



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

<b>Project Title:</b> Iyanola – Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast			
Country(ies):	Saint Lucia	GEF Project ID:	5057
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	00900
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology - Sustainable Development and Environment Division	Submission Date:	26/09/2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multifocal Area	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SFM	Agency Fee (\$):	\$233,182

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Indicative Financing from relevant TF (GEF/LDCF/SCCF) (\$)	Indicative Cofinancing (\$)
<b>BD-1</b>	<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas.	Improved management effectiveness and financial sustainability of existing protected areas encompassed within proposed Iyanola National Park area (5,090 hectares)	665,109	856,232
<b>BD-2</b>	<b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Land Use Plan and enhanced regulatory framework for the NE Coast incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation. Production of biodiversity friendly goods and services	560,000	1,754,789
<b>CC-5</b>	Outcome 5.2 Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non forest lands	1,157 hectares forest lands restored, 200 hectares forest lands enhanced management. Projected annual tons CO <sub>2</sub> savings of 23,056. Potential total carbon benefit of 691,689 tons CO <sub>2</sub> over 30 years.	173,160	359,628
<b>LD-2</b>	<b>Outcome 2.2</b> <b>Improved dryland</b>	1,157 hectares forest lands restored, 200 hectares forest lands	259,740	539,442

	<b>forest management</b> <b>2.4</b> Increased investments in SFM dryland forest ecosystems	enhanced management. 2 private forest concessions established		
<b>SFM/REDD 1</b>	<b>Outcome 1.2:</b> Good management practices applied in in existing forests.	1,157 hectares forest lands restored, 200 hectares forest lands enhanced management.	562,770	1,168,790
Project management cost (5%)			111,039	340,000
<b>Total project costs</b>			<b>2,331,818</b>	<b>5,018,881</b>

## B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** Increased management effectiveness and sustainable use of the North East Coast's natural resource base to generate multiple global environmental benefits.

Project Component	Grant Type (TA/INV)	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Indicative Financing from relevant TF (GEF/LDCF/SCCF) (\$)	Indicative Co-financing (\$)
1. Enhanced Land use Planning and regulatory framework (as applied to NE Coast)	TA	Integration of ecosystems approach into legal and policy framework	1.1.1: Ecological considerations integrated into planning policies and regulations for development categories  1.1.2: Land Use Plan for NE Coast/Iyanola, incorporating valuation of ecosystem goods and services  C1.1.3: Enhanced capacity of national and local leaders	\$260,000  BD-\$260,000	\$856,232
2. Enhanced sustainable land management and carbon benefits in deciduous seasonal and low	TA	Improved ecosystems restoration and management  Restoration of	2.1.1: Zoning plan for restoration of degraded forest areas NE Coast  2.2.1: Restoration of degraded priority forest areas nationwide	\$995,670  CC-\$173,160 LD-\$259,740 SFM-\$562,770	\$2,067,859

montane rainforest zones		<p>1,157 hectares of forest of global BD significance, enhancing carbon stocks</p> <p>Restoration efforts and avoided degradation lead projected annual tons CO<sub>2</sub> savings 23,056. Potential total carbon benefit of 691,689 tons CO<sub>2</sub> over 30 years.</p>	<p>2.3.1: Rehabilitation of riparian, ravine, beach and migratory corridors of NE Coast/ Iyanola forest areas (200 ha)</p> <p>2.3.2: At least 1 agreement negotiated for non government (private) forest areas NE Coast/Iyanola</p> <p>2.3.3: Two private concessions established to raise revenue for SFM</p> <p>2.3.4: Research and Monitoring programme established for indicator species</p>		
3. Iyanola Conservation	TA	<p>Increased management effectiveness score of 20% for Forest and Marine Reserves in NE Coast.</p> <p>Population of threatened species (iguana, turtle, birds) maintained or increased.</p> <p>Increase capacity &amp; income derived from tourism by 10% in NE Coast</p>	<p>3.1.1: Enhanced management effectiveness of 4 key NE Dry Forest Reserves (200 ha)</p> <p>3.1.2: Boundaries set for Grande Anse and Louvet Marine Reserves</p> <p>3.2.1.: Management and sustainable financing plan established for Grand Anse Marine Reserves in NE Coast</p> <p>3.2.2: Community based management plan for Louvet Mangroves</p> <p>3.3.1: Develop business plan to promote new tourism and other income generating activities and enhance existing ones</p>	\$665,109 BD-\$665,109	\$1,026,762
4. Enhanced Capacity for the production of biodiversity friendly goods and services in inland forest and coastal communities	TA	<p>Reductions in pressure on biodiversity and forest ecosystem services</p> <p>Producers adopt best practices for production of BD</p>	<p>4.1.1: Market, knowledge and capacity barriers for the community level production of biodiversity friendly goods and services removed</p> <p>4.2.1: Assessment of marketing potential for BD friendly goods and services</p>	\$300,000 BD-\$300,000	\$728,028

(National with emphasis on NE Coast )		friendly goods	4.2.2: Guidelines for 3 BD friendly goods and services produced		
Project management Cost (5%)				111,039	340,000
Total project costs				2,331,818	5,018,881

**C. INDICATIVE CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME IF AVAILABLE, (\$)**

Sources of Co-financing for baseline project	Name of Co-financier	Cash	In Kind	Amount (\$)
Government	Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology	\$3,411,142	\$34,930	\$3,446,072
	Ministry of Agriculture, Food Production, Fisheries	\$961,000	\$178,074	\$1,139,074
	Ministry of Infrastructure, Port Services and Transport	\$6,683		\$6,683
	Ministry of Social Transformation		\$15,912	\$15,912
	Ministry of Physical Development, Housing and Urban Renewal		\$92,000	\$92,000
NGOS	Durrell Wildlife Trust	\$64,414	\$40,176	\$104,590
	St Lucia National Trust	\$11,400	\$3,150	\$14,550
GEF Agency	UNEP (\$30k, \$45k, \$125k)		\$200,000	\$200,000
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>\$4,454,639</b>	<b>\$564,242</b>	<b>\$5,018,881</b>

**D. GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal area	Country name/Global	Project amount	Agency Fee (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	St. Lucia	1,286,364	128,636	1,415,000
UNEP	GEF TF	Land Degradation	St. Lucia	272,727	27,273	300,000
UNEP	GEF TF	Climate change	St. Lucia	181,818	18,182	200,000
UNEP	GEF TF	SFM	St. Lucia	590,909	59,091	650,000
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>2,331,818</b>	<b>233,182</b>	<b>2,565,000</b>

**E. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

<b>Component</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>	<b>Project Total (\$)</b>
Local consultants*	863,419	2,127,856	2,991,275
International consultants	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>863,419</b>	<b>2,127,856</b>	<b>2,991,275</b>

\*Local consultants are from within the Caribbean region

**F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex E an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF**

**Duration.** The duration of the project has been extended from 3 years to 4 years, as per the experience of the PPG, and advice of the UNEP Task Manager.

**Co-financing.** The originally estimated level of co-finance (\$8.9M) has been scaled back to \$5M for the following reasons: At project inception (PIF) a number of very large initiatives were identified as possible underpinning to the proposed project and included in the PIF documentation. Over the course of the preparation phase, these initiatives were carefully analyzed by partnering agencies to ascertain the relationship with the Iyanola project. In doing so, only very specifically relevant elements of externally funded initiatives are included as co-financing as flowing through the partner agencies involved in the implementation of the Iyanola Project. These initiatives include for example the World Bank’s Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (**PPCR**), the EU financed Banana Accompanying Measures (BAM), AusAid support to Forestry and the like. Furthermore, to a lesser extent, certain previously considered initiatives have advanced expenditures or concluded during the lengthy preparation phase, thus moving co-financing to baseline financing. Finally it should be noted that the EU funded project: Regional- Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) project on Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Land Management in the Eastern Caribbean has only just concluded its gap analysis and will shortly be allocating the EU 10M to the 9 OECS countries for the purposes capacity building in the areas of land use management and implementation of those segments of National Land Management Policies dealing with climate change adaptation measures. Within this phase, the project also intends to identify a set of sustainable land management physical investment best practices in relevant sectors and replicate them through pilot or demonstration projects possibly in each Member State. As such, it is conservatively estimated that S. Lucia will be the direct beneficiary of an additional EU 1.0M of very relevant co-financing in the area of land use planning, which for the purposes of expediency in submission is not yet reflected in the co-financing table, and will be tracked as leveraged financing.

We would like to note that the St. Lucia is a SIDS country, with a population of under 200,000. The current proposal has achieved a co-financing ratio of 1:2, which in this economic climate is commendable.

**Shift in Focal Area Funds.** Some \$44,558 of GEF BD resources have been shifted from Components 3 and 4 into Component 2. Component 2 features outputs which will generate biodiversity benefits through enhancement and restoration of important habitats, monitoring will include populations of at least one rare animal and 2 rare plant species further to the existing indicator species for which IUCN assessment data is available.

**A1. National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc**

NA

**A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.**

NA

**A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:**

NA

**A4. Describe the project baseline and the problem(s) that the intervention seeks to address:**

NA

**A.5. Incremental / Additional cost reasoning:**

NA

**A6. Risks, including climate change risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and if possible, propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design:**

The amended risks and mitigation strategy is presented below.

RISK	Risk Level (L-low, M-Medium, H-High)	Risk Mitigation Strategy
Capacity of the national executing agencies overstretched or	M	Required expertise will be supplemented through partnerships with non-governmental and community based organizations. Synergies will be built on similar

<b>RISK</b>	<b>Risk Level (L-low, M-Medium, H-High)</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
compromised by limited personnel, resulting in inadequate support to the project		initiatives in communities to enable the pooling and maximum use of resources. These are identified in the stakeholder table.
Lack of Project buy in from agencies, businesses and communities in NE Coast Iyanola Region	M	Design and implementation of a public sensitization and training and information strategy presenting the opportunities and benefits available for various actors; Formation of community groups and networks; Creation of business assistance partnerships.
Environment and regulations are in place but monitoring and enforcement remain weak	M	Project will include capacity building for environmental management and monitoring at the local and national levels, including CBOs and NGOs – and specifically at sites/areas of GEF interventions. Co-management /participatory approaches will be undertaken in implementing activities. Development of standards and guidelines to support the production and marketing of BD friendly goods and services.
New regulations and guidelines for land use planning and enforcement thereof may meet with resistance	M	Consultative processes and citizen recourse are stipulated in a number of legislative acts including the Land Use Planning Act. Project will ensure adherence to robust consultative processes outlined in existing legislation that will work on overcoming challenges. Mobilization and coordination of enforcement personnel and activities across key agencies with the Physical Development Section /DCA as the coordinating agency.
Land Ownership	H	Public-private partnerships with respect to forest management (particularly as it relates to private lands)
Construction of proposed NE Coast Highway	M	Coordination and cooperation among relevant agencies (including consultations with the PPG team) is currently underway at feasibility stage for road.
Biodiversity destruction and ecosystem services disruption due to impacts of climate change such as intensified storms and drought.	M	Replanting with native species, and integrating resiliency into forest and mangrove management. The proposed GEF project is concurrent with \$27 million PPCR project whose focus is to build CC resiliency and associated capacity

## A7. Coordination with other GEF financed initiatives

This section has been updated to include projects which have come on line and others that have closed.

### B.1 How stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

Please see Section 2.5 of the Project Document (pages 28-31) and Appendix 14 Project Stakeholder and Participation Plan. A Stakeholder analysis conducted during project design identified the range of individuals, groups, or institutions which have an interest or "stake" in the outcome of the Project or will be potentially affected by it. There are very many stakeholders in Iyanola who will be impacted upon or will impact the project. In addition to these stakeholders who are from the area itself or who create livelihoods in the area, there are a number of public sector agencies and international agencies who also have a stake in Iyanola.

Stakeholder mapping also provided knowledge of all the stakeholders in the communities within the project site and who use the natural resources within the site; all those from outside of the site but who earn livelihoods from the natural resources in the site; and the stakeholders in public and private sector agencies, community organisations, and regional and international agencies that are involved, in some way, in the management and scientific research of the natural resources in the site.

The Stakeholder Map identifies and ranks all stakeholders who presently have a stake in the North east Coast. This Map also includes key agencies that will be involved in some aspect of the project and/or who have been involved in or will be involved in some aspect of resource management in the project site.

Key stakeholders involved in the project including the private sector, civil society organizations, local and indigenous communities, and their respective roles, are identified as follows:

Stakeholders	Role
Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FORESTRY DEPARTMENT</li> <li>• SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT DIVISION</li> <li>• BIODIVERSITY UNIT</li> </ul>	Lead overall Executing Agency  Co- Executing Agency for Component 2 Co- Executing Agency for Component 4
Ministry of Physical Development, Housing and Urban Renewal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PHYSICAL PLANNING DIVISION</li> <li>• DEVELOPMENT CONTROL AUTHORITY (DCA)</li> </ul>	Co-Executing Agency for Component 1
Ministry of Agriculture, Food Production, Fisheries and Rural Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FISHERIES DEPARTMENT</li> <li>• DEPARTMENTS OF AGRICULTURE AND</li> </ul>	Co-Executing Agency for Components 2 & 3 Co-Executing Agency for Component 4



Stakeholders	Role
<b>EXTENSION</b>	
Ministry of Tourism, Heritage and Creative Industries	Cooperating Agency
Ministry for Social Transformation	Cooperating Agency
Ministry of Infrastructure, Port Services and Transport	Cooperating Agency
Ministry for Commerce, Business Development, Investment and Consumer Affairs	Cooperating Agency
Office of Private Sector Development(OPSR)	Cooperating Agency
St. Lucia National Trust	Partner
Durrell Wildlife Trust	Partner
IICA	Partner
Fauna and Flora International	Partner
Employment initiatives	Partner
Land owners	Private sector
Producer Associations	Private Sector
Tourism Ventures (e.g.ziplining)	Private Sector
Local communities & assoc. groups (eg. Des Barras Sea Turtle Watch Group)	Partners

The Project Stakeholder Participation Plan identifies by project component, stakeholders, their possible interest in the project, and the strategies that will be necessary to meet their interests. This Plan is supported by another matrix which attempts to disaggregate the stakeholders by project component and Stages in the project cycle. Every attempt has been made to ensure opportunities to maximise social and gender benefits in the Participation Plan. Nevertheless, the stakeholders need to be validated at the time when the planning for each activity is being finalised. In addition, discussions need to be held with all those who have been identified as primary stakeholders in each project component in order to ensure that these stakeholders are informed of proposed activities and contribute to the final design of the activities. A detailed budget is also provided for such discussions and consultations.

The Plan demonstrates that :

- The stakeholders vary between the project's components.
- There are different stakeholders for different project stages in the project cycle for each component.
- Stakeholders take on different types of involvement (Inform, Consult, Participate, and Control) in different project components and in different stages in the project cycle within each component.
- Stakeholders also shift in type of stake (primary or secondary) between project components and between different stages in the project cycle with each component.
- SDED, the Forestry Department and the Biodiversity Unit are Key Stakeholders in all project components; other key stakeholders vary with the project component. These 3 Key stakeholders are also important in the Monitoring and Evaluation stage for each project component.

**B2. Socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF). As a background information, read [Mainstreaming Gender at the GEF.](#)":**

As part of the PPG, a socio economic consultancy was completed which delivered as socio-economic profile of the intended intervention area, the NE Coast and all of its communities. The findings of this study have been incorporated throughout the baseline sections of the Project Document and the resulting design of the components and supporting activities. Socio economic benefits are the specific aim of several outputs of the project. Outputs C3.3.1 will support the development of a business plan to enhance tourism based income in the Iyanola Region with a target of increasing local tourism related income 10%. The entire Component 4 will enhance capacity for the production of biodiversity friendly goods at the national level with an emphasis on the NE coast. Market data and business performance reports will be tracked.

The 4 project components were analyzed during the project design phase to ascertain the extent to which gender could be incorporated in the activities proposed for each of the concepts. The project integrates gender dimensions into the elaboration of Component 4 interventions to promote sustainable use of biodiversity friendly products and services to derive sustainable livelihoods, and in the development of results frameworks, budgets, implementation plans and work plans. The proposed categories of biodiversity friendly goods, non-timber forest products (NTFPs) for piloting have traditionally been dominated by women. Socio-economic indicators will be developed to measure the impact of improved management of timber resources and ecosystem services, together with increases in income for targeted communities and replication efforts. Restoration efforts also offer gender neutral opportunities by involving women in nursery operations. As part of this effort, disaggregated gendered impacts of increased income generation will be tracked as part of the M & E system. The lessons learned, marketing and innovative successes of the Components 3 will be shared at regularly inter-community venues to en(gender) replication, and will have a positive and sustainable impact on women.

It must be noted that for the Iyanola project, gender considerations are not solely a women's issue but rather looks at yielding advantage to whole communities and benefitting both genders.

**B3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

During the project design phased alternative project approaches were discarded, with the resulting consensus of a cost effective approach for each component of the project:

- Piloting land use planning for the NE Coast is cost effective with scale up potential, a national land use planning effort is not economically feasible at this time.
- Focus on protected areas only would limit the possibility of interventions in privately held areas which feature habitat and species of global biodiversity significance.
- Grassroots options to address head on the staggering unemployment are a win-win economic and ecological strategy for meeting the needs of the St. Lucian people in a manner sensitive to the rich

biodiversity of the country. Human capital will drive the success of the innovations in sustainable use of biodiversity.

Manifestly, an unclear development planning framework, coupled with poor land management processes continue to undervalue biodiversity and ecosystem services, resulting in the degradation of land, biodiversity, priority forest, and marine areas. Accordingly, many regional and national level efforts have sought to address these issues through project-driven interventions targeting specific types of challenges associated with poor land use planning, poverty reduction and sustainable livelihoods. However, implementation of these interventions have for the most part been dis-jointed with a still under-developed framework for sustainable use of natural resources and the dwindling of livelihood opportunities in inland forest and coastal communities, and more specifically, the NE Coast of Saint Lucia. Evidently, the development of alternative livelihoods, including agroforestry and non-timber forest products, can serve to relieve pressure on forest resources while providing opportunities for generation of income in these remote coastal communities which have been hard hit by the economic downturn and loss of tourism revenues.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN**

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in Appendix 7, the Costed M & E Plan. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed by the executing agency and UNEP.

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Appendix 4 includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in Appendix 6 will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved. The means of verification and the costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators are summarized in the Costed M&E Plan at Appendix 7 and are fully integrated in the overall project budget.

The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification will also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team comprising the project implementation unit and FD staff. However, other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators. It is the responsibility of the Implementing Partner and National Project Coordinator to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.

The Project Steering Committee will receive periodic reports on progress and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure that the project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the Task Manager in UNEP-GEF. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications.

Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. Overall, UNEP supervision of the project is to be carried out by UNEP/DEPI-GEF staff posted in UNEP’s Regional Office for North America (UNEP/RONA) in Washington DC. UNEP supervision will be further enhanced by technical staff located in UNEP’s Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean (UNEP/ROLAC) in Panama City, Panama, and UNEP’s Caribbean Environment Programme (UNEP/CEP) in Kingston, Jamaica, and in UNEP’s headquarter staff in Nairobi, Kenya.

The Task Manager however, will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the Project Steering Committee at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

A mid-term management review or evaluation will take place at the end of Year 2 of implementation. The review will include all parameters recommended by the GEF Evaluation Office for terminal evaluations and will verify information gathered through the GEF tracking tools, as relevant. The review will be carried out using a participatory approach whereby parties that may benefit or be affected by the project will be consulted. Such parties were identified during the stakeholder analysis (see section 5 of the project document). The Project Steering Committee will participate in the mid-term review and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented.

An independent terminal evaluation will take place at the end of project implementation. The Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP will manage the terminal evaluation process. A review of the quality of the evaluation report will be done by EOU and submitted along with the report to the GEF Evaluation Office not later than 6 months after the completion of the evaluation.

The GEF tracking tools are attached as Appendix 16. Relevant BD-2, CC-5, LD-2 and SFM Tracking Tool with baselines completed. These include selected CC, LD, SFM impact indicators (with baseline values) to monitor progress of project interventions, developed as preliminary elements to facilitate innovative monitoring and enforcement systems, including recommendations for sampling approach and model engagement with local communities, NGOs, educational institutions (local, national and international)).

These will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the mid-term and terminal evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool.


**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

A. **RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this template. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Caroline Eugene	GEF Focal Point	Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology – <b>St Lucia</b>	

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency Name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (Month, day, year)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Brennan Vandyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP		September 26, 2014	Kristin Mclaughlin	+1-202-974-1312	Kristin.mclaughlin@unep.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK- Mid Term Targets to be established at Project Inception**

<b>Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach</b>					
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>BD-1 Outcome 1.1: Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas</b>	(i) IUCN Category of protection; (ii) area (ha) under protection; (iii) METT Tracking Tool	Forest reserves (ca 1600ha) with few fragmented PAs of international recognition (terrestrial: 21 ha), with information gaps and minimal management (e.g. status "proposed"): 18 terrestrial and marine protected areas with IUCN category not reported, 5 with IUCN category VI;	(i) Majority of currently undesignated PAs are formalized; (ii) Improved management effectiveness and financial sustainability of existing protected areas encompassed within proposed Iyanola National Park area (5,090 hectares) (iii) METT Scores increased by 20% over baseline scores	Technical and financial reports; international databases on PAs and species they contain  METT at mid term and final	<b>Risks:</b> (i) Private absentee land owners may not be cooperative; (ii) a major development (resort, road) is approved within the project area; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) PA management remains GOSL priority; (ii) designation as Protected Area leverages improved management
<b>BD-2: Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.</b>	Extent/Acreage of land and seascape under sustainable environmental management  METT Tracking Tool	No adopted Land Use Plan  Ecosystem Services not taken into account in developments  Minimal income generating alternatives to unsustainable land use practices	Adopted Land Use Plan and enhanced regulatory framework for the NE Coast incorporates biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation;  Increase size of landscape by 25-35% (mid-term) or 50% of total acreage under management;  Production of at least 3 biodiversity friendly goods and services (with increased income by	Land Use Plan, management plans, technical reports, sales figures of target community members; Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Sustainable Development Reports and Documents  METT at mid term and final	<b>Risks:</b> (i) Private absentee land owners may lack interest in sustainable land management approaches; (ii) squatters and sand miners may not be from NE communities; (iii) a major development (resort, road) is approved within the project area; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Adequate community buy-in and internal control mechanisms

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			10%);  METT Targets achieved.		are created; (ii) Improved regulatory framework can be enforced where internal control does not apply (e.g. external squatters); Capacity to assess seascapes currently exists.
<b>LD-2: Outcome 2.2 Improved dryland forest management</b>	Increased Management of dryland forest.	No Private managed concessions in NE Coast area	Two private forest concessions established and managed	Concession documents	<b>Risks:</b> (i) ; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i)
<b>LD-2: Outcome 2.4 Increased investments in SFM dryland forest ecosystems .</b>	LD Portfolio Monitoring and Tracking Tool (PMAT)	Degradation of dry forest is caused by slash-and-burn	20% increase in scores relating to the LD Portfolio Monitoring and Tracking Tool (PMAT)	LD Portfolio Monitoring and Tracking Tool (PMAT) at Mid Term and Final	
<b>SFM/REDD 1: Outcome 1.2: Good management practices applied in in existing forests</b>	(i) Conservation of forests (ii) Avoided deforestation and forest degradation  SFM Tracking Tool	Five fragmented Forest Reserves plus three Protected Areas (mangroves) totaling 1664 ha and ca 3000 ha of nominally protected forests with lack of active management  250 ha of government owned forest reserve managed	1,157 hectares forest lands restored  Additional 200 hectares forest lands under sustainable management	Technical reports  SFM Tracking Tool Mid Term and Final	<b>Risks:</b> (i) ; <b>Assumptions:</b> (ii) No major natural disaster (hurricane, wildfire) upsets implementation and forest regeneration; (i) Adequate community buy-in and internal control mechanisms are created; (iii) Improved regulatory framework can be enforced where internal control does

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
					not apply (e.g. external squatters)
<b>CC-5: Outcome 5.2 Restoration and enhancement of carbon stocks in forests and non forest lands</b>	(i) Conservation and advancement of carbon in forests	Five fragmented Forest Reserves plus three Protected Areas (mangroves) totaling 1664 ha and ca 3000 ha of nominally protected forests with lack of active management, active degradation.	Projected annual tons CO2 savings of 23,056. (691689 CO2 eq. 10,000 ha avoided degradation - 113948011 CO2 eq. ) Potential total carbon benefit of 691,689 tons CO2 over 30 years.	Technical reports, including carbon accounting	<b>Risks:</b> (i) ; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) No major natural disaster (hurricane, wildfire) upsets implementation and forest regeneration
Component 1: Enhanced land use planning and regulatory framework (as applied to NE Coast)					
Component 1 Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome C1.1:</b> Integration of ecosystems approach into legal and policy framework	Land Use trends and patterns; extent of sand mining; extent of turtle poaching of Grande Anse and Louvet nesting beaches; area cleared by slash-and-burn for charcoal production and/or short cycle crops	No Land Use Plan; sand mining seriously affects nesting iguanas and marine turtles; extensive loss of marine turtles (specifically <i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> ) as a result of slaughters for meat and eggs; significant forest degradation by slash-and-burn for charcoal production and/or short cycle crops; ca 30% of charcoal makers practice clear cutting on abandoned estates	Land Use Plan adopted by Cabinet (end-of-project target); Recommendations for policy and regulatory framework reform adopted;  Sand mining and poaching of sea turtles and their eggs at Grand Anse and Louvet stopped; forest clearing for charcoal and agriculture limited to selective cutting by owners/care-takers on their private	Land Use maps, project reports, technical reports; Development Project Proposals	<b>Risks:</b> (i) Illegal sand miners and squatters from outside NE project area largely escape internal community control and GOSL monitoring & enforcement mechanisms; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Land Use Plan remains GOSL priority; (ii) Adequate community buy-in and internal control mechanisms are created; (iii) Improved regulatory



Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			land (mid-term target);		framework can be enforced where internal control does not apply (e.g. external squatters and sand miners); (iv) Au Picon Charcoal and Agricultural Producers' experience can be adapted to NE coast users; (v) Continued technical; assistance from the French Government to collaborate on WBT and iguana conservation.
Component 2: Enhanced sustainable land management and carbon benefits in deciduous seasonal and low montane rainforest zones					
Component 2 Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome C2.1:</b> Improved ecosystems restoration and management	Land Use Zoning developed and taken up.	Land use plan with zonation of intact and/or degraded forests does not exist; Identification and mapping of DFAs in NE Coast conducted under PPG.	Statutory land use zoning plan of DFAs to be restored completed, approved and adopted; national scale map identifying location, distribution, density and road network linkage	Project reports, Technical reports, including carbon accounting	<b>Risks:</b> (i) <b>Assumptions:</b> (i)
<b>Outcome C2.2:</b> Restoration of 1,157 hectares of forest of global BD significance,	Number of planted trees	No restoration programmes targeting NE Coast.	50,000 seedlings planted over baseline;	Project reports, Technical reports, including carbon accounting	<b>Risks:</b> (i) <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) acceptable survival rates of tree seedlings

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
enhancing carbon stocks					
<b>Outcome C2.3:</b> Restoration efforts and avoided degradation lead projected annual tons CO2 savings 23,056. Potential total carbon benefit of 691,689 tons CO2 over 30 years.	Length of restored and stabilized river banks and riparian vegetation strips; Carbon accounting/forecasting;	Land degradation causes erosion and siltation; e.g. Trou Salee River bank seriously affected by ATV tours;	2km of riverbanks restored/stabilized;	GIS maps; Technical reports and international databases	<b>Risks:</b> (i) Potential conflicts of interest with private sector stakeholders; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Continued overlap of interest in riparian conservation with BYS; (ii) no major flooding event interferes with riparian restoration; (iii) buy-in from private land owners can be created;
Component 3: Iyanola Conservation					
Component 3 Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome C3.1</b> Increased management effectiveness score of 20% for Forest and Marine Reserves in NE Coast.	Area of forest protected by Reserve status or active management on private lands	Five fragmented Forest Reserves plus three Protected Areas (mangroves) totaling 1664 ha and ca 3000 ha of nominally protected forests with lack of active management	20% increase over baseline management effectiveness score in Forest and Marine Reserves	Technical reports	<b>Risks:</b> (i) None foreseen; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Regular presence by responsible agencies; (ii) adequate expert input

**Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach**

	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome C3.2</b> Population of threatened species (iguana, turtle, birds) maintained or increased.	Species population statistics for selected indicator species (animals and plants); Nesting data of marine turtles, iguanas and birds stable or increasing;	2 terrestrial species rated CR, 2 VU, 3 EN, and 3 not assessed# of nesting marine turtles (only females), size of nesting female turtles; size and number of large male iguanas. Number of bird species, number of individual birds of each species. Technical feasibility study for "Mainland Island" at Marquis 2 prepared; Draft Iguana Species Action Plan;	Populations of at least one rare animal and two rare plant species show increasing trends; Nesting intensity of marine turtles, birds and iguana. Population counts indicate an increase in population size over the average for the past 5 years.	Population assessment reports and international databases and technical reports; Feasibility studies; Publication/presentation record	<b>Risks:</b> (i) Natural disasters and external impacts on migratory species for example, can mask project impact; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Continued support by international NGOs with relevant technical expertise; (iii) buy-in from private land owners can be created; Data collection is accurate, and standardized. Capacity exists in country to monitor population trends; or community or data collectors are willing and able to be trained. Willingness to carry out annual population assessments for a minimum of 3 consecutive years.

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome C3.3</b> Increase capacity & income derived from tourism by 10% in NE Coast	Income generated (sales revenue) by Iyanola-based tourist enterprises; Feasibility studies; tourism-based enterprises in NE Coast; linkages with BD friendly producers at the local level	Curriculum and training programme developed by Media Impact Plc available for roll-out for NE Coast campaign; A number of nature-based tourism products and associations exist, but there is an unknown number. There is also no cohesive structure and weak local linkages exist	Awareness and pride in NE Coast assets increased by 25% across Saint Lucia; 2 costed studies on novel, BD-related tourism products; increased income derived from tourism by 10% in NE Coast; Increased viability of nature-based tourism businesses through implementation of a cohesive operational structure, greater adoption of conservation and sustainability measures, and expansion of markets and local linkages.	Training reports; Feasibility studies; business reports/accounts; Business performance reports; sales data; operational structure; contracts/agreements	<b>Risks:</b> (i) Novel products selected for feasibility studies turn out to be not economical upon detailed analysis; <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Continued support by international NGOs with relevant social marketing and technical expertise; Existing operators are willing to include NE nature-based products in their offerings; improved data collection measures; accurate record keeping.
Component 4: Enhanced Capacity for the production of biodiversity friendly goods and services in inland forest and coastal communities (National with emphasis on NE Coast)					
Component 4 Outcomes	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Outcome C4.1</b> Reductions in pressure on biodiversity and forest ecosystem services	Poaching levels of threatened species reduced; Criteria for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity incorporated in policies, standards, and regulations for production	Turtle mortalities due largely to poaching around 20% of nesting, deforestation at ~10%; At the local level, there is limited knowledge/awareness of the criteria for	Marine turtle poaching levels reduced to < 5% of nesting. Forest loss is 0%; Increased adoption of biodiversity friendly practices in keeping with criteria and indicators for conservation and	Technical reports; Nesting data from turtle watch teams. Forest loss data; Standards; policies; guidelines; operating procedures; compliance checklists	<b>Risks:</b> (i) <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Data collection is accurate. Capacity exists locally to monitor the poaching and deforestation levels. Resource loss is reversible; Buy-in to

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
	and sale of biodiversity friendly products	sustainable production of BD friendly goods as businesses are mostly informal and production is primarily undertaken at the subsistence level.	sustainable use of natural resources		policy recommendations; Compliance mechanisms are supported
<b>Outcome C4.2</b> Producers adopt best practices for production of BD friendly goods	Number of producers, disaggregated by gender, employing best practices for production of BD friendly goods at one marine reserve; Best practices documented and promulgated among local producers of BF friendly products	Few producers employ best practices; Extension services and other programmes provide information on conservation and sustainability measures, but there is no measure of compliance; No best practice guidelines and certification schemes (Some standards for latanye; lansan; honey)	Number of producers, disaggregated by gender, that adopt best practices in production of biodiversity friendly practices increase to 75%	Technical reports; business reports/accounts; Data based on research on production activities ongoing at the marine reserves; Documented best practices; training curriculum and other relevant materials; compliance evaluations	<b>Risks:</b> (i) <b>Assumptions:</b> (i) Best practices have been identified, tested and approved; Buy-in to policy recommendations; Producers understand the value of conservation and sustainability efforts
<b>Component 1: Enhanced land use planning and regulatory framework (as applied to NE Coast)</b>					
Component I Outputs	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	
<b>Output C1.1.1:</b> Ecological considerations integrated into planning policies and regulations for development categories	Policy guidelines for incorporating ecological considerations into Land Use and Development Policy	Existing DCSG document does not cater for ecological considerations; Some Government policies incorporate species and landscape protection considerations; Current land Use Policy does not	Revised and approved DCSG document with ecological requirements The Physical Planning Dept. & the DCA evaluates planning applications from a multidimensional perspective, including	Existing and revised DCSG document Technical reports; Government / national policy documents.	Risk of competing land use, private ownership resistance, acceptance of zoning

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		integrated ecological considerations; No legislation on land use	ecological considerations		
<b>Output C1.1.2:</b> Land Use Plan for NE Coast/Iyanola, incorporating valuation of ecosystem goods and services	Land Use Plan; electronic inventory of ecosystem goods and services and biodiv in NE Coast	Existence of NE Quadrant plan; No local Land Use Plan exist for NE Coast; no inventory of ecosystem goods & services and biodiv in NE Coast	Formulation of local and integrated land use plan; Land Use Plan adopted by Cabinet (end-of-project target)	Completed land use plan document and strategy map; Technical Reports and documents, databases/ electronic documentation - videography	Existence of NE Quadrant plan, low priority status, financial constraints and acceptance
<b>Output C1.1.3:</b> Enhanced capacity of national and local leaders to uptake ecosystem services values considerations in planning in decision making	Training opportunities and sensitization meetings/ workshops and seminars Number of trainees and weeks training; conservation techniques employed; tools and techniques for mapping and valuing ecosystem services. Awareness Surveys.	Limited awareness of ecosystem services valuation.  Limited qualitative and quantitative capacity and specialized knowledge and expertise;	At least 3 major planning decisions which consider ecosystem services values are documented.  A cadre of practitioners with the requisite capacity - trainees, increased capacity and increased levels of integration; At least one exchange with overseas agency;	Technical and training reports; publications/presentations	Risk of low awareness, recognition lack of technical and financial support and assuming priority acceptance by authorities
<b>Develop</b>					
<b>Component 2 Outputs</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of verification</b>	

<b>Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach</b>					
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>Output C2.1.1:</b> Zoning plan for restoration of degraded forest areas NE Coast	Spatial map showing location, distribution, area and severity	Land use plan with zonation of intact and/or degraded forests does not exist	Statutory land use zoning plan of DFAs to be restored completed, approved and adopted; national scale map identifying location, distribution, density and road network linkage	GIS maps; Technical reports and databases	Risk of competing land use, private ownership resistance; Approval from central govt , acceptance of zoning, sterilization of land in terms of alternative options, private land rights
<b>Output C2.2.1:</b> Restoration of degraded priority forest areas nationwide, enhancing connectivity in a 10,000 ha and a 5,090 ha overall areas), with potential total carbon benefit of 691,689 tons CO <sub>2</sub> at the end of a 30 year period	Extent of Forest areas and acreages planted	Depletion of stocks of intact forest areas that are un-zoned with no legal status for conservation and protection	Planting/replacement of 250 ha in NE Coast within nationwide frame of 15,090 ha of forest lands integrated into a national land use plan	Project reports; Forestry and other department reports	
<b>Output C2.3.1:</b> Rehabilitation of riparian, ravine, beach and migratory corridors of NE Coast/ Iyanola forest areas (200 ha)	Functional and effective mitigative measures such as buffers; Length of restored and stabilized beach fronts, river banks, and riparian vegetation strips; Area of migratory corridors rehabilitated;	Uncontrolled negative ecosystem impacts from unsustainable physical and economic activity with deleterious effects; Land degradation causes erosion and siltation; significant beach degradation due to sand mining at approximately 50 tonnes per week at Grande Anse, and a lesser extent at Louvet. e.g. Trou Salee River bank	Inclusion in zoning regime proposals and strategy of land use plan for implementation; 2km of riverbanks restored/stabilized; total of 200ha of non-fragmented migratory corridors rehabilitated; Quantity of beach sand loss as a result of mining on Grande Anse and Louvet beaches halted or reduced by 70 - 90% of	Technical reports and databases	

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		seriously affected by ATV tours; poor management on private lands between Forest Reserves creating fragmented landscape;	baseline.		
<b>Output C2.3.2:</b> At least 1 agreement negotiated for non government forest areas NE Coast/Iyanola	Incentive mechanisms and MOUs/Agreements	Limited incentive mechanisms applicable to privately owned lands; No formal agreement with private land owners exist; responsibilities on lands owned by absentee owners not always clear	Model Framework for conservation PPP; At least 1 agreement negotiated for non government forest areas NE Coast/Iyanola	Project reports; Signed MoU/Agreement	
<b>Output C2.3.3:</b> Two private concessions established to raise revenue for FD	Signed agreements, revenue generation	No revenue for FD operations at Iyanola sites	Two signed agreements, resulting in revenues to cover at least 20% of recurrent basic management costs of Iyanola sites.	Agreements and records.	
<b>Output C2.3.4:</b> Research and Monitoring programme established for indicator species	Populations of selected indicator species (animals and plants); Research Plan	Knowledge base on rare species limited, but recent assessments of some birds and plants exist; Several additional candidate indicator species have been identified; IUCN assessment: 2 terrestrial species rated CR, 2 VU, 3 EN, and 3 not assessed .	Increased IUCN assessments; Quantity of beach sand loss as a result of mining on Grande Anse and Louvet beaches halted or reduced by 70 - 90% of baseline. Assessment of species and ecosystem responses to human activities including CC; Populations of at least one rare animal and two rare plant species show	Project Reports, Technical reports, international and national databases and statistics; publications and records	



Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			increasing trends		
<b>Component 3: Iyanola Conservation</b>					
Component 3 Outputs	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	
<b>Output C3.1.1:</b> Enhanced management effectiveness of 4 key NE Dry Forest Reserves (200 ha)	Areas of degraded and of reforested land	Forest reserves (200 ha) consist of natural dry forest and exotic plantations; incursions into Forest Reserves are rare, but management levels are low.	Regular and proactive management in at least 4 key NE Dry Forest Reserves, totaling 200 ha	Technical reports, reports to relevant Conventions, publications and presentations	
<b>Output C3.1.2:</b> Boundaries set for Grande Anse and Louvet Marine Reserves	Map boundary parameters - upper limits and buffer zones	Marine reserve designated under SPPA; No delineation of marine reserves for the two areas exist; General outer limits described in relation to the extent of beachfront and fringing forest, and mangroves	Defined boundaries spatially represented in map format - Marine and terrestrial boundaries set and include demarcation around freshwater, swamps, forested sites	Technical reports from Fisheries Department, Survey Dept; Maps	Risk of development policy conflicts and assumption that policymakers will accede

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
<b>Output C3.2.1.:</b> Management and sustainable financing plan established for Grand Anse Marine Reserve	Populations of selected indicator species (animals and plants)	2 terrestrial species rated CR, 2 VU, 3 EN, and 3 not assessed by IUCN; indicator species, marine turtles / <i>Dermochelys coriacea</i> CR and <i>Chelonia mydas</i> , <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i> , EN; Grand Anse Beach and Mangrove is designated Marine Reserve (WDPA ID 31421) but IUCN category not defined; Several IAS and control strategies identified for NE Coast; A Number of sustainable management projects ongoing.	Management and sustainable financing plan; Increased IUCN assessments of species and protected areas; Populations of at least one rare animal and two rare plant species show increasing trends; IAS contained or show decreasing trend	Technical and financial reports, reports to relevant Conventions, international and national databases and statistics, publications and presentations; Reports on biodiversity loss and commercial activities in marine reserves	
<b>Output C3.2.2:</b> Community based management plan for Louvet Mangroves	Engagement and inputs from local council and local groups; Size and distribution of mangrove species; Populations of selected indicator species (animals and plants)	Stakeholder Participation Plan; No management Plan; Spatial map of mangrove, and list of vulnerable plant and animal species; list of community extractive and non-extractive activities	Designate mangroves as part MRM Area of LU zoning plan; Management plan produced through broad-based community consultation, formally endorsed by community representatives, and being implemented. GPS markers established for all outer boundaries, (land and offshore), and key ecosystems such as mangroves, river beds, wetlands demarcated and	Fisheries` Dept and LU Zoning Plan; Management Plan document, endorsement signature; GPS markers	

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
			assessed, with clearly defined harvest control mechanisms.		
<b>Output C3.3.1:</b> Develop business plan to promote new tourism and other income generating activities and enhance existing ones	Business plan, tourism-based income; new nature-based business enterprises	No business plan exists; Most initiatives at the community level are fragmented and lack proper management/operational structures, including guidelines for sustainable resource use two potential opportunities (mainland island and <i>in situ</i> iguana breeding) have been identified by stakeholder consultation; technical feasibility or draft action plans were prepared	Business plan developed and adopted by stakeholders; at least 1 novel revenue-generating enterprise piloted; 10% increase in tourism-related income in NE Coast; Revenue from nature based tourism activities at the community level increased through implementation of a structured and sustainable business approach	Business Performance Reports; Sales Data; Business Plan; Feasibility study on cost-recovery for maintenance of "mainland Island" in Marquis 2; Training reports; Press releases on special events	
<b>Component 4: Enhanced Capacity for the production of biodiversity friendly goods and services in inland forest and coastal communities (National with emphasis on NE Coast)</b>					
<b>Component 4 Outputs</b>	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of verification</b>	

<b>Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach</b>					
	<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Sources of verification</b>	<b>Risks and Assumptions</b>
<b>Output C4.1.1:</b> Market, knowledge and capacity barriers for the community level production of biodiversity friendly goods and services removed	Access to markets with gender equitable opportunities; mechanisms for sharing of information at community level; training programmes; trends in sustainable livelihoods; trading agreements; production and sale of products from three categories of BD friendly businesses	Insufficient data available to inform current availability of resources, level of production, market access, or revenue derived from biodiversity friendly goods and services; absence of an institutionalised and regulated by national systems framework for production of BD friendly goods and services; Government ministries, agencies, NGOs provide support for development and implementation of BD friendly businesses but the support is not holistic; Selected categories for pilots have been identified based on available resources and current activities.	Increased viability of enterprises for the production of biodiversity friendly goods and services facilitated through increased market access, research and training initiatives and piloting of national management system; Pilot management plans and promotional strategies for 3 BD friendly goods and services; Structured/ coordinated approach to providing support at the national level for the production and sale of BD friendly products for the enhancement of sustainable livelihoods; Community Replication Framework established to support the upscaling in production B D Friendly businesses	Market data; Business Performance Reports; Training Materials; Operational structure; Government instrument formalising system; Buyer-Supplier trading agreements; contracts; Business Performance Reports	
<b>Output C4.2.1:</b> Assessment of marketing potential for BD friendly goods and services	Market information	The business component of the production of local biodiversity friendly products is not well developed as most products are mainly used	Market information for application of a more strategic approach to production and trade of biodiversity friendly goods and services	Project Reports; Market data;	

Iyanola - Natural Resource Management of the NE Coast Approach					
	Indicator	Baseline	Target	Sources of verification	Risks and Assumptions
		for subsistence or sold locally and there is little evidence of record keeping.	researched		
<b>Output C4.2.2:</b> Guidelines for 3 BD friendly goods and services produced	Standards, codes of practice and operational procedures for production of BD friendly goods and services	There is limited awareness of measures that inform the use of natural resources for sustainable livelihoods at the community level; No best practice guidelines and certification schemes (Some standards for latanye; lansan; honey)	Pilot guidelines for the production of 3 biodiversity friendly goods and services	Standard operating procedures; Policies, guidelines for the production of BD friendly products	

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Comment	Response
<b>GEF Secretariat Review</b>	
<p>Sept 13 2012</p> <p>For the final CEO endorsement document, please explain how calculations for carbon estimates are calculated for Component 2. Currently, values are given without explanation of how they were obtained, and as a result it is difficult to evaluate assumptions.</p>	<p>Please note Appendix 13 Carbon Monitoring Assessment Monitoring System which includes the baseline table presented at PIF stage calculated using IPCC Tier 1 methodology and existing inventory data.</p>
<p>Please provide a clearer picture of what the situation would be without the GEF investment. In particular, please describe the incremental value of the monitoring program in terms of both biodiversity and carbon benefits.</p>	<p>Without GEF interventions, land use planning would continue to undervalue biodiversity and ecosystem services in the planning and management processes. The GEF intervention will build on existing legal framework to develop appropriate supporting regulations and guidelines which integrate environmental sensitivities, priorities and sustainable management options in forest, coastal and marine ecosystems. In the absence of the possibility of a national land use plan, a pilot land use plan for an area of critical global significance would constitute an incremental building block to move towards this overarching goal. Without the GEF intervention the high biodiversity, priority forest, and marine areas of the NE Coast would continue to be degraded and imperiled by development initiatives which fail to take into account local, national and global environment considerations. A GEF intervention, focusing on prevention and informed decision making strengthens sensitive planning, conservation and management measures in lieu of ad hoc development and inaction. Building on anti-poverty initiatives, GEF support will permit testing of innovative sustainable use of biodiversity resources. Of particular emphasis is the opportunity to integrate biodiversity concerns and sustainable land use options into the forthcoming development scenario for the NE Coast (highway, tourism development).</p> <p>The carbon monitoring system referred to above will allow the project to report on carbon benefits achieved through GEF supported activities, biodiversity indicators (indicator species) will permit measurement of success of GEF financed interventions.</p> <p>Please also see Appendix 3 of the Project Document, the Incremental Cost Analysis which provides excellent details</p>

Comment	Response
	regarding the incremental benefits afforded by the GEF investment.
<p>UNEP's office in Panama is supervising several projects in Latin America (for example, two in Mexico) that seek to mainstream biodiversity conservation into land-use planning and economic development activities. The final project document should discuss how UNEP will ensure that this expertise and lessons-learned are shared with the St. Lucia project.</p>	<p>As part of the land use planning component, tools including InVEST - Integrated Evaluation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs, SWAT - Soil Water Assessment Tool will be assessed for relevance and best practices outlined in the GEF funded Project for Ecosystem Services (ProEcoServ) <a href="http://www.proecoserv.org/">http://www.proecoserv.org/</a> and GEF funded Landuse planning project in Mexico: <a href="http://www.proyctomixteca.org.mx/">http://www.proyctomixteca.org.mx/</a> will be taken up as relevant. Unfortunately much of the documentation being posted to the project web sites is in Spanish so there are some limits to transferability. Furthermore the differences between Mexico and the small SIDs country of St. Lucia should be noted. The St. Lucia project design did benefit significantly from consultation with CAF, the executing agency of the GEF funded Biotrade project. There advice has been integrated into the design of Component 4 on Biotrade, and CAF has furthermore committed to participating in the Project Inception Workshop with a view towards exploring a role in this project and indeed in developing biotrade initiatives in the Caribbean</p>
<p>STAP Scientific and Technical screening – October 16, 2012</p>	
<p>1. The project will need to take into account the status not only of the St Lucia iguana but also of the non-native Green iguana, as well as other forest animals and reptiles. There is little evidence in the PIF of comprehensive knowledge and analysis of the distribution of native endangered species, their habitats and threats from non-native species. This will necessarily have to be included in the full project document. STAP understands that a considerable amount of research has been devoted to distributional aspects of St Lucian fauna and their respective habitats. A key reference is Daltry, J.C. 2009. The Status and Management of St Lucia's Forest Reptiles and Amphibians. National Forest Demarcation and Bio-Physical Resource Inventory</p>	<p>In fact, the term “Iyanola” means “the land where iguanas are found”. The non native Green iguana and St. Lucia iguana were the objective of the St. Lucian pilot under recently completed GEF funded “Mitigating the Threat of Invasive Alien Species in the Insular Caribbean”. The consultant who led that pilot led the development of the biodiversity component of this Iyanola project. A full report on the baseline status of the distribution of native endangered species, their habitats and threats from non native species was carried out under the PPG. it must be noted that the habitats of these are in a different part of the island.</p> <p>The following references were consulted during the baseline study:</p> <p>Daltry, J. C. (2009a) Biodiversity Assessment of Saint Lucia’s Forest, with Management Recommendations, National Forest Demarcation And Bio-</p>

Comment	Response
<p>Project, Caribbean “ Saint Lucia, SFA 2003/SLU/BIT04/0711/-EMF/LC. FCG International, Helsinki.</p>	<p>Physical Resource Inventory Project, Saint Lucia, SFA 2003/SLU/BIT-04/0711/EMF/LC, FCG International Ltd, <a href="http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003">http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003</a>, FCG &amp; Fauna &amp; Flora, pp 80.</p> <p>Daltry, J. C. (2009b) The Status and Management of Saint Lucia’s Forest Reptiles and Amphibians, National Forest Demarcation And Bio-Physical Resource Inventory Project, Saint Lucia, SFA 2003/SLU/BIT-04/0711/EMF/LC, FCG International Ltd, <a href="http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003">http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003</a>, FCG &amp; Fauna &amp; Flora, pp 133.</p> <p>Gardner, L. (2007). Review of the Policy, Legal, and Institutional Frameworks for Protected Areas Management in Saint Lucia. OESC Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods (OPAAL) Project, Environment and Sustainable Development Unit, OECS Secretariat, Saint Lucia</p> <p>GOSL (2009) 4<sup>th</sup> National Report on Biodiversity. <a href="http://www.cbd.int">www.cbd.int</a></p> <p>Graveson, R. (2009) The Classification of the Vegetation of Saint Lucia. Technical Report No. 3 to the National Forest Demarcation and Bio-Physical Resource Inventory Project, FCG International Ltd, Helsinki, Finland.</p> <p>Graveson, R (undated). Plant of Saint Lucia. <a href="http://www.saintlucianplants.com/">http://www.saintlucianplants.com/</a></p> <p>Graveson, R. (2009). The Classification of the Vegetation of Saint Lucia, National Forest Demarcation And Bio-Physical Resource Inventory Project, Saint Lucia, SFA 2003/SLU/BIT-04/0711/EMF/LC, FCG International Ltd, <a href="http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003">http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003</a>, pp 113</p> <p>Haffey, D. (2009) Systems Plan for Protected Areas, OESC Protected Areas and Associated Livelihoods (OPAAL) Project, Environment and Sustainable Development Unit, OECS Secretariat, Saint Lucia</p> <p>John, M. (2010) Investigating the Feasibility of Establishing a Biosphere Reserve on the Northeast Coast of St. Lucia. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada</p> <p>Morton, M (2009). Management of Critical Species on St. Lucia. National Forest Demarcation And Bio-Physical Resource Inventory Project, St. Lucia, SFA 2003/SLU/BIT-04/0711/EMF/LC, FCG International Ltd, <a href="http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003">http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003</a>, FCG International &amp; Durrell Wildlife Conservation Trust, pp 103.</p> <p>Morton, M. (2006) Biodiversity on the northeast coast of St Lucia: the Importance of Grand Anse and Louvet Estates. Unpublished report to the Forestry Department, Saint Lucia.</p> <p>Morton, M. (2007) Iyanola - Sustainable Development for the North East Coast of Saint Lucia. Unpublished report to the Forestry Department, Saint Lucia.</p> <p>Tennent, R.B. (2009) Timber Inventory of Saint Lucia’s Forests. Technical Report No. 5 to the National Forest Demarcation and Bio-Physical Resource Inventory Project, FCG International Ltd, Helsinki, Finland.</p> <p>Toussaint, A., John, L &amp; Morton, M (2009). The Status and Conservation of St Lucia’s Forest Bird, National Forest Demarcation And Bio-Physical Resource Inventory Project, Saint Lucia, SFA 2003/SLU/BIT-</p>



Comment	Response
	04/0711/EMF/LC, FCG International Ltd, <a href="http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003">http://www.bananatrustslu.com/index.php?link=doccentre&amp;project=sfa2003</a> , Forestry Dept, pp 83.
<p>2. Land use planning (Component 1) in and of itself cannot create the conditions for protection of biodiversity. Traditional approaches to LUP are often inflexible and rigid, and enlightened thinking is often required to ensure ecosystem values and consideration of wildlife can be built in. The creation of 'hard edges' between protected areas and human land use has often proved counter-productive. STAP strongly urges the project in St Lucia to build its own approaches on what has been shown to work elsewhere. Useful guidance on land use planning involving conservation is to be found in Naughton, L. 2007. Collaborative Land Use Planning: Zoning for Conservation and Development in Protected Areas. Tenure Brief No.4, Land Tenure Center, Wisconsin-Madison. WWF have also produced guidelines.</p>	<p>Please see Component 1 pages 41-45 of the ProDoc for the extensive description of the activities which will take place to value, integrate and uptake ecosystem services inclusive of biodiversity into the land use planning process.</p> <p>The references have been noted and included along with additional relevant ones including from best practices and lessons learned in the GEF portfolio.</p>
<p>3. STAP notes the intention in Component 2 to "increase capacity and income derived from tourism by 10 percent in the NE Coast". Currently, in the PIF text there is only one very short paragraph at the end of Section B1 on the sustainable use of biodiversity, and no mention as to how this can be achieved. St Lucia, in common with other parts of the Caribbean, struggles with a legacy of the plantation economy, producing agricultural goods for export while importing most domestic agricultural needs - including those for the tourism industry. "Research in St Lucia suggests that promoting linkages between hotels and groups of farmers such as cooperatives has the greatest potential to stimulate local agricultural production for hotel and domestic consumption." (Timms, B. 2006. Caribbean agriculture tourism linkages in a neoliberal world: Problems and prospects for St Lucia. International Development Planning Review 28: 35-56). Attention to issues of marketing agricultural produce and connections with local farmers needs to be highlighted if the sustainable use of biodiversity is to be protected.</p>	<p>The intervention in Component 2, to "increase capacity and income derived from tourism by 10 percent in the NE Coast" will occur through the development of a business plan to promote new tourism and other income generating activities and enhance existing ones, ensuring enhanced provisioning and accounting of ecosystems goods and services through linkages with Component 4 on Biotrade. Activities include:</p> <p>A situational analysis for nature-based tourism product for the NE Iyanola region, a gap analysis and feasibility/business opportunity study to enhance existing and inform potential new product and services initiatives and finally defining a nature-based tourism product for the NE Iyanola region incorporating BD friendly and cultural heritage products and services, giving particular focus to the elements of community based management plans for NE Iyanola Dry Forest Reserves, Grand Anse Marine Reserve and Louvet Mangroves and develop business plan for NE Iyanola Region nature-based tourism product.</p> <p>Concur with STAP advice to seek linkages between farmers and tourism for agro-processing activities under Component 4. The project will further conduct market research for selected categories of BD friendly products and services; assess and evaluate product demand, supply, and current market arrangements for selected BD friendly products and services;</p>

Comment	Response
	<p>identify and assess capacity to comply with industry standards for production and sale of BD friendly products; conduct comparative analysis for select categories of BD friendly products, including pricing, product quality, etc.; collaborate with relevant agencies, e.g. TEPA, to explore additional access to external markets...</p>
<p>4. The proposal rightly identifies (in Section B3) gender as an important issue to address to ensure socio-economic benefits are appropriately distributed. The text in the proposal gives the impression that, other than consulting women's groups, gender impacts will mostly be tracked as part of the project M&amp;E system. STAP suggests that gender should feature more prominently as part of the project design, including how labour and income issues are tackled. Although a little dated, the chapter by J, Momsen (1993) 'Gender and environmental perception in the Eastern Caribbean' [in Lockhart, D.G. et al. The Development Process in Small Island States. Routledge, London, pp. 57-70] could prove a useful analysis as to where and how interventions can be made in a Caribbean context.</p>	<p>The 4 project components were analyzed during the project design phase to ascertain the extent to which gender could be incorporated in the activities proposed for each of the concepts. The project integrates gender dimensions into the elaboration of Component 4 interventions to promote sustainable use of biodiversity friendly products and services to derive sustainable livelihoods, and in the development of results frameworks, budgets, implementation plans and work plans. The proposed categories of biodiversity friendly goods, non-timber forest products (NTFPs) for piloting have traditionally been dominated by women. Socio-economic indicators will be developed to measure the impact of improved management of timber resources and ecosystem services, together with increases in income for targeted communities and replication efforts. Restoration efforts also offer gender neutral opportunities by involving women in nursery operations. As part of this effort, disaggregated gendered impacts of increased income generation will be tracked as part of the M &amp; E system. The lessons learned, marketing and innovative successes of the Components 3 will be shared at regularly inter-community venues to en(gender) replication, and will have a positive and sustainable impact on women.</p> <p>A number of women's groups are partners of the project, see Appendix 14 Project Stakeholder and Participation Plan for further details.</p>
<p>5. STAP has difficulties in accepting the third specified risk in the risk analysis table in Section B4 "New regulations and guidelines for land use planning and enforcement thereof may meet with resistance". Essentially, this appears to be saying that there is a risk that the project will fail. Risks should be because of forces and pressures outside the remit of the project. It is not acceptable to say that the measures introduced by the project may not be good enough.</p>	<p>Introducing new land use guidelines and regulations meet with resistance worldwide. The project cannot ignore this risk and has therefore prepared a number of risk mitigation strategy activities such as participatory mechanisms, awareness building, and most importantly opportunities afforded through alternative livelihoods.</p>

Comment	Response
<p>6. Commendably, the project is to deliver global environmental benefits along with domestic livelihood support and human development. However, the benefits need to be linked explicitly to the impact indicators of the GEF-5 focal area strategies relevant to the project (BD, CC, LD, SFM). For example, changes in land cover would serve well as an indicator that assesses the project contribution to delivering benefits in all four of the focal areas. Opportunities in identifying cross-cutting impacts are being missed.</p>	<p>Please see Results Framework which features impact indicators linked to GEF-5 focal area strategies. Please also see Appendix 13 Carbon Assessment Monitoring System.</p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW;

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: <b>162,727 USD</b>			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)162,727</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Stakeholder Consultations (communities and national) & project validation	32,227	32,227	
PPG coordination and project consolidation/M & E Plan	24,000	24,000	
Baseline Studies and component development, preparation of pilots (land use, terrestrial and marine biodiversity, eco-tourism/agro processing, forest carbon)	91,500	91,500	
Social Scientist – Socio economic Profile, Project Stakeholder and Participation Plan	15,000	15,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>162,727</b>	<b>162,727</b>	