



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

GEF ID:	4454		
Country/Region:	Jamaica		
Project Title:	Integrated Management of the Yallahs River and Hope River Watersheds		
GEF Agency:	IADB	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):	LD-1; LD-1; LD-3; LD-3; BD-2; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,768,667
Co-financing:	\$8,809,256	Total Project Cost:	\$12,577,923
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	DG, 11 Feb, 2011.  LD + SFM/REDD+, BD: yes	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	DG, 11 Feb, 2011.  N/A.	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	DG, 11 Feb, 2011.  Yes, Leonie Barnaby, the GEF OFP for Jamaica has endorsed the project in a letter dated January 16, 2010 requesting a total of \$4,709,518 from the GEF.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	February 14, 2011  Yes, the case is made for watershed management.	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	February 14, 2011  Yes. two hard loans from IDB are	

	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	February 14, 2011 Yes.	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	February 14, 2011 No. please see below. March 29, 2011. Yes. please, see below.	
	• the focal area allocation?	DG, 11 Feb, 2011.  LD: No. Jamaica is a non-flexible country with a total GEF-5 LD STAR allocation of \$2.09 mio. However, the country is seeking GEF LD support for this project of \$2,308,625. Please, keep in mind that Agency fees are already included in GEF-5 STAR allocations.  SFM/REDD+: SFM/REDD+ is not covered by STAR in GEF-5. Based on the 3:1 ratio for the SFM/REDD+ incentive mechanism (also covering PPGs), Jamaica could access up to \$1,177,380 SFM/REDD+ resources for this project.  BD: Yes, Jamaica has access to \$4.8 million in biodiversity.  DG, 29 Mar, 2011. Yes, funding requested from LD Focal Area has been adjusted and is now within Jamaica's available resources for GEF-5.	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	February 14, 2011 NA	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	February 14, 2011 ...	

Project  
Consistency

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>NA</p>	
	<p>8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD: Yes. SFM/REDD+: The project lists "one new source of financing established" as an expected FA output for SFM/REDD+ (in Part 1A: FA Strategy Frameworks). However, no further reference is made to this output any more. Please, include some basic information on this in the project description.</p> <p>BD: The project is aligned with one output of results framework for biodiversity, however the text of the PIF does not reference this output at all. Please clarify how the project will implement one national and two sub-national land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystems valuation and how this is integrated into the overall project as it is not clear at all and is not mentioned as being a key response measure to threats to biodiversity.</p> <p>March 29, 2011.</p> <p>SFM/REDD+: No. Some additional information on the nature of the financing source has been added in the revised version. However, the description provided under B2 on page 10 is still very vague (create at least one new source of financial support for forest management; and implement a pilot financing scheme that will allow users of water to contribute to forest management). Please, provide more information on the new source of financial support for SFM and the nature of the planned PES.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p>	

		<p>provided.</p> <p>April 7, 2011.</p> <p>SFM/REDD+: Yes. Additional information on the financing scheme has been provided.</p>	
	<p>9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD: Yes. The proposed project is fully in line with LD-1.2: improved agricultural management and seems to be in line with LD-3.2: integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities.</p> <p>SFM/REDD+: Yes. The proposed project is fully in line with SFM/REDD+ 1: good management practices developed and applied in existing forests.</p> <p>BD: Yes, but poorly articulated.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: An adequate improvement for PIF stage. However, by the time of CEO endorsement, please comprehensively describe, within the context of the project design section, the fit of the project with objective two of the GEF's biodiversity strategy and in particular GEF's support to biodiversity mainstreaming through incorporation of ecosystem valuation in spatial land-use planning.</p>	
	<p>10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD: Yes. Watershed degradation has been identified in Jamaica's NAP as a major challenge affecting SLM.</p> <p>SFM/REDD+: Yes. The Jamaica's National Forest Management and Conservation Plan from 2002 identified the Hope River and Yallahs River as high priorities for action.</p>	

		<p>BD: The link between this project and the country's NBSAP is not well described. Please improve.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: Adequate clarification provided on project link with current NBSAP.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the institutional sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>No. Please articulate.</p> <p>April 8, 2011</p> <p>Adequate for PIF stage.</p> <p>By the time of CEO endorsement, please more clearly describe the project's strategy for sustaining project outcomes and how the involved institutions will have the capacity to sustain these outcomes.</p>	
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD and SFM/REDD+: yes.</p> <p>BD: The baseline that will exist to allow for national and sub-national land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystems valuation are not described. Please revise.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: Improved description of baseline, but please fully elucidate the baseline project description and the associated GEF alternative by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD and SFM/REDD+: yes.</p> <p>BD: No, in fact it is not described at all. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p>	

		<p>BD: Adequate clarification is now provided.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD and SFM/REDD+: Mainly. The exact scope and output under "Project component 2: Implementing SFM practices" remains unclear. Please, address the following uncertainties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why is land under sustainable agriculture listed as an outcome under this 'forest' component.</li> <li>2. Why does the project only aim at decreasing erosion in middle-and lower watersheds?</li> <li>3. If there are already ideas on this, please briefly describe: Which 'commercially viable crops' should be introduced to conserve soil conservation and how/where and on which scale should this be done?</li> </ol> <p>BD: This aspect of the proposal is not described in any detail whatsoever. As currently presented, the proposal is focused on watershed management with very little attention being paid to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and reduction of threats to biodiversity. The project proposes three land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem valuation, however, there is no rationale behind this choice of activities, how it will be done, and what impact these land-use plans will have on biodiversity.</p> <p>March 29, 2011. LD and SFM/REDD+: Yes.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: An improved explanation has been provided. Please ensure that by the time</p>	

		<p>logframe includes indicators to measure the biodiversity outcomes that will be realized through the development and implementation of land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem valuation.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD/SFM/REDD+: Yes, fully incremental.</p> <p>BD: Because this aspect of the proposal is so poorly articulated, this question can not be answered.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: Adequate for PIF stage. By the time of CEO endorsement, further improvement of incremental reasoning for biodiversity investment is expected.</p>	
	<p>16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD/SFM/REDD+: Mainly. Please, be advised that all projects requesting money from the GEF-5 SFM/REDD+ Program will need to proof climate change mitigation benefits. While this project is clearly expected to create these benefits from its activities related to forest management and agro-forestry (e.g. 200 ha of upper watershed reforested and under sustainable management), no reference is being made to them. Please, make reference to expected CC mitigation benefits (including a rough estimate) from this project in a re-submission of this PIF and include information at CEO endorsement stage on how these benefits will be measured during project implementation.</p> <p>BD: No. The PIF fails to link the land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem valuation to reduced threats to biodiversity and generation of global biodiversity benefits. Please improve.</p>	

		<p>March 29, 2011. LD and SFM/REDD+: Yes. The inclusion of an EXCEL file with estimates of expected carbon benefits of this project is appreciated.</p> <p>BD: Adequate for PIF stage. At the time of CEO endorsement, please ensure that global biodiversity benefits are fully described and allowances are made in the project logframe to monitor and measure them.</p>	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>The PIF does not describe why this is a cost-effective intervention. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>Adequate explanation provided.</p>	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>NA</p>	
	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>To some degree, yes. Proponents intend on conducting further analysis during project preparation stage which seems adequate.</p>	
	20. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+, and BD: Major risks are identified. Please provide initial ideas on mitigation measures for each threat.</p> <p>March 29, 2011. BD, LD and SFM/REDD+: Yes. Information on appropriate mitigation measures has been included.</p>	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>Yes</p>	



	<p>22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?</p>	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+: Mainly. Please, provide some further information under B.5. on how the project is planning to engage with local communities in the upstream areas and farmer groups further downstream.</p> <p>BD: Please describe in more detail the process whereby the national and sub-national land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem valuation will be developed, who are the key stakeholders, and who has the information necessary to develop said land-use plans, in a revised version of the POF.</p> <p>March 29, 2011. LD and SFM/REDD+: Yes. Additional information on how the project is planning to engage with local communities and farmer groups has been added.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: Adequate.</p>	
	<p>23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>Yes, adequate at PIF stage. Please embellish this considerably with discrete plans for coordination by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
	<p>24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>However, please clarify what entity will be in charge of developing the land-use plans being developed with the biodiversity funds and clarify how this will relate to the rest of the activities being implemented.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: Adequate explanation provided. Please ensure that this is fully elaborated</p>	

		particularly with regards to PES. Please refer to STAP guidelines on PES and demonstrate in the final design how the STAP recommendations and good practice on PES design and implementation was incorporated into the project design.	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>No. While about 9% of GEF resources are programed to cover project management costs (which is acceptable), less than 5% of the total contribution from co-financing sources is dedicated to project management. The relative contribution from co-financing to project management should match or exceed the GEF contribution.</p> <p>April 5, 2011.</p> <p>No. The relative contribution from Co-financing to project management (4.6%) is still not matching the relative contribution from GEF to project management (7.1%).</p> <p>April 7, 2011.</p> <p>Yes. The relative contribution from Co-financing to project management is now exceeding the relative contribution from GEF to project management.</p>	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>BD: This is not possible to assess given the lack of a proper description of the</p>	

	reasoning principle?	<p>LD-SFM/REDD+: seems to be appropriate.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>BD: Overall description has improved and this is adequate at PIF stage. However, by the time of CEO Endorsement, please explain the biodiversity outcomes to be delivered by the project in more explicit terms, including identifying biodiversity outcomes in the project logframe, and appropriate indicators to monitor achievement of these outcomes.</p>	
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>Tables 1A and 1B incorrectly total \$11.8 million in Co-financing while table 1C lists co-financing amounting to only \$7.7 million. Please correct Tables 1A and 1B.</p> <p>The cofinancing amount of \$7.7 million is inadequate for a project of this kind and we expect higher cofinancing ratios which currently is less than 1:2, GEF to cofinancing.</p> <p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>Cofinancing has increased.</p> <p>Please note that there are two errors that require correction in Table C. Since all money coming from the EU is grant money, please just report this in one row of the table. Please also categorize the money coming from the Forest Conservation Fund in Table C.</p> <p>April 8, 2011</p> <p>Clarifications have been provided that are adequate.</p>	

	<p>30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?</p>	<p>February 14, 2011</p> <p>BD: Spending \$2 million for three land-use plans seems excessive. Please justify and clarify the cost and what baseline it will be building on during development of the land-use plan.</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+: under project component 2, an 8% increase in land under sustainable forestry, agriculture or agro-forestry in the 2 regions does not seem to be very ambitious. In a revised version, please provide figures for planned increases in sustainable forestry (% and ha), agriculture (% and ha) and agro-forestry (% and ha) separately.</p> <p>March 29, 2011. LD and SFM/REDD+: No. The targets have been increased. However, there are still no figures provided for planned increases in sustainable forestry (% and ha), agriculture (% and ha) and agro-forestry (% and ha).</p> <p>BD: The explanation provided is not adequate. The project is spending \$2.2 million on three land-use plans, two of which are focused at the watershed level. This is more than 25% of the total project budget. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 7, 2011. LD-SFM/REDD+: Yes, seems to be appropriate. At CEO endorsement stage, please provide detailed figures on planned increases in sustainable forestry (% and ha), agriculture (% and ha) and agro-forestry (% and ha).</p> <p>April 8, 2011</p> <p>BD: Please note that we are evaluating the total cost of the component, not the GEF contribution solely. The explanation</p>	
	12	FSP/MSP review template: updated 9-8-2010	

		through this component are the elements of information that are required to develop land-use plans that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem valuation. By the time of CEO endorsement a more robust and justified rationale is expected for the total cost of this component which currently stands at \$2.3 million or 26% of the total budget of the project. In addition, given the nature of the activities funded under this component and the need to maintain updated data and information for the tools that will be used and developed under this component, please provide a plan that will outline how the database and information systems will be maintained financially, what institutions will incorporate their management and application as part of the ongoing operating budgets, and what human capacity will be dedicated to maintaining them and using them post-project.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	February 14, 2011 NA for BD.	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>	April 8, 2011 Please respond to STAP comments as appropriate.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council comments?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	February 14, 2011 BD, LD-SFM/REDD+: not yet. Please address all comments raised above and submit a revised PIF and PPG	

		<p>April 5, 2011</p> <p>No. Please address issues identified above and resubmit.</p> <p>April 7, 2011</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+: yes.</p> <p>April 8, 2011</p> <p>BD: yes.</p>	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	<p>March 29, 2011.</p> <p>1. Please, fill out and include BD, LD and SFM/REDD+ tracking tools.</p> <p>2. Please, provide detailed information on how carbon mitigation benefits deriving from this project will be measured. For this purpose, it is suggested to for use carbon growth rates rather than carbon stocks (tC/ha/yr rather than tC/ha).</p> <p>April 8, 2011</p> <p>Numerous comments have been made indicating requirements to be met at the CEO endorsement stage. Please review them carefully prior to the project design phase and ensure that all are comprehensively addressed by the time of CEO endorsement.</p>	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* 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.

## REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+: Yes, the proposed activities seem appropriate. However, the expected outputs should be formulated more specific. It is not enough to list the different components of the proposed project under this section: e.g. under 1. 'Institutional strengthening component' or under 4. 'Financial sustainability component of the project'.</p> <p>BD: Activity four is not detailed or specific enough. Please improve.</p> <p>April 7, 2011.</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+: Yes</p>
PPG Budget	2. Is itemized budget justified?	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+: It is unclear why GEF should pay almost 75% of the total PPG. Usually, the GEF/Co-funding ratio is similar for PIF and PPG.</p> <p>April 7, 2011.</p> <p>BD, LD-SFM/REDD+: Yes, this has been corrected and GEF is paying 38% of the total PPG, which is acceptable.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	<p>DG, 11 Feb, 2011.</p> <p>LD-SFM/REDD+: not yet.</p> <p>March 29, 2011.</p> <p>BD, LD and SFM/REDD+: not yet. The PPG is basically the same as before. Please, address the comments raised above.</p> <p>April 7, 2011.</p> <p>BD, LD-SFM/REDD+: No. The overall cost envelope of the PPG seems excessive totalling close to \$400,000 as we are assuming that all of the cofinancing is cash. Please revert back with a reduced request and assess what activities should be moved forward to the first year of project implementation and what is necessary for the project design phase.</p>
Secretariat Recommendation	4. Other comments	<p>April 8, 2011</p>

		Please note in the final review sheet of the PIF that there are many requests for more rigorous presentation of details in the final project document. Please ensure that these are all addressed during the design process.
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* 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.