

Enhancing island resilience through improved ecosystem management and sustainable agriculture practices

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID
12356
Countries
Seychelles
Project Name
Enhancing island resilience through improved ecosystem management and sustainable agriculture practices
Agencies
World Bank
Date received by PM
5/26/2026
Review completed by PM

Program Manager
Olusola Uchenna Ikuforiji
Focal Area
Multi Focal Area
Project Type
MSP

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
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments
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
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments
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
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

a) We note reference to the GEB's in the last paragraph of the Summary, suggest highlighting adaptation benefits from the SCCF-investments (adaptation) including expected results

b) Project Description section is missing

GEFSEC 5/27/2026

. The projects components are broadly relevant and sufficiently clear and aligned with the objective. The overall design is logical: Component 1 addresses adaptive capacity and technology uptake in agriculture, Component 2 addresses irrigation, water efficiency and resilient land management, and Component 3 addresses coastal and marine ecosystem resilience through restoration, improved management, and nature-based solutions.

However we note that the activities under each component are not sufficiently described to demonstrate achievement of the project objectives or delivery of the core indicators, such as the proposed restoration of 400 hectares of mangrove forests and improved management across 800 hectares of marine areas, or the 300 private sector enterprises that are expected to be engaged in adaptation and resilience and 22.5 MR to be private capital mobilized. The engagement and role of the private sector is not adequately reflected in the description nor substantiated in the Theory of Change narrative. Component 2 has only one broad outcome, and the outputs "distribution of seeds", "trees planted with crops", and 200 ha land managed under climate resilience monitored and evaluated", read as activity milestones rather than clearly framed outputs linked to objective. We also note possible overlap between the field demonstration activities in Components 1 and 2.

With respect to BD, the project is aligned with BD focal area Objective 1: conservation, sustainable use, restoration and mainstreaming in agricultural sector. The component 3 directly targets management of MPAs and restoration of coastal ecosystems. But for the whole concept, we find the approach from management improvement of terrestrial agricultural areas to management of MPAs not clearly consistent, with no landscape approach detailed in the narrative. The project would gain to explain the links between the unsustainable agriculture to degradation of natural marine areas. And to explain how with a landscape approach it can also answer to climate change adaptation needs, respectfully to natural ecosystems and biodiversity. There is a need to explicitly describe the synergy between the 2 different focal areas objectives. Intensification of agriculture and development of new tools need to be done respectfully and without conflict. For this, a clear landscape approach and land use mapping is necessary. In addition, the BD budget seems to be a little bit low compared to what the project aims to implement. Restorations activities are usually expensive. Please re-assess project activities commensurate with the budget. Also consider the following elements to strengthen the BD rationale for the components.

Component 1: needs to describe the activities to be implemented.

- promote landscape approach in agricultural investments, preserving main natural values, ecosystems and ecological corridors: needs for a clear assessment of the ground and land use mapping taking into account all interests.
- Need for an assessment of the coherence between agricultural policies, water regulations and environmental legislations
- Please be precise on how they will ensure that investments in new agri technology are respectful of ecosystems.

Component 2:

- Needs for an assessment of water resources and how the project will affect the freshwater ecosystems or coastal areas and mangroves (irrigation and water storage).
- We note project's proposal on water conservation. Are there plans for water storage?

?Are there restoration, or at least conservation, of ecological corridors in the agricultural areas are planned?

?Provide an indication of how the project will guarantee no introduction of IAS (invasive species) if changes in the crop varieties are promoted?

Component 3:

?There are needs for an explicit mapping of terrestrial habitats, corridors and BD and for cross cutting with zoning of agricultural needs (land use baseline, BD analysis and project).

?Suggest a clear landscape approach to understand dynamic from agriculture development to marine PAs management

?Clarify the type of NBs to be implemented and identify the activities and the monitoring to be implemented.

?Consider adding a Monitoring of the evolution of the BD during and after restoration activities.

- Provide a list of species indicators for example, and GIS mapping

At PPG please provide clear distinction of the activities. Overall further expound on the activities in the project description referencing the beneficiaries, stakeholders including the private sector roles. And demonstrate clearly how the components and activities will achieve the project objective

Agency's Commentsb) Thank you. Project Description has been added.

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

To a large extent but needs to be further developed during PPG

M&E: The project has a standalone M&E component with \$150,000 in GEF financing , with outputs covering project M&E, audit reports, annual reporting, midterm review, and completion report.

Gender dimensions: Project indicates that gender equality and youth empowerment will be at the core of project interventions and includes sex-disaggregated indicators, however this has not been substantiated in the project outputs, activities and components. It is also unclear how women, and youth will be engaged or benefit from the project.

Knowledge management- project includes activities to foster knowledge sharing and exchange. However KM is not clearly articulated through dedicated outputs or a budget line within the project components.

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

a) Yes

b) GEF funds allocated to PMC represents 4.7% while from cofinancing the allocation is only 4.1%. For a cofinancing of \$9,600,000, 4.7% represents \$451,000 instead of \$400,000. Please amend.

Agency's Commentsb) Thank you. The co-financing amount under PMC has been adjusted.

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

a) Project rationale section is missing. Please address

GEFSEC 5/27/2026

Thank you for adding the rationale section in the Project summary

The project rationale is anchored on the climate, economic, food system, and ecosystem stresses facing Seychelles, which directly informs the project design based on an integrated focus on climate-smart agriculture, irrigation/water management, and ecosystem restoration/nature-based solutions.

At PPG, ensure substantiating the rationale through a the systems perspective. it would be useful to further articulate for instance the underlying systemic drivers of environmental degradation and food system vulnerability (governance, land etc) including how the proposed interventions will address these root causes. Moreover, while we appreciate the adaptation rationale including a climate analysis, we request further elaboration including reference to climatic forecasts and detailed impacts on vulnerable communities -women, youth with emphasis on their livelihoods etc. Also suggest that the project narrative could clearer on how the proposed activities and interventions would reduce exposure to hazards, reduce sensitivity of livelihoods and ecosystems to the hazards and increase the adaptive capacity of communities, institutions etc

b) Not yet. Please identify and elaborate the key barriers and enablers during PPG

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

a) Project rationale section is missing. Please address

GEFSEC 5/27/2026

a) Not yet.

b) Fairly. There is no identification of climatic forecasts, though the project design incorporates an integrated approach that could support resilience to future changes in climate drivers and implementation conditions, including promotion of climate-resilient technologies and practices, etc. However, the adaptive management dimension is not yet fully articulated. The project design does not clearly explain how monitoring, learning, and updated risk information will be used to adjust activities over time, nor does it sufficiently identify contingency options if assumptions change or risks materialize. Suggest a clearer adaptive management framework to address future risks.

c) Thank you. To a reasonable extent, the project describes how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing and previous investments, such as reference to the AFD/GCF EBA programme and the UNDP/GEF-8 Blue and Green Islands child project, and explains how the present intervention will add value at farm, home-garden, and community level while leveraging broader ecosystem-based and systems-oriented investments. The narration however doesn't show evidence of how lessons learned and how specific prior experiences from these projects have informed project design. We also note that the project seems close to the R2R project (2020/2025), with the R2R approach missing in the current proposal. But there is a need to verify that there are no overlaps. There is no mention of any management plans in the MPAs targeted. It could be interesting to understand how this project will work and interact with, to avoid any conflict.

d) Fairly. The proposal references stakeholder groups including women, youth, smallholder farmers, home gardeners, private sector actors and community groups in different aspects of the project. The component narratives do not yet consistently specify how different stakeholder groups will participate, what roles they will play, and how their responsibilities will be differentiated across activities and outputs. Women and youth engagement, for instance, is still somewhat broad, and needs further details on how their needs and priorities will be reflected in the project design and implementation. Please describe more clearly the stakeholders' roles within the project components.

Agency's Comments a) Thank you. Project Rationale has been added.

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

a) ToC and project description section is missing. Please address

GEFSEC 5/27/2026

a) Yes. At PPG, please ensure the ToC narrative is further elaborated especially on the causal pathways and linkages between the components/outputs both on the climate (reducing vulnerability) and biodiversity front.

b) Not fully. Please refer to comments above to ensure define components and outputs during PPG.

Agency's Commentsa) Thank you. TOC and project description narrative has been added.
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
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Not yet.

GEFSEC 5/27/2026

Not yet. The document does not clearly distinguish the baseline scenario (this hasn't been described) from the GEF alternative, nor does it sufficiently explain the specific increment financed by the GEF and how this increment generates benefits beyond what would occur under existing or planned investments. Please provide a clearer articulation of associated baseline projects, and the role of the GEF in delivering the identified adaptation and global environmental (biodiversity) benefits.

Agency's Comments
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
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments
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
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Core Indicator 2.2, please include list of protected areas, WDPA ID, IUCN Category, and METT score.

Meta information table: Please revise "This Project will provide direct adaptation benefits to the private sector." "This Project is explicitly related to the formulation and/or implementation of national adaptation plans (NAPs)." "This project will directly engage local communities in project design and implementation" from false to true

While we note the modest project finance, direct beneficiary target of 500 seems unduly small for a project of this size and ambition. Please clarify

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

The project shows elements of catalytic and potentially transformative intent through introduction of CSA technologies and private sector engagement. During PPG, articulate the project's transformative approach and clear concrete scaling pathway, including how project activities will be institutionalized, financed, or expanded beyond the project. Please address

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Fairly yes. Please demonstrate alignment to the SCCF priority areas including strengthening technology transfer, innovation and private sector engagement

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/27/2026

Not yet. Please provide information on the targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF that the project will contribute towards.

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Not yet.

Agency's Comments

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

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

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 CommentsNo

Agency's Comments
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

Agency's Comments
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
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Yes,

Agency's Comments

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

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

We note the attached Concept Environmental and Social Review Summary. An overall ESS risk is classified as Moderate. A few things to address during PPG

- We cannot locate stakeholder engagement plan for the project. Please provide stakeholder engagement plan.

- Please clarify how the project is consulted with vulnerable populations including small farmers and fishers about project design, particularly related to Component 1, 2, and 3, and how the results of the consultations were integrated into the project design.

- Please consider vulnerable populations, including small farmers and fishers as partners of the project particularly Component 1, 2, and 3.
- Please consider integrating vulnerable groups? governance, traditional and local knowledge, capacity building as a part of the project, particularly in Component 1, 2, and 3.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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 Comments

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

GEFSEC 5/26/2026

Agency requested to resubmit fully completed PIF

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	5/26/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		