



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

GEF ID:	9580		
Country/Region:	St. Vincent and Grenadines		
Project Title:	Conserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation using a Ridge-to-Reef approach		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5862 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; BD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$130,000	Project Grant:	\$3,757,102
Co-financing:	\$10,490,000	Total Project Cost:	\$14,247,102
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	Agency Contact Person:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	August 2, 2016 Yes. October 7, 2016 Yes, all the project activities are aligned with GEF strategies. However, the project should include additional objectives - BD 1.1 - Improving the financial	

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

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>sustainability and effective management of the national ecological infrastructure - project component 1.4</p> <p>December 2, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the revisions.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>August 2, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>August 2, 2016</p> <p>No. This project needs to better consider the drivers of environmental degradation and how the project is addressing them. This project needs to consider the sustainability of the interventions, including the training activities, and how they will continue beyond the life of the project. In addition, what are opportunities for scaling of the project interventions, in particular some of the more innovative components.</p> <p>October 14, 2016</p> <p>Yes. Thank you for the revisions.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>August 2, 2016</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>Yes.</p> <p>August 2, 2016</p> <p>No. While the overall project concept is strong, there are some issues that remain. There may be too many different activities that this project is trying to undertake. It is worth considering paring down the activities to ensure that the activities undertaken are done well.</p> <p>Thank you for including a map showing KBAs and proposed protected areas. The focus on KBAs for the creation of PAs is welcome.</p> <p>Please address the following:</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1 - Is this project supporting the creation of the National Biodiversity Center? If so, please expand on these activities and their global benefits in the body of the PIF. If it is just training, then those activities may better fit under 1.5. - 1.4 - The GEF has already put resources into the development of the conservation trust fund through the World Bank/the Nature Conservancy project. Therefore, the activities in this output need to go beyond simply 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>identifying the possible financing mechanisms to actually implementing them. Given the existing work developing innovative ideas for St. Lucia which the SVG government was interested in using, it would be valuable to now start applying them. Supporting the work of implementation could also provide lessons learned to other countries in the region looking to apply similar solutions.</p> <p>- 1.5 - Please discuss how these training activities will be sustainable. People move from organizations and new staff are hired. How will the project plan for this?</p> <p>- Please clarify the current status and activities of the land Use and Biodiversity Monitoring and Tracking Tool. Does it already exist? Who manages it?</p> <p>Component 2:</p> <p>- Some of the numbers of hectares are confusing. Is the project only going to protect 300 ha of marine area? Are those 300 ha only the nesting beaches? This is a very small amount of area, particularly in comparison to Aichi and CCI commitments. Also, are the sea turtle nesting sites within</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the Leeward Coast protected area? Will they be able to address the major threats to the species?</p> <p>- For the Chatham Bay protected area, only conserving 100 ha or the known habitat of the Union Island gecko may be insufficient. Given how little is known about the gecko, it would be good to provide a buffer from existing known habitat that could prevent encroachment (such as dumping) into critical habitat as well as area to deal with invasive species.</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>- 3.2 - Education trails should be coordinated with other activities and designed with sustainability plans to ensure maintenance and use beyond the life of the project.</p> <p>- In some countries, the Ministry of Agriculture can present a challenge in implementing new and sustainable practices as they can have limited knowledge, work closely agrochemical companies, and/or reluctance to change. How will this project address this issue?</p> <p>- 3.4 - The issue of developing agroprocessing activities is interesting</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>and worth exploring. We look forward to more detail at PPG.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are there plans to scale up these activities to other areas of the island(s) after the pilot? - What sort of support will be available to farmers wanting to implement practices seen at the demonstration farms? Would there be a way for SGP to coordinate and support some of these activities? <p>October 7, 2016</p> <p>Thank you for the edits and responses to comments. The PIF is much improved. There are a few remaining issues that need to be addressed.</p> <p>Component 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1.1 and 1.5 - The GEF supports in situ conservation; therefore in this case, the development and training for a herbarium are not within the GEF strategy. Please revise this section. The work can be undertaken with co-finance. <p>Also, as a minor issue please finish the footnote on page 2, remove the 2 after hectares, and explain the asterisks.</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		December 5, 2016 Yes. Thank you for the revisions.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	August 2, 2016 Yes, for the PIF stage. Please include more on CSO involvement during PPG, particularly on Union Island.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	August 2, 2016 No, SVG's total STAR allocation is 4,256,377 not 4,260,000. Please revise accordingly. October 14, 2016 Yes. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	August 2, 2016 No. See above. Once revised, SVG is a fully flexible country so there should be no problems. October 14, 2016 Yes. Cleared.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	August 2, 2016 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or 	August 2, 2016	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	August 2, 2016 NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	August 2, 2016 No. Please address the issues above and resubmit. October 14, 2016 No. Thank you for the significant revisions. Please address the few remaining issues. December 5, 2016 The program manager recommends this project for CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 02, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	October 14, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	December 05, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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