

# Blue and Green Island Integrated Programme

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11250

**Countries**

Global (Belize, Cabo Verde, Comoros, Cuba, Maldives, Mauritius, Micronesia, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Seychelles, St. Lucia, Timor Leste, Trinidad and Tobago, Vanuatu)

**Project Name**

Blue and Green Island Integrated Programme

**Agencies**

UNDP, FAO, World Bank, IUCN, WWF-US, UNEP

**Date received by PM**

4/12/2023

**Review completed by PM**

5/17/2023

**Program Manager**

Asha Bobb-Semple

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

## GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

### 1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

#### Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

Cleared

4/21/2023:

- the Anticipated Program Executing Entities are bundled in one two lines ? please fill out this information using individual rows so each executing entity can be correctly classified.
- With the expectation of the Work Program to be approved on June 29, 2023, the max Program Commitment Deadline can only be 18 months after, which leads to December 29, 2024 - please amend.
- The total financing envelope for the program is incorrect. Please see below, additional comments on this. The correct figures are country child project total \$119,930,667 + GCP \$ 15,700,000 = \$ 135,630,667

#### Agency's Comments

8 May 2023 - UNDP comments:

- Comoros had previously bundled the Executing Entities but have now corrected it. We have included the 15 Government Executing Entities in individual rows.
- Program Commitments Deadline has been changed to December 29, 2024
- PNG Child Project was corrected, and GEF PM confirmed on April 26 that, with the adjustment to PNG allocations, the total approved envelope for the program is \$135,633,000. Due to decimals correction requested by GEF via e-mail on April 27, the total envelope being

resubmitted now is \$ 135,632,986.00 (child project total \$119,932,986.00 + GCP \$ 15,700,000)

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

**2. Program Summary**

**a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

a)

-Please include the expected GEBs.

-Please also note we are recommending a minor edit to the Program Objective as written below. Please ensure this is reflected in the Program Summary and throughout all of the documentation.

*The objective of the BGI-IP is to facilitate nature-positive development and reduce ecosystem degradation in SIDS by valuing nature and applying NbS with specific application to the food, tourism, and urban sectors.*

b) Yes

## Agency's Comments

8 May 2023 - UNDP comments:

a)

-Expected GEBs included in Program Summary

-The stated objective is correctly included in the Program Summary, throughout the PFD, and other documentation.

### 3 Indicative Program Overview

- a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program components and appropriately funded?**
- d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?**

## Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

All cleared.

4/21/2023:

a) As indicated above, we are recommending a minor edit to the program objective for more clarity.

b)

- 1) Please see suggested edits below for the Program Outcome language- extra words removed for clarity.

- 

Outcome 1.1 ? SIDS enabled to incorporate the value of nature into key economic sectors at the national level.

- Outcome 1.2 - Strengthened policy coherence, systemic and institutional capacity to enable gender responsive nature-integrated development and sectoral planning

- Outcome 2.1 - Nature-based solutions applied at scale in target areas and sectors
  - Outcome 2.2 - Systemic and institutional capacity to implement nature-based solutions at seascape and landscape levels strengthened following the 'ridge to reef' and 'whole of islands' approach; and
  - Outcome 3.2 - Strategic knowledge management, learning and communications implemented at programmatic and country level, and supporting South-South exchange;
  - Outcome 3.3 - Improved availability and access by countries and at different scales to knowledge, technical expertise, and capacity development;
  - 
  - 2) Please include collective action in the name for Component 4. This will cover the work around bargaining and engagement with the private sector. The component should read- Programme Coordination, knowledge management and collective action and upscaling.
- c) Yes
- d) Please include PMC amounts in the table.
- e) Please include PMC amounts in the table.

#### Agency's Comments

8 May 2023 - UNDP comments:

- a) This change has been incorporated into the PFD and related documentation.
- b)
- 1) Thank you for the clarity provided. Please note changes made to the Indicative Program Overview (Pg 3) and throughout the PFD and GCP.
- 2) Please note changes made to the Indicative Program Overview (Pg 3) and throughout the PFD and GCP.
- c)
- d) A total of 5,770,157 has been allocated for the PMC and 6,059,197 for M&E
- e) Same as above.

#### 4 Program Outline

##### A. Program Rationale

**a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the program design?**

**b) Has the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other program outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**

**c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?**

**d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?**

**e) For NGI, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.**

### Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

a) Not fully.

1. Barriers: The discussion on the barriers could be more detailed as it is key to provide an understanding of why the program is needed and how the program plans to contribute to transformative change. We expect a more substantive discussion on each of the barriers and the resulting impacts of these barriers. Further down in the document, a more substantive description of the transformation levers that will be applied to the program will allow the reader to have a clear picture of what barriers will be addressed and how.
2. Barrier 1 indicates: *'lack of harmonization of regional, national, and sub-national policies.'* please expand on this in the text and clarify what this means. Is Component 1 addressing regional policies? In addition, there is no mention of how this barrier is reflected at different institutional scales (local, sub-national, national). Please include.
3. Please revise the narrative for Barriers 2 and Barrier 5 as there is overlap and it is difficult to distinguish between the two. Based on the text that has been included, one can guess that Barrier 2 may be attempting to address the challenges at the upstream/enabling environment level - such as policies and regulations that govern private sector and business practices, investment and lending and whether or not nature is given sufficient consideration. If so Barrier 2 we assume is then focusing on the downstream actions and the operations of private sector (businesses, banks) and whether or not they have the capacity, understanding, tools to incorporate nature considerations into their business

practices and lending/investment operations. If this is the case, please update the narrative to distinguish between the two.

4. Please clarify which barrier relates to insufficient domestic resource mobilization related to public sector? It is not evident. Please include and make more explicit.
5. Noting the narrative on systems change and coincidentally the names of the sectors we are addressing almost mirror the names of the systems, the work on the tourism sector seems absent. It could be referenced as one of the key areas of focus when addressing work on Natural systems for instance (para 19). There is also opportunity to mention the sector in para 36.

b)

1. The PFD indicate that it has consulted Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities and Civil Society Organizations but does not much information on these consultations. Please ask agency to provide additional details and summary of names and dates of consultation with these stakeholders.
2. Additional details on the expected role of the private sector could be included here.

c) Yes

d) It is not clear if or how the lessons from the existing baseline have been considered in the design. Please include or make more explicit.

e) N/A

### Agency's Comments

8 May 2023 - UNDP comments:

a) **STAP comment, Received by email 7 April 2023** (see PFD Response Matrix uploaded to Portal)

*?It's important too that the narrative description of the theory of change aligns with the rest of the document. It may be helpful, for example, to describe objectives, then the barriers and then the actions that will overcome the barriers.?*

*Based on the recommendation in this comment that the description of the ToC aligns with the rest of the document, the detailed description of the barriers have been moved to this section (Current Situation) that describes the ToC to avoid repetition of the barriers.*

1) The recommendation has been incorporated into the PFD and the discussion on the barriers has been further detailed. This includes a more substantive discussion on the barriers and their resulting impacts, as suggested. New text that elaborates on all barriers is all highlighted in yellow. - Para 29. Barriers 1-5

2) Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This aspect of Barrier 1 has been reworded to reflect the intention of addressing lack of harmonization of policies *at and between* the national, sub-national and local levels, not *between regional, national, and sub-national policies*. In addition, regional policies are not being addressed in Component 1 and thus have been removed from the text. The adjusted wording, highlighted in yellow.

- Para 29: Barrier 1

3) The narrative of Barrier 2 and Barrier 5 has been changed to distinguish between the barriers. As indicated in the GEFSec comment, Barrier 2 is addressing the challenges at the upstream/enabling environment level - such as policies and regulations that govern private sector and business practices, investment, and lending, and whether or not nature is given sufficient consideration. Barrier 5 is focusing on the downstream actions and the operations of the private sector (businesses, banks) and their capacity, understanding, and available tools to incorporate nature considerations into their business practices and lending/investment operations. The adapted text is highlighted in yellow. - Para 29: Barrier 2 and 5.

4)The barrier related to insufficient domestic resource mobilization has been incorporated into the revised Barrier 2. - Para 29: Barrier 2

5) The significance of the tourism sector has been noted in the paragraph addressing Natural system as a key area of focus of the IP. - Para 20, 3rd sentence

b)

1) Please note that while the PFD does indicate that it has consulted with the Private Sector and Civil Society Organizations, it did not indicate that it has consulted with Indigenous People and Local Communities. The names and dates of consultations was recorded in the PFD in Para 159. Full consultations (in line with UNDP policies) with IPLCs in child countries will take place during the PPG process. - Para 182

2) Additional information regarding the role of the private sector has been added. Please see the highlighted text at the latter half of Para 33. - Para 33

c)

d) Please see additional and more explicit information on the programme building on baseline initiatives such as? - Para 34-35.

## **5 B. Program Description**

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**



- b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?**
- c) Are the program components described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the program approach has been selected over other potential options?**
- d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?**
- e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?**
- f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?**
- g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?**
- h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?**
- i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/14/2023:

Cleared

5/10/2023:

Follow up comment.

-Please consider revising the introductory sentence of Para 110 on the Role of the GCP. It is not very clear. See below.

The role of the Global Coordination Project (GCP) function is to ensure that the programmatic vision required for the realization of the IP's value-added potential is realized, maximizing the sum of the outcomes expected across the country-level portfolio.

4/21/2023:

The program description is very comprehensive, please see comments below for consideration and revision.

General Comments:

- Please define paragraphs 42-51. Are these meant to be key features of the program? Some are a mix of the overall approach to be taken regarding collective bargaining and collective upscaling and others are simply discussing other themes such as gender, IPLCs etc. A sub-heading would be useful.

- In addition Para 41 and 49 seem to have some overlap as they both speak to finance. Can the narratives in the paragraphs be merged and streamlined so that one section speaks to the private sector role in terms of implementation of the program ? policy, innovation, knowledge and the other speaks to their finance role?

- Recalling the importance of the continuum of ecosystem service valuation to full scale natural capital accounting, it is noted that in many instances throughout this section only NCA is mentioned, where as both options need to be highlighted.

- We note all cross-cutting themes have been identified. It is not clear how behaviour change and resilience will be applied in the program. Please expand on these aspects as the narrative mainly provides a summary that they will be achieved.

- Please ensure there is alignment between the text in the program overview table and the text for the components in the ToC diagram and throughout the program description.

- Please adjust the GEF's Vision for the BGI IP to the following- *Demonstrate the transformational potential of incorporating the value of nature into decision-making and using innovative nature-based solutions to achieve development and MEA goals*  
This is written in the Strategy.

- We note reference is made to some child project interventions in the PFD. Noting that all could not be incorporated in the narrative of the PFD, please be reminded that all child projects are expected to implement all the Outcomes under the program. The only Outcome where significant differences are expected is Outcome 2.1.

- Please ensure the names of the Outcomes are consistent throughout the document. There are variations of the Outcomes in different sections.

a)

1) Overall the description of the theory of change could be improved to tell one coherent logic- how are we moving from the barriers on the left to the systemic long term impacts on the right. Emphasis on how the program can be transformative would be important here as well. Only sections of the TOC are described i.e. the assumptions and extensive discussion on cross-cutting themes and some discussion on the transformation levers.

2) Para 53- Re the narrative around the ToC, valuation should be included as a key aspect and mentioned in bullet 1) as it is meant to underpin many of the decisions and interventions that will take place in the program. The first assumption should consequently focus on acceptance and buy-in by key stakeholders to change the status quo. In addition, for the 3rd assumption, the focus should more be on an assumption around bringing the private sector on board rather than the actual activity of the program to leverage their financing.

3) Please be aware not to confuse the systems that are the overall focus of the GEF-8 Programming Directions, with the 3 sectors of focus on this program. The sentences below in para 54 are not clear. Please clarify.

*Drivers of environmental degradation targeted through this project are impacting food, urban and natural systems. These sectors are contributing extensively to environmental degradation in SIDS.*

b) There is very little in the narrative on how this program is building on past investments and using the lessons or experiences. Please include.

c)

1) Para 62- Please clarify this sentence *Country projects will work on priority development challenges to address systems challenges from the 3 target economic sectors*. Should this be environmental challenges instead?

1.

2) Outcome 1.1- Para 74- It would be important to include any ideas/interventions around collaborations with local educational/scientific bodies to ensure the ability to capture/monitor data is sustained. Additionally, how will the statistical bodies at the local level be involved?

3) Outcome 1.3- Related to the comment under 4A, Para 78, does not highlight any barriers related to domestic public sector spending on nature positive activities. Please include as this would then be a suitable precursor to the activities mentioned under Para 82.

4) Please ensure all the activities listed under Component 2 are all NbS at landscape and seascape level. Some of the narrative and activities mentioned relate to the enabling environment and policy work and should not be listed there in order to maintain consistency and avoid confusion. For example, under Tourism and NBS (Para 92) the following action is listed, which should be listed under Component 1 and not Component 2  
*strengthening enabling policy and regulatory framework and creating incentives for improved nature-positive tourism practices for landscapes and seascapes (e.g., forest/mangrove/coastal conservation, effective waste treatment/reduced pollution/effluent, reduced pesticide use).*

5) Throughout Component 2 there are references to urban governance and urban planning. BGI IP is not focused on these activities, we are looking at planning (integrated land use, coastal zone and/or marine planning), management and governance related to landscapes and seascapes. Please revise.

6) Para 92- It is not clear why the GEF-8 Urban IP and narrative from this IP is referenced here, please exclude and focus the discussion on the BGI IP and how the activities are building on the baseline or the current context in SIDS. Some of this language is there already. In addition, there are activities listed under NbS interventions which are not a part of this IP nor are they related to NbS. These should be removed- eg. implement nature-integrated urban planning; engage opportunities to address chemicals through nature-based solutions through use of green procurement that influences inputs into the sector etc.

7) Outcome 2.2

-Can you say what specific barrier this Outcome is targeting?

-Para 96 has some repetition, please streamline the text as they are many bullets mentioning governance, multistakeholder approaches, institutional frameworks etc. which can be merged and condensed. It is not easy to understand.

-There does not appear to be any proposed activities to address a lack of capacity, knowledge, training to actually implement NbS on the ground. Please include.

-Please clarify the difference between Para 99 and the two sections of Para 100. This is a very long list of activities. Can they be merged and condensed so that it is clear what this outcome will be doing.

8) Outcome 2.3- Please ensure there is no overlap in the write up between this Outcome and Outcome 1.3. The latter seems to reference some of the same language.

9) Throughout Component 3 (in particular Outcomes 3.2-3.4) there is a mix of key words and phrases across all the outcomes which does not make the narrative clear. Please streamline the text so that Outcome 3.2 focuses on KM and Learning, Outcome 3.3 focuses on capacity and technical support and Outcome 3.4 focuses on collective action and scaling externally.

10) Outcome 3.2- Para 112- Please name other KM platforms at the global level and in the other sub-regions that the program intends to explore collaboration.

11) At the moment, based on the narrative it is not clear which Outcome is covering collective engagement and bargaining with the private sector. We assume this would be under Outcome 3.4, which we anticipate would focus on two things:

i) collective bargaining with private sector to leverage finance and investment in NbS across all SIDS ii) collective scaling to embed the approach of the BGI IP - i.e valuation, NbS and nature positive development, in existing and related sub-regional and global policy which govern SIDS actions.

- Outcome 3.4 is not meant to influence wholesale all SIDS platforms about any topic related to SIDS. Please revise/update the narrative where needed with this in mind.

12) Ensure all changes made to Component 3 are also reflected in the write up of the GCP child project.

d) It is not clear where or how this has been incorporated, please include. This can be done at component level as with regular GEF projects.

e) All the transformation levers should be described in greater detail. This will help to demonstrate how the program can drive transformative change. At the moment, Paragraphs 55-56 do not sufficiently address each of the levers in terms of how they apply to this IP. For example, there is continuous mention of multistakeholder dialogues- why is this important for this IP, what will that look like on the ground, who will be involved, will it be at different levels-local, national, sub-regional? The narrative mainly indicates that they will be applied.

f) Not fully. Please see comments above on the private sector.

g) Yes

h) Yes, no further information required at this stage.

i) Primarily through i) valuation of ecosystem services and natural capital accounting the program will enable countries to have the data needed to inform integrated planning and policy reform. This facilitates places greater importance on nature in sectoral policies and enables more informed decisions on trade-offs. Additional support will be provided on ii) governance in order to foster policy coherence e.g. strengthening multistakeholder and cross-ministerial mechanisms to facilitate integrated and harmonized decision making; iii) providing tools and guidance on embedding nature in decisions and actions on public and private domestic finance and investment (PES, harmonized subsidized, sustainability linked commercial lending criteria's etc.) and; iv) capacity building of stakeholders on valuation and nature based solutions among other areas. Three key economic sectors will be used as entry points to engage in this work upstream as well as downstream action on NbS focused on degraded ecosystems. The NbS approach also facilitates policy coherence given the dual benefits which

can be derived for nature as well as human well-being such as food security, water security and disaster risk reduction.

### Agency's Comments

12 May 2023, UNDP comments:

For further clarity, Paras 110 and 111 has been replaced to the following text:

110. The GEF-8 BGI IP Global Coordination Project is a UNDP-led, programmatic advisory services and analytics project, designed to lead the overall IP oversight, coordination, and monitoring and evaluation (M&E) together with project management functions. The GCP will create a platform for collaboration and sharing of experiences between government counterparts and partners to generate knowledge, link experts, and develop partnerships. This project aims to increase technical skills of national project teams and other implementing partners, increase knowledge and solutions sharing that will lead to transformative action and investment in SIDS, and document evidence-based nature-based solutions tested and scaled up in the IP's target sectors. These technical assistance and resources are intended to enhance the speed and scale at which national project solutions are implemented in ways that are relevant for replication and scaling up, out and deep. This will be achieved through training activities and capacity development, strengthening collective action through community of practice efforts and actions, engaging private sector as a partner and donor, and coordinating on key reports and targeted initiatives at the global level. Communications and outreach activities will support knowledge management and strategic global, regional, and national level support efforts. These interventions are expected to result in more active and effective partnerships, integrated policies and successful approaches being adopted beyond the national projects.

111. Key outputs of the GCP will include knowledge events, mobilization of partnerships and coalitions, and coordination amongst donors to mobilize resources to priority areas. Participation in global/regional high-profile events will highlight BGI issues and solutions and offer opportunities to disseminate innovative analytical work. Annual results and documentation of lessons learned will help to increase uptake of collective solutions and action at the national and multi-national levels. These GCP activities will support national project efforts and link the individual investments to help deliver global environmental benefits.

112. In short, the GCP will ensure that the IP's vision and objectives are realized while maximizing the sum of the outcomes expected across the country-level portfolio. The

GCP (or Global Platform) is described under Component 3 of the IP. It is defined by Outcome as follows:

- Outcome 3.1 provides national level and programme level management, coordination and M&E guidance and information.
- Outcome 3.2 will support national level knowledge management for knowledge exchange, learning and upscaling of successful solutions at the sub-regional, regional and global programme levels.
- Outcome 3.3 outlines the support of the Global Coordination Project to ensure effective and enhanced access by countries to different scales of knowledge, technical support and capacity development.
- Outcome 3.4 will focus on how the IP will inform and influence related regional and global initiatives that impact SIDS.

8 May 2023, UNDP comments:

General comments:

- Paragraphs 41-50 are intended to all outline the overall approaches to the IP. Sub-headings have been added and more clearly defined, and the order of the approaches has been changed to support 2 subheadings. - Paras 41-50.

- Please note that finance is addressed in Para 43, not Para 41. As suggested, Para 49 has been merged under Leveraging public and private sector engagement with Para 43, the first part discussing financing and the second section implementation related roles. - Para 43

- ?Valuation? or ?ESV? is included with NCA throughout the PFD, including when discussing integrating NCA into government framework and decision-making.

- Please note clarification in how behavior change will be targeted and applied in this IP. Behavior change will be fostered through multi-stakeholder dialogue, communities of practice and communications as well as through actual implementation of action that addresses the value of nature. It is anticipated that the demonstrated benefits of valuing nature, and those of not making nature-positive decisions, will further foster behavior change.

Resilience and adaptation benefits will be assessed when developing and implementing NCA and ESV processes (Para 82).

Please note the following text that illustrates how resilience will be applied in this IP Para 51: *This IP will also support communities in strengthening socio-ecological resilience of their land/seascapes by providing technical and financial assistance. The aim is to leverage and support traditional knowledge and science, including from local and national academic organizations and its student and youth, to generate global environmental benefits by being an incubator and accelerator of community innovations.*

1. The PFD has expanded on the resilience cross cutting theme as follows: Para 66 - *Strengthening the understanding around the value of nature and its integration into fiscal policies and planning will build **resilience** by reducing environmental degradation through nature-positive decision making and strengthened nature positive fiscal policies.* Para 67 - *Scaled NbS, supported by private sector engagement and innovative financial solutions, will reduce environmental degradation, strengthen environmental resilience to climate impacts, and build social and economic resilience through strengthen livelihoods and access to financing at the local, sub-national, national, and regional levels.*

Behavior change: Para 41, 66, 67, Footnote 52

Resilience: Para 34, 35 ,51, 52, 66, 67

- There is alignment between the text of the Program Overview Table and the text in the PFD sections, the ToC and the GCP.

GEF's Vision for the BGI IP has been changed as per the text provided. - Para 38

- Thank you for the reminder that all child projects are expected to implement all the Outcomes under the program, with the only Outcome where significant differences are expected is Outcome 2.1. This is noted and adjusted in relevant child projects, as described in each child project's review matrix \*resubmitted with this package.

- The Outcomes for the BGI IP has been changed as per the text provided with consistency throughout the PFD sections.

a)

1) Please see description of ToC in Para 53. - Para 57-60

2) Assumption 1 and 3 have been adapted to align with the recommendation provided in this review.

Assumption 1 had been adapted to emphasize the focus on changing the status quo, as follows: "There will be sufficient acceptance and buy-in to change the status quo, and to value nature and its integration into decision making." Assumption 3 has been changed to the following: "There is sufficient financial incentive and reduced risk (perceived and/or real) to bring the private sector on board to help narrow the finance gap." - Para 56

3) Noted and the change has been made to clarify the error in the paragraph (Para 54). The paragraph now reads as follows "Drivers of environmental degradation targeted through this project are impacting food, urban and natural systems. The food, urban and tourism sectors contribute extensively to environmental degradation ? and degradation of these



systems ? in SIDS. Key to the GEF8 programming is the need to help transform these key economic sectors towards sustainable, resilient, and nature-positive outcomes?. -

Para 53

b) Please see additional text and clarification in Para 34 and 35 - Para 34, 35

c)

1) Thank you. Yes, this should be environmental challenges and not development challenges. The change has been made. Para 69 (formerly Para 62)

2) The suggested inclusion of collaboration with local institutions and/or scientific bodies, etc., to ensure interventions are based on the best available local science, data and structures, has been included in Para 86 (formerly Para 74) Para 86

3) Please note the addition of the following text as the 2nd to last sentence of Para 80. ?There are also limited public policies that 1) include or prioritize the development of public finance mechanisms that will generate new public financial resources and enable increased domestic spending on nature positive activities, 2) increase the efficiency of the use of existing financial resources, and 3) support the release of existing budgets for environmental conservation.? - Para 80

4) The referenced intervention (Para 92) has been moved to Component 1, Outcome 1.2. As indicated, activities under Component 2 that are not NbS at landscape and seascape scale have also been moved to the relevant Component outcome. - Para 85

5) All reference to Urban governance and planning have been removed - Component 2

6)All Urban references that do not build on NbS inventions have been removed from Para 92 - Component 2

7) Outcome 2.2 is targeting Barrier 4 that speaks to insufficient capacity for NbS at its scaling necessary for systems change. This barrier also speaks to inadequate human and institutional capacities and national knowledge management systems that are lacking or absent for support of more sustainable environmental management in SIDS. Please see Para 29 for full details of Barrier 4. - Para 29

- The text has been streamlined as suggested. Text is revised throughout the bullets. - Para 94 (changed from 96)

- Please note additional highlighted bullets in Para 104 that address training, capacity and knowledge to implement NbS on the ground. - Para 104

- Para 99 (now 107) describes the financial network of private investors that will be developed through the GCP. Para 108 is an adjusted list of interventions that will be carried out through Outcome 2.3. - Para 98 Para 99

8) Outcome 1.3 and 2.3 have been reviewed and the distinction between private sector financing (Outcome 2.3) and Outcome 1.3 have been removed.

9) The text has been adjusted and streamlined so that the focus of each Outcome is more clearly evident. - Outcomes 3.2, 3.2, 3.4

10) Additional regional KM platforms have been included -Para 120

11) Paragraphs and/or text have been moved to differentiate more clearly between the Outcomes, including ensuring that the focus of Outcome 3.4 is clear (as indicated in the GEF Sec comment) and differentiated from the other outcomes. For example, Para 115 was moved from Outcome 3.3, Para 116 has been consolidated to articulate the intended

focus, the last 2 sentences in Para 113 have been moved from Outcome 3.4 to Outcome 3.3 and other changes. - Para 115, 116

- Text has been included in Para 117 to indicate that the focus of engaging with SIDS platforms will be as it relates to the BGI programming and objectives - Para 116

12) Related changes have been included in the GCP

d) Please see addition of section on Incremental Reasoning, - Para 137

e) The discussion on Transformation Levers has been adjusted to incorporate additional detail as suggested. Note Paras 54-56 - Para 53-55

f) Discussion on the role of the private sector has been added in Para 33, additional information on the role of the private sector as it relates to Barrier 2, 5 and 6, through the programme's approach: Leveraging public and private sector investment (Para 46), the role of the private sector in scaling (Para 50) and others - Para 33, 42, 48, 51 Barriers 2, 5, 6

g)

h)

i) A section on Policy Coherence was added to the PFD, as outlined in the text provided in the GEF Sec comment. - Para 180

## **5.2 Program coherence and consistency**

**a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?**

**b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

**c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?**

**d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?**

**e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

- a) Please address this in the resubmission.
- b) On transformative change, this has not been adequately or clearly described. See responses to Questions 5.1 a and 5.1 e above. Yes the narrative has responded to scaling up opportunities. We request that a reference is included for Figure 4 and that the terms Scale up, Scale out and Scale Deep are used consistently throughout the document if this diagram is going to be used as a framework for scaling. At the moment scale up and scale out are being used interchangeably.
- c) Yes. It would be helpful to include in the body of the PFD a list of all the country child projects, their sub-regions and the sectors of focus.
- d) The descriptions are adequate for the PFD stage. For the PPG stage:
  - please ensure all child projects have a 3rd component which is linked to the GCP
  - All child projects are required to engage in some form of work on valuation or natural capital accounting (currently Mauritius and the Maldives do not include this aspect in their concepts)
  - Ensure consistency in the name and focus of the program components across all child projects
- e) Please see comments on financing below.

### Agency's Comments

8 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

- a) The IP will build resilience through reducing the drivers of environmental degradation that will lead to strengthened ecosystems and services and reduced degradation through implementing NbS at scale and a strengthened enabling environment for nature positive decisions. This will make ecosystems more resilient to a wide range of shocks. Adaptation benefits include increasing incomes and providing alternative livelihoods that could, if successful, improve the socioeconomic state of certain vulnerable populations, which would make them resilient to a wide range of shocks or stresses. - Para 36.
- b) A reference has been included for Figure 3, and additional information on scaling in the BGI IP has been added in Para 47-50. The document has been reviewed to ensure that the use of scaling up and scaling out has been correctly used. - Figure 34. Para 47-50
- c) As suggested, a table of all country child projects, their sub-regions and the sectors of focus has been added. Please see Pg 17 (Para 40) - Para 35
- d)

- Changes in Child Projects were made and are included in the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

- Changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated document, highlighted in yellow.

- Changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated document, highlighted in yellow.

### **5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs**

**a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?**

**b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).**

#### Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

a) Not sufficiently. The description of the governance structure would benefit from additional details.

1) Please include generally the role of the Global Coordination Project and the added value of the GCP for this specific program.

2) Please include the additional key regional or global partners (outside of UNDP) that will be leveraged for governance/coordination and/or execution support of the program to ensure the external reach of the program.

3) The governance structure (Organigram and text) as currently laid out provides details on how the program will support ?internally?, however there is limited narrative on the

external facing role of the governance and coordination component. It does not provide sufficient details on how the program will focus externally.

4) Additionally, related to bullet 3) the Organigram includes an arrow on the left leading to Programmatic Scaling Up and Out- Regional and Global. There is however no discussion around this or how it will be carried out, please include.

5) At this stage we expect some details on the expected role of the PSC and please at least include the names of the Implementing Agencies of the child projects.

6) Please provide further details on how the PAG could be organized, the role of the PAG and potential members/types of members, if none can be named at this stage.

7) Para 124 indicates that the GCU will further optimize strategic engagement with key multi-stakeholder bodies and platforms for policy coherence and change at global, regional, and national levels. How will this be done?

8) Please ensure any relevant changes here are also reflected in the GCP child project.

b)

1) Yes, however please note the Annexes K & M which are very useful will not be circulated to the Council. Please include the necessary information in the portal submission.

2) Please also include financing partners/initiatives that are looking at terrestrial ecosystems. There is a heavy emphasis currently on marine and oceans and there needs to be more of a balance.

### Agency's Comments

8 May 2023, UNDP comments:

1) This information has been integrated into Para 110

2) Contents of Annex M Potential Partnerships, Global Collaborations & Finance Mechanism, have been included in the PFD, including a list of global partners that will be leverage for governance/coordination and/or execution support of the IP to ensure external reach. - Para 151-157

3) The governance structure, organigram (now Figure 5) and text, has been updated to include the external focus of the IP. Please see the additional Figure 6 that further illustrates this external focus, including Potential Partnerships, Global Collaborations &

Finance Mechanisms. These will be further confirmed during the PPG process.

- Figure 5, 6

4) See above related response. Please see Figure 6 that illustrates the Programmatic Scaling Up and Out, as well as a new section added ?Potential Partnerships, Global Collaborations & Finance Mechanism,? (beginning Para 151) that integrates the former Annex M into the PFD text. - Figure 5, 6

5) Additional description of the role of the PSC is defined, including the names of the IAs of the child projects. - Para 135

6) Additional description of the role of the PAG is defined. - Para 136 137

7) Please see text that further clarifies this engagement in Outcome 3.4 in Para 140. This role in the sub-regional, regional and global fora is also discussed elsewhere in the PFD, including in Para 32, 131.

8) Relevant changes are also reflected in the GCP Child Project

b)

1) Thank you for that information. Based on this, we have incorporated a significant portion of both annexes into the PFD text. While we realize it is bulky, we agree that this is useful information to be included in the PFD for Council review. Annex M is now section (Para 151-154) in the PFD: Potential Partnerships, Global Collaborations & Finance Mechanism,?. Relevant sections of Annex K have been integrated into Para 124, though the Annex still remains.

2) Please see list of possible finance partners that includes terrestrial ecosystems. See GCP: Potential Partnerships, Global Collaborations & Finance Mechanism, para 151-154.

#### **5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting**

**a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?**

**b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?**

**c) Are the program?s targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) / adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the**

**GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

**d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptative management?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/18/2023:

Cleared.

5/17/2023:

-Indicator 6, please include the start year and duration of accounting.

5/15/2023:

Bullet 4 not fully addressed. Please see comments below.

**Palau:**

o Excel sheet. With the current excel sheet ?image? is very difficult to follow up the assumptions used for the estimation of GHG. Kindly provide the excel sheet so we can easily track the calculations.

o Uncertainty of restoration practices. The GHG estimations don?t seem to be taking into account the uncertainty of the restoration practices. This seems to be in line with the fact the total number of ha to be restored does not match the resources available, i.e. overall, the total number of ha under improved management of terrestrial PA (2,000 ha), terrestrial landscapes under improved practices (37,036 ha) and improved/created management of marine PA (47,691 ha) seem too high for a GEF budget of US\$8 million and a co-financing of US\$ 11.7 million. Please ask the Agency to clarify whether the uncertainty of the restoration practices have been considered. We recommend to at least change the level of degradation of the landscapes under improved practices to ?Moderate? in the scenario without the project (much of the result comes most likely from this activity, it could be around 10 M CO<sub>2</sub>e, so this change could significantly decrease the overall result).

? **PNG:** Kindly share the Ex-Act excel sheet so we can easily follow-up the calculations. Overall, it seems the child project agency could take a more conservative approach when using the Ex-Act Tool. In this case in particular, the project is assuming

that the forest degradation level without the project will be 'large' (see below in red). Given the uncertainties, we suggest the agency to be on the conservative side and assume that without the project the forest degradation level will remain 'moderate' for both the mangrove forest and the tropical rainforest. By considering this approach, the total amount of GHG estimation will be reduced by half, i.e. approx. 20,000,000 tCO<sub>2</sub> eq. While this is still a large number, it still seems feasible given the large co-financing of US\$97 million.

5/10/2023:

b) Bullets 4, 5, 6 not fully addressed. Please see follow up comments below

4) CI 6:

Papua New Guinea. The country, which did not report on CI6 in the first version of the PDF, has now provided a value of 43,935,572 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. This is above the CI6 target for the entire Blue&Green Island Program. Also, due to this new (extremely high) value, the Program contribution to CI6 has doubled. As per the concept note, the child project has used the Ex-Act Tool for a duration of 20 years, similar to other child projects. However, it seems to be the extremely high values come from the ha of tropic forest expected to be restored (i.e. 127,569 ha). As this CI6 value is an outlier please revisit these numbers.

? Palau. Same as for Papua New Guinea, Palau did not report on CI6 in the first version of the PFD but has updated these numbers to 14,744,447 tCO<sub>2</sub>e in the new version. This number seems to be high and accounts for approximately 1/3 of the entire CI6 target for this Program. However, the child concept note doesn't provide any information on how CI6 has been estimated. Please provide a justification for how these numbers were calculated.

5) Please include the names of the PAs in the PFD Core Indicator Table

6) Please include the names of the OECMs in the PFD Core Indicator Table

4/21/2023:

a) GEBs have been defined. Adaptation benefits have not been defined. Please include.

b)



1) There is no explanation on the methodology used to calculate the GEBs. Please include as required below the Core Indicator table.

2) We also do not encourage a reduction in targets from the EOI stage in particular for those child projects where the funding allocation requested was approved. Please review all targets for the child projects and ensure they are at the EOI amount or higher and are assigned to the correct core indicator. Please also check that there are no missed opportunities to include indicator targets. For example, Maldives- targets appear to be less than the EOI stage for a \$100M project. At EOI the targets were as detailed below:

*CI 2. Marine protected areas created or under improved management (million ha) Before Project: 79 Protected Areas. After Project: 131 PAs.; Before Project: 5 PAs have management plans. After Project: 20*

*CI 5. Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (million ha) Before Project: 14% of corals protected. After Project: 30%.*

3) For the chemicals related targets, we note that EOIs that had previously indicated CW benefits are no longer doing so, please clarify?

-We also note that T& T in particular has removed their CW related targets. Please ensure these are reinserted. It is very feasible without CW resources as the incentive can be considered additional resources. Specially the Caroni and Nariva Swamps are designated as Environmentally Sensitive Areas and Contain Environmentally Species under the Environmental Management Act. The proposal includes references to reductions of hazardous pesticides including HHPs so they should at this stage include targets at least under CI9. They should not limit the interventions in pesticides to bio-pesticides but should broaden to non-harmful alternatives and practices as introduction of biopesticides would need approvals from the pesticide registrar. It is not clear if this approval is envisioned.

4) For CI 6 - At PDF level the total amount of GHG avoided is 40,658,703 tCO<sub>2</sub> all under sub-indicator 6.1. However, when looking into the national child projects separately, the total amount is only 26,338,262 tCO<sub>2</sub>. Please clarify this significant discrepancy?

-We also note no indirect emissions are included. Please explain why this is the case and please include where possible. This is normally expected with all projects.

-Out of the 15 country child projects, only 6 projects are reporting against CI6. Please ensure that all projects that are engaged in activities that can contribute to avoided emissions, also include estimated targets for CI 6.

-Please include the start year and duration of accounting

-Please also ensure there is a common approach to accounting for the CI 6 targets. We note that some projects are claiming emissions avoided on marine/coastal interventions others are not. It would be good if this was done across the board.

5) Indicators 1.2 and 2.2 Please consider listing the Name of the PAs, WDPA ID, IUCN Category of the PAs covered, as available.

6) Indicators 4.5 and 5.3 Please note that the OECM indicator does not feed into the main Core Indicator 4 or 5, as it is of contextual nature. As a result, kindly indicate in 4.5 the OECMs covered in sub-indicators 4.1 4.2 4.3 or 4.4; and in 5.3 those covered in 5. The data entered in 4.5 and 5.3 should include WDPA ID and name of the OECM, as available.

7) Three child projects do not appear to have any targets at all- Comoros, Seychelles, Palau. Please ensure these are included aggregated at PFD level.

c) Not fully.

1) Outcome 1.3 only has one indicator which looks at public finance. This outcome will also work to eliminate barriers at the upstream level (in the enabling environment) related to availability of domestic private finance. There is no indicator referring to this aspect. Please include.

2) There is only one indicator for Outcome 2.2, which does not appear to be sufficient. How will the program measure success for improvements in institutional capacity to implement Nbs

-In addition, the indicator as written is not clear and only responds to a one aspect of what this outcome aims to focus on.

3) Outcome 3.3 Indicators

*-Improved # activities in countries supported by the Global Technical Facility*

What activities are referred to here? What is this indicator measuring?

*- # of NBS identified and shared by the NBS Accelerator*

Based on the narrative, the NbS Accelerator is meant to do the following (text below), however it is not clear how this indicator is measuring all of these interventions. Please revise or include additional indicators.

*convene relevant actors on providing innovation-driven technical assistance to local project developers (such as MSMEs) to structure bankable NBS projects across the target sectors of the IP, as well as supporting the transformation of policy and regulatory enabling environments across SIDS. The latter will be targeted in particular through capacity building within countries to undertake nature-positive reforms across their governance structures conducive to increased investment flows into NBS projects on the ground?.*

d) Socio-economic benefits are not adequately incorporated. This is particularly relevant given the societal benefits which can be derived from NbS. Please include.

### Agency's Comments

#### 18 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

The start year and duration of accounting has been included for CI6. This will be confirmed during PPG phase.

#### 17 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

Palau: The CI 6 has been removed from the Palau Concept Note due to the urgency for resubmission. The CI6 will be revisited during the PPG phase and finalized then.

PNG: The PNG CI6 has been revised as per the comments provided by the GEF Sec. Please see the revised documentation submitted along with the PNG Concept Note.

#### 12 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

B)

4) CI 6

Papua New Guinea:

Under CI 6.1 Greenhouse gas emission mitigated (direct+indirect), Papua New Guinea did report 40 metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>-e in the first submission (see document ?Child Projects Combined? in GEF Portal Roadmap, uploaded on 12 April, Page 121).

In the resubmission, the country reported 43,935,572 and provided the following in the concept note:

Annex III: FAO-EXACT tool results page

**5.1 FOREST DEGRADATION & MANAGEMENT** If country specific data are available, please go to Tier 2 **Tier 2**

Type of forest vegetation that will be managed	Forest degradation level			Fire occurrence		Fire periodicity		Fire impact (% burnt)		Forested area (ha)			Total emissions (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)		Balance
	Start	Without	With	Without (y/r)	With (y/r)	Without Year	With Year	Without	With	Start	Without	With	Without	With	
Mangrove Forest	Moderate	Large	Low	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	20,024	20,024	20,024	2,903,025	-2,903,025	-4,08,058 ▼
Tropical rainforest	Moderate	Large	Low	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	127,589	127,589	127,589	19,904,701	-19,904,701	-38,885,522 ▼
Please select	Please select	Please select	Please select	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please select	Please select	Please select	Please select	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please select	Please select	Please select	Please select	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please select	Please select	Please select	Please select	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Please select	Please select	Please select	Please select	NO	NO	1	1	1.0%	1.0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total forest degradation and management (tCO<sub>2</sub>e)</b>													<b>25,807,736</b>	<b>-25,807,736</b>	<b>-43,885,572 ▼</b>

\*The selection of "0" correspond to a default (static) dynamics of change. Other selection options include "1" for immediate change and "E" for exponential... please refer to the guidelines for further explanation of these assumptions.

Palau:

Indeed, Palau had not reported targets under CI6 in the first submission. In the resubmission, they reported 14,744,447 tCO<sub>2</sub>e. The country did provide information on estimates (picture below), but it was not included in the Child Project Concept Note. In this resubmission, it has been inserted as an Annex to Palau's Concept Note.

GHG Estimate based on EX-ACT Carbon Tool		
Assumptions		Remark
Country	Palau	
Climate	Tropical	
Moisture regime	Moist	
Timeframe	20 years (4 years Project + 16 years Capitalization)	
Soil (Based on reference map in EX-ACT)	High activity clay soil	
Project Intervention 1	Improved Management of terrestrial Protected Areas	
- Total area (ha)	2000.6	Included in GHG estimation
Project Intervention 2	Terrestrial Landscapes under improved practices	
- Total Area (ha)	37036	Included in GHG estimation
- Degradation Level (Baseline)	Moderate (40% of biomass lost)	
- Degradation Level (Without Project)	Large (60% of biomass lost)	
- Degradation Level (With Project)	Low (20% of biomass lost)	
Project Intervention 3	Improved/Created Management of marine Protected Areas	
- Total area (ha)	47692	
-10% of the total area is mangrove and seagrass	4769.2	10% of the total area is assumed to be mangrove and seagrass and thus is included in GHG estimation
<b>GHG Estimate/ Carbon Balance</b>		
Total GHG (tCO <sub>2</sub> e)	14,744,447	For 20 years
Total GHG (tCO <sub>2</sub> e/ha)	337	per ha
Total GHG (tCO <sub>2</sub> e/ha/yr)	17	per ha per year

5) All available information on PAs has been included in the PFD Core Indicator Table. Many PA are to be created and lack WDPAs. We have provided all the information available.

6) All available information of the OECMs has been included in the PFD Core Indicator Table. Many OECMs are to be created and lack names and/or WDPAs. We have provided all the information available.

8 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

a) NbS interventions include - Resilience and adaptation benefits will be included as part of assessments. Para 82. Adaptation benefits are included in Para 36.

b)

1) The methodology used to calculate the GEBs has been expanded upon. - Para 164

2) This comment was shared with child project agencies, who were requested to ensure that targets remain at the EOI amount or higher. Please see the **Consolidated Child Projects Response Matrices** document for the related information from all Child Projects.

3) Please see response below from Trinidad and Tobago. Please note that this response can be found in the **Consolidated Child Projects Response Matrices** document uploaded into the Portal as part of the PFD package. Both Seychelles (2700 Metric Tons) and Trinidad and Tobago (1.2 Metric Tons) have included CI 9 in their concept note. These contributions have been included in this re-submission (not in April 12 PFD submission to GEF).

- Please see response from Trinidad and Tobago. Please note that this response can be found in the **Consolidated Child Projects Response Matrices** document uploaded into the Portal as part of the PFD package.

### **Trinidad and Tobago**

*While we fully recognize that the IP incentive represents additional resources, the TT EOI explicitly included a request for CW resources to address HHPs (i.e. the original proposal was for \$6m while the approved proposal is for \$4m). Nonetheless, while the project will reinsert the targets proposed during the EOI, these targets will be thoroughly evaluated during preparation.*

*Specifically, during project design we will evaluate NbS and other practices that are expected to result in the reduction of chemical pollution. Please note that the proposed concept note does not limit to biopesticides as it states that it aims to shift from unsustainable to sustainable production practices reducing reliance upon HHPs/POPs agrochemicals by applying biopesticide and biocontrol methods, diversification of farm production and agroecological production practices?. The project also will be looking for potential inclusion of technologies such as hydroponics or vertical gardens.*

*Finally, please note that approval of biopesticides registration is not envisioned under this project. The project will collaborate with the GEF funded ISLANDS (tools for registration) and the Regional POPs project (model legislation and registration improvement). These two projects are working on the biopesticide area, including registration.*

4) All child projects were requested to review their CI targets. Maldives is the only Child Project not contributing to CI 6. New PFD levels indicate that the total amount of GHG avoided is 89,889,907tCO2 under sub-indicator 6.1, and 1,190,391 tCO2 under indicator 6.2 (only from Belize). The child projects have been reviewed, and the following contributions are made:

Indicator 6.1 (direct)

<b>Comoros</b>	586,669
<b>FSM</b>	1,337,714.00
<b>PNG</b>	43,935,572
<b>Timor Leste</b>	6,747,992
<b>Cuba</b>	1,593,294
<b>St Lucia</b>	233,982
<b>Samoa</b>	1,951,133
<b>Vanuatu</b>	8,914,813
<b>Mauritius</b>	4,020,352
<b>Cabo Verde</b>	3,339,604
<b>Palau</b>	14,744,447
<b>Seychelles</b>	15,000
<b>Trinidad and Tobago</b>	2,469,335.0
<b><u>TOTAL</u></b>	<b><u>89,889,907</u></b>

Indicator 6.2:

**Belize direct:** 297,598

**Belize indirect:** 892,793

**TOTAL:** 1,190,391

- Indirect emissions are those that result from an organization's activities but are actually emitted from sources owned by other entities. Where targets have not been included at this stage in child projects, this will be addressed at PPG when there will be time for accurate and more detailed engagement with project partner on this issue.

3 Countries mentioned in the Concept Note Review Sheet that they have considered indirect emissions (Belize, Cuba, Vanuatu), but **only Belize actually disaggregated the direct and indirect emissions.**

**Belize** indeed disaggregated the amounts in the CI excel sheet.

**Vanuatu did not disaggregate** in the CI excel sheet, they only explained in the methodological note that 30% is indirect.

**Cuba also did not disaggregate** it in the CI excel sheet, but responded "Indirect emissions are included under CI 6."

- Confirm that we are using the FAO Exact Tool. As per breakdown above, Maldives is the only country out of the current 15 that is not reporting against CI 6.

- Changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

- Changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

5) Changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

6) Changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

7) All Child Projects had submitted their Core Indicators with respective targets and were duly reflected into GEF Portal. However, the Consolidated Child project in PDF document erroneously did not include these 3 CI tables ? please note this was amended for this resubmission. Also, under this resubmission, some countries have revised the CIs as per GEF comments. All changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated document, highlighted in yellow.

c)

1) As suggested, an indicator has been added related to the availability of domestic private finance, as follows: # of laws and regulations that integrate nature into financial and lending policies, submitted to government for formal approval (i.e., gazette).?? - Results Indicators Pg 55

2) Additional indicator included that relates to institutional capacity to implement NbS at the seascape and landscape levels ? based on UNDP Capacity Scorecard? Results Indicators - Pg 55

3) Outcome 3.3 indicators have been added to more accurately measure the interventions - Results Indicators Pg 55

d) Socio-economic benefits have been incorporated that are derived from NbS. - Please see Para 36.

### 5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?
  
- c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

### Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

- a) Yes
  
- b) Yes
  
- c) Yes

### Agency's Comments

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

### 6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

**\*For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

### Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

Cleared

4/21/2023:

-Yes aligned with IP Objectives.

-There is an incorrect reference to SDG 15- which is about Life on Land not climate change.

### Agency's Comments

8 May 2023, UNDP Comments:



- The correct inclusion of SDG 15 ? Life on Land, has been added, including its goal to ?Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and halt biodiversity loss? - Para 172

**b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

Yes

Agency's Comments

**7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards**

**Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)**

## Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

Yes

## Agency's Comments

### **8 Other Requirements**

#### **Knowledge Management**

#### **8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?**

## Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

No further information required at this stage. However please see comments below for consideration.

Given that the Program targets the tourism sector among others, it may be helpful if the agency would consider alignment with the sustainable tourism criteria of the Global Sustainable Tourism Council (GSTC) which is a global body that sets global standards for the sustainable travel and tourism industry and for tourism destinations and provides international accreditation for sustainable tourism certification bodies in countries. Several GEF agencies (IUCN, UNEP, WWF-US, etc.) and many hotel chains around the world, including in SIDS, are active members. GSTC criteria are the result of a worldwide effort to develop a common language about sustainability in tourism and they consider both environmental and social aspects, similar to the GEF safeguards. The criteria are two-fold: 1. Destination Criteria for policymakers and destination managers, and 2. Industry Criteria for hotels and tour operators. See link to GSTC: <https://www.gstcouncil.org/about/>

## Agency's Comments

8 May 2023, UNDP comments:

- The IP has included text that indicates alignment with the sustainable tourism criteria of the GSTC. - Para 100

### **9 Annexes**

#### **Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)**

**9.1 GEF Financing Table:**

**a) 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):**

**Country STAR allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/17/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

Please see comments below on child project STAR allocations.

Agency's Comments

**Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**IP Set Aside**

Secretariat's Comments See comments below.

Agency's Comments

**IP Contribution**

Secretariat's Comments See comments below.

Agency's Comments

**For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)**

**b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program?**

**The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?**

**c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?**

**d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?**

**e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?**

**f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?**

**g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

## Secretariat's Comments

5/10/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

Response related to questions a), b), c), d)

- Papua New Guinea- Please ensure the child country allocation matches the approved envelope at the EOI stage. The total approved allocation is \$13,950,000 and the incentive is \$4,650,000. Please revise the numbers in the portal table and update the LOE.

-The source of funds for the BD Star Allocation do not match the LOE for Mauritius, Vanuatu and Belize. Please update the LOEs so that the figures align.

e) Yes

f) N/A

g)

## Agency's Comments

8 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

- Country allocation for Papua New Guinea has been adjusted as advised.

- **Mauritius**: It seems there is no need to update the LOE:

Total allocation in LOE: \$9,386,667 ? total allocation requested: \$9,381,066.00

BD Star Allocation in LOE: 5,040,000 - BD Star Allocation requested: 5,035,800

?**Vanuatu**: BD and LD allocations were corrected in GEF Portal as per signed LOE.

?**Belize**: LOE was corrected.

**9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments See comments on financing.

Agency's Comments

**9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation**

**Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/17/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

Child project ID11256- Timor Leste: please change the GEF financing table and PPG table so that country STAR allocation by BD, CC, and LD match with Sources of funds table (though this is only one (1) dollar, the mistake needs to be corrected).

Agency's Comments

8 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

- GEF PM has cleared the budget for Timor Leste as it is. Nevertheless, it was adjusted to adequately reflect the approved STAR allocations.

**9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements**

**For non-IP Programs**

**Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**9.5 Indicative Co-financing**

**Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?**

## Secretariat's Comments

5/14/2023:

Cleared.

5/10/2023:

Please ensure the following corrections are made in the PFD portal submission.

-All In kind co-financing should be classified as Recurrent Expenditure

-There are some Grant co-financing entries without a classification. Please ensure they are classified as Investment Mobilized.

-Great Barrier Reef Foundation / Resilient Reef Initiative is not a GEF Agency, please revise.

-Please change all GEF Implementing Agencies to 'GEF Agency' as a source of financing. They are some entries that are still referenced as Donor Agency.

4/21/2023:

- In-kind is normally classified as ?recurrent expenditure?. Please revise the in kind co-financing which are classified as ?investment mobilized?, and change them to ?recurrent expenditures?.

-- Grant is normally classified as ?investment mobilized?. Please revise the grant co-financing which are classified as recurrent expenditures?, and change them to ?investment mobilized?. Please also include investment mobilized for all grant co-financing that is not currently classified.

-- Public investment is normally classified as ?investment mobilized?. Please revise the public investment which is classified as ?recurrent expenditures?, and change them to ?investment mobilized?.

-- World Bank and UNEP are implementing agencies for this project. Please change ?Donor Agency? to ?GEF Agency?.

## Agency's Comments

12 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

All In-kind co-financing has been reclassified as Recurrent Expenditure

All Grant co-financing has been classified as Investment Mobilized

Great Barrier Reef Foundation / Resilient Reef Initiative has been revised as a Civil Society Organization

All GEF implementing Agencies have been listed as GEF Agency.

8 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

- Noted. Child projects have been requested to classify co-financing per the GEF categories. All changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

- Noted. Child projects have been requested to classify co-financing per the GEF categories. All changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

- Noted. Child projects have been requested to classify co-financing per the GEF categories. All changes in Child Projects were made into the Consolidated Child Project document, highlighted in yellow.

- Noted.

#### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

Yes



## Agency's Comments

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

## Secretariat's Comments

Cleared

4/21/2023:

Yes, not compiled as a single document.

## Agency's Comments

8 May 2023, UNDP comments:

This had been compiled as a single Consolidate Child Project document

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

## Secretariat's Comments

5/18/2023:

Cleared.

5/17/2023:

LOEs review:

- a. LOEs from Seychelles and Vanuatu have different child project titles from Portal. Please correct Portal to match with LOE.
- b. LOEs from Cabo Verde, Belize, Palau, Micronesia, Comoros have different executing entities from Portal. Please correct Portal to match with LOE.

5/10/2023:

Cleared.

4/21/2023:

No, please see comments above on Vanuatu, Belize and Mauritius.

## Agency's Comments

### 18 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

- a. The titles have been changed in the PFD (Annex N) and in the Portal to match with the LOE.
- b. The executing entities for Cabo Verde, Belize, Palau, Micronesia, Comoros have been changed in the PFD and Portal to match with the LOE.

### 8 May 2023, UNDP Comments:

?**Mauritius**: It seems there is no need to update the LOE:

Total allocation in LOE: \$9,386,667 ? total allocation requested: \$9,381,066.00

BD Star Allocation in LOE: 5,040,000 - BD Star Allocation requested: 5,035,800

?**Vanuatu**: BD and LD allocations were corrected in GEF Portal as per signed LOE.

?**Belize**: LOE is currently under correction.

### Annex C: Program Locations

**9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?**

## Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023:

Yes

## Agency's Comments

### Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes\* (\*only for non IP programs)

**9.9 a) Does the program 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.**

**b) Does the program provide a detailed reflow table to assess the program capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

**Additional Annexes**

**10 GEFSEC Decision**

**10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the program recommended for clearance?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/18/2023:

The PFD is technically cleared and recommended for approval.

5/17/2023:

Please address follow up comments prior to final clearance.

5/17/2023:

The PFD is technically cleared and recommended for approval.

5/15/2023:

Please address follow up comments on Core Indicator 6.

5/10/2023:

PFD is not yet cleared. Please address the comments above.

22/4/2023:

The PFD is not yet technically cleared. Please address the comments above.

Agency's Comments

**10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.**

Secretariat's Comments

Please see additional comments to be addressed during PPG stage. These are not required at PFD stage.

Core Indicators:

CI 6-

-Accounting period. Most of the child projects with a focus on land degradation and agriculture are now reporting on a 20-year period (5 years of implementation and 15 years of capitalization), but a minority are still using a 15-year (i.e. Comoros) or 10-year period. The accounting period will need to be homogenized across sectors.

-Direct versus Indirect emissions. Only 3 projects are expected to claim indirect emission reductions, of which just one project has actually reported indirect reductions at PFD stage. At child project level, please ensure consistency across countries in the way direct and indirect emission reductions are reported.

- Clarify and finalize the CI 6 target for Palau.

•

#### Agency's Comments

##### 10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/22/2023</b>	<b>5/8/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/10/2023</b>	<b>5/12/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/15/2023</b>	<b>5/17/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/17/2023</b>	<b>5/18/2023</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/18/2023</b>	