



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

GEF ID:	<b>9862</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Jamaica</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using an Integrated Landscape Approach</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>6109 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; LD-3 Program 4;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$182,648</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$6,210,046</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$43,915,347</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$50,125,393</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2017</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Asha Bobb-Semple</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Lyes Ferroukhi</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	07/14/2017 ABS:  The project is well aligned to GEF's Strategic Objectives and as written demonstrates the potential value of the integrated landscape approach to biodiversity conservation and land management. Please, however address the queries/comments below.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments	07/14/2017 ABS:  Not fully.	Thank you for bringing this to our attention. The project does support and contribute to national targets related to

<sup>1</sup> 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>under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>There is no mention of the UNCCD and how the project may contribute to national targets or actions plans related to this Convention, in addition any support to LDN target setting process.</p> <p>9/1/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	<p>UNCCD. The project promotes and supports National LD objectives that specify preventing LD in susceptible areas, halting and restoring areas of significant LD, creating efficient and effective information network on LD and drought, and effecting positive change in individual behavior [outlined in the draft 2002 NAP, currently being updated through GEF support (2014) to align its NAP to the UNCCD 10-year strategy]. The project also promotes the national target (in 2016 NBSAP) that by 2020, ecosystem resilience will have been enhanced through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems that further contributes to CC adaptation and to combating desertification, which in turn also complements the targets of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). The project supports these objectives and targets through systemic approaches in Component 1, including: Output 1.2 - Strengthened institutional capacity to implement decision-making tools such as spatial planning, centralized multi-institutional information management database and monitoring system, baseline BD/ecological assessment, Land Use and Biodiversity Monitoring and Tracking Tool with monitoring programmes; Output 1.3 - Improved planning and</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>management capacities for environmental planning, with local participation and coordination mechanism, other). The project also supports the National LD objectives and targets and through on-the-ground application of landscape planning and management in key biodiversity areas in Component 2 that will: Output 2.1 - improve sustainable land management through a landscape level land use plan that incorporates LD management / land uses in environmentally sensitive areas; Output 2.2 - INRM activities such as SLM compatible production, drought mitigation, SFM in riparian zones and others, and support for the development and implementation of a BD integrated forest restoration plan.</p> <p>The project will contribute to ongoing LDN target setting by supporting strengthened capacity for use and implementation of decision-making tools that can support ongoing national target setting, as indicated above. These GEF supported activities will contribute to future NAP development process, though likely outside the timeframe of the development of the current NAP development process (2014 GEF funded EA).</p>
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	07/14/2017 ABS:	The project will both ensure and

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>Yes the PIF has sufficiently identified the drivers and innovation.</p> <p>In terms of sustainability, please indicate how the project will ensure or facilitate continuity and the potential for scaling up of the livelihood training activities to be developed under Output 2.4 and the enterprise and business initiatives under Output 3.1. The same query also applies to Output 3.1 and market transformation.</p> <p>09/01/2017 ABS:</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	<p>facilitate continuity through the development of integrated training modules for extension agents, with sustainability and scale up furthered through the institutionalization of these training programmes within tertiary education institutions in Jamaica. Training of extension officers will be supported through this project and the training programmes will be available to government officers and the private sector (including producers) through these institutions post project completion, further supporting the replication and scale up of the activities outlined in Output 2.4. Intention within government is to expand and scale up these activities to other areas post project. Trained extension personnel can support ongoing livelihood training and production activities with producers at new sites over time post project completion. The expansion of farmer field schools outside the project target area will be further supported by the trained extension officers and private sector through the institutionalization of the SLM/CSA/BD training modules, model farms, community level nurseries, demonstration sites for SLM techniques. As with activities in Output 2.4, ecotourism enterprises and small</p>

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>business development (Output 3.1) support will be integrated with financial mechanisms and supply chain models developed, enabling replication and scale-up during and post project completion. Lessons learned will be used to inform future replicated endeavours and advise on best practices gleaned through project implementation.</p> <p>Furthermore, supply chain initiatives supported through this project would serve as models for replication and scale up of sustainable livelihood enterprises supported through capacity building, small business development support, and financial support mechanisms. Supply chain initiatives will focus on certification and deal flows through the micro-financing initiatives being developed, linking investors to small and medium sized eco-enterprises (see comments for 1.4 below). It is anticipated that the innovative financing will enhance the supply chain. These supply chain models would be inclusive and accommodate the participation of diverse local persons. Supply chain initiatives supported through this project will interconnect community culture and natural endowment into product creation, enterprise and business initiatives, and will incorporate diverse groups of players on the ground to help ensure</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			benefit to maximum local persons/communities and done in a sustainable manner. This more inclusive sustainable community-based supply chain model support market transformation and a more inclusive sustainable market. The project will be using a sustainable eco-tourism model that will ensure that that natural resources are protected and preserved, as will product development (i.e. crafts and use of invasive bamboo). Government will create an enabling environment to engender the growth of these activities, with training of the private sector, government officers and relevant community personnel to enable continuity, with best practices promoted by government and imparting of lessons learned to promote growth.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	07/14/2017 ABS:  Yes the project has shown the incremental benefit of GEF investment.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	07/25/2017 ABS & SW:  Not fully. Please provide clarification on the points below:  Component 1 Output 1.2- Please indicate plans for hosting and maintenance of the multi-institutional information management	Component 1 Output 1.2 - The multi-institutional information database and monitoring system will be housed within NEPA, which is both an environmental and planning agency. Data sharing protocols would be established with all relevant agencies / ministries with environmental and planning responsibility, and would

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>database and monitoring system.</p> <p>- (Pg. 12) Please confirm whether or not activity (v) (referring to baseline BD/ecological assessments and inventories of fauna and flora) is a BAU activity under the mandate of NEPA.</p> <p>Output 1.3- Please make the wording of the Output more specific and measureable. Who is the target group (s) for the improved capacity/training? Is it national, parish or local level bodies/stakeholders?</p> <p>-EIAs are a BAU activity and so the GEF does not provide support to this activity.</p> <p>Output 1.4- Please provide additional details on the innovative financial mechanism to be developed and provide an indication of the long term funding source for these activities and who will be targeted. By PPG, these activities need to be well-defined.</p> <p>-Please ensure lessons learned from the development of the National Conservation Trust Fund Jamaica are incorporated in the project design at the PPG phase.</p> <p>-There is no mention of the private sector here or in Section 2 on</p>	<p>serve to ensure that information from these agencies / ministries also goes into database as well and access / use is available. These entities include the Forestry Department, Climate Change Division, Fisheries Division, Planning Institute of Jamaica, Institute of Jamaica which houses the Jamaica Clearinghouse Mechanism of the UN convention on BD (data on endemic and invasive species, as well as others. Management and the sharing protocols of the multi-institutional information database and monitoring system will be modeled after other multi-institutional database with protocols already in Jamaica.</p> <p>- (Pg. 12). Baseline BD/ecological assessment and inventories are not a BAU activity under the mandate of NEPA. Currently, there is a lack of current and comprehensive BD and ecological data upon which to inform decision-making to ensure appropriate land use decisions are made. This also pertains to the Cockpit Country, of significant concern due to high levels of localized endemism (i.e. as documented on Karst formations) and BD of global significance, data upon which to make land use decisions is needed but is lacking. Windsor Research Center carries out a few ecological studies within Cockpit Country mainly on birds</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Stakeholders. Will they be engaged for this Output?</p> <p>Output 1.5- is mostly written as an activity. Please clarify what is the tangible output?</p> <p>Component 2</p> <p>Output 2.1- What is the prospect for mining currently? The basis of this question is stemming from the likelihood of the sustainability of the results of this Component and specifically Output 2.1 and 2.2 being eroded if mining goes ahead.</p> <p>Output 2.2-As written the Output refers to biodiversity mainstreaming, however the activities refer to SLM. Please clarify.</p> <p>In addition, the GEF LD strategy makes particular reference to production landscapes managed by smallholder farmers. This output makes reference to SLM activities on the ground. What portion of the 2500ha would be dedicated to SLM activities on production lands? Is this for specific smallholder farmer plots? Are these SLM activities to take place on lands degraded from unsustainable agriculture use and/or deforestation?</p>	<p>and snakes, but these are not exhaustive.</p> <p>Output 1.3</p> <p>- Output 1.3 has been reworded to be more specific and measurable as suggested. Target groups for capacity building/training will be national government personnel (NEPA, Forestry Department, Agriculture, other, others tbd), parish level personnel (Parish Municipal Corporations), and personnel from the local level community groups. Other recipients of capacity building support will be key stakeholders / NGOs that collaborate with government on, for example, biodiversity conservation, land use planning, restoration of mined out lands, other (tbd during PPG phase) to further capacities to support data acquisition for government land use planning decision-making (i.e. Windsor Research Center). The project will also support the development and institutionalization within tertiary educational institution of a standardized EIA curriculum. This curriculum will target both government personnel and private sector that conducts EIAs, but the actual training of the private sector will not be project supported, rather integrated into the enrollment and costing of the institution itself.</p> <p>The project is proposing to address the</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Output 2.3- Regarding the restoration of mined out lands is this activity being supported through co-financing?</p> <p>Output 2.4- The output as written is not specific or measurable. Whose capacities will be developed? Please provide an estimate of how many farmers will be targeted?</p> <p>Component 3 Output 3.1- Please indicate, if available now an estimate of the no. of people to benefit from these activities. Will the activities be confined to the Maroon Community or be expanded to other local communities in the project area?</p> <p>Component 4 Output 4.1- How does the project intend to utilize knowledge management to assist in applying the integrated landscape management approach at this local or sub-regional level to national level? Reference is also made to paragraph 17 (Component 1).</p> <p>09/01/2017 ABS &amp; SW:</p>	<p>systemic issues related to the lack of standardization of EIAs to ensure conformity of implementation and the inclusion of appropriate environmental standards. The project is not supporting the implementation of EIAs, rather the development of standardized EIA regulations with BD / ecosystem services mainstreamed as well as Economic Valuation (EV) of BD integrated. Furthermore, with an EIA curriculum that is standardized and institutionalized (within tertiary educational institution), the project is supporting the enhancement of technical competence at the private sector level to conduct EIAs. The development of standardized EIA regulations and a standardized EIA curriculum will then further ensure quality assurance of completed EIAs reviewed by government personnel. Currently, there are also no standardization in the process to conduct EIAs, no standardized EIA regulations that mainstream BD and ecosystem services or EV, curriculum or certifications in place, nor adequate regulations for assessing / ensuring quality of completed EIAs submitted to NEPA's Planning Unit. Lack of these regulations and standardization can lead to inappropriate developments and resultant environmental degradation.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>All queries have been sufficiently addressed.</p> <p>At PPG, please consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Component 1.6 – Please include well-developed, specific plans for these activities. In particular, ensuring their financial sustainability beyond the life of the project</li> <li>- Component 4.2 – Please link these activities directly to specific project outcomes and how communications will support them. The GEF generally does not fund general awareness raising activities.</li> </ul>	<p>Output 1.4 – Thank you for your comment. This output will focus on financial support systems for incentivizing CSA, SLM and conservation oriented agriculture practices and ecotourism enterprises. This could include microcredit and related certification for agricultural products and tourism enterprises with BD considerations incorporated and CSA products integrated. This output will support the review of existing microcredit schemes (national and regional) and development of new innovative, financial mechanism (sectoral microcredit schemes and related certification schemes) for BD mainstreamed tourism, agroforestry and climate smart agriculture, through national and local financial institutions (such as the Development Bank of Jamaica, Credit Unions, some Commercial Banks and National People's Cooperative Banks). These microcredit schemes will follow lessons learned from similarly designed programs, and will be linked to activities supported in Component 3. For example, in the agriculture sector the project will support microcredit schemes that promote agroforestry and agriculture products with CSA / SLM criteria integrated and BD considerations mainstreamed, supported further with the</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>development of certification schemes. This microcredit financing will facilitate access to sustainable financing for small scale CSA farming enterprises, as outlined in the STAP guidance document on Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Production Landscape and Sectors. Microcredit schemes that promote BD-integrated sustainable tourism initiatives will also be supported, with related certification schemes developed / enhanced. Long term funding from the Development Bank of Jamaica (DBJ) will be explored, which has provided funding through Credit Unions and Peoples' Cooperative (PC) Banks for small farmers and agricultural related enterprises. The project will further explore during the PPG phase the establishment of a revolving fund, replenished based payback by small farmers and small tourism ventures, again routed through a financial institution. These financial mechanisms will engage the private sector, as will the development of certification schemes that engages buyers and marketing boards.</p> <p>-Yes, it will be ensured that lessons learned from the development of the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica will be incorporated into project design at the PPG phase. It is also</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>intended that financial mechanisms will link with the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica, a GEF-4 NPAS Project output, which will be further specified during PPG phase.</p> <p>Output 1.5 – This output has been re-recorded. Thank you for the comment.</p> <p>Component 2            Output 2.1 – Currently, there is no final government decision regarding mining in the Cockpit Country. The activities being supported in this project are being conducted in order to provide information and improved capacities to inform these land use decisions. The potential for mining further increased the need for the development of the land use plan outlined in Output 2.1, as even if mining does proceed in some areas, this land use plan will define those environmentally sensitive areas, areas of BD of national and global significance, areas sensitive to LD, which can be used for decision-making by government. This particular output has been recommended by the government entities with responsibility for environmental protection and planning. Similar to the explanation above for Output 2.1, implementing BD mainstreamed INRM in areas of the target site identified in the land use plan further supports the</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>significance of these activities in particular sites, and again can be used to inform government decision-making. Both the above-mentioned outputs also indirectly provide increased awareness and knowledge of the importance of the importance of BD and environmental sensitive areas as well as the potential impacts of LD including those of mining. Furthermore, the project is also supporting the development of environmental guidelines for the new Mining Policy being developed as well as the development of baseline environmental accounts for the mining sector.</p> <p>Output 2.2 - The output incorporates BD mainstreaming in INRM activities as well as supports BD management actions (i.e. management of species of global significance). BD is incorporated in a number of the activities outlined in the output: (i) SFM and SLM in riparian zones will incorporate use native species; (ii) Agricultural and agroforestry practices supported will mainstream BD (i.e. use of mixed strata agroforestry practices to support BD) as well CSA practices; (v) Management of BD of global significance will be identified and initiated; (vi) support for voluntary reforestation on private lands will promote use of native species and</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>further mainstream of BD, and; (vii) Community Resource Use Plans developed / updated will integrate BD and ecosystem services consideration. -As outlined in the GEF LD strategy, project activities will target production landscapes managed by smallholder farmers. The majority of SLM activities will take place on production lands (75% indicative, tbd during PPG phase) of which all will be smallholder farmers. SLM on production lands will include both lands degraded from unsustainable agriculture use / deforestation as well as production lands identified as environmentally sensitive. The remainder of the SLM activities will address areas identified of BD significance and of LD risk (i.e. riverbanks).</p> <p>Output 2.3. The project will support restoration of mined out bauxite lands that will scale up an ongoing Forestry Department program and support the incorporation of site specific biodiversity considerations into exiting restoration protocols. This Forestry Department program is already being carried out in collaboration with a bauxite mining company. As an ongoing collaboration with government, co-financing is already incorporated in government co-financing contribution (Table C).</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Output 2.4 - Output 2.4 has been rewritten to be more specific and measurable. Target groups for capacity development are government extension and conservation officers (Forestry Dept., Agriculture, NEPA, others tbd), producers of smallholder farms, and communities and Maroon populations in the target project area. Potential additional key stakeholders will be identified at PPG phase. It is estimated that at minimum, 100 producers will be targeted, though to be confirmed at PPG phase.</p> <p>Component 3 Output 3.1 – Activities outlined in Output 3.1 will include both the Maroon population in the area as well as communities / community members within the pilot areas. These communities and the estimate of the number of people to benefit from these activities will be further detailed during the PPG phase, where community level engagement can be further explored and defined, and will confirm potential beneficiaries.</p> <p>Table B, Output 3.1. Text removed "(ii) six (6) demonstration sites for SLM techniques (i.e. slope stabilization)" due to replication with Output 2.4.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>Component 4</p> <p>Knowledge management will be used to assist in applying the integrated landscape management approach at all levels. Information gathered and lessons learned at the local level will be incorporated into national land use planning, where information produced in communities is being fed into sub-regional level planning (i.e. Parish level Development Orders), which then feeds into national level planning (i.e. National spatial planning, BD considerations mainstreamed into Mining Policy). For example, SLM initiatives in Cockpit Country, including agriculture, are based on knowledge produced, that then feeds into Local Sustainable Development Plans (includes land management at parish level), which then feeds into overall development planning at the national level, including National spatial planning. Development Orders necessitate stakeholder/community level participation and local level knowledge to feed into the Orders. Knowledge management will ensure that information is distilled, evaluated and disseminated in a user-friendly format, and that knowledge management systems are supported to inform planning activities, both within and across different production sectors at different scales</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			(local, national, regional, global), as outlined in the STAP guidance document on Mainstreaming Biodiversity into the Production Landscape and Sectors.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>07/14/2017 ABS:</p> <p>We welcome the gender assessment and assessment of vulnerable populations in addition to the incorporation of these target groups into the project.</p> <p>However the project background would benefit from additional information on the socio-economic context of the project site as well as the Maroon community which is a significant target group of the project.</p> <p>09/01/2017 ABS &amp; SW:</p> <p>Cleared.</p> <p>At PPG please consider the following for the Maroon community as a vulnerable group.</p> <p>Please include information on how proper safeguards for the use and dissemination of Traditional Knowledge will be implemented.</p>	Additional socio-economic data has been added to the project background, specifically to the project target site and the Maroons of Cockpit Country.
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	07/14/2017 ABS:  Yes Jamaica's full STAR allocation is available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	07/14/2017 ABS:  Yes. Jamaica has decided to make use of the flexibility option for this project.	07/14/2017 ABS:  N/A
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	07/14/2017 ABS:  N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	07/14/2017 ABS:  N/A	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	07/14/2017 ABS:  N/A	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	07/14/2017 ABS:  No not at this time. Please address the comments and questions above.  09/01/2017 ABS: Please note the additional consideration for the PPG stage mentioned under Questions 5 and 6.  All issues have been adequately addressed in the re-submission and we have received the OFP	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		Endorsement Letter. The project is technically cleared. .	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	July 25, 2017	August 29, 2017
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<sup>3</sup> 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
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		