



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

GEF ID:	9451		
Country/Region:	Regional (Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts And Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines)		
Project Title:	Caribbean Regional Oceanscape Project		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	159653 (World Bank)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	IW-3 Program 7; IW-3 Program 6; BD-1 Program 1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$182,648	Project Grant:	\$6,300,000
Co-financing:	\$102,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$108,300,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Christian Severin	Agency Contact Person:	

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>	22nd of April 2016(cseverin): Yes the project and its results framework is fully aligned with the GEF6 IW results framework.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes, the project will help countries to address issues that will work towards implementing the Caribbean Strategic Action Programme, which all GEF Eligible Caribbean Countries have endorsed.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes,	

<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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	while recognizing the substantial work undertaken by other entities towards addressing the drivers via other investments.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes, the concept lays out a sound incremental reasoning.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes, the components and their activities will be not only supporting the IW focal area identified GEBs, but also supporting regional agreements within OECS and some that have been identified in the Caribbean Large Marine Ecosystem Strategic Action Program, endorsed by 27 Caribbean Countries.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):The project concept includes a section on the range of World bank safeguards that the project will touch upon.	Please at time of CEO Endorsement make sure to include wording that the project will be delivering according to indicators identified in the GEF6 GENDER strategy. Further, please also expand on the impact the development the Marine Spatial Plans will have on the local level and how these will engage with the NGOs and CSOs.
<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>	According to PMIS on the 26th of April, the Grenada STAR should be untouched, hence the funding of	

project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

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

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		\$300k BD funding should be available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):The funding requested from the IW Focal area is available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	22nd of April 2016(cseverin):Yes the PIF is being recommended for CEO Clearance	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		

## CEO endorsement Review

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