



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

GEF ID:	9406		
Country/Region:	St. Lucia		
Project Title:	Integrated Ecosystem Management and Restoration of Forests on the South East Coast of St. Lucia		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CCM-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; LD-2 Program 3; SFM-3; CCM-2 Program 4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,988	Project Grant:	\$4,428,145
Co-financing:	\$28,655,560	Total Project Cost:	\$33,220,693
PIF Approval:	May 04, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	June 09, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	Marianela Ayara

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?	Dec 8, 2017 No, overall this document lacks sufficient detail and decisions on the activities that will be undertaken as part of this project for this point in time.	Additional details have been provided in the various responses below
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to	Dec 8, 2017 No, please address the following issues:	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>Overall:</p> <p>The project outputs and outcomes are unclear in their writing and would benefit from editing and potentially reorganization / reconsideration.</p> <p>Also, there are too many proposed ideas and not enough decisions taken on what this project will actually do.</p> <p>Also, it would be good to see a more thorough treatment of gender at this stage rather than the general statements provided to ensure gender mainstreaming throughout, including at implementation - gender neutral design is not sufficient and isn't guaranteed without real analysis.</p>	<p>The language describing the outputs has been edited for clarity. The outcomes and outputs are the same as in the approved PIF document, with just a few minor changes in wording, and so should not require reorganization. Nevertheless, one of the changes made from the PIF (the addition of Output 1.5) has now reverted back, so that Output 1.5 is now an activity under Output 1.1</p> <p>The project scope has changed very little from the approved PIF (see Table of changes on p. 4 of the CEO ER). Apart from some minor changes in wording and numbering of outputs, the only significant change (now that Output 1.5 has been removed; see point above) is the addition of Output 3.5 (Knowledge management, replication and increased awareness supported) but this output was added in response to the STAP comment 5 on the PIF requesting more emphasis on a knowledge management strategy in the project.</p> <p>While a formal gender analysis was not carried out during project preparation, project funds (Budget Line 1202, \$15,000) have been specified for a National Consultant on Gender to “develop a detail gender analysis for the project interventions in the SE coast and propose gender mainstreaming options to project”. In addition, it is worth noting that the project framework (Component 3) does include two indicators that will require the project to address gender considerations in implementing project activities, namely:</p> <p>Indicator 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator: Vulnerable municipalities without access to renewable energies • End of Project Target: 2 agro-processing initiatives using renewable energy (Aupicon Sea Moss farmers and the Anse Ger women’s group of farmers) (Note: The Anse Ger Rural Women’s Group is an active group with 20 members including farmers, small food processing enterprises, and craftpersons) <p>Indicator 2</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>1.1 – A. Please clarify the title of this output. Monitoring would imply that they are going into the field and collecting information and this is the system they use to do that, which does not appear to be the case.</p> <p>B. Many GEF projects have developed similar databases and it would be good to learn lessons from those activities.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicator: “# of opportunities for improving local incomes being derived from potentially ecologically friendly economic activities and taking into account gender considerations” • End of Project Target: “10 sustainable livelihood projects on ecologically friendly economic activities carried out; at least 50% of beneficiaries are women” <p>Finally, Table 1: Stakeholder Map and Participation Plan in the UNEP Prodoc notes that “Local communities and women’s groups would be involved in the designing and implementation of project interventions for livelihood creation, renewable energy and reforestation”</p> <p>Comment is unclear. The first two paragraphs (underlines added) include text stating “The first step will be to conduct a <u>baseline assessment of biological resources</u> in the SE Coast Region, including forests, coastal areas, mangroves, and coral reefs, which will help in establishing a catalogue of high value species, ecosystem services and habitats. In parallel to this activity, the project will also support the <u>GIS mapping of forests, land uses and biological resources in the South East Coast</u>. This information will be <u>integrated in a monitoring and information system</u> that is being developed as part of the GEF-supported CCCD project being implemented by DSD”, and “<u>Data will be gathered on environmental goods and services</u> in the South East Coast by the Forestry, Fisheries, and Planning Departments during the course of the project as part of a long term terrestrial and marine monitoring protocol. This data will then be uploaded using <u>GEONODE, an open source data sharing platform</u> hosted by the Planning Department, so that it can be shared with all the agencies involved with the project”. Thus, under Output 1.1, field activities to collect and consolidate information will be undertaken, and that information will be put into the system.</p> <p>Text has been added to the end of the second paragraph under Output 1.1 stating that “an analysis of lessons learnt from other GEF projects on setting</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>C. The institutional home and responsibility for ongoing maintenance needs to be decided.</p> <p>D. It also seems to be a number of different activities combined into one database</p> <p>1.2 - The GEF-6 BD strategy specifically lists the criteria for the establishment of new protected areas as places that are KBAs or would qualify as such. However, KBAs are not mentioned here. Please revise.</p> <p>1.3 – This wording confusing. While the International Conservation Corps can be a strong partner, how will long term ability to implement and practice adaptive management be ensured?</p>	<p>up similar biodiversity information systems will be conducted in order to ensure effectiveness and cost-efficiency”</p> <p>As noted under Output 1.1, the Planning Department maintains the GEONODE database system. In addition, DSD has responsibility as the focal point for reporting to use the data in GEONODE to extract and analyze information and thereby generate reports required for national and international commitments.</p> <p>This is correct, in fact the GEONODE information system is designed to incorporate many different data sources and to create many different layers of spatial data, so that this information can be collectively analyzed and used to guide decision-making</p> <p>The project documents have been revised to show that the proposed new terrestrial and marine protected areas do overlap with two existing KBAs in Saint Lucia; the proposed terrestrial protected area encompasses approximately 25% of the Point Sable KBA and approximately 60% of the Mandele Dry Forest KBA, while the proposed marine protected area encompasses approximately 5% of each of those two areas. Changes have been made to the text under Output 1.2 to reflect this information. In addition, Appendix 19 has been added to the UN Environment Prodoc with information on the Point Sable and Mandele Dry Forest KBAs.</p> <p>Output 1.3 does state “As these departments (Forestry and Fisheries) currently have limited capacity for PA management, the project will support capacity building of their staff in basic processes for PA design and management”. Additional text has been added stating: “The International Conservation Corps (ICC) will provide expert training to national professionals in the Forestry and Fisheries departments to develop their capacity for adaptive PA management by directly supporting in them in developing and updating PA management plans, monitoring plans, visitor management plans, etc.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>The NCTF shouldn't be aimed at replacing all government support for protected areas.</p> <p>1.4 - STAP has recognized that all too often sustainable finance mechanisms are proposed for GEF projects but are the part that aren't completed. Bearing this in mind, please address the following:</p> <p>A. St Lucia has already had an extensive study of financing options that was completed prior to the PIF of this project. Consultations as part of the PPG should have selected what activities would be undertaken as part of this project so that implementation can begin from inception. We would like to see specific activities outlined here.</p> <p>B. The STAP guidance document on PES specifically states information that should be present at the PIF stage of a project that is not included here. Therefore, if PES is being seriously considered, we would like to see</p>	<p>It is not. The Govt. is fully expected to maintain their historical levels of support (at a minimum) for the PA system. The NCTF, which is a local mechanism to draw down, manage and monitor funds from the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund, is designed to match any new investments (from Govt., donors, or private sector) into PAs, beyond the historical Govt. funding levels, on a 1:1 basis. The NCTF has just become operational with its legal formation and appointment of a Board. It is expected that it will need perhaps a year to become fully operational and by about year 3 it will start to invest in the PA system.</p> <p>Output 1.4 has been extensively revised. In addition, responses to specific comments are provided below.</p> <p>Although options for partnerships and other sustainable financing strategies were identified in several previous projects / assessments, the Government of Saint Lucia has yet to signal which strategies / mechanisms it will support, and thus one of the first tasks of the project will be to encourage and facilitate decision-making by the Government on their use and their integration into the legal and regulatory framework so that they can become operational in Saint Lucia.</p> <p>The use of PES mechanisms has been removed from the proposed project activities</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>significantly more information present here.</p> <p>C. There seems to be a mixing of public-private partnerships that would involve private landowners in conservation efforts and financing of the conservation trust fund, which would appear to be two very separate things. The GEF can typically support both of these types of activities; however, more detail and clarity is needed.</p> <p>D. The language in para 102 of the prodoc makes it sound like these are separate projects.</p> <p>1.5 - The wording of this output is confusing. What exactly is involved with this component? Is something being piloted?</p> <p>2.1 –</p> <p>A. It is worth noting that GEF support under LD is not limited to native species, but can include improved practices for forestry and agroforestry. However, blue mahoe has been identified as a problem</p>	<p>These activities are separate, but linked. The PPPs are focused primarily on demonstrating a model for sustainable resource use in the SE Coast region that is both profitable and avoids or reduces negative environmental impacts, including those that affect GEBs (e.g. land degradation or habitat destruction associated with agroforestry / agro-processing activities, or negative visitor impacts on fragile terrestrial and marine environments). At the same time, the project will seek to build partnerships whereby these private partners will clearly understand the link between the resources and services supplied by healthy natural ecosystems and the financial and social viability of their operations, so that they become funding partners (and models for others in the SE Coast region) who contribute to the NCTF as a mechanism for protecting the environment of the SE Coast.</p> <p>The term “proposed project” has been removed from para 102 in order to make the language more clear.</p> <p>Output 1.5 has been changed to be an activity under Output 1.1. The idea of this activity is to help the monitoring and information system developed under Output 1.1 to actually “support sustainable ecosystem management” (as stated in the title of Output 1.1) by assisting decision-makers in making informed decisions using the IWCAM methodology, and ensuring effective consultations are undertaken in making management decisions.</p> <p>The blue mahoe is widely used in reforestation activities by the Forestry Department in Saint Lucia and the species does not represent a problem species in the country.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>species in St Vincent. Can you please explain its inclusion here?</p> <p>B. How will the nurseries be sustainable after the life of the project?</p> <p>C. Sustainable rotations for mahogany can be over a human generation in length and require real forestry knowledge. How will this project support this as a long-term investment?</p> <p>D. The language in para 102 of the prodoc makes it sound like these are separate projects.</p> <p>2.2 – This is a wide variety of potential ecosystems to try to restore.</p>	<p>The nurseries managed by the Forestry Department and the Ministry of Agriculture exist already, and the project will simply expand their capacity to produce seedlings. Beyond the life of the project, these nurseries will continue to be managed and supported by these agencies, although they may return to pre-project production capacities. With regard to the community nurseries, these are expected to continue to produce agroforestry seedlings that will be sold in the market to farmers in the area and throughout the country, as well as to commercial customers in the SE coast (e.g. tourism facilities), thereby operating as for-profit ventures.</p> <p>GEF funds will not be used for reforestation efforts using mahogany; the use of mahogany will just be a continuation of existing Forestry Department programs to establish mahogany plantations.</p> <p>The response to this comment is provided under Output 1.4 above (because para 102 of the Prodoc refers to Output 1.4)</p> <p>The text of Output 2.2 has been revised to clarify that the project activities for ecosystem rehabilitation are limited to mangrove forest and other areas of coastal vegetation. For other coastal / marine ecosystems (i.e. seagrass beds and coral reefs), the project will help to protect these areas by establishing new regulations and management plans (within the new MPA) to protect these habitats, and then by supporting enforcement of those regulations / plans.</p> <p>The project will draw lessons learned from the experience of The Nature</p>

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>How will this project learn from existing efforts and document its own efforts for sharing?</p> <p>What systems will be put in place to ensure the longer term support, care and management of these sites?</p> <p>2.3 - How will this catalyze further benefits?</p> <p>3.1 – A. We call installation of RE capacity as INV, not TA. So, the Financing Type for 3.1 should be INV.</p> <p>B. Please split the capital investment (GEF\$1.14 million and co-financing \$3.029), it is difficult to see the cost-effectiveness of the RE investment (component 3.1). We split information in the sub- components of 3.1, 3.2, etc.</p> <p>C. We say "Energy" not "Energies". Please revise.</p>	<p>Conservancy, which has undertake mangrove restoration in Saint Lucia and in other countries within the Caribbean. Project activities will be documented and shared through the knowledge management approaches developed under project Output 3.5</p> <p>The areas designated for restoration are within the boundaries of the proposed terrestrial protected area that will be established by the project. It is expected that other ongoing programs, especially the NCTF, will provide long-term funding for the management of this site, including ongoing conservation of critical and restored ecosystems. Other potential long-term funding could result from the development of ecotourism in the area and the creation of public-private partnerships with ecotourism operators that could include financial contributions for conservation of areas important for ecotourism.</p> <p>Reducing erosion on private agricultural lands in areas upstream or adjacent to the proposed terrestrial and marine protected areas will reduce sedimentation and flooding, both of which degrade natural aquatic habitats in the terrestrial and coastal regions as well as nearshore marine ecosystems.</p> <p>The financing type in Table B of the CEO ER has been changed to INV</p> <p>The GEF and Co-financing funding amounts in Table B of the CEO ER are now shown at the output level, including the funding for Output 3.1 (\$182,000 in GEF funding).</p> <p>Revised as requested.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>D. On page 19, Appendix 15 should be Appendix 16.</p> <p>E. The assumptions for GHG emission reductions are not acceptable. a) Nobody can guarantee a solar PV to work 7 hours every day. b) No equipment on Earth can work 365 days a year. c) Emission factor (703 grams of CO₂/kWh) has not been justified</p> <p>3.2 –</p> <p>A. Is the idea proposed here to create new regulations? Will these be minimum standards or just suggested guidance?</p> <p>B. This output might make more sense as part of component 1 on more national level activities</p> <p>C. How will enforcement be supported? Unchecked development is identified as one of the major problems, yet little seems to be being done about it through this project with the exception of this output.</p>	<p>Revised as requested.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Saint Lucia receives on average between 10-12 hours of sunlight per day. Of course, not at maximum intensity. This is accounted for not only by using a lower amount of sunlight hours but also a de-rating of the PV panels we used 0.8 and 7 hours. The PV system, if maintained, will work 365 days per year, but we adjusted the calculation to cover 325 days a year. <p>The project will develop guidelines, which could eventually evolve into minimum standards</p> <p>While the guidelines are national, they will be piloted at the local level, so the project team feels that they belong under this output.</p> <p>In addition to the ecotourism guidelines developed under this output, the threat of unchecked development is addressed by the project with the creation and operationalization of two new PAs as well as the monitoring and information system that flows into and supports the national spatial plan”. The ecotourism guidelines are important as well because the SE Coast already has nascent tourism activities that are growing without guidelines and standards. Furthermore, the Ministry of Tourism is expected to be a significant partner in the execution of the project and it is expected to reinforce the guidelines through preventing unplanned and unapproved tourism development. Finally, the need for guidelines was identified during a SWOT analysis of the local context and review of established standards for similar initiatives during the PPG phase.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>D. How will this relate to the management information system?</p> <p>3.4 - It would be good to connect how these activities relate to global environmental benefits.</p> <p>3.5 –</p> <p>A. A communications strategy should be developed from the beginning that would go hand in hand with the inception workshop in rolling out. The text here remains too general.</p> <p>B. Learning from other projects in the Caribbean and sharing this knowledge is vital to success. Therefore, we would like to see more attention paid to this aspect as well.</p>	<p>Ecotourism guidelines are not relevant to the information management system</p> <p>The development of sustainable tourism and agro-forestry / agro-processing livelihoods outside the proposed protected areas will not only lead to sustainable national development, but will also improve stewardship of the resources of the SE coast and take pressure off of the natural resources and ecological functions of natural ecosystems, including the existing and proposed PAs. By ensuring that productive activities are sustainably managed, and furthermore by providing local residents with alternatives to unsustainable livelihoods practices such as hunting of iguanas and turtles, sand mining, overfishing, indiscriminate land clearing, shifting cultivation, overharvesting of wood resources, etc., activities under this output will support the conservation of important habitat and ecosystem services.</p> <p>Text has been added under Output 3.5 stating that “an initial strategy will be prepared as part of the project inception activities”.</p> <p>Text has been added under Output 3.5 stating “Field Officers (e.g. Extension Officers, Forestry Officers, Tourism Officers) from relevant ministries and agencies will play an important role in supporting knowledge sharing aligned to project initiatives; the project is designed to provide these staff with exposure to best practices and relevant new methods and technologies developed by other initiatives in the region, through sharing of technical information, and attendance at training seminars, workshops, and exchange visits. In addition, the project will explore the possibility of establishing virtual work groups or networking teams comprising key stakeholders involved in similar projects across the region”.</p> <p>The project will disseminate information and educate residents in the SE</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>C. Communications and engagement would appear to be important components of addressing issues such as hunting and other unsustainable</p> <p>Innovation: The GEF has supported numerous such information systems. With greater detail, there would likely be innovations in engaging the private sector or generating revenue for the conservation trust fund that would be important lessons for neighboring countries.</p> <p>Sustainability: This is a major weakness of the activities described. Please look throughout the project to plan for sustainability.</p> <p>Also, financial sustainability cannot depend on resources that may or may not materialize that are not necessarily</p>	<p>Coast region on the impacts of unsustainable activities and viable alternative activities / behaviors that can be adopted.</p> <p>The proposed information and monitoring system, combined with the promotion of an inclusive IWCAM approach in the SE Coast region, is expected to produce innovative opportunities for engaging a variety of stakeholders in land and resource use decision-making, and in working together to create funding mechanisms for the National Conservation Trust Fund. During the PPG phase, the NCT already engaged with the Saint Lucia Hotel and Tourism Association, which is providing a grant in the first year of NTCF operations to support NCTF grantmaking.</p> <p>The monitoring and information system will be maintained by DSD and the GEONODE system by the Planning Department; as noted under Output 1.1., it is expected that the GOSL will invest in the maintenance and operations of these systems after the end of the project. With regard to field activities, the conservation of seagrass beds, coral reefs and mangroves; the rehabilitation of mangroves and other coastal vegetation; and erosion control measures for degraded areas, agricultural areas, and head waters; all will be carried out as activities within the management plans for the proposed protected areas, and their implementation will be supported by communities in the SE coast along with the Fisheries and Forestry Department. Going forward, as part of the official PA management plans, these activities will be eligible for financial support through the NCTF. Other activities, such as sustainable agro-forestry and alternative livelihoods interventions, will depend primarily on the environmental and economic benefits that they produce, which in turn will provide positive incentives for private landowners to carry on these activities.</p> <p>Many of the proposed project activities will take place within the newly established terrestrial and marine PAs in the SE Coast region; over the long-term, the financial sustainability of these PAs (and other PAs in the country) will depend highly on funding provided by the National Conservation Trust</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>designed to be designated for many of the activities described here.</p> <p>Scaling up: It would be good to see plans to scale up activities that are described here if they are meant to be pilots.</p> <p>March 14, 2018</p> <p>Thank you for the revisions; however, the following issues remain:</p> <p>As for the level of detail, there is an expectation that projects at PIF stage are proposals and that PPG resources will be used to flesh those out rather than following them. It is expected that there will be changes from PIF (with justification) as decisions are made, research is done and context is better understood.</p>	<p>Fund (NCTF), which is designed to support such activities. In addition, however, the project has an entire component dedicated to sustainable livelihoods, with the idea that many activities to support conservation (both within and outside of the PAs) will generate profits for participants and thereby make them more sustainable.</p> <p>The following text has been added to the section on Replication in the CEO ER and to Output 3.5 in the Prodoc: “The demonstration of a Public Private Partnership (PPP) can be scaled up at the national level and/or replicated at other specific sites within Saint Lucia through collaboration with key partners. For example, business support units within relevant Ministries could work with agencies such as the SEDU (Small Enterprise Development Unit in the Ministry of Commerce) to assist stakeholders to develop concepts/business plans for similar businesses based on lessons learned from the demonstration activities; these concepts/business plans could then be used as a basis for submitting proposals / negotiating funding arrangements as extensions of existing PPPs or for the development of new partnerships.”</p> <p>Indeed many changes have been made from the PIF, based on the research and consultations carried out during the PPG phase. At the same time, per previous GEF guidance, the project was designed with the goal of keeping the scope and activities aligned with the approved PIF.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Gender - As stated previously, the GEF Gender Policy is more than a basic do no harm approach or gender- neutral design. Please discuss how gender considerations were taken into account in the development of the project as they should be central from how the project is structured.</p> <p>Components:</p> <p>1.1 - As written, the language states that investment is "expected" from the GOSL. However, we would like to see an agreement of the agency that will maintain the database.</p> <p>1.2 - While minor, the white breasted thrasher is not endemic to SL nor is it rare (as it is described as common within its range). Still worthy of conservation effort has it is restricted range.</p>	<p>During the PPG phase, the selection process for livelihood projects was done by engaging community groups that not only included women, but also groups that were exclusively composed of women (for example, some agro-processing initiatives). In Saint Lucia, men are typically the dominant participants in agriculture and agro-forestry, but women in these sectors also were consulted, and their recommendations influenced the project design. Furthermore, in identifying project livelihoods interventions, the project design team made sure to include work with agricultural associations in which women play a significant role (e.g. in the establishment of a business incubator for agro processors and associated support for product development, testing and market research for members of agro-processing associations), and activities to support the development of a homestay programme (women are frequently in charge of homestay accommodations). In terms of consultation and inputs from government agencies during the PPG phase, more often than not it was women who represented those agencies and so their perspectives and knowledge are implicit in the project design. The Project Committees will be gender balanced. Additional text in this regard has been added to Section A.4 of the CEO ER and Section 3.11 of the Prodoc.</p> <p>The text of Output 1.1 has been revised to clarify that the GOSL will invest in the maintenance and operations of the system after the end of the project (the phrase "it is expected" has been removed).</p> <p>Text under Output 1.2 has been clarified that there is a sub-species that is endemic to St. Lucia and its status is restricted range (limited to two disjunct sub-populations with a combined area of 24 sq. km.)</p> <p>Yes capacity development is an integral part of the work under Output 1.3</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>1.3 - Thank you. Please make sure that the focus is on capacity development along with designing plans or other activities throughout project implementation to ensure sustainability.</p> <p>1.4 - Remains lacking in detail. How will these goals be accomplished to provide resources into the NCTF? Particularly noting that SL will soon need to be putting resources into the NCTF in order to receive the matching resources. If detail cannot be provided at this time, what is the process to develop the plan for this subcomponent? What will be done at inception to design this, particularly the two different initiatives described (ecobusiness and contribution to the NCTF)? At PIF approval, we had asked for decisions to be made in these areas during PPG.</p>	<p>As discussed with the GEF, the focus of the proposed project is not to provide funding to the NCTF, although doing so under Output 1.4 is seen as one of the benefits that will be generated through the PPPs. As part of the project design, when the PPPs are negotiated, the MoUs or Contracts that govern the relationships will include language that a percentage of profits made by each PPP should be donated to the NCTF to protect the resources that the PPP is utilizing. The percentages will have to be negotiated on a case-by-case basis as they would be dependent on the actual enterprise (tourism, agri-processing, agro-forestry, etc.) and its activities. The NCTF would be able to leverage these donations in a 1:1 ratio to get money from the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund. Specific steps to make the PPPs operational are described below, and have been revised in Appendix 5 of the Prodoc:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the start of project implementation, facilitate decision-making by the Government of Saint Lucia (through dissemination of information / studies and convening of meetings with decision-makers) on PPP mechanisms that will be allowed, and draft the regulations necessary for the selected PPP mechanisms to become operational in Saint Lucia 2. By the 6th month of the project, develop sustainable land management guidelines for private sector partners to ensure that environmental mitigation measures will be in place in PPP agreements 3. By the end of year 1 of the project, identify feasible public-private partnership(s) (using the results of several previous studies on public-private partnerships that were assessed during the PPG phase, and working with the framework of those mechanisms that are allowed) 4. During years 1-2 of the project, raise awareness among agro-forestry / agro-processing initiatives or community tourism operators in the SE Coast region on the link between the resources and services supplied by healthy natural ecosystems and the financial and social viability of their

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>2.1 - Minor, but are mangoes or soursops rare? - The ProDoc does describe the creation of new nurseries not simple expansion.</p> <p>- Also, how will farmers and land owners be brought into the project activities as simple information is often insufficient?</p> <p>3.1 -</p> <p>1. The use of the 25 kW solar PV at 7 house per day at 80% of capacity factor may overestimate the production. Please check if the system has batteries installed with. If yes, it can be accepted; otherwise, it is not convincing that the system can use 7 hours daily for 325 days a year.</p>	<p>operations, the opportunities provided by PPPs, and the mechanisms for participating in PPPs</p> <p>5. During years 2-4 of the project, develop and implement at least one public-private partnership between government agencies and already established agro-forestry / agro-processing initiatives or community tourism operators</p> <p>The word “rare” has been removed from the table</p> <p>The previous response was unclear; the project is not creating new government nurseries, but it is correct that it is creating new community nurseries</p> <p>The text under Output 2.1 states that farmers and landowners will be involved in the planning of field activities (“communities and municipalities identified in the project stakeholder participation plan will be engaged in the design of collective forest management systems and practices, supporting conservation, restoration and alternative livelihood opportunities”, the running of the community nurseries (implicit in the name “community nurseries”), and the actual replanting (“community groups, small farmers, and private agricultural producers... will be engaged to rehabilitate areas on private lands and also riparian areas”)</p> <p>Yes, the proposed PV system includes batteries</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>2. The emission factor of 7.03×10^{-4} metric tons CO₂ /kWh is copied from the U.S. which consumes a lot of coal in power generation. In Lucia, I do not think the emission factor is so high. Please ask the project developer to use the emission factor of the country, or a country which is similar to Lucia.</p> <p>3. For the solar dryer, the mission factor should be revised (see comment No. 2 above). In addition, it shows that the dryer will work 365 days a year. It is not correct. In this world, we cannot find any machine that can work 365 days a year for 10 years.</p> <p>3.4 - Please include the information the global benefits in the ProDoc text and how these activities will make sure to remained linked to these objectives (as opposed to being pure development objectives).</p>	<p>The emission factor used is that for a diesel generated power plant, which is the primary electricity generating source in St. Lucia</p> <p>The emission factor used is that for an LPG drier (the cleanest technology). It is assumed that the market for cocoa will continue to grow (in part because of the project's livelihoods activities), and that farmers will therefore need to purchase additional dryers, but in this case the project will provide farmers with solar dryers instead of LPG dryers. In terms of the # of days/year of use, this has been changed to 355 days, and the emissions calculations have been adjusted accordingly. It is important to note that the project is proposing to use passive solar dryers, which are very simple and have no moving parts and are therefore very durable/reliable.</p> <p>The following text has been added to Output 3.4: "The provision of sustainable livelihoods options for residents of the SE Coast region is critical to the success of conserving biodiversity and ecosystem services. In part this is due to the fact that in the absence of viable resource-based livelihoods options, more and more residents of the region are participating in the tourism industry, whose impacts on the natural environment (from land clearance and construction, flows of effluents, visitor impacts, etc.) are a significant problem. In addition, those persons who remain reliant on natural resource based livelihoods frequently engage in unsustainable activities in order to supplement their incomes or because they are unaware of the negative impacts of such activities, which include cutting of coastal vegetation (especially mangroves) and forests for fuelwood or construction purposes, clearing of forest areas, illegal hunting (e.g. of iguanas and turtles), over-use of agricultural chemicals, soil erosion stemming from inappropriate</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>3.5 - Please describe how this project will collect and document lessons learned for dissemination not just within SL but in the broader Caribbean, which is an important part of scaling up as well.</p> <p>Innovation: The case for innovation remains weak if it's focused on this specific region only. Is this innovative for the country? For the Caribbean? Are the pilot projects innovative? Engagement with the private sector is mentioned in the response, but not actually in the CEO Endorsement document.</p> <p>Sustainability: The continuation of project activities does depend on the NCTF, particularly those that do not generate revenue. Yet, it is still vague</p>	<p>agricultural practices (indiscriminate land clearing, shifting cultivation, slash and burn practices), etc. All of these activities have negative impacts on terrestrial, aquatic, and marine ecosystems in the SE Coast region.”</p> <p>The project is not focused on upscaling or replicating project activities or lessons learned at a regional / international level. However, it will support the collection of information, guidelines, best practices, training materials, etc. and the dissemination of lessons learned from project activities within Saint Lucia.</p> <p>Yes, the pilot projects are innovative for St. Lucia, and the following text has been added to Section 6 of the CEO ER. Regarding the Renewable Energy pilot activities, renewable energy use in Saint Lucia is nascent and limited. The innovation proposed by this project is in the promotion and use of RE for community level livelihoods activities (e.g. agro-processing), and in focusing on PV systems and solar dryers that offer ease of use, cheap energy, reduction of production cost, etc., such that by the end of the project community groups will hopefully choose to embrace solar PV and dryers for continued and sustainable use. Regarding the Ecotourism pilots, ecotourism is not new to Saint Lucia, but community organized ecotourism initiatives with effective quality controls have not been developed, and to date investments in the “shared economy” (e.g. bed and breakfast, Airbnb etc.) have grown rapidly but without standards. Thus, the method of engagement, collaboration, development of standards and monitoring of these projects at a community level, including establishment of standards and guidelines to ensure the quality of the ecotourism product, will be innovative. The text in the response regarding engagement with the private sector has been copied into the Section 6 of the CEO ER</p> <p>As explained in more detail above, the focus of the proposed project is not to provide funding to the NCTF, although providing some funding through the PPP agreements is one of the potential benefits of the Public Private Partnerships. It is also worth noting that the NCTF will have its own</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		whether this project will develop a financing mechanism/program for it. Debt swaps are great when they work, but are difficult to pull off and this project should not depend on it.	programme for getting financial support, and that the proposed debt swap is only one mechanism being considered by the NCTF.
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	Dec 8, 2017 Please see comments on co- financing. March 19, 2018 Yes.	
	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)	Dec 8, 2017 No, this project does not account for the possibility of a major natural disaster or how climate change impacts will be accounted for in the decisions made for this project. March 19, 2018 Yes, however it will be important to maintain buffers in the timelines developed for this project to account for potential set backs such as those posed by climate as well as more human factors.	A new risk has been added to the risk table: “Significant climate change related events (e.g. hurricanes) negatively impact the capacity to implement project activities”. In addition, the following risk mitigation strategy has been proposed for this risk: “The project will be adaptively managed and if there is the need to respond to disaster relief or climate change impacts, the Project Implementation Unit will develop and present a response workplan regarding BD threats, LD causes and CCM to the PSC in order to ensure that GEBs are maximized even in the post-hurricane circumstances. The PSC in turn will advise appropriately, within the parameters of UN Environment and GEF rules and regulations, and obtain the necessary approvals etc. as quickly as possible in order to respond appropriately.” The following text has been added to the mitigation measures proposed for climate change risks: “the project will build buffers into the timeline of project implementation in order to mitigate the risk of delays due to climate related impacts”
	5. Is co-financing	Dec 8, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>No, the co-financing coming from the debt-for-nature swap is not confirmed. It is also a stretch to say that the entirety of those resources are co- financing given that the project should start well before money is being paid out.</p> <p>March 19, 2018</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for this change. Cofinancing can be amended if the debt swap resources come through.</p>	<p>The co-financing from The Nature Conservancy related to the debt-for-nature swap (US\$ 14.5 million) has been removed from the project budget. However, the letter from TNC is being retained as part of the submission package in case those funds do become available during the project implementation period.</p> <p>In addition, a new letter of co-financing from the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (US\$ 469,431) is attached to the submission package, and this amount has been added to the project budget.</p> <p>These changes to co-financing figures have been made in all necessary places in the CEO Endorsement Request, the UN Environment Project Document, and all annexes.</p>
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	<p>Dec 8, 2017</p> <p>Tracking Tools: No, please address the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SFM: Please include a value in cell C21 - BD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. It appears that the terrestrial area will be using rehabilitated forests, which is a contrast to the text in the prodoc or is the PA going to be responsible for areas outside its boundaries? (which is possible) Please clarify. B. How will satellite images be used to monitor species populations? 	<p>Cell C21 in the SFM Tracking Tool is incorrectly formatted and will only accept a Date as a valid entry; a note to this affect has been added to the TT</p> <p>Comment is unclear, but forests both within the PA and in adjoining areas will be rehabilitated.</p> <p>They will not be used to monitor species, they will however be used to monitor the amount of habitat available for key species; this has been clarified in the Tracking Tool.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>C. Is mangrove removal the only threat? What about for the coral reefs and seagrasses?</p> <p>- CCM: Please see comments on the calculation of CO2 benefits from question 2.</p> <p>March 19, 2018 - SFM: Thank you for your response and we are working to revise the TT.</p>	<p>A new threat and associated indicator on seagrass bed destruction has been added to the tracking tool; however, baseline and target data will need to be collected at project inception.</p> <p>Answered under Question 2 and tracking tool updated accordingly.</p>
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>Dec 8, 2017</p> <p>No, we would like to see greater description of lessons learned from other initiatives particularly around livelihood activities and tourism standards.</p> <p>March 19, 2018</p>	<p>The livelihood activities were derived from consultations and discussions with various community groups in the project site. In addition, there were also site visits; consultations with technocrats from relevant Government ministries, Government agencies, NGOs and donor agencies, as well as a review of project reports and other relevant documents on livelihood activities in the project area.</p> <p>The SE Coast already has nascent tourism activities (outside the proposed protected areas) that require guidance to ensure that negative environmental impacts are mitigated and that sustainable tourism initiatives are created. The need for tourism guidelines was identified during a SWOT analysis exercise of the local context and review of established standards for similar initiatives during the PPG phase.</p>

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		No, the agency response does not respond to how lessons have been taken from other initiatives. Coordination is not only about UNEP or other SL activities.	The design of project activities around livelihoods was based in part on analysis of several other sustainable livelihoods projects done in the region, including projects managed by the Environment Foundation of Jamaica, Forest Fund in Jamaica, and the Caribbean Development Bank funded Basic Needs Trust Fund. Within St. Lucia, guidance was derived from the UNDP GEF Small Grants Programme (which has a portfolio of projects in the SE Coast region). The preceding text has been added to Section 2.7 of the Prodoc. Finally, some of the key lessons learned were taken from interviews with stakeholders during the project preparation process; among the key lessons learned were the following: 1) projects with a high degree of community involvement in design and implementation stand a better chance of success; 2) it is important to streamline bureaucracy to aid project implementation; 3) projects that generate profits become sustainable.
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	Dec 8, 2017 Yes	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	Dec 8, 2017 No, the knowledge management plan remains insufficient at this time. Please see question 2. March 19, 2018 No, please see question 2.	Responded to under question 2 (Output 3.5) above. Refer to comment under Output 3.5 above
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ¹ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	<p>Dec 8, 2017</p> <p>No, many of the issues are covered in question 2. However, the role of local CSOs is missing.</p> <p>March 19, 2018</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>Table 1 (Stakeholder map and participation plan) on pages 24-33 of the UN Environment PRODOC identifies the roles of all project stakeholders, including the following CSOs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 Environmental Groups • 1 Cultural Group • 1 Micro Enterprise Development Fund • 3 Community Groups • 3 Community Agro-processing Groups • 7 Resource User Groups / Companies (including tourism, crafts, etc.)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	<p>Dec 8, 2017</p> <p>No, the theory of change needs to be more than putting project components in boxes. Please see earlier comments on knowledge management</p> <p>March 19, 2018</p> <p>No, the theory of change remains more a rehashing of the log frame than a theory of change. This blog may provide some helpful guidance - https://www.annmurraybrown.com/single-post/2016/03/20/Theory-of-Change-vsThe-Logic-Model-Never-Be-Confused-Again</p>	<p>Theory of Change has been redone and the diagram now indicates that knowledge management is a continual process throughout the project.</p> <p>A new Theory of change has been added in Appendix 17.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>Dec 8, 2017</p>	

¹ 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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	Dec 8, 2017 NA	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	Dec 8, 2017 No, significant changes are needed. Please let us know if you would like to discuss issues with the GEF Secretariat.	Please see above how comments have been addressed.
Review Date	Review	December 08, 2017 March 19, 2018 No, several issues remain with this project. Please let us know if you would like to discuss with the GEF Secretariat.	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		