



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9402		
Country/Region:	Antigua And Barbuda		
Project Title:	The Path to 2020 – Antigua and Barbuda		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-3 Program 7;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$91,324	Project Grant:	\$2,729,153
Co-financing:	\$5,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$8,229,153
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Kristin McLaughlin

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	<p>March 8, 2016</p> <p>No, please address the following issues:</p> <p>- Overall, this PIF would benefit from editing and considered additions for clarity and explanation. At points, it can be difficult to understand how this project will be operating. A few examples on page 10: the "green card" mentioned is not explained as to</p>	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>what it is and how it works; under component 2.2.2 "the measurement of state, pressure and response variables should be monitored annually" is confusing as it sounds as though the monitoring will be measured not the variables themselves; "genetically important species for globally significant biodiversity and agriculture" is also quite confusing as globally significant biodiversity is generally defined by the threat and limited range of a species, not its genetics; component 1.4 is quite focused on budgetary limitations, which should be a consideration throughout, but does not describe the types of needs that would be met through the activities of this component.</p> <p>- PA Location - Sites for expansion of protected areas should be identified as high priority sites for the conservation of globally significant biodiversity (as done through the Key Biodiversity Area designations of the IUCN). These sites were identified and prioritized for the Caribbean as part of the GEF-funded Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund's Ecosystem Profile for the Caribbean. While there appears to be overlap with these sites and the areas selected for PA expansion, please provide a map of</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the proposed new protected areas to be clear on where these activities will take place.</p> <p>- Agriculture in new PA? - The division between the activities of component 2 and 3 are quite unclear as to where they will take place, the activities undertaken, and how they will be prioritized. On page 6 in the third paragraph, one of the new protected areas is described as having high agrobiodiversity. Does the new PA have other areas of agriculture or only within the Dunnings area?</p> <p>- Financial sustainability - It is suggested that visitor fees for entrance to the Dunnings area would be sufficient to make a significant difference in the financing gap of the PA system as a whole. However, component 2 does not describe how this fee collection system would be setup. Component 2.2.4 calls for a cost-benefit analysis, but does not describe what would be analyzed. It seems unlikely that visitor fees from a single 22 hectare site would be able to significantly reduce the PA financing gap. It is a welcome idea to concentrate visitors (and, thus, fee collection) in one area, however, more explanation is needed to show how this would work particularly given the fact that from the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>explanation given there is agriculture in this area as well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Globally significant biodiversity - The Red List of Vascular Plants in Antigua and Barbuda conducted an assessment of the status of species within Antigua and Barbuda. However, many of these species are Pantropical or found more widely in the Neotropics and, thus, are not the focus of the GEF, which is working to protect globally significant biodiversity. From the information provided and additional research, the new PA does appear to have globally significant biodiversity which should lead the justification of PA expansion. The focus should be on endemic or restricted range species that are threatened. There is a KBA in the vicinity, which could provide justification for the site protecting globally significant biodiversity. - Key Biodiversity Areas - Please note that Key Biodiversity Area is an official term used by IUCN for a specific set of designated sites. It's unclear how training on this subject and other related fields is a major barrier for current protected area management. - Aichi Targets - It is unclear how this project will contribute to some of the Aichi targets mentioned, such as the 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>protection measures for specific threatened species identified as those species are not listed as occurring in the new PA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SMART Indicators - SMART indicators for the different components have not been identified. <p>March 25, 2016</p> <p>This project shows significant improvements in clarity and thinking, but still has issues that need to be resolved. Thank you for adding the map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explanation of the SIRF Fund and green card system - There is more discussion of the green card in this version, but it is still not explained what it is and how it works. How is it different than simply collecting entry fees? The SIRF Fund is also quite unclear for how it will actually address PA funding gaps. Is the SIRF fund a trust fund? If so, the GEF cannot finance trust funds only support establishing systems to fund them. If not, how will it reduce the funding gap rather than moving around existing funds/consolidating future grants? - Globally significant biodiversity - This project still struggles to focus on 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>globally significant biodiversity. These values should be the principle justification for the project, not just a tack on sentence. Please see the previous comments on this subject. As an example, <i>Acrocomia aculeata</i> is actually a very wide ranging species that is not a focus of global conservation efforts. Many of the species listed as threatened on the A&B Red List of Vascular Plants are also wide ranging through the tropics and not a focus of GEF resources. Please work to better articulate the value of this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Section 5 (page 13) - Please articulate the global environmental benefits for this project, such as specific threatened species that will benefit from a new protected area. This shouldn't simply be a repeat of project activities. Agrobiodiversity isn't really mentioned in this section, despite being a component of this project. - Training activities - Page 5 still has very short list of identified needed areas of capacity building, even as an indicative list and the focus on KBA training seems confusing as previously mentioned in the comments. <p>April 6, 2016</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Yes. Thank you for the revisions. During PPG, please ensure that the justification for the project and the project activities are focused on the conservation of globally threatened biodiversity and endemic species.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	March 8, 2016 Yes. This project is consistent with national legislation and their NBSAP.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	March 8, 2016 No, please address the following issues: - Ministry of Agriculture - The Ministry of Agriculture is identified as one of the sources of the loss of agrobiodiversity through the promotion of certain types of seeds. The Ministry of Agriculture is listed as a partner executing agency and co-financier in the stakeholder table, which is important and welcome given their role in preserving agrobiodiversity. However, it is unclear how their activities will be modified through this project. - Please address the question of drivers of environmental degradation, the sustainability of interventions,	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>market transformation, scaling and innovation as these topics were not addressed in the PIF.</p> <p>March 25, 2016</p> <p>No. Please address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ministry of Agriculture - While departments of the Ministry of Agriculture are involved, this project still does not address the identified driver of agrobiodiversity loss that is the Ministry of Agriculture's providing seeds to farmers. It's actually surprising to not see agricultural extension/farmer support services involved given the focus of this project on agrobiodiversity. Please include this engagement in the project. The quick mention in Table 1 makes them seem like simply workshop participants rather than partners in the project (note Table 2). - Financial sustainability - please discuss how this will be achieved, including for the agrobiodiversity component. - Innovation - The discussion on innovation focuses on financing mechanisms, which aren't developed through this project, please revise. - Scaling - how will the government 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>scale this project to other parts of the country? What lessons or models are being sought?</p> <p>- Sustainability - how do you ensure the sustainability of capacity building?</p> <p>April 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the revisions.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>March 8, 2016</p> <p>Unclear. Please make the revisions requested under other questions to clarify this.</p> <p>March 25, 2016</p> <p>Again, unclear as questions related to the SIRF Fund are important for understanding the role of the GEF.</p> <p>For coordination, are there any non-GEF initiatives this project will coordinate with and how specifically will this project coordinate with the initiatives mentioned.</p> <p>April 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the revisions to this project. However, during PPG please make sure to include an explanation of what the SIRF fund is</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and how it functions to allow someone to read and understand this project without any prior knowledge of GEF activities - likely a paragraph would suffice.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>March 8, 2016</p> <p>No, please address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The descriptions of each sub-component in the body of the document are hard to follow. Please consider using formatting, such as bold text with a header to show clearly what the objective of each sub-component is. While we appreciate that this is a PIF and more detail will be provided after the PPG, it is still unclear what activities will take place under each component, particularly in areas like capacity building. - The SIRF seems like a promising opportunity for collaboration and co-financing, but the description provided in the PIF does not explain how this fund operates and, thus, how it will interact with the project. Also, what is a "SIRF fund asset"? - Component 3 requires more explanation of the varieties targeted, processes used, marketing strategies, and activities undertaken to protect 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>agrobiodiversity. - Please also include more information about how this project will relate to other initiatives, including those with bilateral donors. Some of the connections to other institutions seem out of place for this project, such as on page 16 - "The project will also benefit from the recognized expertise of the Caribbean Environment Programme Regional Coordinating Unit/Secretariat to the Cartagena Convention in matters related to the marine and coastal environment and in working in a multi-lingual environment, as well as its expertise in implementing the Cartagena Convention and particularly its SPAW Protocols".</p> <p>March 25, 2016</p> <p>The description on pages 10-12 is much improved and provides much more clarity about the activities of this project. Thank you.</p> <p>No. Please address the following issues:</p> <p>Component 1, Outcome 1 - A change in score is not an outcome. It's an indicator of an outcome. What do you hope to achieve by doing the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>outputs?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.2 What is financial cohesion? - 1.3 - The GEF does not typically support outreach and awareness as these are initiatives that require on-going support. Please explain how these activities will generate global environmental benefits or do not include them. <p>Component 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Again the outcome is an indicator, but not a true outcome. The TT for this program may provide some guidance in this area. - Are all the lands community run/owned as implied in 3.1? - 3.2 - What kind of feasibility is being assessed? Shouldn't general feasibility information be known for some of these species or very similar ones? - Outputs 3 and 4 read more like outcomes. The description of how they will be achieved is lacking on page 12. The question still remains about how it will be done? <p>April 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This project is much improved. For the PPG, please consider revising the wording for outcomes 1 and 3 to not focus on a score (which is the indicator) but on an overall goal.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>March 8, 2016</p> <p>No. Please provide more description of insuring full participation of women and CSOs.</p> <p>March 25, 2016</p> <p>Yes. This section is much improved, thank you.</p>	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>March 8, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Antigua and Barbuda is fully flexible under the STAR. As such, it is using land degradation, climate change mitigation and biodiversity resources in support of this biodiversity project.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>March 25, 2016</p> <p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance at this time. Despite being much improved, there are still number of issues remaining.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>March 8, 2016</p> <p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance at this time.</p> <p>April 6, 2016</p> <p>Yes. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 09, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 25, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 06, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC • STAP • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.