



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

CPP COUNTRY PILOT PARTNERSHIPS ON SLM: PMIS 3005 - Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and Drought (NPCDD)			
Project Title: Capacity Building for Information Coordination and Monitoring Systems/SLM in Areas with Water Resource Management Problems (Project #2 of the CPP)			
Country(ies):	Cuba	GEF Project ID:	2437
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	00271
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA)	Submission Date:	14/11/2014
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and drought (PMIS 3005)	Agency Fee (\$):	244,450
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/> 			

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management (OP #15) ¹	(a) Institutional and human resource capacity strengthened to improve sustainable land management planning and implementation to achieve global environment benefits within the context of sustainable development	NA	GEFTF	1,466,700	14,726,628
	(c) Improvement in the economic productivity of land under sustainable management and the preservation or restoration of the structure and functional integrity of ecosystems	NA	GEFTF	977,800	9,817,752
Total project costs				2,444,500	24,544,380

¹ The Country Pilot Partnership Program (CPP) of which this project is a part was approved under the Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management (OP#15). In keeping with the CPP the table has been completed with OP#15 data. Throughout implementation, the project will ensure alignment with emerging GEF-6 guidance under the Land Degradation Focal Area.

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

Project Objective: Strengthened coordination of information and monitoring systems for management of water resources based on an SLM approach						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Individuals and institutions have the human and material capacities to undertake SLM emphasizing in water management	TA	Systems for planning, regulating, decision-making and coordination mainstream SLM considerations Key stakeholders reflect awareness of SLM and of the CPP	1.1 Territorial plans and programmes related to use of water and agricultural production mainstream SLM considerations 1.2 Technical standards and regulations on use and management of water mainstream SLM considerations 1.3 Increased SLM awareness of decision makers at national, provincial and municipal level 1.4 Increased SLM knowledge of resource managers of key institutions and agencies at national, provincial and municipal levels, and local producers	GEFTF	376,416	3,495,838
2. Strengthened biophysical and information management system adjusted to user interests for better land use decision making	INV	A network for coordination of information among key institutions in the four intervention areas for integrated water resources management and SLM Long term monitoring and evaluation system for integrated management of water resources modernized and generating updated information for SLM	2.1 Integration of data bases and monitoring systems 2.2 Strategy for dissemination of information to end users 2.3 Strengthened hydrometric network, water quality laboratories and early warning systems 2.4 Water availability assessments in four intervention areas 2.5 Monitoring of water use and management in four intervention areas	GEFTF	887,028	9,407,365
3. Comprehensive management model for monitoring integrated water resources	INV	A comprehensive management model for monitoring integrated water resources	3.1 Integrated water resources management model and action plans in four intervention areas	GEFTF	942,618	10,329,858

management / SLM increases agricultural production in four intervention areas, with replication potential to other areas		management / SLM increases agricultural production in four intervention areas, with replication potential to other areas	3.2 Increased efficiency in water use for agricultural production 3.3 Monitoring and evaluation of action plans, impacts and lessons learned 3.4 Upscaling of the management model to new geographical areas			
4. Project monitoring and evaluation, adaptive management and lessons learned	TA	The project is subject to effective monitoring, adaptive feedback and evaluation	4.1 Project monitoring system operational and providing six-monthly reports on progress in achieving project output and outcome targets 4.2 Mid-term and final evaluations 4.3 Project best practices and lessons learned	GEFTF	122,398	84,100
Subtotal					2,328,460	23,317,161
Project management Cost (PMC)				GEFTF	116,040	1,227,219
Total project costs					2,444,500	24,544,380

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form²

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Development Center: US\$ 36,433 • Meteorology Institute: US\$ 538,000 • Tropical Geography Institute: US\$ 108,300 • Environment Agency: US\$ 101,450 • Total: US\$ 784,183 	Grant	688,356
		In kind	95,827
National Government	Ministry of Agriculture (MINag) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institute for Research and Agricultural Engineering: US\$ 3,378,007 • Soil Institute: US\$ 1,481,430 • Total: US\$ 4,859,437 	Grant	2,468,086
		In kind	2,391,351
National Government	National Hydraulic Resources Institute (INRH) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Innovation and Technology Management Directorate: US\$ 1,470,600 	Grant	2,933,690

² Amounts in cofinancing letters are expressed in local currency (MN). Exchange rate US\$: MN = 1:1

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Management Entrepreneurial Group: US\$12,214,680 Havana Company for Hydraulic Research and Projects: US\$ 837,580 Total: US\$ 14,533,860 	In kind	11,589,170
National Government	Ministry of Higher Education (MES)	Grant	1,080,000
National Government	National Sugarcane Research Institute (INICA)	Grant	1,425,368
	Total: US\$ 2,251,750	In kind	826,382
National Government	Institute for Physical Planning (IPF)	Grant	496,800
	Total: US\$ 504,150	In kind	7,350
CSO	National Association of Small Farmers (ANAP)	Grant	131,000
	Total: US\$ 542,000	In kind	411,000
Total Co-financing			24,544,380

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEFTF	LD	Cuba	2,444,500	244,450	2,688,950
Total Grant Resources				2,444,500³	244,450⁴	2,688,950

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	72,048	0	72,048
National/Local Consultants	0	8,137,640 ⁵	8,137,640

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

³ US\$ 2,500,000 was earmarked for this project within the programme including preparation 125,000 and implementation 2,375,00. The PPG used only 55,500 hence the balance is 2,444,500 which is being used as project total. For ease of reference: Footnote #9 on page 56 of the CPP programme document explains that savings in preparation accrue to project implementation.

⁴ At the time of CEO endorsement of the programme 10% was earmarked for the fee as standard under GEF 3.

⁵ The Government of Cuba will provide co-financing in the form of specialized staff from MINag, INRH, CITMA, MES, IPF, ANAP and INICA given that the national regulations do not envisage national consultancies as a possible contractual modality.

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

Background: This project is the second of five projects within Cuba's Country Pilot Partnership Program (CPP), which was included in the 2005 Work Programme and approved in 2008. Project design is therefore based on the CPP and not on a PIF and for this reason, the alignment of the project design is compared to the CPP.

The CPP has the objective of strengthening the implementation of Cuba's National Action Programme to Combat Desertification and Drought (NAPCD). It consists of 5 projects to be implemented sequentially:

- **Project #1:** Capacity Building for Planning, Decision Making and Regulatory Systems & Awareness Building/Sustainable Land Management in Severely Degraded Ecosystems - **Ongoing**
- **Project #2:** Capacity Building for Information Coordination and Monitoring Systems/SLM in Areas with Water Resource Management Problems **The project being submitted with this CEO endorsement request**
- **Project #3:** Capacity Building for Sustainable Financing Mechanisms / Sustainable Land Management in Dry land Forest Ecosystems and Cattle Ranching Areas
- **Project #4:** Validation of SLM Models at Landscape Scale
- **Project #5:** Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of Cuba CPP - **Ongoing**

These five projects combined constitute national actions to strengthen the capacities for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and field demonstrations in the intervention areas located in three main regions of Cuba: the Southwestern Lowlands of Pinar del Rio and the Havana-Matanzas Plains in the Central region; North of Villa Clara and Sancti Spiritus, and to the East, the coastline of Maisí-Guantanamo and the Cauto River Basin (see location map in Appendix 15 of Project Document). Implementation of the CPP was initiated in 2008 through Projects #1 and #5. This project *Capacity Building for Information Coordination and Monitoring Systems / SLM in Areas with Water Resource Management Problems* constitutes Project #2 of the CPP. This 5-year project will build upon the advances achieved in Project #1 in satisfying fundamental capacity needs, and will focus more specifically on the development of the capacities required to ensure that key stakeholders (decision-makers, technicians and producers) have adequate access to useful information on SLM emphasizing in water resources management.

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

No major changes with respect to the CPP. Information has been updated to include recent developments in national policies and strategies with which the project is aligned, namely the National Water Policy, the National Environmental Strategy 2011-2015 and the National Environmental Education Strategy 2010-2015. Please refer to Section 3.6 *Consistency with national priorities or plans* of the Project Document for further details.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The CPP was approved under the Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management (OP#15), hence the project keeps the alignment with this OP. Throughout implementation, the project will ensure alignment with emerging GEF guidance under the Land Degradation Focal Area.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

The same criteria for distribution of CPP projects to Implementing Agencies (IA) remains; UNEP is the sole IA for this project while UNDP is lead agency for the CPP. For further detail regarding programmatic alignment refer to the Project Document.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address:

NA.

A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

The CPP architecture has been respected. The project design now includes a detailed intervention logic; the incremental reasoning has been developed and the global environmental benefits have been identified. Please refer to Section 3 *Intervention Strategy (Alternative)* and the Results Framework (Appendix 4) of the Project document.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

The assumptions identified in the CPP remain. A specific risk assessment and risk mitigation measures for the project has been included in Section 3.5 *Risk analysis and risk mitigation measures* of the Project Document.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

Project #2 will coordinate with the UNDP/GEF Project “A *landscape approach to conserve threatened mountain ecosystems*”. The main objective of this project is to reduce the vulnerability of biodiversity of mountain ecosystems to ensure its effective management and protection against current and future threats at landscape level. This will be achieved through connectivity of fragments of mountainous ecosystems where economic and conservation interests are integrated harmoniously and in compatible ways in terms of mitigating the loss of biodiversity and increasing the ability to generate environmental goods and services to improve the livelihoods of the inhabitants of the mountains. The intervention areas are mountain ranges, which are the main shelters of biodiversity in Cuba and considered as Special Regions for Sustainable Development (REDS). Project #2 will coordinate with this project the implementation of SLM through meetings in demonstration sites for exchange of experiences, sharing of information and lessons learned, workshops and training

Project #2 will establish synergies with several projects under the GEF Small Grants Programme (SGP), especially with SGP projects associated with the production of renewable energy from solid wastes to reduce pollution, and rainwater harvesting. Projects #1 and #5 have provided training to sector specialists that have established technical teams that work in SLM issues at local level. These teams work in SGP intervention areas implementing the Procedures Manual to declare Lands under SLM. Project #2 will continue to provide capacity building through training, awareness, and assessments under the SLM principles in replication areas where the SGP projects are being implemented.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

B.1.1.1 Project implementation and coordination arrangements

UNEP will be the GEF Implementing Agency and the Ministry of Science, Innovation, Technology and Environment (CITMA) will be the Executing Agency (EA) for the Project. The EA will be responsible for the coordination, management and day-to-day administration of the project and its delivery in accordance with the outcomes, outputs and activities outlined in the this document. CITMA will be represented by the Environment Agency (AMA) as the National Coordinator of the CPP and its projects. The organization for the project comprises the following structures at national and local levels.

At national level, project implementation will be coordinated through the **Project Implementation Unit (PIU)** headed by

a Project Coordinator from the National Institute of Hydraulic Resources (INRH) who will also be a member of the Technical Unit for Desertification and Drought (TUDD). To ensure harmonized inclusion of the Project within the CPP as a whole and its compliance with the overall goals of the CPP, the Coordinator will also be a member of the PIU and Project #5 through which the CPP as a whole is coordinated, monitored and evaluated. The PIU will comprise two project management offices. One office will be located at the **National Institute of Hydraulic Resources (INRH)** as the agency responsible for directing, implementing and monitoring the implementation of the policy for planning and control of the country's water resources. The other office will be located at the **Institute for Agricultural Engineering Research (IAgric)** which is the body that represents the Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG) in terms of water use, and provides the technical and methodological support for the development of scientific research and technical services for irrigation and drainage, and agricultural mechanization in Cuba. Each of these Offices will be staffed with a Head of Office and a technical working group.

The Project will be guided by a **National Steering Committee (NSC)** composed by the Ministry of Foreign Trade (MINCEX), CITMA, UNDP and UNEP. The NSC will meet regularly twice a year and whenever necessary. The NSC is responsible - among others - to adopt the project's strategic decisions, reports and approve annual work plans and financial procurement, as well as control of the use of financial resources. The **Technical Unit for Desertification and Drought (TUDD)** will provide support to the Project Coordinator through its technical staff assigned by the key institutions related to the project, namely: AMA, INRH, IAgric, Tropical Geography Institute (IGT), Institute for Physical Planning (IPF), Forest Ranger Corps (CGB), Sugarcane Research Institute (INICA) and others as may be required. The **Project Executive Group** will be responsible for organizing and preparing the documentation regarding decisions to be taken at meetings of the National Steering Committee (NSC). Its role is to periodically review work plans and procurement activities and submit reports to the NSC for approval, control and monitoring financial and administrative implementation of the Project.

At the local level, in each of the four intervention areas, **Intervention Area Coordination Teams** will be established, directed by an **Intervention Area Coordinator** and made up of the principal stakeholders in each area. These include institutional representatives of the provincial delegations of CITMA, MINAG, INRH, IPF and AZCUBA, scientific and academic institutions, and organizations representing the local interests of stakeholders, including IAgric specialists in the provinces involved in the project, the National Association of Small Farmers (ANAP), the Federation of Cuban Women (FMC), the Cuban Association of Agricultural and Forestry Technicians (ACTAF), the National Union of Engineers and Architects of Cuba (UNAIC) and representatives of the Ministry of Higher Education (MES) in each demonstration site.

Concrete actions at local level to promote SLM in demonstration sites will be carried out by **Demonstration Site Work Teams**, which will include local institutions and stakeholders such as community leaders, leader farmers, extension agents, researchers and local Government representatives. **Intervention Area Coordinators**, together with their work teams, will be responsible for developing annual plans, for carrying out the activities which these specify, for monitoring and informing the operational staff of each project regarding impacts on the environment and for ensuring the efficient use of the material resources of the project in their area of influence. The close links between the Technical Unit and the local teams at Intervention Area and Demonstration Site levels will be maintained through periodic visits to the intervention areas, technical and financial audits, scientific and technical activities, and the transmission of information and periodic joint meetings of the project team, which should be held twice a year. The constant interchange and flow of information, including the dissemination of activities carried out and of lessons learnt, will be made effective through a virtual network which will link the Local Coordination Teams, the Technical Unit and key stakeholders. Intervention Area Coordinators for each intervention area are included in the following table:

Table 1. Intervention Area Coordinators

Intervention Area	Coordinators
Cauto River Watershed	Cauto River Watershed Council
Habana-Matanzas	Pedrozo-Mampostón Hydraulic Complex CITMA Government of Artemisa Province
Pinar del Río	Government of Pinar del Rio Province (Demonstration Sites in the Municipalities of Consolacion, Los Palacios en Sandino)
Guantánamo	Government of Guantanamo Province (Demonstration Sites in the

UNEP, as the GEF Implementing Agency, will be responsible for overall project supervision to ensure consistency with GEF and UNEP policies and procedures, will provide guidance on linkages with related UNEP and GEF-funded activities, monitor implementation of the project activities and will clear and transmit the financial and progress reports to GEF. Additionally, UNEP will be responsible for reviewing and approving the substantive and technical reports produced according to work schedule, and will provide the linkages with major international conventions and international environmental conservation networks and fora.

B.1.1.2 Stakeholder involvement plan

The stakeholder mapping carried out during project preparation is presented in the table below, including their roles and participation in project implementation.

Table 2. Stakeholder analysis and mapping

Stakeholders	Mandate and role / interest in the project
Governmental Agencies	
Ministry of Foreign Trade (MINCEX)	Represents the Cuban government regarding international collaboration. Will be a member of the National Steering Committee.
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environment Agency (AMA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meteorology Institute (INSMET) • Tropical Geography Institute (IGT) - Local Development Centre (CEDEL) - Territorial Delegations 	CITMA is the GEF Focal Point and is responsible for the coordination of the NAPCD and the CPP. AMA is a branch of the Coordination Group and of the Central Coordination Unit for the Country Partnership Program, and will be responsible for project management. CEDEL will participate in capacity building activities, while the IGT and INSMET will be responsible for implementing activities to strengthen the biophysical monitoring systems and information management. CITMA Delegations will play an important role in the coordination of project activities in the intervention areas and demonstration sites.
Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Institute for Research and Agricultural Engineering (IAgric) - Soil Institute (IS) - Forestry Directorate, represented by the State Forestry Service (SEF) - Institute for Research in Agroforestry (INAF) - National Center for Land Control 	Responsible for the Agricultural Policy. MINAG is one of the two entities that will coordinate and implement Project #2 through IAgric in collaboration with the Provincial Offices and Soil Departments at provincial and municipal levels. MINAG agencies will be responsible for developing capacities and strengthening monitoring systems (IAgric) as well as implementing demonstrations on the ground (IAgric, IS, SEF, INAF). The extension agents from MINAG Agencies will be trained in participatory approaches, SLM concepts and specific technologies and practices to develop their capacities to provide an effective assistance to farmers.
National Institute of Hydraulic Resources (INRH) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Directorate for Management of Innovation and Technology - Directorate for Watersheds - Business Group for Research and Engineering Projects (GEIPI) - Habana Company for Research and Hydraulic Projects (EIPHH) - Business Group for Hydraulic Uses (GEARH) - Directorate of Rational Use of Water (DURA) 	INRH directs, implements and monitors the implementation of the State and Government policy for the water resources of the country. INRH is one of the two entities that coordinates and implements Project #2 and its dependencies will have different responsibilities in the project, including capacity development (CTNR, DURA), strengthening monitoring systems (GEARH) and implementing demonstrations on the ground (EIPHH).
AZCUBA <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sugar Cane Research Institute (INIC) 	AZCUBA is the main institution for sugar production; it is responsible for planning of land use within its territories. INICA will be responsible for the design, validation and implementation of scientific and technological innovation programs and projects in sugarcane cultivation. INICA will have responsibilities in strengthening of the monitoring system. INICA extension agents will be trained in participatory approaches, SLM concepts and specific technologies and practices to develop their capacities to provide an effective assistance to farmers.
Institute for Physical Planning (IPF)	IPF is the national organism subordinated to the Council of Ministers

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Directorate for Land Use - Territorial Directorate for Physical Planning (DTPF) 	that leads the implementation of the State and Government policy on land use, urban planning (including design and architecture) and cadaster. Throughout Project #2 the IFP will carry out land use planning in the intervention areas and demonstration sites management areas and sites of intervention, and will coordinate the harmonious development of territorial land use plans and project activities to ensure sustainability of project results.
Ministry of Higher Education (MES) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Higher Institute of Applied Science and Technology (InSTEC) - School of Social Communication (Havana University) - University of the East - Directorate of Science and Technology - Agrarian University of Havana - “José Antonio Echeverría” Polytechnic Institute 	Will be responsible for training technicians and extension agents through various academic and vocational trainings. The main mission of MES is to develop the country’s scientific and technical potential. Their participation will be of vital importance to ensure appropriation of SLM concepts, methodologies and good practices and mainstreaming into the curricula of related careers. The Directorate of Science and Technology will coordinate training of technicians and extension agents through various academic and vocational training. The School of Social Communication will be the focal point for communication activities within the project.
Ministry of Education (ME) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural Polytechnic Institutes - Universities for Teachers 	The ME’s mission is to train youths in agricultural technical careers. Within Project #2 it will be responsible for mainstreaming SLM practices and lessons in their curricula as well as disseminating the vision of an integrated and adequate management of water resources to professionals, technicians, decision makers, and the general population, to ensure sustainability of CPP actions.
Ministry of Interior <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Forest Ranger Corps (CGB) 	The Forest Ranger Corps is responsible for forest protection. The CGB has training centers that will be used by Project #2 to carry out capacity building activities.
Municipal Governments	Responsible for coordinating planning of land use at the municipal level. Eighteen municipal governments (see table 2 below) are involved Project #2 and will be responsible for coordinating interventions in their territories.
NGO’s	
National Association of Small Farmers (ANAP)	ANAP is a non-governmental organization that brings together all the farmers at all levels in the country. ANAP has training centers that will be used by the project for capacity building and extension activities. ANAP is a key target group of the project for implementation of sustainable water management systems. It will also support awareness raising and replication activities among its members.
Federation of Cuban Women (FMC)	The FMC brings together women at all levels. It will coordinate project activities on gender and water issues in the demonstration sites.
Cuban Association of Agricultural and Forestry Technicians (ACTAF)	The ACTAF represents technicians and professionals of the agricultural and forestry sectors in spaces that promote an agro-ecological based sustainable development. ACTAF will be a partner for implementation of forest strips for protection of water bodies. It will support awareness raising activities among its members.
National Union of Architects and Construction Engineers (UNAIC)	Organization of social interest and professional character that brings together several construction related associations. UNAIC will raise awareness and provide training to professional staff in the project’s intervention areas.
Beneficiaries	
Cooperatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural Production Cooperatives (CPA) - Credit and Service Cooperatives (CCS) - Basic Units of Cooperative Production (UBPCs) 	Cooperatives are associations of producers with which the project will work to implement demonstrations, promote the dissemination of knowledge and upscaling of technologies.
Individual Farmers	The project will work with farmer and community leaders to implement demonstrations, promote replication of technologies, facilitate local processes of analysis and research, and interact with other local stakeholders of interest to the project.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The project will increase the capacities of key institutions on integrated water resources management for SLM, including in issues such as livelihoods, comprehensive approaches of the biophysical and socioeconomic aspects of productive ecosystems, participatory evaluation of traditional management practices, water harvesting, aquifer recharge and protection, solid waste management, increased productivity and irrigation efficiency and mechanisms for water planning in agriculture, among other subjects. It will train 2,800 individuals at national level and 800 individuals at intervention area level in the afore-mentioned subjects thereby increasing the incorporation of SLM concepts in the implementation of the environmental, water, soil and forest policies; strengthening of land use plans in the demonstration areas to include water management, and the review and updating of water related policy and regulatory documents under an SLM approach. Furthermore, 680 producers and water resources managers (160 of them women) in the intervention areas will have acquired the capacities to implement sustainable land management measures with emphasis in water management.

These increased capacities will help to deliver a number of socio-economic benefits that will help improve the livelihoods of the Cuban rural population: (i) increased water and fuel savings and related costs at farm level; (ii) 5,120 hectares of lands managed with greater efficiency, thereby increasing the productivity of water in the main crops - tobacco, rice, beans, maize, soy, *malanga*, potato, plantain, sweet potato (see Table 3 below for the detailed expected increase in efficiency of water productivity per crop and intervention area); (iii) increased productivity of water used in each of the crops grown in the intervention areas will improve crop yields and food security; (iv) establishment of 100 demonstration farms for replication of best practices, hence upscaling socio-economic benefits.

Table 3. Current and expected improvements in water productivity in main crops

<p>Current water productivity</p> <p>Pinar del Rio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tobacco: 2,976 m³/t - Rice: 5,788 m³/t - Beans: 6,472 m³/t - Maize: 7,284 m³/t - Soy: 1,818 m³/t - Malanga: 4,615 m³/t <p>Havana-Matanzas</p> <p>a) Artemisa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rice: 6,967 m³/t - Malanga: 1,519 m³/t - Potato: 279 m³/t - Sweet Potato: 355 m³/t - Plantain: 823 m³/t - Maize: 7,467 m³/t - Beans: 3,729 m³/t <p>b) Mayabeque</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rice: 6,967 m³/t - Malanga: 1,195 m³/t - Potato: 315 m³/t - Plantain: 943 m³/t - Maize: 8,671 m³/t <p>Cauto River Basin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rice: 9,429 m³/t - Plantain: 1,823 m³/t - Maize: 5,128 m³/t <p>Guantanamo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sweet Potato: 1,441 m³/t - Plantain: 1,757 m³/t - Maize: 10,235 m³/t 	<p>By EOP:</p> <p>Pinar del Rio:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Tobacco: 2,609 m³/t - Rice: 3,946 m³/t - Beans: 4,959 m³/t - Maize: 5,364 m³/t - Soy: 1,364 m³/t - Malanga: 4,532 m³/t <p>Havana-Matanzas</p> <p>a) Artemisa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rice: 4,479 m³/t - Malanga: 1,214 m³/t - Potato: 256 m³/t - Sweet Potato: 288 m³/t - Plantain: 675 m³/t - Maize: 3,500 m³/t - Beans: 2,880 m³/t <p>b) Mayabeque</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rice: 4,479 m³/t - Malanga: 902 m³/t - Potato: 225 m³/t - Plantain: 752 m³/t - Maize: 3,100 m³/t <p>Cauto River Basin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rice: 5,587 m³/t - Plantain: 1,046 m³/t - Maize: 3,740 m³/t <p>Guantanamo</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sweet Potato: 1,137 m³/t - Plantain: 1,023 m³/t - Maize: 8,700 m³/t
--	--

The project will contribute to the effective empowerment of women as social actors. To this end it will prioritize the empowerment of women through: (i) assessing the role of women in the management of irrigation and developing awareness raising activities on gender and water management; (ii) generating opportunities for women (producers, technicians and staffs of institutions working in SLM-water management) to increase their access to information and knowledge on water resources management; (iii) increasing the capacities of female technicians and operators of water management infrastructure (dams, irrigation systems) in the use of new technical instruments (e.g. water balance for planning and use of irrigation water, participatory monitoring and evaluation approaches for water use and management, information and monitoring networks and systems); (iv) ensuring access to technical assistance and training to female producers for incorporation of best practices at farm level; and (v) fostering participation of women in project planning and decision-making. The Project Results Framework (Appendix 4 of the Project document) includes gender-disaggregated indicators at intervention area level (Outcome 3). As part of the project's M&E activities disaggregated data by gender will be recorded to monitor differentiated project impacts.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

Within the framework of the CPP the proposed project has the key objective of contributing to ensure the long-term viability of the ecosystem functions in Cuba. To achieve this objective the project has identified three types of interventions. Firstly, institutional strengthening so that institutions and individuals may implement SLM emphasizing in water management. Secondly, the strengthening of the biophysical and information management system as per the interests and needs of the users to enable land use decision making. Finally, development and implementation of an integrated management model to monitor the land degradation processes linked to water resources in the four intervention areas, and replication to other areas.

Cost-effectiveness is reflected in the design as all three interventions are collectively attending the removal of the barriers that currently hinder the solution of threats to global environmental benefits. The project will build upon the baseline activities, existing capacities and infrastructure at national and local level to contribute to advance toward the sustainable development objectives expressed in the national plans and programs.

To reduce land degradation and the vulnerability of the rural population in the intervention areas, the following strategies and methodologies have been identified and will be implemented within the framework of the project:

- i) Capacity development to improve interinstitutional and intersectoral coordination and collaboration, to reinforce synergies, avoid duplication of efforts and reduce project implementation costs.
- ii) Stakeholder participation (government institutions, cooperatives and NGOs) in all project stages will ensure that the mechanisms for decision making and implementation of activities are aligned with the project objectives and the local development priorities, as well as complementarity with other ongoing initiatives in the intervention areas.
- iii) Generation of updated and timely information through the biophysical monitoring and information management system will improve access to information on climate agro-meteorology and water management, thereby improving decision making by decision makers and users.
- iv) The development of an integrated model for water management with best practices will help to improve the efficiency of irrigation and productivity of water in agriculture, thereby counteracting the environmental degradation and increasing crop yields with less water.
- v) Training and awareness raising of producers to attain a shift toward sustainable SLM/IWRM practices and implementation of appropriate technologies.
- vi) Systematization of experiences and lessons learned will contribute to a cost-effective replication of the project results.

The proposed strategies are cost-efficient because they will allow decision makers to improve decision making processes for agricultural and livestock production to satisfy the demand for food and the small producers to maintain and increase production and yields thereby recovering and maintaining the ecosystem services that are the basis for agricultural and

livestock production. The soil, water and forest polygons⁶ will also favor the replication of project results in a cost-effective manner.

The project includes an M&E component that will support project management so that the project managers will take the most appropriate decisions for implementation of the project, thereby achieving the expected outcomes, and contributing to the CPP objectives.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

The project will follow UNEP standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Reporting requirements and templates will be an integral part of the UNEP legal instrument to be signed between UNEP and the executing agency, DEA. The project's M&E framework is consistent with the GEF M&E policy, and includes a detailed Project Results Framework with SMART indicators and mid-term and end-of-project targets (Appendix 4 of the Project document). These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in Appendix 6 of the Project document will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project results are being achieved.

A fully costed M&E Plan is presented below (see also Appendix 7 of the Project document) with costs associated with obtaining the information to track the indicators and other M&E related costs fully integrated in the overall project budget. The M&E plan will be reviewed and revised as necessary during the project inception workshop to ensure project stakeholders understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Indicators and their means of verification may also be fine-tuned at the inception workshop. Day-to-day project monitoring is the responsibility of the project management team but other project partners will have responsibilities to collect specific information to track the indicators. It is the responsibility of the Project Manager to inform UNEP of any delays or difficulties faced during implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.

The National Steering Committee (NSC) will receive periodic reports on progress and will make recommendations to UNEP concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Results Framework or the M&E plan. Project oversight to ensure that the project meets UNEP and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility of the Task Manager in UNEP-GEF. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of scientific and technical outputs and publications.

At the time of project approval 100% percent of baseline data is available. Any possible baseline data gaps will be identified and addressed during the first year of project implementation. Project supervision will take an adaptive management approach. The Task Manager will develop a project supervision plan at the inception of the project, which will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed with the PSC at agreed intervals. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UNEP. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

UNEP will be responsible for managing the mid-term review/evaluation and the terminal evaluation. The Project Manager and partners will participate actively in the process. The project will be reviewed or evaluated at mid-term (tentatively in PY 3 as indicated in the project milestones). The purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) or Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to provide an independent assessment of project performance at mid-term, to analyze whether the project is on track, what problems and challenges the project is encountering, and which corrective actions are required so that the project can achieve its intended outcomes by project completion in the most efficient and sustainable way. In addition, it will verify

⁶ The polygons are special areas created by the Soil Institute (MINag) for a comprehensive application of scientific results. These have been adopted within the framework of the CPP as areas for replication given that they provide an opportunity to demonstrate the integrated economic, social and environmental aspects of SLM. There are currently 34 polygons and 4 extensions throughout the national territory, covering a total surface area of 12,380 hectares in 845 farms

information gathered through the GEF tracking tools. The project Steering Committee will participate in the MTR or MTE and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UNEP Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented. An MTR is managed by the UNEP Task Manager. An MTE is managed by the Evaluation Office (EO) of UNEP. The EO will determine whether an MTE is required or an MTR is sufficient.

An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place at the end of project implementation. The EO will be responsible for the TE and liaise with the UNEP Task Manager throughout the process. The TE will provide an independent assessment of project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of impact and sustainability. It will have two primary purposes:

- i. to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
- ii. to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNEP and executing partners.

While a TE should review use of project funds against budget, it would be the role of a financial audit to assess probity (i.e. correctness, integrity etc.) of expenditure and transactions.

The TE report will be sent to project stakeholders for comments. Formal comments on the report will be shared by the EO in an open and transparent manner. The project performance will be assessed against standard evaluation criteria using a six point rating scheme. The final determination of project ratings will be made by the EO when the report is finalized. The evaluation report will be publically disclosed and will be followed by a recommendation compliance process. The direct costs of reviews and evaluations will be charged against the project evaluation budget.

The GEF LD-tracking tool is attached as Appendix 17 of the Project document. It will be updated at mid-term and at the end of the project and will be made available to the GEF Secretariat along with the project PIR report. As mentioned above the mid-term and terminal evaluation will verify the information of the tracking tool.

M&E Plan and Budget

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF (US\$)	Budget co-finance (US\$)	Time Frame
Inception Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • AMA • UNEP 	5,400	20,000	Within 2 months of project start-up
Inception Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • UNEP 	0	0	1 month after project inception meeting
Measurement of project indicators (outcome, progress and performance indicators, GEF tracking tools) at national and global level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • Project Team 	0	In kind support of national and local counterpart agencies	Outcome indicators: start, mid and end of project Progress/perform. Indicators: annually
PPR/PIR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • Project Team 	10,000	13,100	PPR: Within 1 month of the end of reporting period i.e. on or before 31 January and 31 July PIR: Annually
Project Steering Committee meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • AMA • UNEP 	8,498	0	Once a year minimum
Reports of PSC meetings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-Iagric • Project Team • UNEP 	0	0	Annually
Monitoring visits to field sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-Iagric • UNEP 	0	In kind support of national and local	As appropriate

Type of M&E activity	Responsible Parties	Budget from GEF (US\$)	Budget co-finance (US\$)	Time Frame
			counterpart agencies	
Mid Term Review/Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-Iagric • Project Team • UNEP • External Consultants 	20,000	20,000	At mid-point of project implementation
Terminal Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-Iagric • Project Team • UNEP • External Consultants 	30,000	23,000	Within 6 months of end of project implementation
Audit	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-Iagric • Project Team • UNEP • External Consultants 	12,000	8,000	Annually
Project Final Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • Project Team • UNEP 	15,000	In kind support of national counterpart agencies	Within 2 months of the project completion date
Project Final Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • Project Team • UNEP 	0	0	Within 2 months of the project completion date
Co-financing report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • Project Team 	0	0	Within 1 month of the PIR reporting period, i.e. on or before 31 July
M&E reporting costs (publications)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • INRH-IAgric • Project Team • UNEP 	21,500	0	Annually, part of Semi-annual reports & Project Final Report
Total M&E Plan Budget		122,398	84,100	

PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
<i>Jorge Luis Fernandez Chamorro</i>	Director de Colaboración Internacional	MINISTERIO DE CIENCIA, TECNOLOGÍA Y MEDIO AMBIENTE	DATE: 31, AUGUST 2005

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Brennan Vandyke, Director, GEF Coordination Office, UNEP	<i>Brennan Van Dyke</i>	November 14, 2014	Robert Erath Task Manager	+507 305 3171	robert.erath@unep.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

See Appendix 4 of the Project Document

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

This project is the second of five projects within Cuba's Country Pilot Partnership Program (CPP) "Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and drought (NPCDD)", which was included in the 2005 Work Programme and approved in 2008. In this scenario, the prior review process for workprogram inclusion took place at the programme level. As such responses to reviews were included with the submission of the CPP Programme to GEF Council. Additional reviews will of course be addressed once received following the present CEO endorsement request submission as and if required.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS⁷

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$55,500			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
1. Stakeholder consultation process and field activities	15,000	15,000	-
2. Project design workshops	19,000	19,000	-
3. Project 2 programme and M&E coherence	21,500	21,500	-
Total	55,500	55,500	-

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used): NOT APPLICABLE

⁷ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.