

Prioritising Biodiversity Conservation and Nature-based Solutions as Pillars of Seychelles' Blue Economy

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10535

Countries

Seychelles

Project Name

Prioritising Biodiversity Conservation and Nature-based Solutions as Pillars of Seychelles' Blue Economy

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/23/2020

Review completed by PM

4/14/2020

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes. However, can you please provide a bit of explanation of what a coral recovery program involves in the text?

During PPG, please make sure to focus on the implementation of plans not just doing scoping exercises. Also, please consult the STAP guidance on certification programs and look into best practices. Certification programs sometimes do little to substantially change the worst and most impactful bad impacts, so it will be important to assess that.

4/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

07April2020

Yes. However, can you please provide a bit of explanation of what a coral recovery program involves in the text?

Coral recovery, in the context of Component 3, Output 3.1.1 where it relates to the 'recovery of degraded coral reef ecosystems in Iles Cocos Marine National Park', refers to a set of actions designed to strengthen the resilience of reefs impacted by repeating bleaching and damage in recent years through a combined set of actions

including better protection, targeted nature-based restoration (in line with best available science and ICRI Coral Restoration Guidelines) and reduction of local stressors (e.g. reducing tourist impacts). The precise approach will be defined during PPG. The text has been clarified Under Output 3.1.1 on p17.

During PPG, please make sure to focus on the implementation of plans not just doing scoping exercises. Also, please consult the STAP guidance on certification programs and look into best practices. Certification programs sometimes do little to substantially change the worst and most impactful bad impacts, so it will be important to assess that.

Thank you, this is understood and will be addressed at PPG.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF comments received 4/16/2020 with Agency response 4/20/2020

- Cofinancing: Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures".

Agency response:

The definition/approach used is consistent with current GEF guidelines on co-financing:

Investment mobilized is co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures

Recurrent expenditures is used where co-financing consists of contributions in the form of goods or services other than money, including but not limited to salaries and wages, office space and utilities

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

No, we are confirming how to enter expanded national parks. Is the project going to get 433 different fisheries under certification? Or did you mean to put 433 hectares of fisheries?

4/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

07April2020

Thank you. We meant to put 433 ha of fisheries. This has been corrected.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

4/7/2020

No, sorry we didn't address this the first time. Please untag the following that do not appear to be relevant - Infrastructure, Wildlife for Sustainable Development, Terrestrial PAs, Tropical Rainforests, LD, SLM, and any others that don't fit.

4/9/2020

Yes, thank you.

Agency Response

9April2020

Amended as requested.

Part II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

No, please provide information on if a site is a KBA. Please note that new and expanded PAs should be KBAs (Ile Cocos is a KBA so we just need that information highlighted).

For the areas that are the focus of component 3, can you please provide more information about the specific biodiversity values of those parks (especially those with restoration activities)? Please note that the biodiversity strategy requires a high standard to be met for funding restoration.

4/7/2020

Yes. Thank you for the additions and clarifications.

Agency Response

07April2020

No, please provide information on if a site is a KBA. Please note that new and expanded PAs should be KBAs (Ile Cocos is a KBA so we just need that information highlighted).

Thank you. Please note that there are no marine KBAs in Seychelles. A 2013 KBA Study only looked at terrestrial and only at Inner Islands. As IUCN only published a formal guideline to declare "KBAs" in 2019, this new approach has not yet been used at all in Seychelles, so no 'formal' KBAs are yet recognized. The Ministry aimed to address that gap with CEPF funding but did not get it. This is an area that the project could potentially provide support.

For the areas that are the focus of component 3, can you please provide more information about the specific biodiversity values of those parks (especially those with restoration activities)? Please note that the biodiversity strategy requires a high standard to be met for funding restoration.

Thank you. This is understood. We have revised Output 3.1.1 to read as follows to clarify planned activities and removed the focus on 'restoration':

- Rehabilitation of eroded coastal ecosystems and protection of Hawksbill turtle nesting sites and seagrass beds in Ste Anne Marine National Park (SNPA): with Club Med Hotel and Ste Anne communities

- Recovery of degraded coral reef ecosystems in Iles Cocos Marine National Park (SNPA): with Six Senses Hotel on Felicite

- Effective management of biodiverse and highly endangered seagrass bed in Baie Ste Anne, Praslin: co-managed with fishing communities

- Effective management of coastal and marine ecosystems (mangroves, seagrasses and coral reefs) in Port Glaud Ramsar site: with Constance Ephelia Hotel

Please see above for details on the coral recovery program envisaged at Iles Cocos.

Some additional text has been inserted in the PIF on p9 to emphasise biodiversity values in Iles Cocos, Ste Anne MNP and Port Glaud Ramsar Site.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

No, please note that new protected areas need to meet the KBA standard to receive GEF support.

4/7/2020

Yes, thank you for this clarification. However, Iles Coco NP is listed as a KBA.

Agency Response

07April2020

There are no marine KBAs in Seychelles at this point in time.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes. There are some interesting ideas in implementation of MSPs and engaging businesses in conservation.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF comments received 4/16/2020 with Agency response 4/20/2020

- Stakeholder engagement: Please include a description of consultations that have already occurred with IPLCs, CSOs and the private sector on the activities of this project.

Agency response:

Effective consultation to support project development has taken place since the earliest stages of project development through the establishment of a multi-sector National Steering Committee. The NSC comprises representatives from Government agencies, NGOs and CSOs. The chair is shared by GEF OFP/PS Climate Change, Wills Agricole and PS Biodiversity Alain de Commarmond, with support from the PCU National Coordinator as secretariat. Key stakeholders include: MEECC, Ministry of Tourism, Ministry of Finance, Trade and Economic Planning (Blue Economy), Ministry for Habitat, Infrastructure and Land Transport, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, SFA, SNPA, ICS, MCSS, IUCN, TNC, UNDP, UNISEY, SGP, SEYCCAT and Sustainability 4 Seychelles, which works to find ways to promote sustainable 'green living' in local communities affected by the project e.g. Port Glaud.

As indicated above, consultations with private sector partners (hotels) have taken place with the support of the relevant Park management authorities where activities are envisaged, specifically:

- MEECC/Port Glaud: The Constance Ephelia already actively leads efforts to support mangrove restoration in the Ramsar site and is interested to take action to protect/effectively vulnerable fringing reefs in the adjacent Port Launay MPA managed by SNPA. The RTA and PCU National Coordinator met the hotel's conservation team during PIF development.
- SNPA/Iles Cocos: The Six Senses Hotel on Felicité Island (which will be included in the expansion of Iles Cocos MNP) has reached out to SNPA to request partnership to better manage and protect delicate reefs and marine biodiversity on and around the island. Their co-financing commitment was confirmed through SNPA.
- SNPA/Ste Anne: The Club Med Hotel on Ste Anne is under construction. Discussions with hotel management have commenced and efforts to manage local impacts and protect the important turtle nesting site on the island are under way. Communities living within Ste Anne MNP are also committed to reduce the impacts of increasing tourism and promote sustainable management of marine and coastal ecosystems within the Park. These discussions are being facilitated by SNPA.
- ICS (Aride): Efforts to work with local tour operators based on Praslin and La Digue to better manage visitors wishing to visit Aride will be stepped up with the support of the project, while improving education within local communities about poaching seabirds and fishing within the SNR perimeter.
- SEYCCAT Blue Grants Fund and (Baie Ste Anne): Discussions have been held with Praslin Fishers Association (via Dr. Jude Bijoux), which is currently implementing a self-imposed fisheries closure with the full support of the Praslin island community. SEYCCAT also provides small grants to local fishing cooperatives on Praslin and La Digue through the Blue Grants Fund to support sustainable practices and management. Building on the Coastal Wetlands and Climate Change project that is being supported by Pew, TNC and SEYCCAT, which will map significant blue carbon habitats in Seychelles, the project will support more effective management of the globally significant seagrass bed in Baie Ste Anne. Full feasibility will be explored during PPG.

Please note that further consultation will take place during PPG to consolidate the expected private sector engagement in the project. We must keep in mind that the new and evolving COVID-19 pandemic (that has accelerated since submission of this PIF) may place the tourism and fisheries sectors in Seychelles under severe pressure.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

No, we would appreciate a short reflection on gender relates to this specific project. Given that the number of male beneficiaries is 50% greater than females, it would be good to include some explanation of that number.

4/7/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

07April2020

Thank you. We indicate under F. Project's Target Contribution that the project will benefit (directly) about 2,500 people (1,500 F/1,000 M). These comprise include communities (such as Port Glaud, Baie Ste Anne and within Ste Anne Marine National Park) living in/adjacent to sites targeted under Component 3 to pilot nature-based solutions and localized threat reduction of threats in vulnerable coastal and marine ecosystems. The ratio favours females. The numbers have been corrected in Annex B: GEF7 Core Indicator Sheet.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

No, the private sector engagement looks promising but it is unclear from the text whether the hotels mentioned have already been consulted.

4/7/2020

Yes. We also acknowledge the challenges that COVID may cause in the development of work with the tourism sector.

Agency Response

07 April 2020

Yes, the hotels have been actively consulted and engagement will be managed through existing partnership arrangements with the management authorities, specifically MEECC (Port Glaud), SNPA (Iles Cocos, Ste Anne) and ICS (Aride). Further consultation will take place during PPG to consolidate the expected private sector engagement in the project. We must keep in mind that the new and evolving COVID-19 pandemic (that has accelerated since submission of this PIF) may place the tourism sector in Seychelles under severe pressure.

GEF comments received 4/16/2020 with Agency response 4/20/2020

- Stakeholder engagement: Please include a description of consultations that have already occurred with IPLCs, CSOs and the private sector on the activities of this project.

Agency response:

As indicated above, consultations with private sector partners (hotels) have taken place with the support of the relevant Park management authorities where activities are envisaged, specifically:

- MEECC/Port Glaud: The Constance Ephelia already actively leads efforts to support mangrove restoration in the Ramsar site and is interested to take action to protect/effectively vulnerable fringing reefs in the adjacent Port Launay MPA managed by SNPA. The RTA and PCU National Coordinator met the hotel's conservation team during PIF development.

- SNPA/Iles Cocos: The Six Senses Hotel on Felicite Island (which will be included in the expansion of Iles Cocos MNP) has reached out to SNPA to request partnership to better manage and protect delicate reefs and marine biodiversity on and around the island. Their co-financing commitment was confirmed through SNPA.

- SNPA/Ste Anne: The Club Med Hotel on Ste Anne is under construction. Discussions with hotel management have commenced and efforts to manage local impacts and protect the important turtle nesting site on the island are under way. Communities living within Ste Anne MNP are also committed to reduce the impacts of increasing tourism and promote sustainable management of marine and coastal ecosystems within the Park. These discussions are being facilitated by SNPA.

ICS (Aride): Efforts to work with local tour operators based on Praslin and La Digue to better manage visitors wishing to visit Aride will be stepped up with the support of the project, while improving education within local communities about poaching seabirds and fishing within the SNR perimeter.

SEYCCAT Blue Grants Fund and (Baie Ste Anne): Discussions have been held with Praslin Fishers Association (via Dr. Jude Bijoux), which is currently implementing a self-imposed fisheries closure with the full support of the Praslin island community. SEYCCAT also provides small grants to local fishing cooperatives on Praslin and La Digue through the Blue Grants Fund to support sustainable practices and management. Building on the Coastal Wetlands and Climate Change project that is being supported by Pew, TNC and SEYCCAT, which will map significant blue carbon habitats in Seychelles, the project will support more effective management of the globally significant seagrass bed in Baie Ste Anne. Full feasibility will be explored during PPG.

Please note that further consultation will take place during PPG to consolidate the expected private sector engagement in the project. We must keep in mind that the new and evolving COVID-19 pandemic (that has accelerated since submission of this PIF) may place the tourism and fisheries sectors in Seychelles under severe pressure.

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF comment received 4/16/2020 / Agency Response 4/20/2020

No, please make the following edits:

- Management: Please clarify that the GEF-GOS-UNDP PCU sits within the government. As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

Agency response:

Thank you. This is duly noted. We confirm that GEF-GOS-UNDP-PCU sits within Government (within MEECC) and confirm that implementation and execution roles will be kept separate. No DPC will be requested by UNDP. The PIF has been updated accordingly.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country’s national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

Yes.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/29/2020

No, relatively minor changes are needed. We look forward to receiving the resubmission of this project.

4/7/2020

No, just the taxonomy needs to be fixed.

4/9/2020

No, please take International Waters out of the taxonomy.

4/16/2020

No, please make the following edits:

- Management: Please clarify that the GEF-GOS-UNDP PCU sits within the government. As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.
- Cofinancing: Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures".
- Stakeholder engagement: Please include a description of consultations that have already occurred with IPLCs, CSOs and the private sector on the activities of this project.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval