



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

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| GEF ID: | 4932 | | |
| Country/Region: | Regional (Antigua And Barbuda, Barbados, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Grenada, Jamaica, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, St. Vincent and Grenadines) | | |
| Project Title: | Integrating Water, Land and Ecosystems Management in Caribbean Small Island Developing States (IWEco) | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNEP and UNDP | 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): | IW-1; IW-1; IW-1; IW-2; IW-2; LD-3; LD-3; LD-3; BD-2; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; SFM/REDD+-1; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$299,500 | Project Grant: | \$20,722,571 |
| Co-financing: | \$68,017,191 | Total Project Cost: | \$89,039,262 |
| PIF Approval: | April 24, 2012 | Council Approval/Expected: | June 07, 2012 |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Christian Severin | Agency Contact Person: | Isabelle Van der Beck |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|---|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible? | 2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the participating countries are eligible. | 15th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the countries are eligible. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | 2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the operational focal points of all participating countries have endorsed the project. However, there seems to be some discrepancies between the amounts mentioned in the endorsement letters from Jamaica as well as St Kitts and Nevis/ In the case of jamaica the endorsement letter mentions the allocation of \$3.175 mio and the PIF | |

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>only lists 43.037 mio and for St Kitts and Nevis, the endorsement letter mentions \$700k for project preparation, where in reality it should probably had mentioned that \$700k was to be allocated towards project activities.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): The issue with the Jamaican Endorsement letter have been addressed by explaining the difference in a footnote. The revised endorsement letter from St Kitts and Nevis has still not been recieved, but will be forwarded to GEFSEC when received by UNEP.</p> <p>13th of November 2014 (cseverin): Only one country's endorsed amount is corresponding with the amount included in Table C, namely Trinidad and Tobago. Please provide explanation.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): Explanation provided and included in submission.</p> | |
| Agency's Comparative Advantage | 3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported? | 2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the two implementing agencies of this proposed project will be UNEP and UNDP> Both of these two agencies have substantial expertise from working in the Caribbean region in general and from implementing the IWCAM project upon which this proposed investment will built and upscale and replicate successes, while expanding its activities to more actively include Land Degradation and Biodiversity | 15th of September 2014 (cseverin): The comparative advantages of the two implementing agencies and the multiple executing agencies have not changed since WP inclusion. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|--|--|---|
| | | investments. | |
| | 4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it? | 2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): No | 15th of September 2014 (cseverin): NA |
| | 5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country? | 2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project fits nicely with the agencies and their programs in the region as well as its staff capacity. | 15th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes the activities fits with the national and regional capacity. |
| Resource Availability | 6. 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>4th April, 2012</p> <p>(mbakarr): All amounts requested by the countries are available under the STAR. However, the amount for Antigua and Barbuda needs to be separated out by focal area in Table D. Please revise the Table.</p> <p>(avelthaus): The amounts requested for BD are available from the four BD country allocations.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin):The Antigua and Barbuda amount has been broken down to each focal area.</p> | <p>15th of September 2014 (cseverin): There is still inconsistencies in the attached Endorsement letters and the amounts listed in the Request for CEO Endorsement, regarding Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago. Further, the endorsement letter from Antigua and Barbuda does not mention any amount at all, so hard to check if it correlates with the amount included in Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): please forward explanation on discrepancies between endorsement letters and what is mentioned in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): Explanation provided and included in submission.</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? | 2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the amount of 9.5 mio is available under the | 15th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the IW funding is still available. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---------------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>IW focal area, as according to requested amount in PIF.</p> <p>(mbakarr): Yes. Antigua and Barbuda will utilize all of its allocation (\$4.4 million) as a flexible country under the STAR rules. St Kitts and Nevis, St Lucia, and St Vincent and the Grenadines will utilize all of their LD allocations for 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 Technology Transfer)? | N/a | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | N/a | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focal area set-aside? | <p>4th April, 2012</p> <p>No focal area set-aside is being requested.</p> | 15th of September 2014 (cseverin): NA |
| Project Consistency | 7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework? | <p>2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the project have been aligned with the IW strategy with suggested activities under objective 1 and 2. The output indicators included are quite advanced for a PIF proposal. However, please do reformulate the objective, as it does not clearly stand out to be a functional Objective as is presently.</p> <p>5 April 2012 (avelthaus): The BD components appear to be aligned with the BD strategy in that the funding will be used for BD-2, which is consistent with the focus on SLM and IWRM. However, the description of how the project is relevant to the GEF BD</p> | <p>15th of September 2014 (cseverin):</p> <p>1) The Project activities proposed for Antigua and Barbuda, does not seem to have a direct link or being aligned with the Land Degradation Results Framework under the listed FA Objective. Please suggest alternative project activities, as the described can not be supported, as is.</p> <p>2) Component 2, 3 and 4 is fully aligned with the focal area results framework</p> <p>3) "Installed", "upgraded", "conservation" and "restoration" measures are not words that allude to</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>strategy, objective 2, needs to be improved. The sections on page 13 and 17 concerning BD need to be improved to make them more relevant to the project. The descriptions should address shortcomings in terms of biodiversity conservation outside PAs that will be addressed by the project.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the Objective have been revised, so that it stands out clearer now. On SFM please do revisit the carbon benefit calculations at the time of CEO endorsement, as they appear a bit high and include a full analysis of the carbon benefits likely to be derived from the project. Such analysis is expected at time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>17 April 2012 (avelthaus): We are pleased that details on the actions to be taken in each country has been added. The descriptions of actions in the four countries wishing to draw from their BD allocations (Antigua and Barbuda, Cuba, Dominican Republic, and Jamaica) vary, however, in terms of quality. Jamaica's description is adequate to justify the use of BD resources as it identifies the objective for the use of BD funding (protection of the Negril Great Morass), describes some of the actions to be undertaken, and why it is relevant for global biodiversity conservation.</p> | <p>the quantifiable impact of the suggested activities in the project framework. In the project results framework, especially the hectares of forest either restored or under improved management have been identified and to some extent quantifiable output indicators on sediment loading. However, for the remaining indicators they are not indicators that will be able to identify impact, but more focused on deliverables. E.g. Diverting 1600 M3 wastewater needs to be linked to an output indicator on kg of N, P and BOD. Please make sure to update the project framework to include quantifiable outputs of the suggested activities.</p> <p>4) Solid waste management (Output c1.2.c) (as suggested for DR) does not fall under any of the FA Objectives that this project is funded under.</p> <p>5) the alignment with private sector was a strong feature of the PIF, now at the time of CEO Endorsement, both the partnership with Sandals and Coke have ended up with no firm commitment. The PIF was among others approved due to its ability to leverage private sector funds towards addressing the objective of the complex multi country project. What activities are planned in order to re-engage with the private sector during the initial 12 months of project implementation??</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|---|
| | | <p>20 April 2012 (avelthaus): The justification for the use of BD resources in Cuba and the Dominican Republic is still weak. As requested in the section on comments for CEO endorsement below, please provide a clear description of what globally significant biodiversity will be protected by the project and explain how biodiversity considerations will be mainstreamed within the watershed management plans, productive sectors in these areas, and through relevant policies.</p> <p>The descriptions for Cuba and DR are not yet sufficient to justify the use of biodiversity funding. Antigua and Barbuda is a flexible STAR Country, but we would appreciate more detail if possible. In these cases, the actions to be undertaken relate to reducing nutrient loading and other pollution flowing into streams and the coastal zone, but this is an objective more appropriate for IW. These sections need to be enhanced to describe: (a) the tangible biodiversity objectives in each watershed for which BD funding will be used. What biodiversity and related ecosystem services does it aim to protect - Forest resources, freshwater resources, or marine? (b) What specific actions will the project undertake to protect this biodiversity? How will this address problems, including drivers of biodiversity loss, that the country is encountering? For example, how</p> | <p>6) Please include the detailed analysis of the carbon benefits to be derived from the SFM funds allocated to this project in relation to the national investments that will have SFM activities, and make sure that these benefits (and activities) are also featured in the Project framework, the project results framework as well as in the national sub project descriptions.</p> <p>A useful tool for the needed analysis is the EX-ACT Carbon-Balance Tool.</p> <p>(swyatt): The descriptions of how BD considerations will be incorporated remains weak particularly for Cuba and the Dominican Republic. As an example, the few sentences about the BD values in the within the targeted watershed that is provided in the Cuba Sub-Project Annex (in Spanish) on page 78 could be fleshed out into a paragraph that would strengthen the document to outline what biodiversity this project will benefit specifically. Building upon this information, the connection needs to be made to how the specific actions undertaken as part of this project will address the major threats to globally significant biodiversity. As a BD-2 project, this project should focus on mainstreaming activities and outcomes.</p> <p>13th of November 2014 (cseverin):</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|
| | | <p>significant is the nutrient loading problem for biodiversity in rivers and marine areas? (c) Why is the target biodiversity of global significance?</p> <p>Also, table B needs outputs that link with output 2 under table 1. Please confirm if the four watershed basin master plans listed under 3.2 are the same as the 4 land use plans under output 2. If not, please clarify in table B the hectares of the four land use plans in an appropriate manner. Also, table A states that the land-use plans will "incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem service valuation" - but we can see no ecosystem service valuation analysis that will be done, either in table B or the descriptive text. This should be mentioned in both the table and the text. This is an important output for output 2.1 under BD.</p> <p>With regard to the BD objectives and outcomes in table A, alternative or additional to targeting Outcome 2.1, the project could consider targeting outcome 2.2 and the related outcome. In this case, however, we would need to understand the clear sectoral policies and regulatory frameworks that the project will seek to reform and how this will contribute to BD conservation.</p> | <p>Comments 1,2 and 3 have been addressed. On comment 4 it essential to note that the new description does not mention solid waste in any form, nor plastics, as the GEF funds CAN NOT be used for such activities. Thanks for addressing this. Component 5) The outputs in the project log frame are still consisting of words such as enhanced, implemented, disseminated, enhanced, but the detailed logframe includes quantifiable indicators, however, please still submit a full baseline within the 1st year of implementation, towards which the indicators will be measured against.</p> <p>Please make sure to keep on pursuing private sector engagement throughout the projects implementation, as early as possible, to make sure to bring the private sector in to be able to be a true partner even in the stage of activity formulation.</p> <p>For BD national investments: The national project descriptions (Cuba, Jamaica and DR) are still thin on the actual details of implementation. For instance, the Jamaica project mentions wetland banking in the introduction and nowhere in the rest of the text (if it is not an activity, it shouldn't be mentioned). In the Dominican Republic, the documents mention working with fishermen to change practices but no details beyond that are provided (how? who will they target? what practices will</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | | | <p>they encourage/discourage etc.).</p> <p>Therefore, please explain in more detail how biodiversity considerations will be mainstreamed within the watershed management plans, productive sectors in these areas, and through relevant policies.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): Addressed</p> |
| | <p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p> | <p>2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the respective objectives under IW, BD and LD have been identified and output indicators have been identified to satisfy the accompanying outcomes.</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes the objectives have been identified, however, please make sure that all suggested activities are aligned with these. As is, the activities in Antigua and Barbuda are not.</p> <p>20th of November 2014 (cseverin): Yes, and now the planned activities in Antigua and Barbuda includes activities to address land degradation in conjunction with wastewater management.</p> |
| | <p>9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?</p> | <p>2nd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project will be addressing the issues identified in the national strategies.</p> <p>(mbakarr): While consistency with Convention action plans is presented, the PIF still needs to include other relevant national strategies for the individual countries. Please provide brief details for each country.</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, the detailed sub-project descriptions outline consistency with the national priorities on IW, BD, and LD, however, please expand on the SFM descriptions in relation to the national and regional investments.</p> <p>20th of November 2014 (cseverin): Cleared, now also includes sound SFM calculations.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>16th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes descriptions of national investments have been included, which makes it easier to identify consistency with the national strategies and plans, however, this should be strengthened at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>17 April 2012 (avelthaus) For Antigua and Barbuda, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Jamaica, please include short language how the BD oriented interventions are consistent with the relevant country's NBSAPs.</p> | |
| | <p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p> | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): The proposed project will be based on a number of national projects that will be addressing the issues linked to the Ridge to Reef approach that will be implemented through the project. These activities will be supported by regional activities that among others will assist the participating countries to implement obligations under the LBS protocol. Hence this structure will only function if the developed capacity will be applied towards the outcomes.</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): The project includes multiple avenues for developing and sustaining local and regional capacity towards supporting the project outcomes.</p> |
| | <p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): It is not straightforward to understand what each national or regional project will be working towards addressing. please do include more information on the baseline projects.</p> <p>(mbakarr avelthaus): The description of baselines and problems is too generic and vague, and lacks sound data and</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): The national and regional baseline projects have been described in detail for LD, IW and BD, but not really for the SFM activities, please expand on this.</p> <p>20th of November 2014 (cseverin): Cleared.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|--|
| Project Design | | <p>assumptions across the board. Despite the long narrative, there is no clear definition of problems based on the context and realities in each country. As a result, it is hard to understand how much needed "ridge to reef" innovations will be targeted to safeguard ecosystem services in spatially integrated landscapes and seascapes. Please consider cutting down on the narrative (B.6) to provide a more concrete articulation of the problems relative context and realities in each country as basis for the project framework.</p> <p>For BD mainstreaming, please describe the shortcomings in BD conservation outside of PAs that the project will address. Several bilateral donors (e.g. USAID) and NGOs have invested a significant amount in ridge-to-reef programs in the past decade in several countries, including Jamaica, so significant capacity has been built in cases.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, with the rewritten section B, it is now much easier to understand what the baseline projects are all about. It is cleared from IW, SFM and LD's perspective.</p> | |
| | 12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, this regional approach towards tackling regional and national identified issues seems to be offering a set of cost-effective measures. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | <p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p> | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the fact that the project will invest regionally to address Natural resource constraints and mismanagement nationally appears to be an approach what will be incremental compared to doing a suite of stand alone national investments.</p> <p>(mbakarr): Not for the LD focal area. Please provide an adequate explanation of how the SLM activities are driven by needs of specific production systems, based on factual information on LD problems manifested in each country utilizing the focal area resources.</p> <p>(avelthaus): For BD, we believe the PIF needs to make a more convincing case about what problems will be addressed in terms of ridge-to-reef BD conservation outside of PAs. There is insufficient detail on how BD resources will be used and why it will cost \$5.6 million for 4 national or sub-national land-use plans. Please verify where these land-use plans will be developed (countries and watersheds, if possible) and that similar land use plans have not already been developed. Also, for sub-national land-use plans, please explain whether the area includes globally significant BD or the potential for rehabilitation to occur so that globally significant BD will occur there in the future.</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, which is evident when reading the national as well as the regional project descriptions.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>12th of April 2012 (Cseverin): Yes, with the added description it is now possible to understand how the SLM activities proposed will be driven by national needs.</p> <p>17 April 2012 (avelthaus) The question of globally significant BD has not been addressed. Please address it and how actions proposed will protect it in the context of addressing question 7 above.</p> | |
| | <p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p> | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, however, please do include more detailed descriptions on the national and regional investments.</p> <p>(mbakarr): While the project framework is sufficiently detailed, it is not clear how the outcomes and outputs under the four components will lead to measureable GEBs associated with the focal areas, including potential indicators to be validated during project development. Please provide a clear articulation of how the proposed framework will be anchored nationally to demonstrate tangible results in landscapes and seascapes, and consider including a simple conceptual framework that illustrates this for easier understanding.</p> <p>(avelthaus): This PIF suffers from both being excessively verbose (many acronyms, jargon, and separately divided outputs) while also being rather undetailed in terms of how it will use</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): The project document and its immense amount of annexes indeed articulates a much clearer outline of the project and its deliverables.</p> <p>However, the actual project framework still does not include quantifiable output indicators towards measuring impact of the proposed investments, instead focus is kept on the output indicators such as "strengthened", "upgraded" etc. Please make sure that the project framework includes quantifiable indicators that focus on the impacts of the investment.</p> <p>29 Sept 2014 (swyatt): For the BD components and projects funded by BD, it is important to recognize that these projects have been developed as BD mainstreaming (BD-2.1) rather than protected area focused projects. Therefore, in the Dominican Republic and Cuba in particular the focus of the project and project activities should be on how biodiversity will be brought into</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|---|
| | | <p>BD funding. The PIF would actually be improved by simplifying table B. Please describe more clearly the land-use plans that will be invested in and how BD will be mainstreamed into them. We are pleased, to see that under C1.5, output 5, that change in species abundance will be tracked.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin & MBakarr): Yes, with the added descriptions of the planned national and regional investments the project framework is now considered sufficiently clear. Still there is considerable room to be much more explicit at the time of CEO endorsement.</p> <p>17 April 2012: (avelthaus) As mentioned above, the additional descriptions have not sufficiently described how biodiversity will be mainstreamed into the watershed management/land use plan.</p> <p>20 April 2012: (avelthaus) As described below in comments for CEO endorsement, please explain, with sufficient detail, how watershed planning will mainstream the protection of globally significant biodiversity.</p> | <p>planning processes and on-the-ground, productive activities. All three sub-projects (DR, Cuba, Jamaica) need to expand upon how the activities will be implemented and clarify the logic of how they will benefit biodiversity in the places where actions will be undertaken (not solely downstream protected areas). For example, how will reforestation sites be chosen? Will the land reforested be public or private? If private, how will landholders be brought into the program? etc.</p> <p>Extensive documentation to address the above issues is not necessary, but the project documents need to address some of these fundamental questions. Building on the previous comments for IW, please find more tangible or better quantifiable indicators for the BD components.</p> <p>GEF SGP is not currently listed as co-finance and, thus, their activities should not be counted as part of the project. (However, if that changes please address the fact that the creation of an eco-tourism trail in and of itself does not necessarily benefit globally significant BD. Mainstreaming requires bringing BD considerations into broader productive sectors and thereby reducing impact on BD.) The idea of coordinating with SGP is promising, but must still provide global benefits.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | <p>20th of November 2014 (cseverin): The above comment on the log frame have been addressed, not in the project framework (table B) but in the actual detailed LOGFRAME of the project.</p> <p>The project will be coordinated with regional SGP activities, so that SGP gets to be coordinated with this much larger regional investment. The premise being that SGP then will not be a single standing investment but tied to other national and regional investments.</p> <p>BD: As mentioned in earlier review, please address following comment:</p> <p>All three sub-projects (DR, Cuba, Jamaica) need to expand upon how the activities will be implemented and clarify the logic of how they will benefit biodiversity in the places where actions will be undertaken (not solely downstream protected areas). For example, how will reforestation sites be chosen? Will the land reforested be public or private? If private, how will landholders be brought into the program? etc.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): Addressed, but please make sure to carefully work on how the demonstration projects will be implemented during the inception phase.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | <p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p> | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes</p> <p>(mbakarr): But not for the LD focal area. Given the focal area mandate to address land degradation in production systems, there is need to include a clear reasoning for the LD increment based on established needs in each country. Please explain how the incremental benefits of LD investments are justified in the proposed project approach, including evidence of targeted geographies where those benefits will be demonstrated in a "ridge to reef" framework. This will also help clarify what to expect for the focal area TT during the project development.</p> <p>(avelthaus) please include a rationale for why the addition of BD resources to this project will provide incremental benefits in terms of integrated water management. It is not clear that this funding will provide additional benefits beyond what will be achieved through the use of IW and LD resources.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin & Mbakarr): Yes, now with the strengthened section B, it is more clear where the planned activities will take place. Still there is ample room for more specificity, but since this is a PIF document, it is considered adequate.</p> <p>20 April 2012 (avelthaus) concern in this section can be addressed in the</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, each sub project description includes a thorough incremental reasoning section. Further, the overarching incremental reasoning presents the incremental opportunities that lies in a project like the proposed, that will integrate resource use from four different funding streams within the GEF.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | | context of responding to comments at CEO endorsement. | |
| | 16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, 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>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): No, this have not been addressed, please include.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, this has been addressed in the revised document provided.</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): The socio-economic benefits including the gender dimension has been described in each of the sub-project descriptions and an overarching para have been included alluding to how socio economic dynamics will be instrumental for reaching long-term sustainable solutions for the participating nations.</p> <p>However, the gender dimension description in each sub project seems to be very similar. It is questionable that GENDER inclusion will take the same standard approach in all the participating nations, as well as in the regional projects. Please be more specific and please include local/national/regional specificity, while also being more specific on which benefits GENDER inclusion will entail and what specific outputs will be achieved.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): The minimal changes to the gender descriptions are not addressing the issue. Please while addressing the above comment from September 16, consider if this could be done through development of a common set of regional Gender indicators supported by a number of national and maybe even</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>local gender indicators, applied to all funded activities. On top of this some activities may be needed targeting GENDER specifically.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): Addressed</p> |
| | <p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p> | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Please strengthen the description on how the CSO communities will be involved.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, this is now appropriately addressed in the revised PIF.</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Some of the sub-project descriptions include details on public participation including CSO and NGOs, however the actual roles of the CSO and NGO communities within project implementation structure has not yet been identified. Please describe NGO/CSO participation and their roles in the sub-projects in St Kitts \$ Nevis, Trinidad and Tobago, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Jamaica and Antigua & Barbuda.</p> <p>In the Regional sub projects 2, 3 and 4 there is a lack of specificity, the proposal only mentions NGOs as a stakeholder group, but has no information on specific NGOs, this is expected after the PPG period, please include.</p> <p>Furthermore, in the overarching Request for CEO Endorsement, there is also a lack of identification of the NGOs/CSOs and of their roles. please include.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): Addressed</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|--|--|
| | 18. 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>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, a number of potential risks and associated mitigation measures have been included. However, Climatic variability and change does not seem to be an issue that will affect the Caribbean SIDS in relation to implementing the Ridge to Reef concept. Please consider if this is truly the case and if not, please include description on potential climate induced risks and associated mitigation measures.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, with the reformulated text, climatic variability and change have properly been addressed.</p> | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, each sub project as well as the overarching project description includes a risk matrix including mitigation measures. |
| | 19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | 4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed project activities have been properly coordinated with the appropriate national agencies. | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes |
| | 20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate? | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the execution arrangements are appropriately addressed, However, please do clarify if the actual budget line the UNDP executed component on IWC7, is the total of the \$372,219 USD listed in budget annex.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): Cleared.</p> | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, for both regional and national investments. |
| | 21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin): There have been some changes since PIF, on the number of partners and especially the co-financing have dropped considerably since PIF stage. However, most of these changes have been adequately explained, but |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-------------------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>there is still a need for including a strategy on how the project aims to re-engage with the private sector, especially focusing on the initial 12 months of project implementation.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): The private sector issue have been addressed in para 396 - 392 During the process of developing the national sub-projects, more detail have been included. However, additional information is needed for the sub-projects for Cuba, Dominican Republic and Jamaica.</p> |
| | 22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin):NA |
| Project Financing | 23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate? | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes the proposed PM budget is at 5%, which is well below the GEF guided PM budget rules, however, IW can not pay for all the PM costs out fo the IW allocation, please make sure that the PM bduget is cost shared accross all focal area allocations.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin):Cleared, as the PM budget is now cost shared between the focal areas involved.</p> | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin):Yes the Overall PM budget is in accordance with the GEF guidance. |
| | 24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | 4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, the proposed funding per objective and activity seems to be adequate to be able to reach the expected outcomes and outputs. | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin):Yes, even after the reduction in associated co-financing, the funding/cofinancing seems to be adequate to acheive the expected outcomes and outputs. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|---|--|
| | <p>25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.</p> | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): The indicated co-financing for a project involving nine caribbean countries is high. However, it is hoped that during the project preparation that it will be possible for the project coordination group to attract more private sector funding.</p> <p>(mbakarr): Please separate "grant" and "in-kind" co-financing for UNEP (Table C); they should be on separate lines even if the amounts are just indicative. Please do not include co-financing that is "unknown" at this stage.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): the grant and in-kind contributions from the two agencies have now been given separate lines. Unknown has been removed.</p> | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin):The final confirmed co-finance from the participating countries is much lower than the indicated amount at PIF stage, but this lowered co-financing have been explained sufficiently, and the confirmed through endorsement letters.</p> <p>Further, unfortunately the project have not been able to attrach any private sector finance, which is a major draw back, for long term sustainability of the industries relying on a sustainable natural resource base. Please include a strategy on how the project aims to re-engage with the private sector, especially focusing on the initial 12 months of project implementation, in conjunction with the regional and/or the national investments.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): The private sector issue have been addressed in para 386 - 392, including a strategy for how to re-engage.</p> <p>The co-financing letters from Trinidad and Tobago is missing, please forward these. We can not process the project without all Co-financing letters.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): Addressed, however, please during inception phase work deligently and focused to obtain cofinancing from Trinidad and Tobago towards the</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | implementation of the national Activities and present evidence of the co-financing in the first AMR report after the project starts implementation. |
| | 26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, both UNEP and UNDP will be allocating substantial amounts of co-financing, which seems to be more than usual to this project.</p> <p>(mbakarr): UNDP should consider including some cash to its co-financing contribution.</p> <p>12th of April 2012 (cseverin): the issue of UNDP and its grant financing have been cleared in the revised PIF.</p> | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes, however, all co-financing have now been categorised as in-kind. |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): The submission includes 355 pages of individual tracking tools for nearly all sub and regional projects (it seems that Antigua and Barbuda is missing). The effort in producing these Tracking Tools to the individual Focal Areas will indeed be a great help for implementing and tracking the impact of the national subprojects and needed, especially for BD and LD, however, please prepare and submit one tracking tool for each focal area (along the lines of what have been presented for IW), as this is a project and not a programme.</p> <p>Further, please make sure to include stress reduction indicators for all national and regional investments, as is, the IW TT submitted only captures the</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | <p>stress reduction from four national projects.</p> <p>29 Sept 2014 (swyatt): As this is a BD mainstreaming project, the only tracking tools that are necessary are the TT for Mainstreaming Biodiversity for the 3 countries using BD resources and none of the protected area related TTs. These sub-projects need to have the TT filled out as completely as possible in the relevant areas. Part II is filled out incompletely and inconsistently. Direct coverage are areas of land or sea that will see changes in management as a direct result of the project, which means that a farm that is simply within a chosen watershed is not directly included but may be indirectly impacted through learning, education, etc. All projects should have Part III of the TT filled out (please note that the boxes next to "foreseen at project start" should be filled out, not the ones in italics). Also, there should be estimated area of coverage provided. Please fill out Part V for all the targeted policy areas.</p> <p>Lastly, there is no need to fill out the section on Invasive Alien Species given the fact that this project will not be working on IAS specifically.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): The IW, BD and SFM tracking tools are cleared, however, please roll together</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | | <p>the LD tracking tools to one reporting tool summarizing the five LD investments. if needed, the national investments can use the national LD TTs, but when reporting to GEFSEC, it is to be done in one TT, as is the case for IW.</p> <p>Further, please find a couple of specific LD TT related comments below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) In the aggregated TT, it is expected that the information entered in the Agro-ecological context 1.b somewhat reasonably reflects the information in 1.c; 2) To the extent possible, the socio-economic context information is very useful and needs to be supplied to partly help track LD investments vis-À-vis socio-economic benefits; 3) Wherever possible, measurable global environmental benefits (GEBs) in the project target areas need to be entered to track LD investment contribution to the generation of GEBs; 4) To the extent possible, for the Outcomes and Learning, every applicable LD focal area objective and outcome need to necessarily be entered. Since the TTs will be aggregated into one, <p>it is expected that all applicable LDFA objectives are entered for all the participating countries.</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>BD is fine with having separate tracking tools.</p> <p>The project needs to consider how it will report on the overall impacts and results achieved by the multitude of national and regional investments under this project.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): The final LD tracking tool submitted is perfect.</p> |
| | 28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | 16th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes |
| Agency Responses | 29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from: | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? | 4th of April 2012 (cseverin): No comments have been given by STAP at present time. | <p>25th of September 2014 (cseverin): STAP review received 30th of April 2012, please make sure that project is addressing all points, as well as circulated to STAP as requested.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): Addressed.</p> |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? | | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | <p>4th of April 2012 (cseverin): No please address the points above and resubmit.</p> <p>17 April 2012 (cseverin): No. Please address fully the comments in item 7 and 9 above on biodiversity.</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | | 23rd of April 2012 (cseverin): Yes, PIF is now recommended for Work Program Inclusion. | |
| | 31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | <p>20 April 2012</p> <p>1. Logical Coherence: The prospect that this project will generate multi-focal area (MFA) benefits would be enhanced if the logical framework is made simpler, made more logically coherent, and with reduced overlap and less reliance on buzzwords.</p> <p>(a) We recommend that the watershed management plans and coastal zone plans provide the framework in many of the other (currently separate elements) (e.g. wastewater management, land-use planning capacity, policy reform, investments in reforestation) should be nested. But currently, they are only one element of several others included under output 3. They should be the main output in this area, with more attention to how they will be created, monitored, and enforced.</p> <p>(b) Please reduce overlap where possible. For instance, Outputs C1.6 (best practices) and C1.7 (replication) appear to be duplicative of outputs under C4, "enhancing knowledge exchange, best practices, and replication." Outputs under outcome C3 on strengthening policy frameworks appear on their own, but these should be tied to the issues of watershed and</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|--|--|
| | | <p>coastal zone management.</p> <p>(c) The final project document should explain more clearly how this project will build on the accomplishments of the previous IWCAM project in each country and on a region wide basis. It would be helpful to have annexes that describe the baseline in each country, where remaining deficiencies are in each country, and how the project will fill these gaps in each case.</p> <p>2. Demonstration of Global Biodiversity Benefits: As a condition for CEO endorsement, the final project document will need to demonstrate, clearly and precisely, how investments of GEF biodiversity focal area (BD FA) resources will contribute to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity. The justification for investing BD FA resources in the watersheds in Cuba and the Dominican Republic (DR) is extremely weak, and it is not clear why these watersheds were selected. (For Jamaica, the justification in the PIF is clear: interventions are aimed at will protecting the Negril Great Morass, an internationally recognized key biodiversity area.) This justification must go beyond general statements that the entire Caribbean is a biodiversity hotspot and that reduction in nutrient and sediment flows will benefits for coastal marine habitats.</p> <p>(a) The project will need to identify</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | <p>threatened species (terrestrial, freshwater, or marine) and associated significant habitat that will be protected or benefit from the project, at least for the countries where biodiversity resources will be invested. \par (b) Explain whether there are key biodiversity areas or protected areas in the watersheds or in the coastal zones and how actions undertaken in the project will reduce stress on them.</p> <p>(c) Since a key goal of the project is to reduce stress on downstream coastal areas, the project will need to offer evidence that the coastal zones include critical habitats and species of concern.</p> <p>3. Approach to Biodiversity Mainstreaming The project's approach to biodiversity mainstreaming is not very clear. The watershed management plans to be developed are one of several objectives, and there is little detail on what will be done to improve capacity for integrating biodiversity into land-use planning and monitoring and enforcing the plans.</p> <p>(a) Please explain, with sufficient detail, how protection of globally significant biodiversity will be incorporated into the watershed plans. Please describe how site level conservation priorities in the watersheds either have been established or will be established under the project so these can be incorporated in watershed/land-</p> | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---|---|--|---|
| | | <p>use planning.</p> <p>(b) Please indicate the specific budget that will be available to enforce the watershed management plans.</p> <p>(c) Describe the main economic sectors in the watersheds and what actions will be taken to protect species, protect or enhance habitats, and reduce stresses on biodiversity. How will the project increase forest and/or habitat cover and enhance connectivity, and what species will benefit from this?</p> <p>(d) Will the project support the adoption of BD-friendly economic activities, such as certified crops, ecotourism, etc.</p> | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG? | | 30th of September 2014 (cseverin): Yes PPG progress report included. It indicates that the PPG funds have been fully committed. |
| | 33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | <p>16th of September 2014 (cseverin): No, please address above comments.</p> <p>25th of November 2014 (cseverin): No, please address above comments.</p> <p>5th of January 2015 (cseverin): Yes, project is now recommended for CEO Endorsement</p> |
| Review Date (s) | First review* | April 05, 2012 | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | |
| | 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. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

| Review Criteria | Decision Points | Program Manager Comments |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| PPG Budget | 1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate? | |
| | 2. Is itemized budget justified? | |
| Secretariat Recommendation | 3. Is PPG approval being recommended? | Yes, PPG request is being recommended. The delay in the processing of this request has been caused by the innovative "PG Residual reasoning" approach being applied for this request. However, all Endorsement letters has been checked and there is coherency between the amounts listed in the endorsement letters and the amounts in listed in the "PPG Residual Reasoning". |
| | 4. Other comments | |
| 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.