



Watershed Action for Restoring Ecosystems in the South Corridor of St. Vincent

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID 11541
Countries St. Vincent and Grenadines
Project Name Watershed Action for Restoring Ecosystems in the South Corridor of St. Vincent
Agencies UNEP
Date received by PM 3/20/2024
Review completed by PM 4/1/2024
Program Manager Asha Bobb-Semple
Focal Area Land Degradation
Project Type FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments
4/15/2026

Cleared.

4/2/2026

No fully.

The project title in the Portal (Watershed Action for Restoring Ecosystems in the South Corridor of St. Vincent (SVG-WARE)) is different than in LoE (Conserving biodiversity through participatory innovative nature-based solutions in St. Vincent & the Grenadines). Title in Portal must match that in LoE (title can be modified during preparation) - alternatively, a new LoE is required.

12/09/2025

Not cleared.

- The primary objective and focus of the project are to address land-based sources of pollution in alignment with the Cartagena Protocol. Given this, the project as presented does not align with the CCM focal area and so funds under this focal area would have to be reallocated to either LD or BD. In addition, while there are elements of the project which could be supported by the BD and LD focal areas, full technical clearance will require revisions to strengthen the BD and LD rationale for the project.
- In order to take advantage of GEF-8 funding, SVG may wish to consider rescoping the project. Two options could be explored:

1) Retain the project as an MFA with LD and BD only but strengthen/revise the rationale and focus of the project for the delivery of BD and LD outcomes and GEBs primarily and with LBS as a co-benefit. For the LD FA the primary objective is to avoid, reduce and reverse land degradation, so the project could be aligned with LD-2 or a combination of LD-1 and LD-2 with language that links to how the project will assist SVG to meet its LDN targets and/or other national plans under the UNCCD.

Most of the targeted areas are productive landscapes and only a small part is in the National Reserve at the upstream of the watershed, and at the bottom, in a marine protected area. For BD, this could mean alignment with BD-1-1 (Protected Areas) and/or BD1-2 (Mainstreaming). For BD1-1 on PA management, this would require expanding on how the proposed activities and landscape approach could be linked with and strengthen the management of the protected areas and their buffer zones within or in close proximity to the target watersheds. For BD1-2 this would mean expanding on how BD considerations are being included in activities in integrated landscape planning etc. On Biodiversity Mainstreaming in Priority Sectors, supports are to improve spatial planning, reduce harmful subsidies and change in practices. If landscape planning could be aligned, there is nothing in the project dedicated to improvement of practices, and policy coherence. Consistently, please consider in that option adding the Core indicators dedicated to improvement effectiveness of PAs management, terrestrial and marine, CI 1.2 and 2.2.

OR

2) Change the project to an LDFA project only looking at LD-1 and LD-2 following the same logic as above thereby creating a dedicated LD investment in SVG. For LD, we do see alignment with the SLM and restoration activities, however the pollution elements do not fall within the objectives of the LDFA. For example,

changes could be as follows.

- **Outcome 1.1** *Enhanced policy, legal and institutional framework with effective capacity that will foster integrated landscape management to mitigate land-based sources (LBS) of pollution triggered by land degradation, contributing positively to ecosystem protection.* There would be no need to eliminate the pollution focus, but it would have to be secondary. So, the revised Outcome could be Enhanced policy, legal and institutional framework with effective capacity that will foster integrated landscape management to restore and rehabilitate degraded landscapes, to mitigate land-based sources (LBS) of pollution and contributing positively to effective ecosystem functioning.
- **Output 3.1.1** *National pollution information system within the NEDIP, integrating watershed and coastal monitoring data, accessible to government, academia and communities.* This output could be revised to focus improving an existing integrated environmental data monitoring system where LD hotspots can be identified together watershed and coastal monitoring data and pollution hotspots
- **Output 3.1.2** *Upgraded national laboratories with equipment and capacity for monitoring environmental / water quality parameters.* This output could be revised to specify land parameters or link to the lab being established under SOILCARE.

For either option you may refer to LDN Transformative Projects and Programs guide here <https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/LDN%20TPP%20checklist%20final%20draft%20040918.pdf> or we recommend to make contact with the UNCCD Global Mechanism for support on improving the LD rationale and links to LDN and potential synergies with the Cartagena Protocol.

A more comprehensive LBS focused project could then be explored with the requisite CW and/or IW funding under the next cycle of the GEF replenishment.

- We will conduct a more comprehensive review of the submission once the PIF is rescoped.

b) Cleared

9/15/2024

The PM and project lead had substantial discussions about this project on the sidelines of the SIDS conference, so revisions should be ongoing. The overarching issue is the lack of coherence of project activities and GEBs.

No, the FA allocation of funding in the Portal doesn't match the project.

5/9/2024

No.

a. This is a biodiversity project and does not meet the criteria for CCM 1-4 in particular. Therefore, the focal area elements should be all biodiversity. The only place it should mention the other FAs is the source of funds table.

4/1/2024

No.

a. No, the project focal area designations do not match the project activities.

b. Yes.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

The LoE had already been updated to the new project name (to match the revised scope) and had been uploaded to the Portal in the last submission. (SVG-WARE) has been from the project title in the portal so matches the LoE.

01/07/2026

The PIF has been further rescoped to substantively change to a land degradation focal area project considering the two options suggested by GEF Sec considering LD-1 and LD-2 in the proposed LD investment in SVG. The reformulation to the LD option as opposed to maintaining BD-related outcomes is due to the fact that the project will now not be intervening proactively in the protected areas management or mainstreaming biodiversity considerations in landscape management development frameworks. Indeed is noted that the land-based pollution elements are not made explicit in the narrative of the LDFA, but the manifestations of LD in St. Vincent and the Grenadines is most immediate in terms of the pollution streams into waterways and coastal receiving environments that result from poor land management and the inability to address the drivers of LD that would otherwise be addressed by mainstreaming an SLM approach to land management. The guidance that there would be no need to eliminate the pollution focus but make it secondary, is welcome and this is now how the PIF is rescoped. In this regard Outcome 1.1 title has been revised as per the suggestion. Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 has been revised as per the guidance to give emphasis on to land degradation and hotspot assessment considering the contributions of the incoming SOILCARE 2 national project for St. Vincent. The changes have been reflected in the Project Summary narrative, the ToC diagram and the main component narratives in Section B where the LD rationale and links to LDN and potential synergies with the Cartagena Protocol are emphasized. (all changes to the text in the updated PIF highlighted in yellow)

10/14/2025

We are grateful for the guidance from GEF Sec to date. The PIF has had a significant redesign based on GEF-Sec review but on request by the country. Component 1 has been re-formulated in line with what is now an overall emphasis on addressing land-based sources of pollution in terms of impacts to terrestrial, aquatic and coastal ecosystems with integration across components within the pollution control underpinning. The country is in the process of ratifying the Land Based Sources of Marine Pollution of the Cartagena Convention, hence this project will support the much of the initial work that will be needed to reform the regulatory and institutional frameworks, develop means to enhance sustainable financing options, demonstrate innovation in addressing land degradation and pollution control with agricultural and other business enterprises. The knowledge management component will be cross-cutting over all components. We trust that the

coherence in design is improved with the re-focus and that the GEBs are more clearly contextualized based on this re-orientation. Note that the country requested the change in the project title to **Watershed Action for Restoring Ecosystems in the South Corridor of St. Vincent?**.
4/10/2024 a. The project narrative has been reformulated to substantially orient toward the biodiversity focal area designations.

10/14/2025

We are grateful for the guidance from GEF Sec to date. The PIF has had a significant redesign based on GEF-Sec review but on request by the country. Component 1 has been re-formulated in line with what is now an overall emphasis on addressing land-based sources of pollution in terms of impacts to terrestrial, aquatic and coastal ecosystems with integration across components within the pollution control underpinning. The country is in the process of ratifying the Land Based Sources of Marine Pollution of the Cartagena Convention, hence this project will support the much of the initial work that will be needed to reform the regulatory and institutional frameworks, develop means to enhance sustainable financing options, demonstrate innovation in addressing land degradation and pollution control with agricultural and other business enterprises. The knowledge management component will be cross-cutting over all components. We trust that the coherence in design is improved with the re-focus and that the GEBs are more clearly contextualized based on this re-orientation.

Note that the country requested the change in the project title to **Watershed Action for Restoring Ecosystems in the South Corridor of St. Vincent?**.

4/10/2024

a. The project narrative has been reformulated to substantially orient toward the biodiversity focal area designations.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Yes

12/09/2025

Not cleared. Depending of the option in a revised project. Please, precise the biodiversity global significance of the areas targeted by the project, to justify the GEF's mandate. This can be done providing justification of presence of KBA, EBA, Hotspot, Global 200... in the areas targeted by the project. Please consider using a landscape approach to better describe the system and understand the change that will be generated by the project, from the forests in the reserve to the coastal areas and the marine protected areas. Please consider describing the issues related to the protected areas of main importance related to the project, and explaining how the project will contribute to improve the conservation of the globally significant biodiversity in the protected areas through a landscape approach. Please see comment above about CI 1.2 and 2.2 and update the GEBs to be produced by the project.

9/15/2024

Yes, though likely needs adjustment based on other comments.

5/9/2024

No, unfortunately this project still requires significant refocusing to be eligible.

4/1/2024

No. It would be good for the summary to focus on the project activities. The summary could help support the organization of the project and explanation of logic.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

Considering the rescoping of the project it is no longer relevant to emphasize the GEBs related to the biodiversity focal area; further there are no targeted investments in the areas classed as protected areas that fall within the target geography; specifically the Kingstown Forest Reserve (that traverses the upper reaches of the Arnos Vale watershed) and the Kingshill Forest Reserve (within the Diamond watershed) and the proposed South Coast Marine Conservation Area (SCMC). However, the project investment across the landscapes will be of very direct co-benefit to the health of the coastal environment including the SCMC in terms of pollution influx mitigation.

10/14/2025

The reformulation addresses the coherence, describes the problem to be addressed, the objective and articulates the strategies to deliver the GEBs based on the prior reviews and suggestions.

4/10/2024

The summary section has been reformulated to enhance the description around the project activities. The project outcome areas have been adjusted in line with the guidance provided elsewhere in this review.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

Cleared.

3/30/2026

a) Not fully please make the project objective more concise and specify the main target area.

b) Please see comments in the sections below.

12/09/2025

a) Not cleared. See comments above on alignment.

b) Not cleared.

See comments above on BD alignment if it is the option selected for a revised project.

- Component 1: Please precise the coherence between policies that will be pursued and different ministries and stakeholders to be involved. Precise if this improvement in policies will also include land use planning and development of new guidance in BD positive practices. To be aligned with BD directions in priority sectors, spatial land-sea use planning should demonstrate that land, freshwater and marine resources use are appropriately situated to optimize production without undermining or degrading BD.

- Please also consider providing an analysis of the roots of the BD loss.

- Could you precise if the policy and regulatory framework to be implemented includes a analysis an a reform of harmful subsidies?

- Component 2: Please precise if the financial mechanisms will be used to improve the management of the 2 protected areas targeted upstream and downstream

- Component 3: Please consider adding an outcome dedicated to improvement and change in practices to be better BD positive and to promote sustainable use of BD.

- Component 4: Please precise how ministry of education and universities will be involved in the process.

9/15/2024

No.

a. Vulnerable species are a subset of Threatened species and unnecessary and could also end at livelihoods to help simplify and it would be good to note something about the type of NbS (for agriculture? to address food security? etc).

b. There is still a lack of outcomes and indicators that tie back to GEBs with most of the focus appearing to be on training/capacity building type of activities.

Component 1

- KBAs - Please note that we typically use the term KBA in the context of the IUCN definition. Therefore, it's confusing about whether the intention is to survey within existing KBAs to understand species ranges within them or going outside to find new KBAs.

- Center of Excellence - The GEF typically does not support the costs of construction of such a facility. There needs to be substantial co-financing dedicated to the building and a long term maintenance strategy. The justification and planning for this needs to be strong. Is the idea that this would also cater to tourists and, therefore, be able to provide long term financing potential?

- It's unclear what "in-field conservation demonstration" would mean. What type of conservation activities are meant here?

- Will the surveys do anything to improve the current management of the various reserves? How will they be used?

Component 2

- Resources - Are there resources available for the implementation of these mechanisms?

- This is rather amorphous and has the potential to just be some plans or studies that sit on a shelf or are too academic/idealistic/not grounded in reality of politics and implementation. How will the project avoid this?

- If the intention is to create a PES program, please see STAP guidance on PES.

Component 3

- On the ground activities - These need to be discussed further and given adequate attention and resources to ensure that it actually happens. Please provide more information about the "how" of this. Will there be any improvement of practices on the farms participating or only restoration? What type of restoration?

While the BD strategy includes restoration focused on natural habitat, there is also recognition that this can be difficult and expensive to implement. How will these areas be selected? Or is the focus on agricultural use?

The core indicator shows 3,500 ha of mainstreaming but it's not clear where or how this will happen.

- "Incentivized with increased capacity" - This language is problematic. Will this support the provision of any resources or just training? Please clarify.

- Monitoring - The connection of the monitoring activities to actual changes in activities remains weak. While monitoring is important, there needs to be a way to circle back to changes in practices.

- Chatham Bay seems to have been completely removed noting that some of the areas mentioned are PAs.

Component 4

- Policy/regulatory change - If the generated in component 2 are to actually take shape, communications are likely very important and need to be integral to the project as a way to achieve objectives. This is quite different from a KM focus and general awareness raising focus.

5/9/2024

No, thank you for the revisions. However, a number of issues remain in the logic, eligibility, and logic of the project.

Throughout, we would encourage the project proponents to simplify language and be concise to improve the clarity of the writing and hopefully assist with identifying and addressing the remaining issues.

Please remember that GEF support is meant to support the incremental costs of global environmental benefits not only the idea of "improved environmental quality."

Component 1

As noted previously, the GEF does not support ex situ conservation including herbariums. Buildings for general awareness raising are also not eligible for GEF support. The connection to tangible biodiversity results is difficult to see.

Component 3

It is hard to understand the logic of how an ecosystem services valuation and environmental monitoring system is actually going to translate into improved results for biodiversity. The mechanism to connect back ESV to on-the-ground practices is not described. We note that that STAP has provided specific guidance on PES including pieces that need to be in place at PIF, which are missing from this project. 3.2 says that farmers will be incentivized through increased capacity, so is the project only going to provide training or is there going to be supplies, ongoing technical support, etc.

4/1/2024

No.

a. No, the project objective is convoluted and unclear. Please revise while minimizing the use of buzzwords when the project has been revised.

b. No, the project needs significant reorganization and rethinking.

Please address the following:

- Outcomes: The project essentially skips this level of organization and focus. Every component has only one outcome, which covers too much ground and lacks the ability to be measured. It could help to consider what the indicators would be of each and try to provide more structure to the project.

- Logic and theory of change - At this point, the project activities feel rather scattered. This makes it hard to see the logic of the project and how the different components will come together. It is also unclear whether this project is getting at the specific drivers of the challenge. As an example, 2.1.5 and 3.1.3 seem like they overlap significantly rather than being separate work.

- Nature-based Solutions - While we appreciate working with this framing and the BGI IP, it is important to note that NbS are not an end in themselves but rather a means to an end. Part of the idea of NbS is to bring in other resources and efforts to achieve BD outcomes rather than what BD resources should go out seeking. Hopefully, NbS prove that there isn't the need for BD resources but rather investing in nature creates value for other sectors and makes it worth investing in. It is also quite possible that NbS do not deliver GEBs but rather local benefits and, therefore, don't require limited ODA.

- Water pollution - There has not been sufficient justification for why water pollution is linked to GEBs for biodiversity in this context. Water pollution benefits are more appropriate as co-benefits rather than the primary goal of project activities.

- Biodiversity surveys and species plans - It is unclear how this information will really be used to change actions and/or be implemented by the project. The concern is that such an assessment is done and then put on a shelf. This information would be ideally incorporated into decision-making by other ministries, but there is no discussion of this.

On specific outputs:

- 1.1.2 - Is this the result of the support in components 2 and 3 (such as 2.1.3)? If so, it would make sense to put these together and if not, how is it going to be accomplished? Also, as written in the beginning doesn't seem to match the project description.

- 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 - These require further description and elaboration to show the benefits for globally significant biodiversity. The GEF does not support ex situ conservation such as zoos or botanical gardens.

- 2.1.3 - It would be good to go direct sales of fresh produce as strategies for supporting sustainable livelihoods for farmers.

- 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 - These seem rather amorphous when the general banner of NbS is used rather than what the goal is. Is it sustainable agriculture?

- 3.1 - This activity has not been sufficiently justified in how it will deliver GEBs (specifically biodiversity). Therefore, all of the activities need to be reconsidered.

- 4.1 - The GEF does not support general awareness raising activities, but rather communications that relates specifically to a project and to the delivery of GEBs.

- 4.1.3 - It will be important that those receiving training do not leave the country. How will the project ensure this? How will this training be related to the rest of the project?

- Chatham Bay - This is at least the second GEF project to support work in and around Chatham Bay. What is the current status of this area for protection? Are there plans to make it a protected area or otherwise give it a special status? If not, what are the barriers to this?

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

Thank you for the suggestion; the project objective is now more concise and mentions the main target area.

01/07/2026

a) Consider the rescoping of the project as a LDFA project.

b) Given the rescoping of the project, the alignment to the biodiversity focal area is no longer emphasized. There are however relevant points in the review that apply in this rescoping; the Component 1 narrative is augmented in terms of policy and institutional coherence and the need to pay attention to reform of harmful subsidies that may contribute to drivers of land degradation. Component 2 is explicit in the anticipated modalities for development of a financial mechanism that will support investment in good practices in SLM that will positively impact the environmental quality status of the downstream proposed marine protected area most directly (as the main receiving environment). Benefits to the relatively small area of forest reserve in the upper reaches as a result of SLM is no longer a significant consideration with the project rescoping.

On the engagement of educational bodies such as the Ministry of Education and universities; Component 3 notes the active engagement of schools through the Ministry of Education in the watershed stewardship programme where this will be the primary mode of engagement. There is no university campus in St. Vincent & the Grenadines, but the learnings of the project that lend for ready transformation into teaching curricula will be taken up under the GEF SIDS-SIDS Knowledge Hub Project that is under active implementation, where there is already explicit connections to the GEF Caribbean SoilCare Project and the GEF ISLANDS Project, both of which have strong complementary mechanisms for knowledge management and learning. These opportunities are already elaborated in Component 4. It is expected this will be fully fleshed out in the PPG phase with the full project design.

10/14/2025

Observations noted, however given the re-orientation some of these will no longer be valid/apply but we note as follows:

Component 1: no longer references working within KBAs, rather the project is noting that KBAs that fall within the project geography within the southwest coast will have the benefit of reduced risk of degradation within adjacent landscapes; the context is different from the prior version of the PIF. The Centre of Excellence is no longer part of the revised PIF, along with

references to in-field conservation demonstration that referred to demonstration of good conservation practices within the immediate areas of the Centre of Excellence within the Botanical Gardens. No biodiversity surveys of areas within the reserves are envisaged in the reformulation. Component 1 is now oriented toward fostering a policy, legal and institutional framework to allow for integrated landscape management to mitigate land-based sources (LBS) of pollution triggered by land degradation, contributing positively to ecosystem protection.

Component 2: This still involves incentivization of best practice uptake by practitioners so parallels what was previously presented. In this reformulation however, the proposed process is explained in more detail and more concretely ties into existing financial mechanisms that will be more viable and sustainable. The connection between the financing model to be developed under this component and component 3 is made explicit.

Component 3: The narrative is significantly expanded to explain. The target geography is expanded by inclusion of another watershed area in the southwest corridor. The types of restorative actions are explained in the context of addressing land degradation abatement and diffuse or non-point sources of pollution and point-sources of pollution as main demonstrative interventions from which lessons can be derived for replication across the island. Restorative work will be confined to degraded areas and within an estimated 200 hectares although it is estimated that enterprises and their combined footprint of impact will be equivalent to approximately 3,300 hectares over the target area that will be accounted for in the context of development of planning tools for improved landscape management. The monitoring aspects are better outlined with the loop back to anticipated mainstreamed processes for decision making in pollution control following provisions under the LBS Protocol. In this reformulation, work on the Grenadines (Chatham Bay on Union Island) is no longer included. The PIF takes consideration of the incoming GEF SoilCare Phase 2 that is under development that the country is participant to.

Component 4: Comment noted. The KM aspect places emphasis on the development of case studies to facilitate uptake of lessons and sharing. The project will draw on the BCRC's experience in its KM platform for learning and knowledge exchange particularly in synergy with the GEF-ISLANDS Project. This will lend to sustainability and scaling of experiences to other Caribbean SIDS.

4/10/2024

- a. The project objective statement has been reformulated.
- b. The project has been reorganized with a revision of the theory of change toward a re-orientation of the intended outcomes to rationalize the outputs to achieve the impact in a more coherent delivery.

Specifically:

- Outcomes: The review assessment is agreed, and the outcomes have been adjusted so that the intended results are more measurable; in that there is not such a wide scope under each project component so that results are not measurable at the outcome level. Proposed indicators have now been included in association with the outcome areas.

- Logic and theory of change: In the reframing of the outcomes the outputs were reorganized. Some of the outputs that could be potentially duplicative were condensed and reformulated toward a more closely integrated design.

- Nature-based Solutions: This point is well-noted and guidance appreciated. The prior narrative considered NbS as separate technical solutions (sort of end-point investments) that are geared at improving environmental quality within a field context, rather than considered as a process at the project strategic delivery level toward national policy and technical uptake (the means to an end). Further contextual guidance was obtained on review of the Draft Approach Paper of the GEF Independent Evaluation Office by Anupam Anand *Evaluation of the GEF support for Nature-Based Solutions* (March 2024). The narrative was adjusted to contextualize NbS as the 'collective' of approaches at the strategic level.

- Water pollution: Indeed, this is a co-benefit of investments in good practices in maintaining ecosystem functioning over the intervention areas of the project. The local environment, particularly the receiving waters along the southwest coastal areas are being impacted where there are nationally important marine biodiversity. The reformulation of the project has integrated the restoration work under what was previously two outcome areas and corresponding components, under the same outcome area.

- Biodiversity surveys and species plans: The narrative has been updated to include application of the assessments and plans by the lead national agencies and stakeholders. This is clarified under Component 1 where the findings of the assessment will inform further management interventions to safeguard threatened species.

On specific outputs:

- 1.1.2 ? restorative work under the project is all clustered in the reformulation of the project under Output 3.1.2 in a more streamlined design.

- 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 ? These two outputs are now merged in the project reformulation under Component 1. It should be noted that the proposed Centre of Excellence will be a significant learning resource asset to the country and the intention is not to make investments in ex-situ conservation. The botanical gardens is already a well-known and highly used asset so makes it very convenient for the purpose. This proposed project contribution is considered a major element in the national strategy to build sustainability in advocacy and action around biodiversity conservation in the country.

- 2.1.3 ? this is noted and opportunities will need to be further explored in the PPG phase.

- 2.1.4 and 2.1.5 ? the reformation will have hopefully addressed this. The capacity building for areas related to restorative investments have now been more appropriately clustered. 2.1.5 is pulled out and given focus as the means for building capability to incorporate nature into fiscal incentive programmes in productive sectors that are reliant on ecosystem services.

- 3.1 ? Degradation from pollution is a significant concern in the country and impacts on freshwater and coastal ecosystems and impacts on biodiversity, notably reef ecosystems which are considered part of the wider Caribbean biodiversity hotspot. In the project design it is accepted from the review that it could be reshaped into a consolidated approach for investments to address ecosystem degradation.

- 4.1 ? Indeed understood concerning general awareness raising; the narrative points to the specific support to the project in its delivery of outputs toward achieving the outcomes, but is recognized that this effort will have to be mainstreamed into the existing efforts in-country, hence the direction provided in the narrative.

- 4.1.3 ? In line with the review recommendations, this important element of BD-related capacity building is now aligned under Component 1 for better cohesion and serves to make the connection with the lead project cluster of outputs associated with enhancing the knowledge base on biodiversity and management investments for safeguarding biodiversity. The matter of loss of built capacity (trained personnel leaving the country) is an important consideration that is an ever-present reality in small islands. Capacity building will therefore be an on-going effort. The PPG design phase will need to propose approaches for retaining talent; for example, exploring the possibility of ?bonding? trained personnel for a specified period based on prevailing government protocols regarding scholarship awards.

- Chatham Bay ? the process is underway, the national agencies note that the process is moving slower than anticipated however. This project will give additional support to the BD assessment there to build the knowledge base.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Yes

12/09/2025

Please precise in all components and outcomes how women will be involved in the development of new policies, guidance, NbSs to be implemented, communications and knowledge, and in decision making. Precise their roles as members of steering committee, as teachers, as students...

4/1/2024

Yes.

Gender equality considerations have been well-reflected in the project description and components. Please ensure, when developing the Gender Action Plan, that it is budgeted, monitored, and reported on.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

A paragraph has been included under the Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment section that explains that the project will ensure fairness in the distribution of financial and technical support to beneficiaries. As required in the development of the full project dossier, the precise roles of women (including youth and other groups) will be detailed in the gender analysis and the gender action plan that will be formulated during the PPG. This statement has been added to the component description narratives to clarify.

4/10/2024

Noted that in developing the Gender Action Plan, it will need to be budgeted, monitored, and reported on within the project monitoring framework.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Yes

12/09/2025

a) Not cleared. Component 4 seems to me a bit high compared to components 2 or 1. Especially if component 1 and 2 are a little bit improved. Please revise to better balance the 4 components.

b) Cleared.

c) Cleared.

4/1/2024

No, please address the following:

1. On the PMC Proportionality: there is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5%, for a co-financing of \$14,500,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$725,000 instead of \$500,000 (which is 3.4%). As the costs associated with the project management must be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to the PMC, the GEF contribution and the co-financing contribution must be proportional, which means that the GEF contribution to PMC might be decreased and the co-financing contribution to PMC might be increased to reach a similar level. Please ask the Agency to amend either by increasing the co-financing portion and/or by reducing the GEF portion. A more definitive estimation of PMC will be presented and adjusted at CEO Endorsement stage.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

This was discussed with the project proponents, and it was requested that the allocation for Component 4 be reconsidered to remain as-is. Components 1 and 2 will largely be delivered through expert studies and consultations toward policy-shaping and development of the incentive mechanisms and as such, the costs allocated are considered to generous based on the anticipated scope of work. It is considered that significant effort will need to be dedicated in the knowledge management and awareness raising aspects of the project under Component 4 to serve to secure and build buy-in across the other components. Nonetheless the component costs will be further reviewed when the outputs and associated activities are fleshed out and fully costed.

10/14/2025

The slight downward change in the overall co-financing led to proportional reduction of PMC assigned to co-financing; updated figure is \$690,000

4/10/2024

The PMC apportioned to co-financing has been adjusted proportionally to also reflect approximately 5% of the anticipated co-financing amount. The revised co-financing amount to PMC is \$750,000.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Yes

12/09/2025

a) Cleared

b) Cleared

9/15/2024

Yes.

4/1/2024

No.

a. No, while we appreciate a concise description of the general situation, it would likely be helpful to have some expanded thinking on the major drivers of BD loss and what opportunities might exist to address them. Notably, the project seems to really only focus on a small slice of the identified drivers, agriculture specifically, with tourism and urban development as drivers given little attention. It does appear that there is some thought of looking to tourism as a revenue source for conservation (2.1.2?) but the additional steps needed to make that have results not included.

It is worth noting that we do not expect or want a project to attempt to address every driver or possible pathway. However, laying out the landscape is crucial for ensuring a good theory of change and project justification.

b. No, barriers 2 and 3 are mixed together. It does seem like the barriers were designed after the project components rather than the other way around. They do not have to perfectly align to the project components.

Agency's Comments
10/14/2025

Note that the barrier analysis was updated based on the reformulation.

4/10/2024

a. Included in the narrative is a further elaboration on the key drivers within the same paragraph on the threats to biodiversity under the Project Rationale section that attempts to present a wider explanation of the main sectoral influences (urban/commercial development and the hospitality sector)

b. Given the reformulated outcomes the barrier analysis has been reconsidered. Indeed, the original barriers listed as 3 and 4 have been merged as the limitations/challenges at the country level in terms of addressing ecosystem impairment; pollution, land degradation, land use change, etc that results in negative biodiversity impacts or loss are common. The narrative has been updated.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments
4/15/2026

Cleared.

3/31/2026

Please see follow up question below.

c) *GEF-6 ID 9580- Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using a Ridge-to-Reef Approach (UNDP)* . There are similarities in both projects in particular related to the policy updates/revisions, establishment of a sustainable financing mechanism, upgrading database systems. Noting the challenges outlined in the PIRs for the GEF-6 project (see extract below from PIR 2025), how will this project do things differently in order to achieve the expected results?

'Number of policy, legislative, regulatory and planning instruments developed/revised (with support for submission to Cabinet) that integrate Sustainable Land Management (SLM), CSA, gender responsiveness and/or biodiversity conservation. This indicator was not achieved, however, progress was made in the revised National Parks Protected Area Policy, National Parks Protected Area System Plan, and the Gender Action Plan that are still awaiting comments from relevant stakeholders including government, donors, and NGOs. Discussions for the Forestry policy and Strategic Plan are ongoing with FFI. The estimated completion timeline for policies and plans was June 2025, but challenges in identifying suitable candidates or legal entities to assist with revisions persist. Support from Crown Counsel through the Office of the Attorney General has been appointed to aid in these developments.'

12/10/2025

Not cleared. To be reassess after resubmission.

9/15/2024

Yes. However, this will need careful attention during PPG.

4/1/2024

No.

a. No, see previous question. It is also notable that it appears that the main GEF projects for SVG for the past 3 phases have been focused on the same area. It is unclear how this project will make real steps forward, particularly in regards to sustainability so continued ODA resources are not needed.

b. No, see previous question on drivers.

c. No, while extensive information is not required on this at this point, given the multiple GEF projects in this specific region, more information is needed.

d. No, while the consultations are well documented and the number of co-financing partners is remarkable, it is not clear the role many of them will have.

At PPG please address that at least one partner that would be expected, FFI, is missing from the list.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

On the similarities between this new initiative and 9580 - *Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using a Ridge-to-Reef Approach* and how the projects differ in terms of approaches / focus is further clarified in the comparative table featuring the active projects in section ?Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project?.

On how this project will do things differently in order to achieve the expected results, the narrative in the monitoring and evaluation description is expanded to state that the M&E framework will need to incorporate uptake of the lessons learned from implementation challenges and that mitigation will be built into the full project design during the PPG phase. Additionally, the narrative under the section ?Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project? concerning the value of engagement of the BCRC Caribbean as the Executing Agency (on behalf of the GoSVG) has been expanded to emphasize the

greater adaptability / nimbleness in procurement processes, capacity building processes among others, that would be otherwise be challenged with execution by national governmental agencies.

The updated text is in blue highlight.

01/07/2026

Consider the rescoping as a LDFA project.

10/14/2025

This is noted for consideration under the PPG phase

4/10/2024

a. The project is proposed to be undertaken alongside ongoing GEF projects but will have other targeted location sites and intend to scale out further some of the contributions from these initiatives. Reference is particularly made to the GEF Ridge-to-Reef project where the technical and policy differentiation with this project is specified. This is explained under section *Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project?*. The project is attempting to hammer out an approach to incorporate ecosystems valuation approaches that is to be connected to the existing incentive framework mechanisms of government that can influence or foster how NbS may be financially supported via local incentivization (tax waivers, concessions, etc) resource mobilization. This is under a reformulated Component 2. This aspect is a key element toward sustainability and intended to be transformative.

b. The updated narrative under the project background and the project description addresses the resilience and sustainability of the investment.

c. More information is provided mainly pertaining to the ongoing Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Management Strengthening Project (GEF ID: 10549) and Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach (GEF ID: 9580). This has been included in various parts of the narrative with an explanation under section *Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project?*.

d. Noted; considering the need for PIF template to be brief, this detail was anticipated to be elaborated in the PPG.

Noted that Fauna and Flora International will be a likely partner considering their prominent role in this area in the region; this engagement will be explored during the PPG phase.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

12/10/2025

a) Not cleared. See comments above on alignment.

b) Not cleared

9/15/2024

Yes.

4/1/2024

No, please see previous comments.

a. No, for the Theory of Change, please discuss the assumptions of the project. The assumptions should be about the internal logic of the project (i.e. assumptions about the paths from project activities to outcomes). The assumptions should be, in a way, hypotheses that are being tested by the project that will guide learning and adaptive management.

b. No, please see above comments about needed revisions.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

a) Consider the project rescoping as an LDFA project.

b) The key outputs of each component have been defined and further updated in accordance with the guidance to better emphasize the alignment to the LDFA.

10/14/2025

Note that the TOC has been modified in the context of the reformulation. For consideration.

4/10/2024

a. The theory of change has been reformulated toward a more coherent design. The assumptions as presented however are reflective to the best the reasoning of the proponents, of

the underpinnings upon which successful project implementation depends. For reconsideration, unless more specific guidance can be provided.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

No, in revising the issues highlighted above please include some more information on this subject.

Agency's Comments

10/14/2025

To be considered with the re-formulation.

4/10/2024

The reformulated narrative across the various sections of the PIF addresses the incremental reasoning that the GEF investment is directed towards.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

12/10/2025

a) Not cleared. Please answer the question

Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project?

b) The executing agency is BCRC-Caribbean (The Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer for the Caribbean).

c) Please complete the list of projects with a table describing how this proposal will complete or build on the current projects in the same areas.

d) Cleared.

4/1/2024

Yes.

a. Yes. Working with a large NGO is welcome and responds to the challenges in bandwidth we have heard from SVG over the years, however it will be important that the NGO focuses on national ownership, hiring of national (or at least regional) staff, and tailored activities to SVG.

b. N/A

c. Please see other comments on this topic.

d. Yes.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

a) Under the section 'Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project' an account is provided on the executing agency, the Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer for the Caribbean, with a brief statement on their competency and rationale for engagement. Note is made of the Partnership Initiative on Sustainable Land Management considering the need for close cooperation given their role as executing agency for the SOILCARE Phase 2 project that will include a national sub-project in the country, anticipated to be complementary with this project.

c) A table is inserted in Section 'Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project' that lists incoming and ongoing GEF projects in the country, summarizing their key 'complementary' outputs and how this proposed project will build on or complement these efforts.

10/14/2025

Note the change in the proposed project executing agency to the Basel Convention Regional Centre for Training and Technology Transfer for the Caribbean (BCRC-Caribbean) that is regional in scope. The EA has extensive experience in the Caribbean and will have arrangements for local counterpart recruitment/engagement.

4/10/2024

a. During PPG the details of the project execution arrangements will be detailed. Consideration of implications of external execution by a global non-resident NGO is well noted.

c. The narrative makes clearer the relationship of this proposed project against ongoing GEF investments in the country.

d. Noted

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

Cleared.

3/31/2026

Not fully. Given the alignment with LD 1 and the focus in Component 3 on work around SLM with farmers, please also include GEBs under sub-indicator 4.3.

12/10/2025

a) Not cleared. Please see comments above related to BD core indicators and the need to use CI 1.2 and 2.2 if the project has to be BD aligned with the GEF programming directions.

b) See comment above and update.

9/15/2024

No, this information on mainstreaming is missing from the body of the project and it is unclear how this will be achieved. Component 1 seems to be light on on-the-ground action so it's not clear what is meant by "improved management". The percentage information is helpful to note the scale of the work being done, so please continue to provide this.

4/1/2024

No.

a. While we understand the challenges of hectare numbers for SIDS, the hectare numbers are still low especially given the significant co-financing. Please reexamine these figures. The project should also include the carbon core indicator even if not working with any climate change resources. ExACT can provide an estimate of carbon impact that can be included at this time.

b. Yes.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

This was to have been changed to the sub-indicator 4.3 *Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems*, from previously sub-indicator 4.1 that was specified under the previous biodiversity-oriented version of the proposal. This was overlooked and under the Core Indicators table narrative is now changed to sub-indicator 4.3 so that is aligned to SLM outcomes and contributing to GEBs, specifically 3,300 ha under improved management planning. Changes are in blue highlight.

01/07/2026

- a) Consider the project rescoping to a LDFA project; the BD core indicators will not apply.
- b) The GEBs in the context of the core indicators are aligned to the LDFA.

10/14/2025

To be considered with the re-formulation in the context of the greater emphasis now on the land degradation focal area

4/10/2024

a. The absolute acreages estimated are indeed constrained considering the spatial footprint of the other active projects in the country so as to avoid overlap, notwithstanding the co-financing estimates (which will need to be further validated during the PPG). The hectare figures have been increased to include an additional 866 hectares for a total of 3,500 ha, in consultation with the local Sustainable Development Unit and the Forestry Department to include other dry coastal forest tracts and riverine environments. It should be noted that this will now correspond to the acreage under assessment under Component 1 that is an approximate to 10% ecological sampling of the wider landscape acreage corresponding to the total area of the country at 34,500 hectares. The spatial estimates presented will need to be validated during the PPG phase. See the revision under the Core Indicators section.

b. Noted

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

Cleared

3/31/2026

Please include a brief explanation for the overall risk rating in the risk table.

12/10/2025

a) Not cleared. Risk rating of SRIF and the environmental and social risk in the Key Risk section of the Portal is both Moderate. However, the project design will be changed. Please provide revised SRIF based on revised project design aligning with the BD Focal Area.

b) Cleared.

c) Cleared.

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

An explanation for the overall risk rating in the risk table is now included. Changes are in blue highlight.

01/07/2026

The SRIF has been updated in response to the project rescoping.

10/14/2025

The risks to project implementation narrative have been adjusted relevant to the reformulation.

4/10/2024

Noted

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

a) Cleared

b) Yes, there is a potential to scale up the project to the rest of the island.

c) Yes cleared.

9/15/2024

Yes.

4/1/2024

No, please see above.

Agency's Comments

10/14/2025

Consider the reformulation

4/10/2024

The narrative has been reformulated across various sections to take into account the review suggestions in terms of improved integration and with the potential for being transformative via innovation and scale-up, in line with national priorities.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

Cleared.

3/31/2026

Please include alignment with LD 4 given the intended interventions on the enabling environment (policy and finance) in support of LDN.

12/09/2025

Not cleared. The project is not fully aligned with the programming directions. See comments above.

9/15/2024

Yes.

4/1/2024

No, please see above.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

An inclusion on LD-4 alignment has been made under Section C. ?Alignment With GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities?. The Indicative Focal Area Elements table in ANNEX A has also been updated to reflect the alignment to LD 4. Changes are in blue highlight.

01/07/2026

Given the project rescope, the entire narrative has been updated to better reflect alignment to the GEF LDFA programming directions. This is made explicit in the introductory Project Summary section and under Section C where the alignment to the LDFA objectives is elaborated.

10/14/2025

Consider the reformulation

4/10/2024

The narrative on the alignment to the GEF programming strategies has been further expanded in terms of alignment to the land degradation and climate change focal areas.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

10/14/2025

Consider the reformulation

4/10/2024

Noted

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Please update the KMGBF targets when the alignment is modified.

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

The KMGBF targets that have been originally listed are considered to remain relevant with the rescoping/alignment.

4/10/2024

Noted

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Noted

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

Yes, this is exemplary.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Noted

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Cleared.

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Noted

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Yes

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Noted

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Noted

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Not cleared. Please provide the co-financing letters.

9/15/2024

No, this has not been fixed.

4/1/2024

No, please revise the Conservation International (CI) and International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) to ?Donor Agency?. For this project, they are not implementing agencies so they should be labeled Donor Agency or other applicable status.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

Co-financing letters are not required at PIF submission; expected when the full project dossier is prepared. To clarify.

10/14/2025

Consider the reformulation and the changes made to the co-financiers. Note that Conservation International (CI) and International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) are no longer listed. The BCRC is included as executing agency and co-financing has been pledged.

4/10/2024

Conservation International (CI) and International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) have been re-classified as ?Donor Agency?

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

4/2/2026

See comment above on the project title.

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

The project title has been changed in the GEF Portal to match the LOE.

4/10/2024

Noted

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

No, please address the following:

1. The template utilized for this LoE removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?". While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE)
2. Sources of funds table in Portal which includes the three STAR focal areas (left-hand side below) doesn't math the allocations in LoE with only one STAR focal area (right-hand side). The Agency needs to either (i) modify the table in Portal to match the allocated amount in LoE (if there are enough resources in each focal area); or (ii) getting a new LoE that matches the amounts in Portal. We will review again when the PIF is resubmitted.
- 3.

Agency's Comments

10/14/2025

The LOE is updated to reflect the new executing agency

4/10/2024

1. A new LoE has been issued by the OFP that now includes the footnote regarding the capacity assessment of the executing partner. This LoE has been uploaded to the GEF Portal.
2. The new LoE specifies the STAR focal areas that are in alignment with the data in the portal.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Noted, however note the amendments.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments
3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Noted

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

12/10/2025

Cleared

4/1/2024

No, we note that the overall ESS risk of the program is classified as moderate, and UNEP attached the Safeguard Risk Identification Form (SRIF). However, the environmental and social risk in the Key Risk section of the Portal is low. 1) Please make these two environmental and social risks consistent and revise them. 2) Please also provide a summary of environmental and social risks and further environmental and social assessment and action plans or mitigation measures in the table of the environmental and social risks in the Key Risk section of the

Portal. Please note that the SRIF needs to be revised based on the revised PIF suggested by the Program manager.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

1) The environmental and social risk in the Key Risk section of the Portal has been corrected to 'moderate'.

2) A summary of environmental and social risks and further environmental and mitigation measures are now included in the table and carried to the portal entry. The SRIF will need to be revised and re-evaluated as required during the PPG phase by the PPG team and the social and environmental safeguard specialists respectively.

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared

12/10/2025

Cleared but to update with revision of alignment.

9/15/2024

No, noting the lack of information of the on-the-ground activities this is still not justified.

4/1/2024

Yes. However, the adaptation value needs to be better described.

Agency's Comments

01/07/2026

The Rio Markers have been adjusted with the project rescoping.

4/10/2024

The adaptation value of the project is further described under the project description.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

Cleared

3/31/2026

Please reconsider the tagging for protected areas and threatened species given the shift in focus of the project.

12/10/2025

Cleared.

4/1/2024

Yes.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

The PIF no longer tags protected areas and threatened species with the shift in focus of the project.

4/10/2024

Noted

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

The project is technically cleared and recommended for PIF and PPG approval.

4/2/2026

Follow up comments are to be addressed prior to clearance.

12/10/2025

The project is not ready and need important revisions and comments to be addressed.

9/15/2024

No, a number of changes were not made in the Portal, but also the project needs substantial revision. The PM and the RTA discussed have discussed, but please do not hesitate to reach out for further conversations.

4/1/2024

No, this project requires significant revision before approval. Please reach out to the GEF Sec with any questions.

Agency's Comments

04/09/2026

Comments have been addressed for consideration.

01/07/2026

Consider the significant rescoping of the project as a land degradation focal area project

10/14/2025

Consider the PIF reformulation

4/10/2024

The project has been reformulated in line with a revised theory of change. Areas where the narrative was weak has been enhanced as per the review comments above.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

9/15/2024

- Any curriculum developed should seek to build from existing materials that have been developed for other projects, neighboring countries, etc. and with the intention to both be easy to update and share with other countries and projects. The lack of tailored materials for the Caribbean is definitely an issue to be addressed, but there is an opportunity to share this work.

4/1/2024

- Building on GEF and other projects - Please provide information on this project will build upon previous GEF and other investments and create sustainability.

Agency's Comments

4/10/2024

Additional information has been provided on how the project will build on ongoing investments under the project description and 'Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project' narrative.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	12/10/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/2/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/15/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		