

Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

9785

Countries

St. Kitts and Nevis

Project Name

Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

5/29/2019

Review completed by PM

2/19/2020

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Project Design and Financing

1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes. However please clarify the following:

- Please explain the need to change the execution agency from a Government Agency to a GEF Implementing Agency.
- We note with concern the reduction in the number of hectares to be targeted. Please clarify what is meant by Special Purpose Vehicle? Please also indicate the tentative sites which could be identified for interventions once the project has started.
- The allocations by focal are have changed since the PIF stage. An updated OFP endorsement letter will need to be submitted.

8/26/2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

7/18/2019

- Change of execution agency from a Government Agency to a GEF Implementing Agency: The GOSKN has adopted a collaborative approach with partners to facilitate execution of the myriad of initiatives on sustainable development in the country. This is due on part to resource constraints, but is also the government's approach to strengthening networks for collaboration with regional and international partners. This has been a precedent with several other initiatives implemented by organizations such as FAO, UNDP, etc. Text clarifying this has been included in section A.6 of the CEO-ER and Section 4 of the ProDoc.

- the reduction in the number of hectares to be targeted: At PIF approval the PPG phase was to have more concretely assessed the costs for the SLM and restorative interventions. The labour and materials costs particularly for a small island state are relatively high and when applied over the initial hectareage at PIF stage was determined to be prohibitive in consideration of the other project elements that need to be funded. Hence, the available project budget for these activities was insufficient to cover the number of hectares initially proposed at PIF approval (650 ha). In light of this, and the need to balance resources to adequately cover the other project components, the proposed strategy is to ensure that the practices, methods and tools are extended to farmers, land users, other stakeholders at the broadest level so that as much influence from the project is exerted over management of landscapes in the country. This will be done through the agricultural, reforestation activities, extension services to farmers and other stakeholders in order to enhance and improve the understanding and application of ANR and reforestation concepts and activities for sustainable management of crops.

The text under Components – Outcomes – Outputs in section Output 2.1.1 of the CEO-ER document and section 3 of the ProDoc respectively attempted to capture this explanation. However further clarification has been provided in the narrative under these sections, specifically under Outcome 2.1 in both CEO-ER and ProDoc.

- clarify what is meant by Special Purpose Vehicle: According to SKN debt management strategy <http://mof.govt.kn/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Debt-Management-Strategy-2013-2015.pdf>

The debt-for-land swap covering approximately EC \$900 million in secured loans and overdrafts owed to domestic banks has been executed, and is expected to shortly come into effect. Two special purpose vehicles (SPVs) are being established to manage the land sale process and also hold some of the land to be exchanged.

The SPVs will be managed professionally on an arm's length basis, following best international practice. As the land is transferred to the lender of the SPVs, the debts secured by relevant land assets will be cancelled in their totality, with no further recourse to the Government. In this way, the debt for land swap will provide the country with extraordinary debt relief in a way that preserves and even strengthens the stability of the domestic banking sector. This therefore means that lands subject to debt-for-land swap cannot be considered as intervention sites for the project as per the query on reduction of the number of hectares to be targeted as the implications of the management of the lands under the SPV became clear after the PIF was approved.

- indicate the tentative sites which could be identified for interventions once the project has started: The geographic locations for the interventions have been further clarified; St. Kitts: the steep upland watershed areas adjacent to the Central Forest Reserve and National Park inland from the communities of Fahies, Belmont and Newton Ground in the western part of the island, upland areas adjacent to the communities of Sadlers, Tabernacle, Philips and Cayon along the northern part of the island, and in the south in the Wingfield area; Nevis: The New River community and the coastal areas under aggressive erosion in the western part of the island. Note that the Ministry of Sustainable Development and the Agricultural Department maintains that further discussions may result in some further adjustments in site selection and will be considered at project start-up. The text in both the CEO-ER and ProDoc under the 'project sites' section and section 3.3 respectively, have been updated to reflect this. Revised maps showing the locations have been added in the CEO-ER document (Figures 3 and 4).

- The allocations by focal are have changed since the PIF stage: An updated letter from the OFP has been acquired and attached with the resubmission.

2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Not fully. Please address the questions below.

Table B/Project Description

- Output 1.2.2- Please confirm how GSKN will ensure the staff who are awarded scholarships are retained for the benefit of future initiatives

-In terms of maintenance. Output 2.1.1- How will the nurseries be maintained (financial and human resources) after the projet has ended and in particular for upscaling purposes. The same question applies to the enhancements to the existing GIS system under Output 1.2 and the drones mentioned in the project budget and Appendix 13.

--Output 2.1.2- How is the mangrove restoration being coupled with added protection for the mangroves? We note the importance of replanting, but also considering the potential to lose the mangroves elsewhere or in the same location in the future.

-Output 2.2.1- There is no reference to the financing programme mentioned in the project description. Is there a target associated with the program, in terms of no. farmers assisted etc. Additional information would be useful on the potential program and partners such as private sector and their role.

-We note that this intervention will require the removal of invasive species. What is the long term plan for maintenance and control of the invasive species.

-Output 3.2- We note the targeted public education and awareness campaign (Appendix 18). What are the plans to test the effectiveness and impact of the intervention?

-

Other

-We would like to see specifically how gender will be considered and mainstreamed in the project interventions. We note the considerations made in the Gender and Project Results Framework sections of the CEO ER as well as the Safeguards section of the Project Document. However please provide additional details in Table B as well as the project description of the CEO ER and the Project Document on how gender will be incorporated.

-As activities related to earth dams and water ponds will not be undertaken, please remove references to these interventions throughout the project document (Stakeholders section, TORs, Procurement Plan etc)

-The Safeguards section refers to renewable energy, please clarify.

-Please ensure the figures in the Ex-Act tool match the target hectares as described in the project text (CEO ER).

8/26/2019:

Responses are cleared.

The Table B referenced is in the portal version of the CEO Endorsement Request i.e Table B- Project Description Summary.

Re the GIS software, we encourage you to also consider open source options as any related costs may be easier to maintain following project completion.

Response to Secretariat comments

7/18/2019

Output 1.2.2- Please confirm how GSKN will ensure the staff who are awarded scholarships are retained for the benefit of future initiatives: This is detailed in Appendix 17 (item i) of the UNEP ProDoc. The program will support the initial deployment of at least six students, who will be required to provide co-financing through the provision of service to the SKN government through bonded agreements of service, thus ensuring that knowledge and expertise acquired benefits the government for a minimum number of years. Bonded agreements are standard practice where public servants receiving support are required to sign commitment to service commensurate with the value of capacity acquired.

Output 2.1.1- How will the nurseries be maintained (financial and human resources) after the project has ended and in particular for upscaling purposes. As stated in the narrative, farmers best-suited to participate based on their history of farming in areas adjacent to critical areas will be at the core of capacity building and front-line beneficiaries. To enhance sustainability these farmers will enter into co-management arrangements with the Department of Agriculture in the establishment and operation of the field nurseries. It is anticipated that these co-management agreements will result in long-term investment by the farmers and supported via associated farmer cooperatives. This information has been added to the narrative of Output 2.1.1 in section 3 of both the CEO-ER document and the ProDoc.

The same question applies to the enhancements to the existing GIS system under Output 1.2 and the drones mentioned in the project budget and Appendix 13: Please note enhancement of GIS systems is considered under Output 1.1.3 and not Outcome 1.2. The GOSKN has very limited GIS capacity and there is lack of a national repository and clearing house on environmental data and other relevant information. There is no standing committee of key government departments to develop or supervise the development of a National Spatial Data Infrastructure (NSDI) and a National Land Information System (NLIS). The project will support the enhancement of the GIS system by providing trainings, building capacity, practical application of approaches as well as equipment (e.g. GIS software, drones) to improve data collection and analysis aiming to improve land use planning and policy development. The idea is that after the project ends, the GOSKN will be enhanced and be able to maintain the GIS system from own budget. During the project, a sustainability strategy will be explored in order to generate income from the GIS information services related to building permits, environmental monitoring analysis as environmental audits, among others, that could be paid for companies or institutions. The Ministry of Environment or the Ministry of Planning should govern this.

This is further clarified with additional narrative under section 3 both the CEO-ER and the ProDoc under Output 1.1.3 specifically.

Output 2.1.2- How is the mangrove restoration being coupled with added protection for the mangroves? We note the importance of replanting, but also considering the potential to lose the mangroves elsewhere or in the same location in the future: Output 2.1.2. Includes the conduct of a Rapid Mangrove Ecosystem Assessment, which will ensure sustainable actions, and will design a mangrove conservation action plan that will take into consideration potential negative impacts elsewhere. In addition, policy makers and resource managers will have access to the mangrove conservation action plan and the information and recommendations generated, data so that conservation efforts can be better targeted.

This is further clarified with additional narrative under section 3 of both the CEO-ER and the ProDoc under Output 2.1.2.

Output 2.2.1- There is no reference to the financing programme mentioned in the project description. Is there a target associated with the program, in terms of no. farmers assisted etc. Additional information would be useful on the potential program and partners such as private sector and their role.

The financing programme as described refers to the facilitation of the development of a protocol on compliance to CSA/SLM best practices that will be linked to access to credit (and markets) so as to incentivize the uptake of good CSA/SLM practices by farmers. The project will contribute to the review of existing credit

facility and access mechanisms, including relevant existing incentive (subsidy support) schemes by government and make recommendations for CSA/SLM practice adoption within credit access schemes. This will be closely coordinated and directed by the Department of Agriculture with technical guidance and support from IICA and the FAO, based on needs articulated mainly by the agricultural cooperative societies whose members are the target farmers. The development process will be defined on project inception in which a target on number of farmers associated with a validation/test will be determined. Development of the programme will include engagement of the private sector in terms of market access, with focus on main retail outlets and hotels to build on corporate service responsibility in encouraging that produce supplied is from SLM/CSA-compliant practice.

This clarification has been added to the narrative in section 3 of the CEO-ER and ProDoc, under Output 2.2.1.

-We note that this intervention will require the removal of invasive species. What is the long term plan for maintenance and control of the invasive species.

The project refers to control of invasive vegetation species at the site level where active interventions will take place. This will entail a combination of physical removal and other control measures to reduce further proliferation over the time until the desired rehabilitation and planting measures take effect. In the longer-term, as lands are recovered and revert to more SLM/CSA management regimes and active management measures are in place by the farmers, it is expected that invasive species will be reduced and kept in a low presence. It should be noted also, as included in the project narrative, that the GEF funded regional project “Alien Species (IAS) in Barbados and the OECS Countries” aimed at managing the risks and costs of invasive alien species on important ecosystems was launched in St. Kitts and Nevis in March 2019. This project will focus on prevention, early detection and the establishment of control and management frameworks for IAS that emphasize a risk management approach by prioritizing the highest risk invasion pathways. This project will coordinate closely with the regional IAS project (and the national component in St. Kitts) to avoid duplication, understand the lessons learnt and support replication.

This clarification has been added to the narrative under “Coordination with ongoing projects” and section 3 (output 2.2.1) of the CEO-ER and sections 2.7 and 3 (output 2.2.1) of the ProDoc.

-Output 3.2- We note the targeted public education and awareness campaign (Appendix 18). What are the plans to test the effectiveness and impact of the intervention? A local consultant will be hired to evaluate the impact of the public awareness campaign. This is specified in the Procurement Plan, Appendix 9 of the UNEP ProDoc. The methodology will involve the conduct of on-site knowledge-attitude-practice-behavior (KAPB) surveys of stakeholders actively engaged in the project and wider civil society and other indirect stakeholders on the effectiveness of messaging from the project. Other means such as direct interviews and feedback from face-to-face, written and other inputs will be captured and complied. This has been reflected in the text of both CEO-ER and the ProDoc under section 3 (output 3.2.1) respectively.

Other

-We would like to see specifically how gender will be considered and mainstreamed in the project interventions. We note the considerations made in the Gender and Project Results Framework sections of the CEO ER as well as the Safeguards section of the Project Document. However please provide additional details in Table B as well as the project description of the CEO ER and the Project Document on how gender will be incorporated. Yes, under section ‘A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment’ and specifically under subsection ‘Project Activities to promote Gender Equity’ of the CEO-ER document, and under the Environmental and social safeguards section of the ProDoc this was extensively elaborated. To reiterate, gender mainstreaming will be incorporated in the implementation of all capacity building processes, as well as promoting planting of nurseries, reforestation activities and mapping of market potential. These include for example design and implementation of gender oriented methodology to promote inclusive spaces within the existing governance structure of the local community, in which women particularly have an active presence as well as the challenges they face regarding their participation and decision making, in order to identify opportunities that will lead to more inclusive processes. It should be noted that the project will take into consideration the recently launched National

Gender Equality policy launched in December 2018 by GSKN. Further, the results framework sets out gender-related targets that will be assessed over project implementation. These provide orientation to the project in the gender mainstreaming process.

Clarification is requested on which 'Table B' is being referred to, if this was the intention.

-As activities related to earth dams and water ponds will not be undertaken, please remove references to these interventions throughout the project document (Stakeholders section, TORs, Procurement Plan etc): Noted and these references have been removed and replaced with the term water storage tanks.

-The Safeguards section refers to renewable energy, please clarify. This was included in error and has been removed.

-Please ensure the figures in the Ex-Act tool match the target hectares as described in the project text (CEO ER). A prior version of the Ex-Act tool was submitted. The updated version is now provided.

3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/3/2019:

Not fully. Please clarify the following.

- Please justify the need for GEF financing for a project vehicle

-Annex F-1 refers to a National Project Coordinator, however the Budget notes refers to a Regional Project Coordinator. Please clarify.

-The budget notes make mention of an M&E specialist, however there is no TOR (Appendix 10) provided or description in the Procurement Section (Appendix 13). Please provide.

8/26/2019:

As indicated in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy- GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged as such costs are normally expected to be borne by co-finance. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified. Following a review of the justification provided, we will not be able to support the purchase of a project vehicle. Please adjust the budget accordingly.

10/10/2019:

Following further internal review by our policy team, and in keeping with our policies, please see questions below for consideration and response.

-We note that several specialists have been categorized as 'project staff' within the budget. If these specialists are not charging 100% of their time to the project, they should be included in the Consultants/International Consultants line items as appropriate. If they are, then they will be considered as project staff to be paid by the PMC. Please adjust accordingly.

-In relation to the above, for the Sustainable Agriculture Specialist, the project document indicates that this is a staff member who will be a part of the PCU and will charge 100% of their time to the project. In this case their charges will have to assigned to the PMC (to be shared between GEF financing and co-financing). Otherwise, adjustments to the terms of employment should be considered.

-Please reassign all of the project coordinator financing to the PMC, which should be shared between the GEF Financing and the cash co-financing that has been identified for the project.

12/10/2019:

The responses and adjustments have been noted. We also note that the TOR for the Project Coordinator has been adjusted in view of technical responsibilities that will be carried out. However as written, the TOR is not clear on what specific technical tasks will be undertaken by the project coordinator under each of the components. Please clarify and revise.

Additionally, we recommend, utilizing the co-financing available to the PMC category, to assist with covering the Project Coordinator costs. We note that the budget line for *Administrative Staff* has cash co-financing of \$1.4M and \$496,922 in kind.

2/6/2020:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

7/18/2019

- Please justify the need for GEF financing for a project vehicle This is substantially a field project, which will require significant coordination and mobilisation of project staff to the project sites and will necessitate engagement with stakeholders in the field. Reliance on the small number of existing vehicles of the department of Agriculture will be problematic in terms of ensuring timeliness and responsiveness to the project needs. This was conveyed by the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Department of Agriculture during the project development process. This explanatory note has been added in the procurement plan in the ProDoc to make clear.

-Annex F-1 refers to a National Project Coordinator, however the Budget notes refers to a Regional Project Coordinator. Please clarify. Noted; this has been changed to National Project Coordinator.

-The budget notes make mention of an M&E specialist, however there is no TOR (Appendix 10) provided or description in the Procurement Section (Appendix 13). Please provide. The TOR for the M&E specialist has now been included in Appendix 10 of the ProDoc. Note however this will not represent an additional procurement as this role will be carried out by IUCN.

9/4/2019 RESPONSE

Following a review of the justification provided, we will not be able to support the purchase of a project vehicle. Please adjust the budget accordingly: Accepted; the vehicle purchase has been removed from the proposal. Note the changes in the Budget and PRODOC (specifically in Appendix 13, Procurement Plan) have been adjusted accordingly.

11/17/2019 RESPONSE

We note that several specialists have been categorized as 'project staff' within the budget. If these specialists are not charging 100% of their time to the project, they should be included in the Consultants/International Consultants line items as appropriate. If they are, then they will be considered as project staff to be paid by the PMC. Please adjust accordingly: The budget has been revised on the basis of the PMC threshold in consideration of the guidance. These specialists have been moved to consultant budget lines.

-In relation to the above, for the Sustainable Agriculture Specialist, the project document indicates that this is a staff member who will be a part of the PCU and will charge 100% of their time to the project. In this case their charges will have to assigned to the PMC (to be shared between GEF financing and co-financing). Otherwise, adjustments to the terms of employment should be considered.: This specialist has been shifted to the consultant line.

-Please reassign all of the project coordinator financing to the PMC, which should be shared between the GEF Financing and the cash co-financing that has been identified for the project: The project coordinator will undertake technical responsibilities under the project hence a portion of the salary of the PC has been retained under the project component budget. The TORs for the PC Appendix 10 has been adjusted to reflect this.

12/10/2019 response:

The responses and adjustments have been noted. We also note that the TOR for the Project Coordinator has been adjusted in view of technical responsibilities that will be carried out. However as written, the TOR is not clear on what specific technical tasks will be undertaken by the project coordinator under each of the components. Please clarify and revise. The TORs for the project coordinator have been further defined in respect to the anticipated technical functions, with references to the activities and outputs that the PC will be expected to contribute to. Please refer to Appendix 10.

Additionally, we recommend, utilizing the co-financing available to the PMC category, to assist with covering the Project Coordinator costs. We note that the budget line for Administrative Staff has cash co-financing of \$1.4M and \$496,922 in kind. An adjustment has been made to reflect co-finance contribution

in the amount of \$47,400 toward the cost of the Project Coordinator. This adjustment is now reflected in both the GEF budget and co-financing budgets. The amount removed from the PC cost has been allocated to the technical components (budget line for national consultants).

It should be further noted that the co-financing contributions from the Ministry of Sustainable Development and the Ministry of Finance (NAO European Union) are associated with ongoing and anticipated initiatives that, while are directly associated with this project, these resources are however not earmarked to support project coordinator costs. The co-financing represents personnel and other costs that are linked to initiatives under these ministries.

4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes

8/26/2019:

Cleared.

Response to Secretariat comments

5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes. However please adjust the Co-financing letter from the Ministry of Finance to include the US\$ equivalent.

8/26/2019:

Thank you for this note. We await the updated co-financing letter prior to processing the CEO Endorsement. Please ensure that the figure in the letter aligns with the corresponding figure in Table C.

Response to Secretariat comments

7/18/2019

However please adjust the Co-financing letter from the Ministry of Finance to include the US\$ equivalent: An adjusted co-financing letter has been requested from the Ministry of Finance via the OFP. This is still being pursued and will be forwarded as soon available. Kindly note that the prevailing Euro to USD exchange rate at the time of receipt of the co-financing letter was:

Saturday	29/12/2018	1 EUR =	1.1441 USD	EUR USD rate for 29/12/2018
Friday	28/12/2018	1 EUR =	1.1441 USD	EUR USD rate for 28/12/2018
Thursday	27/12/2018	1 EUR =	1.1433 USD	EUR USD rate for 27/12/2018

Source: <https://www.currency-converter.org.uk/currency-rates/historical/table/EUR-USD.html>

This was used to convert the Eur 4,920,000 to an equivalent of USD 5,629,833 based on on-line currency exchange information at the time of finalization of the co-financing tables in the project documents. This has been added as a footnote following Table C of the CEO Endorsement Request.

9/4/2019 RESPONSE:

We await the updated co-financing letter prior to processing the CEO Endorsement. Please ensure that the figure in the letter aligns with the corresponding figure in Table C.: The updated co-financing letter has been received. Figures updated to reflect USD amount in letter on the following documents: Appendix 2 – Co-financing budget and throughout PRODOC and Endorsement Request.

6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes. However please clarify the GEF related costs associated with the preparation of the Inception report, Semi-Annual Reports, Reports of PSC Meetings, PIRs and Project Final report which have been associated with IUCN. Our expectation is that the Project Coordinator (of the PCU) will undertake these tasks and they are covered under the costs for this Project Staff.

8/26/2019:

Cleared.

1

10/10/2019:

Following further review by our policy team, please see additional comments below.

There are a number of items included in the M&E budget which are ineligible and will need to be reallocated to other line items within the budget. These are:

-**Semi-Annual Progress Reports** and the **PSC Meetings and Advisory Technical Meetings** which have been identified as the 'Project Coordinator's staff time estimated for these activities'. Please reassign these costs to the PMC category only, which should be shared between GEF financing and the cash co-financing available for the project.

-The **Financial Audit** costs will need to be reassigned to the PMC, which should be shared between GEF financing and the cash co-financing available for the project.

-The **Publication of Lessons Learnt** should be reassigned to Component 3

12/10/2019:

Noted re the Financial Audit and the Publication of Lessons Learnt.

However we have not seen adjustments related to the allocation of the other ineligible expenses. Additionally, please see related comments under Question 3. In reference to the GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle , **PSC Meetings and Advisory Technical Meetings** as well as the **Semi-Annual Progress Reports to UN Environment** are ineligible M&E expenses. These are to be allocated under the PMC only and should not be included as a cost under M&E budget. Please adjust.

Please also clarify the increase in the Inception Workshop costs by \$22,000.

2/6/2020:

Cleared

Response to Secretariat comments

7/18/2019

In reference to the M&E table (in the CEO-ER) where the information is contained, note that IUCN is not charging additional costs; the annotation in the table is to indicate the corresponding tasks that are under IUCN's full responsibility. Costs reflected do refer to project coordinator's staff time estimated for these activities.

11/17/2019 RESPONSE:

-**Semi-Annual Progress Reports and the PSC Meetings and Advisory Technical Meetings** which have been identified as the 'Project Coordinator's staff time estimated for these activities'. Please reassign these costs to the PMC category only, which should be shared between GEF financing and the cash co-financing available for the project: The costs for the M&E budget have been adjusted as directed. Please refer to Appendix 7 of the ProDoc.

-The Financial Audit costs will need to be reassigned to the PMC, which should be shared between GEF financing and the cash co-financing available for the project: These costs have been assigned to PMC.

-The Publication of Lessons Learnt should be reassigned to Component 3: These costs have been assigned to Component 3.

12/10/2019 response:

However we have not seen adjustments related to the allocation of the other ineligible expenses. Additionally, please see related comments under Question 3. In reference to the GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle , PSC Meetings and Advisory Technical Meetings as well as the Semi-Annual Progress Reports to UN Environment are ineligible M&E expenses. These are to be allocated under the PMC only and should not be included as a cost under M&E budget. Please adjust. The nomenclature for the M&E budget has been brought into line with the expectation of eligible costs specified in the GEF guideline (Table 1 on page 15) as indeed the costs provided are intended to support monitoring and evaluation. The classifications “*Standard semi-annual progress reporting and monitoring to UN Environment*” and “*Monitoring by the Project Steering Committee and advisory technical group of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant*” are specified in the M&E budget table for clarity. As per previous guidance the amount for audits that was previously under M&E has been shifted to PMC. Please see revised M&E budget (Appendix 7)

Please also clarify the increase in the Inception Workshop costs by \$22,000. The amount has been reconsidered and scaled to \$10,000 which has been considered reasonable in terms of meeting hosting costs and travel given that inception activities will need to be hosted on two islands.

10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

Agency Responses

11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:

GEFSEC

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

STAP

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

GEF Council

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/2/2019:

Yes

Response to Secretariat comments

Convention Secretariat

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement N/A

Response to Secretariat comments

Recommendation

12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

7/3/2019:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

8/28/2019:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

9/30/2019:

The Project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

10/10/2019:

Following further internal review by our policy team, please address additional comments under Questions 3 & 9. In addition, in the Portal under Other Executing Partner, the Executing Agency is the Ministry of Sustainable Development – however, the project document indicates that IUCN is performing the role of Project Executing Agency. Please adjust this discrepancy in the Portal entry.

12/10/2019:

Not at this time. Please address further comments under Questions 3 & 9.

2/6/2020:

The comments have been addressed and the project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.

2/12/2020:

Prior to final approval by the GEF, please correct the Executing Agency Type in the Portal entry of the CEO ER. The Executing Agency is IUCN, however the Agency type currently states 'Government Agency'.

2/27/2020:

We have noted the change, however, as IUCN is a GEF Agency, please select 'GEF Agency' as the Agency type.

3/5/2020:

The adjustment has been made and the project is cleared for CEO Endorsement.

Response to Secretariat comments

9/4/2019 RESPONSE:

Comments Addressed.

11/17/2019 RESPONSE:

Request to make the adjustment in the portal has been sent to the WB IT team so that the Executing Agency is reflected as IUCN.

19/02/2020 RESPONSE:

The Agency Type has been corrected.

Review Dates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations