



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

GEF ID:	9785		
Country/Region:	St. Kitts And Nevis		
Project Title:	Improving Environmental Management through Sustainable Land Management in St. Kitts and Nevis		
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):	BD-1 Program 1; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 2; LD-2 Program 3;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$99,999	Project Grant:	\$3,015,982
Co-financing:	\$14,500,000	Total Project Cost:	\$17,515,982
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2017
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Asha Bobb-Semple	Agency Contact Person:	Marianela Araya

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	3/16/2017 ABS: Not fully The project is looking at a substantial number of focal areas. Consideration should be made to assess the depth of the activities being proposed and how they may align with the GEF focal areas strategies. Greater focus is needed.	6/14/2017: The revised PIF no longer includes activities related to renewable energy and energy efficiency in buildings, and therefore funding is no longer being requested from CCM-1. The project is now focused primarily on LD interventions, with complementary activities on BD and CCM-2. The funds that were requested from CCM-1 have been eliminated, and an equal amount of

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>For example, CCM 2 Program 4- where except for agroforestry (which could also come under LD2-3), other expected measures in support of this Program, such as reduced tillage, integrated crop-livestock, soil improvement techniques; policies and financial mechanisms to maintain and enhance carbon stocks or reduce emissions from LULUCF and agriculture; integration of carbon considerations into forest management etc. do not appear to be considered for this project.</p> <p>6/20/2017 ABS & SW:</p> <p>Not fully.</p> <p>-Revisions have been made to the focal area objectives and additional activities included in support of CCM2-4.</p> <p>-However regarding the BD focal Area chosen and given the additional details provided in response to Question 5, we do not see the justification for using BD 4-9 (mainstreaming) as the activities described are more in line with improved management, which would be BD 1-1 or BD1-2(See additional</p>	<p>funding is now being requested as additional funds for CCM-2, LD-1 and LD-2 (see Table A for details). In addition, the description of field-based activities in Component 2 has been revised to clarify that sustainable and climate smart agriculture activities will include reduced tillage, soil improvement and conservation techniques, low GHG emissions practices, carrying out a climate-related suitability analysis of potential crops.</p> <p>7/13/2017: Programs within BD focal area have been changed as suggested.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>comments under question 5).</p> <p>7/19/2017 ABS: Cleared. Suitable focal areas have been selected for the BD component of the project.</p>	
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>3/16/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Not fully.</p> <p>SKN has committed to voluntary setting of LDN targets. Please elaborate on how the project may contribute to achieving LDN targets.</p> <p>Please also indicate which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and consider for the PPG SMART indicators, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s).</p> <p>6/20/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Cleared. Additional information has been included in support for the LDN target setting process and alignment with Aichi Targets.</p>	<p>6/14/2017:</p> <p>The Govt. of SKN is currently working with the Partnership Initiative on Sustainable Land Management (PISLM) to establish LDN targets, which would be integrated in the overall review of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). An Inception Workshop to begin the process of developing national LDN targets took place in January 2017, and work is continuing through a multi-sectoral National LDN Working Group to develop the baseline information need to establish national LDN targets. At the same time, PISLM is working to develop a National Work Plan and a Leverage Plan for LDN. The baseline data should be available for analysis shortly for the development of the national work plan. There is still an opportunity to provide inputs to the baseline, work plans and final LDN targets, and during the PPG phase the project will identify ways in which it will contribute to these processes, and also to achieving the LDN targets once they have been drafted.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Summary text on this issue has been added to Section 6 – Consistency with National Priorities.</p> <p>Text describing how the project will help to achieve Aichi Targets 1, 2, 7, 14, and 15 has been added to the section on Global Environmental Benefits. SMART Indicators will be developed during the PPG phase, including ones relevant to contributing to achievement of the Aichi Targets.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>3/16/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Not fully.</p> <p>The drivers, innovation and scale have been sufficiently identified.</p> <p>-The text describing sustainability does not adequately cover the issues of sustainability of results of land restoration, maintenance of SLM and climate smart agriculture practices, capacity issues to implement the legislation, policies etc. that will be prepared.</p> <p>- Regarding market transformation. What provisions are already in place in SKN to provide farmers who will</p>	<p>6/14/2017:</p> <p>The text on sustainability has been revised to further explain the project's strategy to ensure the sustainability of results.</p> <p>A priority of the Government of St. Kitts and Nevis (GSKN) remains enhanced food security, and therefore local agricultural production will continue to be prioritized. The GSKN, in partnership with bilateral and multilateral development partners, has provided substantial assistance to both farmers and agro-processors. For example, the Government of Taiwan has supported agro-processing to create more opportunities to sell to the local market and to expand exports to other islands.</p>

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>benefit from this project with access to markets, micro-loans, marketing of products etc.?</p> <p>6/20/2017 ABS: Cleared.</p> <p>Additional text has been included on sustainability and market transformation. Please see an additional related query under Question 5.</p>	<p>The GSKN is also exploring the establishment of a Partial Scope agreement with the Governments of Guyana and Brazil to encourage export of products, including those produced through agro-processing. The Development Bank of St. Kitts and Nevis (DBSKN) has developed a number of financial mechanisms to provide funds for onlending from the locally founded Sugar Industry Diversification Foundation (SIDF) to micro, small and medium agro-businesses, as well as opportunities provided through a partnership with the Government of Venezuela. The GSKN continues to provide assistance on an ongoing basis to both farmers and agro-processors through the provision of inputs (seeds, materials, small supplies etc.) as well as training in bookkeeping, improved business practices, and cultivation of new crops and/or processing of new value added products. These programmes will continue as the GSKN continues to advance the development of the agriculture sector and to diversify products to meet the requirements of the population and ensure food security. Text on these baseline programs has been added to the section on Baseline, and also referenced under Outcome 2.2 in the Alternative</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>3/16/2017 ABS: Not fully.</p> <p>See additional comments for Question 5.</p> <p>6/20/2017 ABS: See comments for Question 5.</p> <p>7/19/2017 ABS: Cleared.</p>	<p>Scenario.</p>
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>3/16/2017 ABS & SW: No. General Comments</p> <p>- A better focus is needed for the project. The Project Outcomes and activities are varied and as written are not clearly aligned to demonstrate a cohesive project. Please revise to show greater alignment.</p> <p>-The project objective is broad and vague. As it may be difficult to achieve low carbon development and sustainable development in St. Kitts and Nevis through this project alone, we recommend that you refine the objective to a more specific and</p>	<p>6/14/2017:</p> <p>The project Components, Outcomes and Outputs have been revised so that the project design is more cohesive.</p> <p>The project objective has been revised to the following: To transform degraded forest landscapes into biodiversity and climate-friendly areas of sustainable agricultural / agroforestry production.</p> <p>The Outcomes and Outputs have been numbered.</p> <p>The description of the project in Section 3 – Alternative Scenario has been revised to be better aligned with Table B, and the</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>realistic statement. Please consider include the sectors you are targeting and/or the specific sites of the project.</p> <p>-Please number the outcomes for ease of reading. In addition, all Outcomes should have (numbered) corresponding Outputs.</p> <p>-Please also provide details where necessary in the Project Description section and ensure alignment with Table B, and separate the sub-components in the project description for clarity.</p> <p>Component 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is not clear how the Outcomes, as written, are in support of this Component. - Please reduce the number of Outcomes for Component 1 or consider merging where possible or shifting some of the Outcomes to Outputs. For example, the Outcome on species as written, could be an Output. - Output 1.1- Given the capacity issues outlined in the Section II, please confirm as stated in Output 1.1 that St. Kitts and Nevis will be able to implement the NPDP during 	<p>sub-components have been separated.</p> <p>The outcomes under Component 1 have been revised.</p> <p>The NPDP is an integral part of the ongoing policy decision-making process that guides all development and management of land and natural resources in the country, and will guide zoning and the siting of developments, as well as the program priorities of relevant ministries / departments, over the 10-15 years following the adoption of the updated NPDP. As such, the NPDP will not be "implemented" by the project, nor will its implementation be over by the end of the project; it is a much broader national process. Nevertheless, the project will provide capacity building to partners who play a leading role in implementing the NPDP, for example technical training for the GIS Division within the Department of Physical Planning, which is responsible for providing data to support decisions on land development and for tracking overall changes in land uses; will strengthen the capacity of other staff in DPP as well as the Water Services Department, Inland Revenue, etc. in land use planning; and will strengthen the capacities of key technical officers in these departments through the technical training provided to scholarship recipients (under Output</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the life of the project. If so, please indicate in the project description what capacity improvements will be made to ensure this is achieved. It would also be useful to highlight in Table B that digital land use mapping will be used.</p> <p>- Output 1.2 is not clear. The 'capacity of the institutions will be built for coordinated action' on which specific activities or interventions? Please clarify the link between building the capacity of institutions and a scholarship program for post-graduate students? Will the capacity of existing staff and other resources within these intuitions also be strengthened?</p> <p>- The final Outcome of Component 1 refers to construction. The GEF does not fund construction activities. In addition, this Outcome is written as an Output.</p> <p>- Output 1.3- A key underpinning of SLM, INRM, CSA action would not only be the NPDP but also the policy and legislative framework. Are these already in place? If not, how will the project build on what is in place?</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>- Please consider making the text for</p>	<p>1.2.2)</p> <p>Reference to digital land use mapping has been added in Table B.</p> <p>Implementation of the NPDP, and effective land use planning and management in general, will require improved capacity for coordination among relevant stakeholder, including government institutions, CSOs and local communities. The project will provide training to these stakeholders in coordination and information management and sharing (including participatory planning methodologies and strategies for outreach to communities). In addition, this output has been revised to show that training is about more than just coordination, but also includes capacity building such as training and practical application of approaches to land use planning and policy development, reducing pressure on critical habitats and species, and identifying and addressing existing and potential drivers of land degradation (see Output 1.2.1).</p> <p>With regard to the scholarship program, the approach that will be used is to provide scholarships to persons already</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>the Outcomes more brief and provide the additional details in the project description.</p> <p>- Output 2.1- Which KBA will this activity take place? Please provide more specific information on the BD habitat mentioned. What is the proximity of this project site to sites proposed for Output 2.2? Additionally, it would be useful to build on the work of the Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund in conservation priority setting and for BD restoration, it is important for the restoration activities to have a direct impact on specific threatened species (i.e. those referred to in Component 1). For example the Canyon to Keys KBA is for sea turtle nesting, so the activities need to match the species and the threats it faces.</p> <p>- Output 2.2- Please confirm if the 200 ha of land being restored is for agriculture use. If so how many farmers/small holders will benefit? Will they be trained along with extension officers on SLM and climate smart agriculture practices so that the results of the project can be sustained? In which KBA will this activity take place?</p>	<p>employed in institutions with responsibilities for land use planning and natural resource management. The idea is to train persons who are already familiar with the practical aspects of implementing government policies and programs for land use planning and land and resource management in technical areas that are in short supply in SKN (detailed under Output 1.2.2). In so doing, the project will build the Government's capacity to address these issues, and will select persons with ongoing government service who will be more willing to commit to the requirement to provide a minimum number of years of additional service in exchange for the scholarship.</p> <p>The construction referred to under Component 1 was not a GEF-funded activity, rather the project would have developed new codes and standards to reduce CO2 emissions that would have applied to baseline construction programs. However, with the elimination of project activities under CCM 1, this activity has been removed from the project.</p> <p>The relevant policy and legal framework to support SLM, CSA etc. in St. Kitts and Nevis, as described in Section 6 (Consistency with National Priorities), is relatively robust. In addition to the NPDP, this framework includes such policy</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>- In the Project Description, there is reference to EIAs. GEF does not fund EIAs as this is a business as usual activity.</p> <p>- Output 2.3- The link of this section with the rest of the project is not clearly demonstrated. Are these proposed buildings within the KBAs? Is the Agro-Processing Centre to be fed with produce from the restored hectares of land mentioned above? In addition, as SKN currently has ongoing RE and EE initiatives (Pg. 7), please explain how this investment will be a pilot as indicated on (Pg. 10).</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>- The text stated in Table B and in the Project Description (Pg. 10) should align with text in the Knowledge Management section (Pg 15). Currently only the text on Pg. 15 provides substantive details on this component. Please adjust Table B and the Project Description for consistency and include relevant Outputs.</p> <p>- In terms of the awareness campaign for tourists, we question the sustainability. Additionally, for the</p>	<p>instruments as the Sustainable Land Management Plan, which contains guidelines on land management with linkages to environmental conservation and adaptation to climate change; the National Environmental Management Strategy, which seeks to reduce environmental degradation, raise awareness on environmental issues, promote environmentally friendly technologies, and protect biodiversity; and the UNCCD NAP and the NBSAP. In terms of the legal framework, important legal instruments exist such as the National Conservation and Environmental Protection Act (NCEPA) and the Development Control and Planning Act, which makes provisions for the development of land in urban and rural areas. Finally, as noted above, SKN is working to develop its LDN targets, and the project will contribute to establishing and/or achieving these targets.</p> <p>The wording of the Outcomes has been reduced and details have been put into the Alternative Scenario.</p> <p>Under Output 2.1.1, the conservation of 300 ha of upper/mid forests through reforestation and Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) will not take place</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>carbon offset scheme, how it will be implemented, what are the carbon offset activities, how will funds be collected, and what uses will the funds be directed towards? A opt-out program of a hotel tax could be considered to assist in raising matching funds for the conservation trust fund supported under the CBF.</p> <p>- Please also consider a KM and public education awareness program that is more systemic. Possibly a program that targets schools, the agricultural curriculum, agricultural training programs/institutes; a partnership with a regional research institution or platform; contribution to existing knowledge platforms by preparing tools, publications, documenting lessons learned.</p> <p>6/20/2017 ABS & SW:</p> <p>Not fully.</p> <p>The text has been revised and additional information included for all components.</p> <p>However, please clarify/address the following related to Component 1:</p>	<p>within a KBA; rather they will take place in communities located adjacent to the Central Forest Reserve and National Park (CFRNP), which is a KBA. Additional information on forest habitats both within and adjacent to the CFRNP and the project sites has been added to Output 2.1.1. Under Output 2.1.2, the conservation of 20 ha of mangrove ecosystems will take place in the Cayon to Keys KBA. The reforestation of 300 ha will take place in the same landscape (upper-mid forests just below the 1,000 foot contour line that defines the lower boundary of the CFRNP) as the activities under Output 2.2.1 to reduce land degradation and increase soil carbon sequestration on 200 ha of degraded / abandoned arable land.</p> <p>To date, the CEPF has not undertaken activities in St. Kitts and Nevis. With regard to the restoration activities, the restoration of 20 ha of mangrove ecosystems in the Cayon to Keys KBA will help to protect coastal areas that are used as nesting areas by the Leatherback turtle (<i>Dermochys coriacea</i>) as well as other sea turtle species.</p> <p>Yes, this 200 ha of land in the foothill areas below the CFRNP KBA will be restored for agricultural use; a final decision on which areas will be selected</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Output 1.2.1 as written is not measurable. Is there an estimate of how many institutions, or community groups? If this is not available at this stage please include at PPG.</p> <p>Output 1.2.2 as written is not measurable. Please quantify the output and make it more specific.</p> <p>Output 1.3.1- Is this a BD management strategy for the two KBAs? In addition, please clarify what the project is seeking to accomplish regarding this Outcome. Is it improved management of the KBAs? 'Indicator species' are used to assess the health and quality of an ecosystem and so the outcome listed is really an indicator, and a more suitable Outcome should be included to reflect the broader aim/goal that is to be achieved.</p> <p>Please clarify/address the following related to Component 2:</p> <p>-All of the Benefits listed here, would be better placed in Section 3 or could even be included as outputs. This would allow a clearer picture of the intended Outcomes. Additional</p>	<p>will be done during the PPG phase. GSKN estimates that at least 100 farmers will benefit; farmers will receive training in SLM and climate smart agricultural practices.</p> <p>The EIAs are really scoping exercises specifically to address the potential impacts of the small dams, and the wording has been changed accordingly. However, it is important to note that 1) these dams would not be built without the GEF project, and therefore this activity is not business as usual; and 2) UNEP is required to minimize environmental and social impact with its projects, and therefore with the building of small dams at least some social and environmental scoping exercise needs to be undertaken. During the PPG phase, the extent of this scoping exercise will be determined.</p> <p>This output has been removed from the project (Output 2.3).</p> <p>The text on Knowledge Management in Table B, the Alternative Scenario, and the KM section has been revised so that it is fully aligned.</p> <p>Additional text on the sustainability of the tourism awareness campaign has been added to Output 3.2.1 The carbon offset</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>relevant text that could be included during the PPG phase are indicators and targets.</p> <p>-Please check the alignment of figures between Table B and Table F and the numbers under Section 4- Incremental Cost. In addition, we are not clear how the total of 20 hectares is arrived at, in Table F for the BD Target. Output 2.1.1 also appears to be targeting restoration for BD purposes in addition to productive purposes (LD). Please estimate the no. of hectares that will have a biodiversity benefit from the restoration activities proposed for the 350ha. Please ensure not to double count with the SLM targets.</p> <p>-Output 2.1.1- Please indicate whether or not the sites proposed for the restoration of activities will become a part of the protected areas//CFRNP or if not, how they will be maintained and managed? We would like more clarity on the sustainability of the restoration activities.</p> <p>-Output 2.1.2- Please clarify where the mangrove rehabilitation will take place. Table B indicates Southeast Peninsula (under the Outcomes), but</p>	<p>scheme has been removed from the project.</p> <p>The knowledge management program (Output 3.1.1) and public education and awareness program (Output 3.2.1) have been revised. Some of the GEF funding that was originally allocated to CCM-1 activities will now be allocated to these programs.</p> <p>7/13/2017:</p> <p>Output 1.2.1 have been rephrased to make it more measurable. # of target stakeholders to be defined during PPG.</p> <p>Output 1.2.2 have been rephrased to make it more measurable.</p> <p>Output 1.3.1: Yes, the BD management strategy is for the 2 KBA, the project will recommend management strategies and regulations to ensure the conservation and sustainable management of selected priority species in those 2 areas. The outcome has been changed and the target species will be left as indicator of the same.</p> <p>Text for outcomes and outputs on component 2 has been amended as per GEF suggestions. The benefits previously</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Section 3 (Alternative Scenario) indicates Canyon to Key KBA. The listing of benefits under the Outcomes doesn't help to bring clarity.</p> <p>-Output 2.2.2- In order to make this output more measureable, please specify which assets. Please also include an output related to improved farmer capacity for SLM and another on livelihoods.</p> <p>8/22/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Cleared. All comments and questions have been addressed. Given small hectare numbers in Table B and E. (20 ha BD and 650 ha SLM) we recommend that PPG explores how these pilot level activities can be replicated on a wider scale.</p>	<p>highlighted under the outcomes have been now incorporated under the respective outputs of the component. Indicators and targets are to be included during PPG.</p> <p>Figures on table B, Table F and section 4 have been revised for alignment. The 20 ha on table F under corporate result 1, are related to the area targeted for mangrove rehabilitation.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1: The number of ha that will have a biodiversity benefit would be estimated during PPG phase, when a more detailed analysis of the area will be conducted.</p> <p>Output 2.1.1: At this point in time it is not possible to indicate if the sites proposed for these activities will become part of the CFRNP. However the activities under component 1, in particular those related to National Physical Development Plan are meant to support those decisions in the future. In relation to the sustainability of the restoration activities, the target areas will be managed in partnership between local farmers and the Ministry of Sustainable Development, which is expected to contribute towards this end due to the mutual interest of the parties engaged. In addition, the project will assist these stakeholders in undertaking reforestation and ANR using native and</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>valuable agroforestry tree species such as Soursop, Sugar Apple, Plum, Golden Apple, Mango, Guinep and Sea Grape from which they can improve their income. This will trigger the need for conservation and use of sustainable practices in these areas. The project will also provide training (through farmer field schools) to the staff of extension services and all interested farmers. This will contribute to sustainability since the involved stakeholders will learn on how to carry out the activities; which will prevent this to be a one-time investment that will not be sustained after the project. The training program here is key to create the local capacities for continuation and sustainability.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: The mangrove rehabilitation will take place at Cayon to Key. However the project will develop an action plan to conserve remaining mangrove areas, and it will also including the coastal mangroves in the Ponds of the Southeast Peninsula KBA. The information in table B has been amended accordingly for clarity.</p> <p>Output 2.2.2: the output has been rephrased for more detail. See table B</p>
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs	3/16/2017 ABS: Not fully	6/14/2017: Text describing the expected role of CSOs

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	considered?	<p>Gender elements have been considered and we welcome the proposal to prepare a gender analysis.</p> <p>Please consider the input of CSOs from an early stage. What role do they currently play in Biodiversity, LD and CCM related issues in SKN? Can they contribute to the conceptualization of this project?</p> <p>6/20/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Cleared.</p> <p>Additional information has been included on CSOs role in project design and implementation.</p>	in project formulation and implementation has been added to the Stakeholder table.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	<p>3/16/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Yes</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>3/16/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Yes. St Kitts and Nevis has full flexibility allowance and so there is sufficient funds within each focal area to cover the sum total of the project.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or 	N/A	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 	N/A	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>3/16/2017 ABS: No, not at this time. Please respond to the abovementioned comments.</p> <p>6/28/2017 ABS: No at this time please address the additional comments in the review sheet.</p> <p>8/22/2017 ABS: Please note the additional consideration for the PPG stage mentioned under Question 5. All issues have been adequately addressed in the re-submission and we have received the OFP Endorsement Letter. The project is technically cleared.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 16, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 28, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 26, 2017	

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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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.