



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

GEF ID:	4717		
Country/Region:	Seychelles		
Project Title:	Expansion and Strengthening of the Protected Area Subsystem of the Outer Islands of Seychelles and its Integration into the Broader Land and Seascape		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4529 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; LD-3; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$87,046	Project Grant:	\$1,785,500
Co-financing:	\$10,577,241	Total Project Cost:	\$12,449,787
PIF Approval:	December 13, 2011	Council Approval/Expected:	February 29, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Jaime Cavalier	Agency Contact Person:	Fabiana Issler

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?	11-29-11 Yes. Seychelles is eligible for GEF funding. Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	11-29-11 Yes. There is a LoE from the OFP for \$2,059,800. Cleared	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	11-29-11 Yes. UNDP has the comparative advantage for this project. Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	11-29-11 NA Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	11-29-11 Yes. UNDP has a Country Development Document for Sevchelles (2012-2026).	10-11-13 Cleared

		Country Office in Mauritius. Do you mean in Seychelles? Please clarify this as well as the number of staff dedicated to the environmental portfolio (Numbers in PIF may refer to Mauritius). Thanks. 12-07-11 These issues have been properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted December 6, 2011. Cleared	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	11-29-11 Yes. In STAR, Seychelles has BD \$4.9 million (requesting \$1.2) and LD \$ 0.7 (requesting \$0.6). Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	• the focal area allocation?	11-29-11 See above Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	NA	NA
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	NA	NA
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	NA	NA
	• focal area set-aside?	NA	NA
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	11-29-11 Yes. Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	11-29-11 Yes. With BD-1 and LD-3. Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	9. Is the project consistent with the	11-29-11	10-11-13

	strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	Sustainable Land Management Action Plan (2011-2020), and Seychelles 2017 Strategy. Cleared	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<p>11-29-11 The deployment and training of staff is included in Component 1 under the Improvement of the PA Management. Please clarify if the staff will be permanently hired by the Department of the Environment or if the staff will be paid by the project only. Is so, are there plans to keep the staff after the completion of the project? Please also indicate if human capacities will be developed for the spatially-based decision support system, and the Ecosystem-wide zoning & master plan. Thanks.</p> <p>12-07-11 These issues have been properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted December 6, 2011. Cleared</p>	10-11-13 Cleared
Project Design	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>11-29-11</p> <p>Please address the following:</p> <p>COMPONENT 1</p> <p>A well structured component to deliver new CMPAs.</p> <p>A few questions of clarification:</p> <p>1. Are the "Public-Private-Civil Society PA Partnership Boards", new altogether in Seychelles? What makes the project proponents think they will work</p>	10-11-13 Cleared

provide examples of role models of these Boards working in similar environments (biogeographically and culturally). One example provided in Risk table (p. 11). In short, please develop the idea and make a case of its utilization in this project.

2. What are the "Ecosystem conservation strategies" to be developed with NGOs? Please provide examples of existing similar strategies? As before, please develop the idea and make a case for its utilization in this project.

3. What are the "Long term monitoring systems"? How these systems look like? Are these for the BD or the management of the islands? Who covers the recurrent costs after the completion of the GEF project?

4. There is ample reference to Aldabra, but no proposed activities for the Atoll. Is that correct?

COMPONENT 2

It has two parts:

First, the spatially-based decision support system for Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) and the Ecosystem-wide Zoning & Master Plan. Second, the restoration of the 60 has on Desroches and Alphonse.

Questions:

decision support system and the zoning and master plan and take the necessary actions on the ground? While these two investments appear logical and desirable on paper, it is not clear if the Government of Seychelles is willing to sustain the effort by maintaining the systems, and most importantly, to use and enforce the outputs of these systems. The issue of enforcement is particularly difficult to visualize in such wide spread chain of islands where logistics are extremely difficult and costly.

2. Are the following outputs likely to take effect and render tangible and measurable impacts on the ground? a) "Legally binding sustainable land management plans (SMPs) approved for islands that are targeted for development prior to the approval of investment projects", b) "Institutions with sectoral responsibilities for the development and conservation of the Outer Islands, together with relevant CSOs and engaged private sector partners, are capacitated for coordinating action at the wider landscape level on SLM".

Please elaborate and make necessary changes/clarifications/additions in the PIF.

Please also include relevant risks in table and provide a reasonable management strategy.

Thanks.

		These issues have been properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted December 6, 2011. Cleared	
	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?		10-11-13 Cleared
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?	11-29-11 Yes. Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	11-29-11 The project is structured around the following components: 1. Expansion of core PAs to an estimated 1,152 ha of land area (plus marine), and Improved PA management effectiveness in target PAs. The target protected Areas are: Goellettes Island and Banc de Sables (27 ha), South Island Farquhar (420 ha), South Island (Poivre) (137 ha), Alphonse (174 ha), and Desroches (394 ha) 2. Sustainable Development and Coastal and Marine Protected Areas management integrated into broader land/seascape in the Outer Islands. This will be achieved by establishing and operating the following: i) A spatially-based decision support systems	10-11-13 Cleared

		management, ii) Ecosystem-wide Zoning & Master Plan for the Outer Islands, iii) Ecosystem restoration on Desroches and Alphonse Islands to counteract on-going and past land degradation. Cleared	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	11-29-11 Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	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?	11-29-11 Yes. Properly addressed on page 10. Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	11-29-11 To be included as participants in Component 2. Risks associated with their collaboration addressed on page 11. Cleared	10-11-13 Cleared
	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)	11-29-11 Some of the risks were properly identified and addressed. Please elaborate on the risks associated with the willingness and capacity of the Government of Seychelles to set up and run the Decision Support Systems and Zoning & Master Plans. What are the risks of these two outputs to be developed but not used? What are the proposed mitigation measures? Alternative actions? Have Hotels management companies	10-11-13 Cleared

		<p>project?</p> <p>12-07-11 These issues have been properly addressed in the revised PIF submitted December 6, 2011. Cleared</p>	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>11-29-11 Yes. See list in page 11. Cleared</p>	<p>10-11-13 Cleared</p>
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>11-29-11 The project will be executed by the Environment Department on behalf of the Government of Seychelles. Cleared</p>	<p>10-11-13 Cleared</p>
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		<p>10-11-13 Cleared</p>
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		<p>10-11-13 Cleared</p>
	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>11-29-11 PM cost is 8.6% of the GEF grant. Cleared</p>	<p>10-11-13 It is 9.5% Cleared</p>
Project Financing	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>11-29-11 Yes. All components with co-financing in cash. Cleared</p>	<p>10-11-13 Cleared</p>
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>11-29-11 Co-financing ratio is 1:3.3 Could this co-financing be increased to 1:4?</p> <p>12-07-11</p>	<p>10-11-13 Cleared</p>

		addressed in the revised PIF submitted December 6, 2011. Cleared	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	11-29-11 UNDP is providing \$250,000 (cash). Cleared	10-11-13 The co-financing was reduced to \$150K. Cleared
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		10-11-13 Cleared
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		10-11-13 Cleared
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	11-29-11 No. Please address the outstanding issues under items 5, 10, 11, and 18. Thanks. 12-07-11 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	12-07-11 At CEO Endorsement please address the following: 1. Thorough description of the structure and function of the "Public-Private-Civil Society PA Partnerships Boards".	

		<p>decision support system and monitoring systems to be developed and deployed as a result of this project. Emphasis on partner responsibility to cover the recurrent costs associated with these systems.</p> <p>3. Detailed budget associated with the activities necessary for enforcement. This is critical considering the area to be cover, the difficulties in logistics and associated cost.</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?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		10-11-13 Yes
Review Date (s)	First review*	November 30, 2011	October 11, 2013
	Additional review (as necessary)	December 07, 2011	
	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?	<p>5-15-12 Yes. The PPG has the following activities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review and analysis of financial investments thought the study area, with emphasis on PA management and SLM initiatives. 2. Assessment and scorecards of target PAs and relevant sections of the LD PMAT scorecard.

		4. Project strategy, detailed budget and monitoring & evaluation plans. Cleared
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	5-15-12 GEF is contributing \$1000/week for local consultants and \$3000/week for international consultants. There is a request for \$16,800 for travel (local and international), and contractual services for PPG activity 2. Cleared
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	5-15-12 Yes. This PPG is recommended.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	May 15, 2012
	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.