also the cost to the economy of losing the mangroves due to certain economic activities.

o Output 3.1.3 - Beyond, building institutional capacity and general awareness in terms of having more information on the value of the mangroves, it will be important to take things a step further and see how the data can be used when decisions are being made on FDI related to tourism and other coastal developments-port and industrial development (shipping, harbour development) etc. Please also consider a more targeted awareness campaign in terms of publications or consultations geared towards the large private landowners and banks who finance the developments as well as insurance providers.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will work to include the requested information during PPG.

May 10, 2021

Component 1:

Point taken. The GEF project is expected to have an influence at national level through the National Forest Management and Conservation Plan (NFMCP) - Collaborative Implementation Framework. The NFMCP is led by the Forestry Department and supported by nine governmental agencies and key non-governmental stakeholders. The implementation of the National Mangroves Management Plan (NMMP) supported by this GEF project will be framed into the NFMCP - Collaborative Framework. This arrangement will embody a national-level focus and will contribute to influence national government's actions through the GEF project outcomes. Policy updating will be comprised. During PPG a policy analysis will be conducted to refine the design of Component 1 and further validate it with key government agencies. Please see changes made in Section 3) *Proposed alternative scenario* and 7) *Innovation, Sustainability and Potential for Scaling Up* of the revised PIF.

Output 1.2.1 has been revised in Table B and Section 3: *Alternative Scenario*. The project will strengthen the National Mangroves Management Plan (NMMP) by mainstreaming the *mangrove ecology science* approach, aimed to promote ecosystem restoration and biodiversity conservation. Outputs 1.2.2 and 1.2.3 (socio-economic and ecosystem services science), and 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 (knowledge repository and mangrove policy briefs) will apply the same focus. A participatory process will take place. Emergent recommendations will be critical to raise the importance of mangroves ecosystem restoration and biodiversity conservation within the Collaborative Implementation Framework, and dissemination of this mangrove knowledge among government agencies and non-government stakeholders

In Section 2) *Baseline Scenario* of the PIF, the status of the NMMP work plan has been described. Most NMMP elements are already complete, including data collection, on-ground assessments, stakeholder consultations, and consensus building in locations for

ecosystem management and rehabilitation. Given that the Forestry Department is leading both the development of the NMMP and this GEF project, it has been intentional to co-design both efforts from the beginning to ensure implementation alignment. The NMMP is expected to be drafted by December 2021 and issue the final report by June 2022. Ideally, the stakeholder consultations to finalize the NMMP will overlap with this GEF PPG phase, ensuring additional opportunities to hone the GEF project strategy with further stakeholder inputs.

Component 2:

Correct, local **NGOs** are already key stakeholders in targeted mangrove ecosystems and will have a major role in project restoration activities. The National Forest Management and Conservation Plan (NFMCP) comprises Cooperative Management Agreements between NGOs and the Forestry Department. As the GEF project sites will be confirmed during PPG, local NGOs will be engaged based on these existing Agreements. Kindly see insertions in Section 3: *Alternative Scenario* and Section 2: *Baseline scenario* of the PIF.

While the focus of the project's targeted restoration interventions with limited funds are on key mangrove ecosystems on government-owned lands, opportunities to engage with **private landowners** in adjacent lands is the exact focus of Output 1.1.2. A baseline assessment of land ownership (individuals and business) will be conducted, to inform different pathways for management incentives and policy recommendations. Additional opportunities to work with private landowners in mangrove ecosystem restoration will further be explored during PPG, including leveraging the newly established partnership between UWI-SODECO and private sugar company lands. Description added to Section 2) *The baseline scenario* of the PIF to highlight this new project opportunity.

Component 3:

Output 3.1.1 is focused on knowledge products, such as documents and reports, and not specifically on the raw data. The Forestry Department already manages mangrove data for Jamaica, and the stakeholder consensus was that the more important need is a single accessible location for data synthesis, including the numerous past mangrove documents, reports, research, and other knowledge products. This output will be coordinated with and is modeled after a similar Jamaica biodiversity clearinghouse mechanism (jamaicachm.org.jm) that is focused on Taxonomical, Ecological, Policy, Legislation & Regulations, Scientific Assessments, Educational Resource Material, Publications, Images, Activities and Events, as well as an electronic newsletter. Additional information on collaboration with other data systems has been added to Section 3: *Alternative Scenario*

The text for **Output 3.1.2** has been updated to include an additional policy brief (five in total) that target relevant mangroves polices to consider for Private Sector Investment/Foreign Direct Investment, particularly for port and coastal infrastructure development. All five policy briefs will also incorporate the estimated valuation of mangrove ecosystem services and the cost of losing mangroves due to economic activities. Also, as noted in the response directly below, each policy brief will also feature the important associated terrestrial and marine biodiversity benefits.

Output 3.1.3 has been revised by focusing on knowledge dissemination, awareness campaigns, consultations for the respective five policy brief audiences: key stakeholders, private sector entities, private landowners, bank/financiers, and insurance agents.

Please see all changes in Section 3: the *Alternative Scenario* and Table B of the revised PIF.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and

Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12/1/2021

Yes.

11/1/2021

No, please add "GEF Agency" to the organization type in the co-financing list.
Otherwise fine.

11/20/2020

No, we note that the agency is not providing any cofinancing.

During PPG, it would be good to continue to look for financing from other donors/CSOs/private sector during PPG. There may be opportunities to work with COVID relief programs, such as jobs programs that could be involved with restoration.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Well noted. The type of organization was inserted in the GEF Portal as requested.

May 10, 2021

Point taken. FAO will provide co-financing as part of the FAO Sustainable Forest Management toolbox aimed at supporting practical recommendations for mangrove restoration and management. Please see changes in Table C and Section 2: the *Baseline scenario* (Part II-2) of the PIF.

The project will also continue to look for additional co-financing from other donors during the full development of the project document. Opportunities to align with COVID-19 relief programs will equally be sought as they become available.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/20/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/20/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/20/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response
The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response
Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
11/20/2020

Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
11/2/2021

Yes, thank you and we look forward to receiving revised information at CEO Approval.

11/20/2020

No, the values for CO2 seem high. Can you please provide the ExACT tool?

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will work to include the requested information during PPG.

May 10, 2021

The estimated value of CO₂ emissions has been adjusted based on changes to the indicative project spatial targets, now with an improved estimated value of -1,152,654 tCO_{2e}. The relevant calculations are made through from the EX-ACT methodology (Management Degradation and Coastal Wetlands). Please see description under Table F and the ExACT summary calculation in Annex E of the revised PIF.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/20/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/2/2021

Yes, thank you for the addition. During PPG, it will be good to further examine these barriers and how the project can work to address them.

11/20/2020

No, please provide consideration for barriers related to limited incentives to protect the ecosystems as a whole and limited dis-incentives to degrade or off-set in unsustainable ways their destruction.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will work to include the requested information during PPG.

May 10, 2021

This text has been added to the barriers section to stresses the limited incentives for ecosystem management more broadly, and additional specific details on mangrove ecosystem protection due to policy gaps. These include limited policy and economic incentives as well as weak disincentives, largely due to outdated policies lacking recent scientific research rendering them ineffective. This is true for both many government agencies, and especially for private stakeholders where the disincentive for developers opting for offsetting via mangrove replanting versus deciding not to develop is provided as an example.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/2/2021

Yes, thank you. During PPG, please include more information on the assumptions of how the outputs of the project lead to the desired impacts and how the project will work to mitigate them, particularly in the areas related to behavior change and the private sector.

11/24/2020

No, please provide a theory of change consistent with STAP guidance. In particular, as mangrove destruction often occurs as the result of the actions of the private sector it is important to examine the assumptions internal to the project. For example, what are the assumptions and conditions needed for the activities undertaken to result in the desired outcomes? How can the project address those issues?

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will work to include the requested information during PPG.

May 10, 2021

The project's theory of change has been revised in accordance with STAP guidance. The TOC now better addresses key project assumptions at the precondition and per component levels. The project TOC figure has been updated and added as Annex D and additional text to support the key assumptions has been included to the project narrative in Section 3 - *Proposed alternative scenario*. Key assumptions are also identified, and proposed mitigations are noted within the project risk table.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/2/2021

Yes. As plans are being developed and information collected, it will be important to highlight the particular biodiversity values of each site targeted for restoration and conservation. Please remember that the GEF strategy requires that all new protected areas be KBAs, areas that could qualify as such, or other areas of high global

biodiversity significance and, therefore, the justification of site selection is important. We can discuss in further detail during PPG if requested by project proponents.

11/24/2020

Yes. It will be important that restoration is targeted to KBAs and/or places with threatened biodiversity that will directly benefit. Please ensure that these programs are designed with learning in mind to support further mangrove restoration.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will take this comment into account during PPG.

May 10, 2021

Additional detail is provided in the project strategy description (Section 3: *The Alternative Scenario*) to stress the importance of KBAs for the restoration activities under Component 2 as well as part of the knowledge management and dissemination under Component 3. The text has also been updated to stress that proposed project sites contain several of Jamaica's 21 KBAs, including the Goat Island site within the Portland Blight Protected Area and the Hanover site in Negril.

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/2/2021

Yes, thank you for these additions and we understand that these numbers will be refined during PPG.

11/24/2020

Yes, however we hope could see higher hectare numbers. At the same time, we know that mangroves are often in quite small areas.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will work to revise and confirm the numbers during PPG.

May 10, 2021

The specific mangrove hectare numbers mentioned in the PIF were informed by the data collected by Forestry Department staff as part of the data collection for the NMMP. In light of this review, the project preparation team has re-confirmed the numbers for Core Indicator 1 and 3 at 2,000 ha of new PAs and 4,027 ha of restored mangrove ecosystems, respectively. Using the same review, the value for core indicator 4 was adjusted and increased from 5,835 to 7,600 (See core Indicators and modifications in the Results Framework, Alternative Scenario and Global Environmental Benefits sections). The project is now collectively addressing the majority of Jamaica's mangrove area (13,627 ha from the above-mentioned review), prioritizing ecosystems with key biodiversity areas and/or in high need for restoration due to degradation.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/2/2021

Yes, thank you for the revisions. During PPG, it will be important to continue to focus on the long-term sustainability (and hopefully growth) of these results.

11/24/2020

No, please understand that sustainability in this context means how project results will continue and hopefully grow after the end of the project.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will work to include the requested information during PPG.

May 10, 2021

The *Sustainability* section has been revised to explain how the project has been designed for the results to persist, and potentially grow, after the project concludes. This includes stressing the project's ecosystem-based restoration approach that aims to improve overall ecosystem health, including key biodiversity, to allow mangroves to grow and repopulate degraded areas. The restored areas will also build on existing joint-management approaches with local NGOs that already work closely with communities. Also core to the project design is a focus on removing the key barrier of national policy gaps that emerged as a result of overlapping policies over the years that indirectly support mangroves. Through the project's gap filling and the NMMP, Jamaica's mangroves ecosystems will have dedicated sustainable management directives. This sustainable management approach is further complemented by Jamaica's strong commitment to scientific research. Coupled with the project's mangrove knowledge repository, local management moving forward will be incrementally more science-based as the collective mangrove ecosystem knowledge in Jamaica and globally grows.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/2/2021

Yes, thank you for the additions.

11/20/2020

No, indicative information on the role of the stakeholders should be included. Please also consider other key private sector stakeholders.

Agency Response

May 10, 2021

More information has been added to Section 2: *Stakeholders* to include indicative information for future stakeholder engagement. This includes a particular focus on engagement of local communities and NGOs as well as private sector actors, key private landowners adjunct to project sites, and additional government agencies to include finance/development and the Bureau of Gender Affairs.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes. Thank you for a project-specific section.

One small note - In this section, there is a reference to coal production when what is meant is charcoal.

Agency Response

May 10, 2021

The reference to "coal production" has been revised to read "charcoal".

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/2/2021

Yes, thank you for this information. We look forward to receiving information on the inclusion of the private sector and other government agencies not just as beneficiaries but how they have helped informed project design and outputs to ensure their use long term and for high impact.

11/20/2020

No, beyond tourism stakeholders, please consider including the stakeholders such as the Ministry of Finance, as well as those who fund the developments along the coast, such as the Banks, Insurance Companies as well as those government agencies responsible from FDI such as JAMPRO.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. We will work to include the requested information during PPG.

May 10, 2021

The *Private Sector Engagement* section has been reworked to stress the multiple new entry points the project will undertake to engage directly and indirectly with key private

sector actors from the foreign direct investment, finance and banking, and insurance industries. JAMPRO is recognized in the PIF to potentially serve as an important opportunity for private sector engagement. The specific opportunities to work with JAMPRO will be identified during the PPG phase.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12/1/2021

Yes, thank you for the addition.

11/4/2021

No, please add information on the institutional arrangement which is missing from the document.

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. The information on the institutional arrangements has been completed. Please refer to the Coordination section in the attached PIF and GEF Portal.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/24/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

12/1/2021

Yes.

11/2/2021

No, please include information on managing COVID risks, co-financing, and institutional arrangements.

11/24/2020

Not at this time, please revise and resubmit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	11/24/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/4/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/1/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval