



**GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\***  
**THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS**

GEF ID:	5757		
Country/Region:	Bahamas		
Project Title:	Implementing Land, Water and Ecosystem Management		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; LD-3; LD-4;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$945,250
Co-financing:	\$997,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,992,250
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mohamed Bakarr	Agency Contact Person:	Isabelle Van Der beck

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	March 24, 2014 Yes, Bahamas is eligible. Cleared	
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	March 24, 2012 Yes, the OFP endorsement is included with the submission. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.  
 FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 24, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the country is requesting \$1.035 million for this MSP, which is within its total allocation.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 24, 2012</p> <p>Yes, the MSP is designed as a multi-focal area project utilizing resources from BD (\$487,549) and LD (\$547,500) which is available.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>	n/a	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>March 24, 2012</p> <p>No set-aside funds are being requested.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
<p><b>Strategic Alignment</b></p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi</i></p>	<p>March 24, 2012</p> <p>No. The project is not appropriately aligned with the BD and LD focal area results framework. Given the size of the grant amount requested and geographical target (East Grand Bahama), the PIF</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><i>Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>needs to be very focused in its approach to demonstrate alignment with focal area objectives and outcomes. Please provide more clarity on the alignment with the focal area result frameworks (including Aichi Targets for BD).</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>The re-submission does not reflect any change to suggest that the concern has been addressed. Please revisit.</p> <p>June 11, 2014</p> <p>The PIF is now updated with all concerns addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>March 24, 2012</p> <p>Reference is made to NAP (for UNCCD) and NBSAP (for BD), but no national strategies that justify the sectoral focus (e.g. agriculture and tourism). Please highlight specific national plans and / or strategies that reinforce need for the proposed approach.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>Consistency with national strategies is now clear.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to</p>	<p>March 24, 2012</p> <p>No. The narrative is too generic and lacks</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	<p>clear articulation of the problem as well as adequate justification for the proposed integrated approach. Please provide a more succinct description of the baseline context and projects, including appropriate data and assumptions. Please note that the LD focal requires direct involvement with production landscapes where livelihood practices can benefit from sustainable land management innovations.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>The baseline problem still lacks sound data, but reinforces the need for a PPG phase. Furthermore, the need for an integrated BD and LD approach is now justified based on growing threat from competing land uses, including consequences for adjacent coral reefs.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>March 24, 2012</p> <p>No. The framework is silent on concrete activities on the ground to reduce pressure on competing land uses including threats to biodiversity, and to generate GEBs and socioeconomic benefit (as expected for the LD focal area). The components are simply too many. For example, components 1 and 4 can be combined into 1, and component 2 eliminated because it does not involve any actions that will lead to restoration of the ecosystem. Please revise the framework to take these into account, and</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>streamline outputs and outcomes accordingly (i.e. outputs should be measurable and / or quantified as evidence of the expected outcomes).</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>The project framework is now clear and consistent with expectations for influencing change that will create impact for people and the environment.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>No. The GEBs are not clearly identified even if the potential for multiple benefits exist. Please address the following:</p> <p>a) substantiate how increasing capacity in this project will reduce pressure on the islands' fragile ecologies. What is the intended "management regime" for 20,000 hectares of ecologically important biological corridor?</p> <p>b) describe approach to monitoring and quantifying the multiple GEBs (on land and in the coastal waters); and</p> <p>c) clarify how the GEF increment will help deliver the multiple benefits over and beyond what is possible through baseline investments.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>The resubmission does not reflect change to indicate that these concerns have been addressed. Please revisit and provide an updated document with clean and tracked</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>change versions.</p> <p>June 11, 2014</p> <p>The PIF is now updated and all concerns addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:  a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and  b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>No. The PIF makes reference to increased pressure on natural resources from the local population, but does not indicate how the approach proposed will engage this population to alleviate the pressure. Beyond awareness raising and citizen science, there is no evidence of how the CSOs listed as co-financiers will be engaged to justify public participation. Please address this and clarify how the stakeholders will be engaged.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>The re-submission does not reflect any change to suggest that the concern has been addressed. Please revisit.</p> <p>June 11, 2014</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The PIF is updated and all concerns addressed.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Yes, relevant risks have been identified but will need to be further elaborated if the proposal is submitted for CEO approval.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Reference is made to other GEF projects for coordination, but details of aspects for coordination should be provided if the project is submitted for CEO approval.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>The project lacks evidence of innovativeness despite the opportunity presented to demonstrate integrated approaches to natural resource management at scale. Although it targets the East Grand Bahama, the approach is largely knowledge-based and informational with no on-the-ground activities. Development of a watershed management plan is proposed with no baseline characterization of the actual watershed to serve as model for integrated management. Hence it is hard to understand how the project will lead to any scaling-up. Please address this more clearly in the PIF.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>The potential for innovativeness is now clear, and should be further enhanced during the PPG phase.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
Project Financing	<p>16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>No. The grant amounts and co-financing are spread too thinly because of too many components. Furthermore, the co-financing amounts are not adequate to justify the GEF increment. Please revisit and revise in connection with comments made in #7.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>The breakdown of GEF grant and co-financing is now appropriate and adequate.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>17. <u>At PIF</u>: Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p>as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u>: Has co-financing been confirmed?</p>	<p>The co-financing amount is very low despite the good mix of sources. Please consider increasing the amount to achieve a ratio of at least 1:3 to further demonstrate commitment by the Government and partners to the proposed project. Agency contribution is entirely in-kind, but it is not clear how this is related to its role as described in B.3. Please address.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>A case has been made for the level of co-financing, which is acceptable given the scope of what is being proposed. The Agency contribution is also welcome.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>No. The PMC must be 5% or less of the GEF grant. Please correct.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>PMC is fine.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	<p>19. <u>At PIF</u>, is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u>, if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the</p>	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>Yes. PPG is requested, but needs to be justified. What exactly will the PPG help to deliver?</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>PPG is now justified.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?	Cleared	
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>March 24, 2014</p> <p>No. PIF cannot be recommended at this stage. Please address all concerns raised in this review.</p> <p>June 5, 2014</p> <p>No. PIF can still not be recommended. Re-submitted text must reflect changes in text based on responses provided.</p> <p>June 11, 2014</p> <p>Yes, the PIF is now recommended for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		CEO approval.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
	First review*	March 24, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	June 05, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)	June 11, 2014	

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**