GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS*
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	**5078**		
Country/Region:	**St. Kitts And Nevis**		
Project Title:	**Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Habitat Degradation in Protected Areas and their Buffer Zones**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**5088 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Biodiversity**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1; BD-1; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$64,725**	Project Grant:	**$3,371,630**
Co-financing:	**$17,140,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$20,576,355**
PIF Approval:	**October 02, 2012**	Council Approval/Expected:	**November 15, 2012**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mark Zimsky**	Agency Contact Person:	**Jose Vicente Troya**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	08/16/12: Yes.	6/12/14 Yes.
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	08/16/12: Yes. The letter of endorsement mentions the use of the flexibility option. The STAR budget will be allocated to a biodiversity project. Request is made for a PPG budget of US$ 64,725.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	08/16/2012: Yes, UNDP has an extensive experience in implementing protected areas projects and in working in Latin America and Caribbean countries.	6/12/14 Yes.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	08/16/2012: N/A	6/12/14 N/A
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	08/16/2012: Yes, the project fits well with the sub-regional UNDAF. UNDP has an office in Barbados, which will be able to provide support on technical and financial issues.	6/12/14 Yes. UNDP's regional office in Barbados will support this project.
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	08/16/2012: Yes, St. Kitts and Nevis has US$3,787,000 remaining as of this date.	6/12/14 Yes.
	• the focal area allocation?	08/16/2012: Yes.	6/12/14 Yes.
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	08/16/2012: N/A	6/12/14 N/A
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	08/16/2012: N/A	6/12/14 N/A
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	08/16/2012: N/A	6/12/14 N/A
	• focal area set-aside?	08/16/2012: N/A	6/12/14 N/A
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	08/16/2012: Yes, the project is well aligned with the Biodiversity focal area results framework.	6/12/14 Yes. This project is a good fit for the Biodiversity focal area results framework.
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	9/18/2012: UNDP has added BD outcome 1.2 as recommended. We clear on this.	6/12/14 Yes. This project will address Outcomes

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		08/16/2012: Yes, the project objectives will address the BD objective 1 "Improve management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas". However, the project activities will also contribute to improve the financial sustainability of the PA system. Therefore, it is recommended that the BD outcome 1.2 is also included.	1.1 and 1.2 on improvement management and financial resources for protected areas.
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	08/16/2012: Yes, the project is consistent with the country's national strategies. The project will contribute to the implementation of the Protected Areas system's Plan and the National Conservation and Environmental Management Act.	6/12/14 Yes. This project is in line with national and regional strategies, including the NBSAP, PA Systems Plan and the Caribbean Challenge Initiative.
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	9/18/2012: The target audience and types of training have been clarified. We clear on this. 08/16/2012: Preliminary information is provided. However, please elaborate further on the targeted audience (e.g. PA rangers, government, CSOs) and the type of training that will be offered.	6/12/14 Yes. The focus on improving the capacity of national institutions will be important for the ensuring sustainability.
	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	9/18/2012: UNDP has fully provided the information requested and responded to the concerns below. Clear on this. 08/16/2012: The baseline description provides useful information on on-going activities and allocated budget. The rationale to create new protected areas and to strengthen institutional coordination is well explained.	6/12/2014 Yes. This project builds on support provided by several different institutions.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design		However, please provide information on the implementation status of the National Protected Area Trust Fund and its role in the project. Please, also provide more information on programs supported by international organizations at national and regional levels (e.g., CAR-SPAW, Birdlife International, and Conservation International), in which the country is involved. Regarding paras 12 and 13, please only mention the baseline budget.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		6/12/2014 Yes. The costs for these important activities are reasonable.
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	08/16/2012: Yes, we understand that the project will contribute to the conservation of critical ecosystem such as Rainforest, Elfin Woodland, and the conservation of species, including two species of green lizards, eight species of native bats and the three endangered turtles. Finally, the project will strengthen the global network of protected areas.	6/12/2014 Yes.
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	08/16/2012: The framework is well developed and provided clear expected outputs. However, quantitative elements describing the targeted outputs will be required at the CEO Endorsement stage (rate of ecosystem coverage, coverage and integrity of habitat, species status, METT scores).	6/12/14 Yes. Thank you for adding the requested information.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	08/16/2012: Yes.	6/12/14 Yes.
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	9/16/2012: The additional information requested has been provided in the PIF. We clear on this issue. 08/16/2012: We need additional information regarding the socio-economic benefits which will be delivered by the activities developed in the buffer zones and how these benefits will support the PA long term sustainability.	6/12/14 Yes.
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	9/16/2012: Adequate information is now provided regarding participation by CSOs. There are no indigenous communities in St. Kitts and Nevis. 08/16/2012: We need additional information regarding how CSOs and Indigenous peoples will be included in the processes of creating and managing the new protected areas. Please, also clarify if these stakeholders will be involved in the PA buffer zones activities. If these stakeholders are not relevant to these processes, please explain why.	6/12/14 Yes. Including CSOs in the development and implementation new PAs will be fundamental to their success.
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	9/20/2012: The section on risks has been enhanced to include the risks of tourism and housing development. 08/16/2012: Information on the potential risks and mitigation measures has been included. However, tourism	6/12/14 Yes. The elaboration of this section was very helpful.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		and housing development under and around the buffer zones should also be taken into consideration.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	9/12/2012: Adequate information is provided regarding coordination with on-going efforts. 08/16/2012: Information is provided on some on-going projects. However, please provide additional details on how the coordination arrangements with these projects are to be addressed, including the relationship with other regional and national programs related to biodiversity conservation supported by NGOs.	6/12/14 Yes. The changes to build complementarity rather than overlap with the regional international waters project are welcome.
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	9/16/2012: Adequate information is now provided on coordination arrangements among the different government departments involved. We clear on this. 08/16/2012:We understand that the Department of the Physical Planning and Environment will have the lead responsibility in project implementation, and that the Department of Economic Affairs will oversee the activities regarding the policy and legislative framework. However, please provide further information on the coordination arrangements among the different government departments involved and about the day-to-day life of the project.	6/12/14 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		6/12/14 Yes. The relatively small changes are well justified.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		08/16/2012: N/A
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	08/16/2012: The GEF project management cost represents 4.4% of the GEF project budget, which is fine.	6/12/14 Yes.
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	08/16/2012: The funding and co-financing per objective are appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes.	6/12/14 Yes.
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	08/16/2012: The cofinancing ratio is 1:4.2 which is satisfactory. The cofinancing is in the form of a grant.	6/12/14 The increased cofinancing ratio of 1:5.1 is welcome.
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	08/16/2012: UNDP will provide a grant to the project for an amount of US$ 250,000; which is satisfactory.	6/12/14 UNDP will provide $300,000 which is satisfactory.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		6/12/14 Yes.
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		6/12/14 Yes. The budgeted M&E Plan does not include the indicators and targets, but they are listed in Table B.
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		6/12/14 Yes.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	9/18/2012: UNDP has addressed adequately all the issues raised by the GEF Secretariat in previous comments. This PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program. 08/16/2012: The PIF cannot be recommended at this stage, please address the issues raised in the review sheet.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		6/12/14 Yes.
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 16, 2012	June 12, 2014
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 19, 2012	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	AWV 10/24/2012 All of the four project activities are appropriate. They consist of: 1. Analysis of policy, legal, institutional, and financial frameworks for system-wide PA management; 2. Project site profiling and detailed baseline information analysis; 3. socio-economic analysis and pre-feasibility studies for demonstration activities; and 4. Definition of project strategy.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	AWV 10/24/2012 The budget for the GEF of $64,725 is justified and is cost-effective. The co-financing ratio for this PPG (1.4.2) is quite robust, and the all of component 3 will be financed through co-financing.
Secretariat Recommendation	**3. Is PPG approval being recommended?**	AWV 10/24/2012 Yes, we recommend this PPG for approval.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	October 24, 2012
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.