

# Strengthening access and benefit-sharing (ABS) policies and institutional frameworks through demonstrable models in Saint Lucia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10840

**Countries**

St. Lucia

**Project Name**

Strengthening access and benefit-sharing (ABS) policies and institutional frameworks through demonstrable models in Saint Lucia

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

1/14/2023

**Review completed by PM**

1/31/2023

**Program Manager**

Sarah Wyatt

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

**PIF**   
**CEO Endorsement**

**Part I ? Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes. However, it would be good if the indicators were more qualitative rather than a simple number of platforms. The number doesn't speak to the quality or usage.

Agency Response

**Response 03/07/2023**

Please see revisions in the Results Framework (in yellow highlight) where the outcome level indicators were adjusted to better signal application of the outputs in a more qualitative context. The more quantitative indicators remained at the output level.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

**4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/24/2023

Yes, thank you for the revision to the figures.

1/31/2023

No, it does not seem like there are adequate activities to justify that this project will lead to improved management of over 10,000 hectares. Please explain how this figure was calculated.

Agency Response

**Response 03/07/2023**

The project assumed that conservation of the target species in the interest of accruing benefits sharing will have implied that the local management authority (the Forestry Department) will have emphasized community and landowner participation in conservation of landscapes that harboured the species. Indeed, it is accepted that there may not necessarily be 'improved practices' or active management related to the proposed acreage advanced under Core Indicator 4.1 given the orientation of the project. The estimate under CI 4.1 is revised to 2,000 ha. The following explains how the estimate was derived:

*The estimated combined spatial extents (distribution) of the Saint Lucia Viper (*Bothrops caribbaeus*) and the lansan tree (*Protium attenuatum*) that lie outside already protected areas (government forest reserves) is 12,300 hectares. This spatial estimate was derived using a heads-up Google Earth trace over the landscape features corresponding to the estimated range distributions, yielding the areal estimate. The known acreage of the protected government forest reserves that overlapped with the range of the two species was subtracted from this estimate to yield the approximate acreage outside protected areas. The project anticipates contribution to improved conservation management practices with stakeholders over approximately 15% of the wider 12,300 hectares, or 2,000 hectares as now reported under Core Indicator 4.*

The CI tables have been updated and explanation provided in the document narrative.

**Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
Child Project

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
NA

Agency Response  
Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
Private Sector Engagement

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Consistency with National Priorities**



**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

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 CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/6/2023

No, please address the following:

1. Core Indicators: Core indicators are missing in the results framework. GEF Core Indicators targets need to be aligned with Results Framework (Annex A). GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework.

2. Co-financing :

a. The letter of evidence indicates 250,000 but the portal shows 92,593.

b. The letter of evidence is missing the committed co-financing amount of \$222,200.

c. The letter of evidence for the committed co-financing amount is missing.

3. Annex A ? Project Results Framework is off margin.

4. Budget table is not readable. Please ask the Agency to include a readable version ? otherwise, when posted this information will not be accessible to external audiences. Per the resubmission, we will review and provide comments if appropriate.

## Agency Response

### Response 03/07/2023

1. Core Indicators: The only core indicator retained now on this review is the number of direct beneficiaries. This has now been clarified in the results framework. The associated core indicator has been flagged where referenced in the results framework (yellow highlight in revised document). The total number of beneficiaries associated with the Core Indicator now corresponds to numbers in the results framework.

#### 2. Co-financing

- a. The letter expressed co-financing in 250,000 East Caribbean Dollars with the equivalent amount in USD of 92,593 based on the 2.7 East Caribbean dollar to 1 US dollar.
- b. The letter had 2 parts; the second of which stated the amount. This was omitted on initial submission to the portal. Has since been updated and re-submitted.
- c. The letter has now been received; included within the project document and uploaded to the portal.

3. The Results Framework has been adjusted so now is all within the margin.

4. Budget table adjusted so now readable and re-integrated back into the document.

### **Project Results Framework**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

## Agency Response

### **GEF Secretariat comments**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
NA

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/31/2023

Yes.

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/24/2023

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

2/6/2023

No, please address the questions on indicators and annexes.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>1/31/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**