



BIOREACH: Biodiversity Conservation and Agroecological Land Restoration in Productive Landscapes of Trinidad and Tobago

Basic Information

GEF ID

10188

Countries

Trinidad and Tobago

Project Title

BIOREACH: Biodiversity Conservation and Agroecological Land Restoration in Productive Landscapes of Trinidad and Tobago

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 656761

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/3/2019

Yes.

4/11/2019

There is largely alignment with the LD focal areas. However, consideration could be made for LD 1-1 as well, in particular as unsustainable agriculture practices were cited as a cause for the land degradation at the project site and possible SLM practices may also be a suitable intervention for the productive sections of the landscape being targeted. Additionally, the project has selected sub-indicator 4.3 (500 ha) which responds to SLM and does mention SLM under Output 3.1.2.

Agency Response

Focal areas LD-1-1 has been added in Table A. As mentioned in the comment unsustainable agriculture practices were cited as a cause for the land degradation at the project sites and possible SLM practices may also be a suitable intervention for the productive sections of the landscapes being targeted.

Indicative project/program description summary

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/12/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes and we understand that these figures are estimates at this time.

4/12/2019

No, please include expected GHG emissions reductions from this project.

Agency Response

As indicated in Table F, the accumulated sequestration potential due to project implementation amounts to -1.65 million tCO₂-e over the entire 20-years-period of analysis (4 years implementation + 16 years of capitalization phase). The total project area is 2 500 ha.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

We understand there have been issues with submitting the taxonomy. Please try to address but resubmit when otherwise ready.

4/12/2019

No, please ensure that habitat types are selected and terms related to specific GEF programs (such as Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration) are not.

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes, thank you for providing the KBA information as it is a helpful short hand to understand an area's importance for BD.

4/12/2019

No, please discuss the KBAs and threatened species that will benefit from better management through this project since they are targeted and in similar locations. Additional information should be included on the site of focus. There is currently very little information and data on forest loss and degradation in T&T overall and within the specific site of focus for the project.

Agency Response

KBAs and threatened species have been included and regrouped as ecologically vulnerable areas. **Key biodiversity areas** located in the project sites, species as well as key pressures/ threats have been described with more detail.

Additional information on land degradation is provided on page 28 under the alignment strategies.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes, thank you.

4/12/2019

Additional details needed as outlined above.

Agency Response

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/12/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes.

4/12/2019

Please see the answer to number 1.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost recovery properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C 31 /122

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.5.1/12?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/12/2019

Yes.

Agency Response**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/12/2019

Yes, though more details are needed in line with previous responses.

Agency Response**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

5/6/2019

Yes. This project's work with agricultural squatters as well as green supply chains could yield interesting lessons and are innovative approaches.

4/12/2019

Overall the sustainability section could benefit from additional information on how sustainability will be facilitated. The linkages to government plans, the continuity of the training, sustainability of financing mechanisms for the value chains, the challenge that the target group are not legal owners of the land that is being target site are all aspects that can affect sustainability. Additional details are required here.

In terms of upscaling this section does not specify 'how' the upscaling will happen in terms of the agroecology approach and the green value chains. What institutional mechanisms will be put in place to ensure there is upscaling?

Agency Response

Additional text has been added on page 26 referring to how the project will integrate data, seek to foster organizational culture/networks among farmers, and strengthen government institutions. It is worth noting that legal ownership of land will not be an issue as for all intents and purposes the land that long term squatters occupy is politically perceived as theirs due to Certificate of Comfort obtained through political officials.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/12/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/12/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes.

4/12/2019

No, it would be good to have a short description specific issues for women's engagement in TT as well as the logic behind the numbers presented and how they compare with baseline.

Agency Response Additional gender information has been included and a justification of numbers has been provided. A baseline figure has not been provided but will be available with a complete gender analysis at CEO Endorsement.

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/12/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes.

4/12/2019

No, please address the following:

- The mitigation actions outline for Risk 2 does not consider financing. This needs to be a factor as it is a key input.
- The mitigation action for Risk 5 needs to be strengthened.
- Risk 5- mitigation measures should include planned collaboration with the Climate change unit/agency of the GOTRR

Agency Response

The mitigation actions outline for Risk 2 does not consider financing. This needs to be a factor as it is a key input.” This has been noted and added in text.

On “The mitigation action for Risk 5 needs to be strengthened.” The actions now include additional mitigation actions including: planting of more resilient species, trainings on resilience-building, early warnings for fire prevention.

Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/12/2019

Yes. At CEO Endorsement, the project could include collaboration with CAF on their high-value cocoa initiative.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes, thank you for information.

4/12/2019

No, please provide some information on any specific activities or goals from the TT NBSAP. Please include details on alignment with TT LDN targets or LDN target setting process if this not yet complete.

Agency Response

Information on NBSAP was present but additional alignment information is presented on page 36.

Trinidad and Tobago has not yet set an LDN target under the LDN Target Setting Programme and accordingly the project cannot be stated to be in alignment (or conversely out of alignment) with a target under the programme. It is likely that when T&T establishes the baseline data for the requisite parameters for LND which is land coverage, soil organic Carbon content and land productivity a target would subsequently be adopted. This target in the first instance, is likely to be limited to one developmental sector for ease of implementation which may focus on degraded areas that have a legal obligation for rehabilitation.

The first two years of the NBSAP has a target set for the Forestry and Agriculture sectors:

"7a. By 2020 at least 30% of areas under agriculture are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.

7c. By 2020 at least 50% of areas under forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity."

70. By 2020 at least 90% of areas under forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.

The project would have synergies with these targets as the project would occur in forested areas or be on the edges/boundaries of acreages under agriculture.

Target 7a's Output of the Revised NBSAP states that "*Land use policy is updated to support sustainable agriculture and forestry practices and implemented*" aligns with Component 1. Biodiversity-supportive land use planning" of the Project

The Project Component 2.1.4: Invasive alien species management plan established for four sites, aligns with the revised NBSAP's Target 9a

Output: "*Existing laws and regulations, plans and policies governing the management and control of IAS are harmonised*"

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

Yes.

4/12/2019

No, See comment above on Table B section. Additional information should be included on how the project will engage in learning from relevant projects/programs/evaluations.

Agency Response

New component on knowledge management has been included.

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/6/2019

We are awaiting the OFP's updated LOE.

4/15/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/9/2019

Yes, this PIF and PPG are recommended for technical clearance.

5/9/2019

This PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

However, please address the following:

- The numbers in the portal tables A and D do not match.
- We need an explicit request from the OFP for the agency to execute the project.
- GHG indicators should be under 6.1 not 6.2.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/15/2019	4/29/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/7/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/9/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

