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

Review PIF 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

7/29/2021

Review completed by PM

12/20/2021

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

10/7/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021

noted

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

10/7/2021

Yes.

During PPG, it would be good to consider revising indicators on the number of events or publications to try to also assess the quality and effectiveness of these activities.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted and will be evaluated during PPG

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

2/1/2022

Yes.

12/20/2021

Yes.

11/15/2021

No, if co-financing is provided as grant (cash), select ?Investment mobilized? (not ?Recurrent expenditures?) ? if so, please fill out the section on how investment mobilized was identified.

- IUCN regional office: Source ? change ?GEF Agency? to ?Donor agency?.

Agency Response

16/11/2021

Cash co-financing of the two ministries changed to ?Investment mobilized? and section on how investment mobilized completed

In co-financing source table IUCN regional Office changed from GEF Agency to Donor Agency

UNEP Response: Jan/11/2022 (ref additional comments from the GEF-PPO)

In consultation with the Department of Sustainable Development in respect to the nature of co-financing, it was advised that the total amounts contributed by the (i) Ministry of Education, Gender, Innovation and Sustainable Development and the (ii) Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Physical Planning, Natural Resources and Co-operatives should be reverted to in-kind, as recurrent expenditures. This has been updated in Indicative Sources

of Co-financing Table. We anticipate that the section on how investment mobilized was identified is not needed. The change to wholly in-kind CF has been updated in the portal.

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

10/7/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021

noted

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/7/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021

noted

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/7/2021

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
10/7/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted

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

10/7/2021

Yes. While we understand that it is difficult to derive a reasonable hectare number for an ABS project particularly at this point, it would be good to see if there is a number that can justifiably used at CEO Endorsement.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted. This will be explored. It may be possible to derive spatial extents based on project on-ground influence at the local level. The GEF Core Indicator that may be considered is Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity.

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

10/7/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

10/7/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/7/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/7/2021

Yes.

During PPG, please clarify or further expand on the following:

- Ensuring sustainability of the capacity building efforts both as new people enter positions as well as maintaining specialized skills and techniques that may only be used in limited contexts (e.g. genetic analysis)

- Coordination and learning to support similar efforts in other countries in the region, noting some of the challenges of limited human resources that are shared across countries.

- More clarity on the relationship with the antivenom producing facility in Costa Rica and the Kentucky Reptile Zoo. KRZ has already shown significant commitment to build capacity and the partnership sounds promising. It is important that animal welfare best practices are employed in this project.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
All recommendations are well noted and will be pursued during the PPG phase.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

11/4/2021

Yes. We understand that it is not reasonable to provide hectare numbers for the activities of this project at this point.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted. This will be evaluated during the PPG phase. The GEF Core Indicator that may be considered is Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

12/20/2021

Yes thank you.

11/4/2021

No, the submission indicated that IPLCs, CSOs and the private sector have been consulted, but the project does not include any information on the consultations carried out to inform project design and the PIF. Please ask agency to provide a summary of stakeholder consultations

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Annex E with the stakeholder consultations carried out from 2018 leading into the detailed PIF design from 2019 is now included with the revised PIF.

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

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

11/4/2021

Yes. During PPG, please elaborate on climate risks as well as risks specific to ABS projects based on experiences of the executing agency and others.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Recommendation noted and will be pursued during PPG phase.

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

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

11/4/2021

Yes.

Knowledge management is very important with this project as it is following on from the regional ABS project in the Caribbean and could serve as a helpful model for other countries in the region. Therefore, documentation and collecting lessons learned should be worked on throughout and learning from other projects in other regions will be important. Working with an experienced executing agency in this topic could certainly help with this. At PPG, please address how project design has incorporated lessons from the GEF IEO evaluation of ABS projects.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted, these lessons will be incorporated within this project design. Additionally, recent experiences in The Bahamas with the ongoing national GEF ABS project will be instructive. This reference is already made in the PIF under section 7) innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up

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

11/4/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

16/11/2021
Noted.

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

12/20/2021

Yes.

11/4/2021

No, Executing Partner in Portal (IUCN) is different than in LoE (Department of Sustainable Development) ? please: (i) modify the Executing Agency in Portal for the same Executing Agency in LoE; (ii) get a new LoE with IUCN as the Executing Partner. Same applies to the mention of IUCN as the executing partner in Section 6 ? Coordination.

Agency Response

16/11/2021

Noted. The revised LoE is now attached that specifies that IUCN is the project Executing Agency.

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

2/1/2022

Yes.

12/20/2021

No, please update the table in the Portal with the changes in the co-financing organizations.

11/15/2021

No, 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	11/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/1/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval