



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

GEF ID:	<b>9431</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Seychelles</b>		
Project Title:	<b>A Ridge-to-Reef Approach for the Integrated Management of Marine, Coastal and Terrestrial Ecosystems in the Seychelles</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5502 (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-1 Program 2; BD-3 Program 6; LD-2 Program 3;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$120,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$3,898,914</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$28,250,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$32,148,914</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2017</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jean-Marc Sinnassamy</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Robert Kelly,</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>	No. BD1 program 2: - This project can significantly contribute to expand the marine protected area network of Seychelles. However, you have to demonstrate the role of temporal protected area to generate GEB. There is potentially a problem of sustainability and value for money of such approach. - The use of BD resources under the	

<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>GEF6 BD1 program 2 cannot be used to address a problem of invasive species. You can however explore the options to develop appropriate and eligible outputs under the BD2 Program 4.</p> <p>- Please, include the Aichi Target(s) the project will help to achieve and provide indicative SMART indicators that will be used to track the project's contribution.</p> <p>BD 3 Program 6: If the project supports the development of MPA on coral reefs, including actions that will enhance coral reef health and resilience, address direct pressures on coral reefs and complement the current GEF funded Ridge to Reef projects, we will recommend to target the program BD3 Program 6 (BD3 Sustainably Use Biodiversity, Program 6 Ridge to Reef+: Maintaining Integrity and Function of Globally Significant Coral Reef Ecosystems). The BD3 Program 6 notably aims to reduce land-based pollution and promote Integrated Water Resources Management; the BD1 Program 2 focusing on the establishment and management of MPA themselves.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>BD2 Program 4: Some activities related to Invasive Alien Species may be considered under the BD2 Program 4 (Prevention, Control, and Management of Invasive Alien Species). The GEF can support the implementation of frameworks that emphasize a risk management approach by focusing on the highest risk invasion pathways. Targeted eradication can only be supported in supported in specific circumstances where proven, low-cost, and effective eradication would result in the extermination of the IAS. It is potentially possible on the agroforestry landscape you mentioned in the PIF. In general, it is very difficult to make the demonstration for marine species. Please, revise.</p> <p>We do not think that this project can be developed under CCM2 program 4 and SFM programs.</p> <p>IW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The use of IW resources can be justified if the proposed investments facilitate sharing of results with other SIDS in the region as well as globally.</li> <li>- Table F: Only Transboundary River systems are targeted by the IW indicator, not national. We should read 0, not 6.</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?</p>	<p>April 7, 2016 Addressed.</p> <p>We recommend to develop a BD/IW project.</p> <p>CCM2: This project is not consistent with the national strategies of climate change. Other ideas should be explored based on the INDC and the National Climate Change Strategy, on energy for instance. In the National communication, forest sector is mentioned as a sink, but "the area covered by mangroves were assumed to be insignificant". In the INDC, it is mentioned that opportunities for emissions reduction in LULUCF are limited. LULUCF is not prioritized in the Seychelles National Climate Change Strategy either.</p> <p>SFM: It is difficult to prioritize this project if LULUCF and forests are not clear priorities in the National Climate Change Strategy and the INDC.</p> <p>- The project mentions that land issues and SLM are prioritized in the UNCCD NAP, the National Land Use plan and guidelines. However the project is not developed under LD objectives. We do not support the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>marginal adjustment from LD to CCM. Either include LD objectives, or transfer the resources, as they are limited, to BD.</p> <p>IW:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a description on how this project will help the country to deliver according to the two mentioned SAPs (WIO LME SAP and WIO LaB SAP). Please, provide the dates that these SAPs were endorsed.</li> <li>- You have to make clearer that the activities proposed to be cofunded by IW, will support the country in delivering towards the Nairobi Convention, specifically towards "proper management and conservation of marine and coastal resources".</li> </ul> <p>April 7, 2016            We are taking note of the revised budget. Depending on the PPG results, the breakdown between BD and LD could be adjusted (more BD resources were expected for this revised concept; \$1 million seems relatively limited for the component 1; while \$2 million for the component 2 might be excessive for soft activities and only 110 ha of SFM and agroforestry...).</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Addressed.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>This framework is potentially innovative as this will be the first time that the GEF financed R2R concept will be implemented in the Indian Ocean.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is a strong problem of scale, targeting mangroves to justify CCM and SFM resources.</li> <li>- Detail the sustainability aspects, especially with the use of temporal protected areas.</li> </ul> <p>April 7, 2016 Please, include an cost-effectiveness analysis in the PPG, exploring the use of TPA versus other options (permanent protected areas, conservation agreements with local communities</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>Addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is relatively difficult to follow the incremental reasoning in this 26 page PIF. Can we remind that a PIF is supposed to be a 10 page concept? Simplify the document and, please, focus on the questions asked.</li> <li>- Please, revise the baseline, focusing on the programmes and initiatives that</li> </ul>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>will have a role in this project. Connect this baseline with the appropriate cofinancing opportunities (those you would have contacted for synergy and partnerships).</p> <p>April 7, 2016 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>- Component 1: the use of IW, SFM and CCM resources is difficult to justify for, at the end, reinforce the protected area network of Seychelles Inner Islands.</p> <p>- The activities related to domestic wastewater and overflows of septic tanks cannot be financed under the GEFBD program 2 on MPAs. Either you reshape the project under other GEF objectives and programs, or you address these activities with other funds (cofinancing).</p> <p>Component 2: again the use of SFM and CCM resources is difficult to justify.</p> <p>Output 2.1: What is the baseline to develop such activity? Please, justify the reference of REDD+ in a country that did not prioritize LULUCF in their national strategies.</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: We understand the importance of such inventories for every country. However, the baseline and cofinancing should be developed.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Very often, these national inventories should be financed by the baseline and cofinancing. Sustainability issues should be clarified.</p> <p>Output 2.1.3. This is typically a BD1 program 2 output (while only 240,000 are coming from BD).</p> <p>Output 2.1.4. The field activities targeting IAS are not eligible under BD1 program 2.</p> <p>Output 2.1.6. The partnerships with the GEF SGP is in theory a very good idea. However, the evaluation of GEB is often more difficult with small grants. You have to demonstrate the value for money, using CCM and SFM resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Without SFM resources, it will be difficult to maintain a certain number of outputs (from 2.2.1 to 2.2.31).</li> <li>- Output 2.3.2. Please justify the GEF reasoning for communication and education campaign.</li> <li>- Component 3: This component will have to be reduced because of the decrease of IW resources for this project.</li> <li>- There is an appreciated effort to anchor the proposed activities in the two SAPs. However, the use of IW resources can be justified if there is a value for other SIDS who share the</li> </ul>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>same ecosystem. This aspect should be reinforced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- All in all, we are seeing in this project a very good BD project that should focus on reinforcing the MPA network, eventually with IW resources if the regional benefits are demonstrated. Beyond the creation of MPA, and in view of addressing direct pressures on coral reef health and resilience, please check the BD 3 Program 6.</li> <li>- The use of GEF resources for developing a IAS framework is possible, but the activities of eradication can only be supported in specific circumstances where proven, low-cost, and effective eradication would result in the extermination of the IAS and the survival of globally significant species and/or ecosystems.</li> <li>- However, we are not seeing a strong rationale for the use of CCM and SFM resources.</li> </ul> <p>\$38.25 million in grants and loans is a big cofinancing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could you explain the level of dialogue you had with these different agencies.</li> <li>- We are not clearly seeing how this cofinancing fits into the result</li> </ul>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>framework.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Please, make clear that 1% of the GEF grant will be funding IWLEARN related activities.</li> <li>- There is another IW/BD project under preparation, including coastal area management aspects (fisheries and MPAs). Please, confirm there is no duplication with this WB/GEF project.</li> </ul> <p>April 7, 2016 Addressed. At CEO endorsement: - Confirm the cofinancing; - Include the design of coordination mechanisms with cofinancing projects.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	At CEO endorsement, include a stakeholder analysis.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	The level of requested CCM resources is \$2,659,000 with the PPG and the fees, needing a marginal adjustment of \$878,000 (\$219,000 were used by Seychelles for their INDC) -\$655,606 from LD and the rest from BD. We think that the use of LD resources would have eventually	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>been easier to justify the development of agroforestry and soil erosion techniques.</p> <p>April 8, 2016 The PIF is now a LD/BD/IW PIF. A new letter of endorsement is available justifying a marginal adjustment of STAR resources from CCM to LD.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>Focal area allocations are available. The marginal adjustment is proposed to increase the CCM allocations. We do not support this reasoning based on Seychelles' priorities under the Conventions and agreements for which the GEF is the financing mechanism.</p> <p>April 7, 2016 The project now is developed with LD, BD, and IW resources, applying an adjustment of \$1,781,000 from CCM to LD. Addressed</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>No. SFM: It is difficult to prioritize this project under the SFM programme.</p> <p>IW: based on last communication between UNDP and the GEFSEC, an</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>amount of \$800,000 was proposed, not \$1.3 million. Please adjust with what was discussed originally.</p> <p>April 7, 2016 Addressed. At CEO endorsement, confirm the 1% for IW:learn.</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>The PIF cannot be recommended and needs deep revisions.</p> <p>April 7, 2016 The quantification of GEB, notably from a LD perspective, should be revised. Please, revise this point and the PIF will be recommended for clearance.</p> <p>April 8, 2016 The PIF is recommended for clearance. Please check the following points for inclusion in the PPG.</p> <p>March 30, 2017. The project budget has been adjusted with 1) the removal of the IW resources and 2) additional STAR resources. A new letter of endorsement is available. The PID is recommended for clearance.</p> <p>At CEO endorsement, please address the following points: - Confirm the breakdown of resources</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>between focal areas (BD vs. LD);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Demonstrate the cost-effectiveness of Temporal Protected Areas versus other means (conservation agreements, protected areas, etc.);</li> <li>- Include a comprehensive risk assessment;</li> <li>- Confirm the carbon reasoning and the values.</li> <li>- Confirm the Global Environment Benefits and the way to measure them (indicators, baseline data, methods).</li> <li>- Provide a M&amp;E plan, including the Aichi Targets.</li> <li>- Confirm the cofinancing. We will pay a particular attention to the confirmation of the cofinancing in cash.</li> <li>- Include the design of coordination mechanisms with cofinancing projects.</li> <li>- Confirm the 1% of IW resources for the IW:learn platform.</li> </ul>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 14, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 07, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 08, 2016	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<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 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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<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.