



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

GEF ID:	9791		
Country/Region:	Bahamas		
Project Title:	Meeting the Challenge of 2020 in The Bahamas		
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-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$182,648	Project Grant:	\$6,243,004
Co-financing:	\$11,963,000	Total Project Cost:	\$18,206,004
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Sarah Wyatt	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	<p>March 21, 2017</p> <p>No. While the project is well aligned, please identify SMART indicators.</p> <p>The project provides a strong justification for the biodiversity importance of these sites.</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>No, the LD components of this</p>	

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>project are not well-aligned with the LD strategy which is specifically aimed at making on the ground changes in productive landscapes. These activities (Outcome 1.2 and 3.1) would fit within the biodiversity mainstreaming framework (BD Program 9). Lastly, IAS activities should be considered under the IAS program (Program 4). The Bahamas could use its marginal flexibility (up to 2 million) to accommodate this change.</p> <p>June 14, 2017</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>March 24, 2017</p> <p>Please include the following information in the PIF: a) How does the project propose to align with and contribute to implementation of the INDC, including reference to specific measures or activities in the INDC that will be addressed by the project activities?; and b) When was the INDC submitted to the UNFCCC?</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes, addressed.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	March 24, 2017	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>No.</p> <p>Please explain sustainability and scaling up strategy for RE and EE, especially beyond protected areas.</p> <p>For output 3.1.3, please describe how this will be scaled up.</p> <p>For Output 3.1.1, please describe the sustainability of these activities.</p> <p>Sustainability of park operations</p> <p>1. Is the expectation that visitor fees alone will be sufficient to meet financial needs?</p> <p>2. If not, how will this project address these issues?</p> <p>3. How will this relate to the conservation trust fund and will develop programs to raise funds and meet upcoming match requirements?</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes, thank you for the additional information.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 24, 2017</p> <p>No, please include baseline and</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>additionality on CCM. Bahamas implemented RE project in 2010-2014, and the rating was marginally unsatisfactory (ID 3875). Please explain how this proposed project use its experiences and lessons learnt.</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>June 14, 2017</p> <p>During PPG, please continue to seek additional partners and co-financing. Are there opportunities for private sector involvement or groups like the International Conservation Corps?</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 24, 2017</p> <p>No, please address the following.</p> <p>Threats - Please discuss climate change mitigation related threat, such as issues of use of fossil fuels, because this project request CCM financing.</p> <p>Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Please clarify the language on the outcomes. - How will the project ensure that the plans are used? - How will the system be maintained 	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>after the end of the project?</p> <p>Output 2.1: Sustainable energy management should be mainstreamed in the PA management. Please articulate if the PA Management Plan will include the plan and activities on carbon neutral PA including renewable energy (RE) and energy efficiency (EE). Also please explain if the financial sustainability of MPA will take into account the implementation and operation of RE and EE related activities. (The financial sustainability is discussed as barriers, but it is not clear if it will be addressed by this project.)</p> <p>Output 3.1 - This output doesn't seem to mention the IAS work that's described in the body of the PIF. From the description, it does not sound like this work fits exactly with the IAS activities that the GEF will support in the GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy. Please revise. Financial sustainability of any activities need to be included in any IAS work.</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes, thank you for the revisions.</p> <p>During PPG, please keep in mind</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>both the points around using the RE installations in PAs to catalyze broader adoption and ensuring alignment with the GEF strategy on IAS. For IAS, we target activities that will generate long term outcomes rather than simply funding a piece of initiatives that require long term funding. Also, please discuss how these activities will coordinate with the regional UNEP project on IAS for the OECS and Barbados.</p> <p>Also, for component 3, please use indicators that look at the actual impact of the activities undertaken (IAS control for instance) rather than public perception.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>March 24, 2017</p> <p>We welcome the development of a gender plan as part of the PPG.</p>	
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>March 21, 2017</p> <p>No. When this project is combined with the proposal for SGP of \$500,000, the Bahamas are over their STAR allocation by \$2,000. Please revise this project or SGP proposal.</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Yes, the project is actually \$2 under budget now.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	<p>March 21, 2017</p> <p>Please see the response above on total availability. With the SGP proposal, LD is over by \$69 and CCM by \$2,341. However, Marginal Flexibility allows up to \$2 million in movement between focal areas, so the issue is the \$2,000 over the total allocation.</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>March 24, 2017</p> <p>No. Please revise and resubmit.</p> <p>April 14, 2017</p> <p>No, thank you for the revisions but please revise the programming areas and re-submit.</p> <p>June 14, 2017</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		The program manager recommends this project for CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	March 24, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 14, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 14, 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		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

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.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		