



CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multicountry soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems

Basic Information

GEF ID

10195

Countries

Regional (Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Lucia)

Project Title

CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multicountry soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems

GEF Agency(ies)

FAO

Agency ID

FAO: 654640

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

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:

Cleared. Please disregard the previous message. The Policy team has verified this is not necessary.

5/3/2019:

I have verified with our Policy Team and Table A has to include the LD Set-Aside row, similar to what has been done for the SCCF financing. This was an oversight. Please include.

4/30/2019:

FI comment of 4/16 is cleared.

ABS comment of 4/16 is cleared.

ABS 4/15/2019:

The project is aligned with LD, however there should be consideration for LD sub-objective 1-1 as many elements of the project in particular Component 3 are looking at SLM interventions.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Not yet for CCA. As the SCCF grant can only support regional-scale activities, the agency is requested to please use only the adaptation indicator CCA-2 (mainstreaming adaptation and resilience for systemic impact).

Agency Response

Point taken. LD-1-1 has been included.

Point taken. CCA-1 has been removed.

May 3 2019 No response needed.

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

ABS, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Adjustment is requested:

Please include the expected project outcomes and outputs in the rows corresponding to the SCCF funding in Table B (these cells are currently blank). Note that these will need to be regional scale activities, only.

ABS 4/30/2019:

Not fully.

-Please include an indicator in Components 2,3 &4 which focuses on the no. of farmers livelihoods/beneficiaries that will be improved or positively impacted.

-We note Outcomes 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 have been shifted to Component 1 (Outcomes 1.2 & 1.3 and their related Outputs). But they are still mentioned under Component 5. Please revise.

-Gender considerations have only been captured in the M&E plan. Please also include in the rest of Table B especially Components 2, 3 & 4.

ABS 4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please see specific comments below:

1. As much as possible please include targets within the Table B. Also align the GEF Core sub-indicators selected with the specific Outputs where you expect these targets to be fulfilled.

2. Related to point 2 above, the indicator 'number of hectares under improved climate resilient management' is repeated a number of times. Other indicators should be included, such as 'no. of ha of land restored', 'no. of hectares of forest land restored' (Component 2) etc. as well as other non-GEF sub-indicators that reflect progress on the food systems, improvement of income for small farmers, access to financing (Component 4). Please consider other indicators and include where appropriate.

3. Overall there are a few Outcomes that are written as Outputs (such as 5.2- what is the broader result that is being targeted by developing the knowledge hub;) and a few Outputs that are really activities (e.g 1.1.4- workshops are an activity; 3.1.1 is an input/activity towards achieving the Output of 3.1.3). Please review Outcome/Output language and adjust where appropriate.

4. There are a few Outputs that can be merged and Outcomes and Outputs that can be moved to different Components, to assist in making the project framework more streamlined. Please consider merging:

-Output 3.1.1 and 3.1.3-The revised output could be- Target sites selected, and land capability assessed to determine best SLM practices... ;

-Output 3.1.4 and 3.1.5- Baseline data collection is a part of the monitoring process. As monitoring is already mentioned in the wording of Output 3.1.5, this can also be included.

-Output 5.1.1 and 5.1.2- it is not clear why these two are separate.

-Outputs 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 which are not very different are both addressing the enabling environment (legal, policy and financing) and will consider opportunities for mainstreaming. Please merge.

- Output 5.5.1 and 5.5.2- it is not clear why these two need to be separate. 5.1.1 is an activity/input needed for 5.5.2.

-In terms of reorganization, we expect that Outcome 1, would focus largely on the enabling environment (at national and regional levels) and Outcome 5 on Monitoring and Evaluation, KM and Communications activities for the entire project. Please consider moving Outcomes 5.3, 5.4 and 5.5 to Component 1; as well as moving all the training Outputs under their respective Components- Output 5.1.1 and 5.1.2 (now to be merged) to Component 1, Output 5.1.4 to Component 1, Output 5.1.3 to Component 3.

6. As mentioned above, there should be a Component (in this case possibly Component 5) which is addressing M&E for the project, KM and Public Awareness and Communication around the project. In this case Outcome 5.2 is relevant. Please add Outputs for M&E and Communications/Public Awareness.

7. Gender considerations need to be considered here in Table B in particular for field-based intervention and those related to the food systems as well as any training related interventions and improvements for the enabling environment.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Not yet for CCA. As the SCCF grant will only support region-scale activities in the context of this adaptation mainstreaming effort, please ensure that Table B activities mapped to the SCCF will support only regional – and not national – actions. This includes regional technical and institutional capacity, assessments, data collection, climate projections, trainings, awareness raising, and other actions with shared regional benefits.

Agency Response

1. Point taken. Targets have been included.
2. Point taken. Indicators have been revised.
3. Point taken. Log-frame has been revised
4. Point taken. Log-frame has been revised
5. Log-frame has been duly revised
6. Noted. Component 5 is focusing on M&E and KM
7. Point taken. Gender sensitive indicators have been included.

May 3 2019

The following outputs have been included in the portal:

Output 3.1.4.-Regional capacity building activities (climate modeling, CCA training, identification of resilient technologies and practices) support the adoption and upscaling of SLM and CSA (\$253, 361)

Output 4.1.4. Regional capacity building activities (research on new adaptation technologies, regional knowledge sharing) adopted increase the resilience of food systems in the region. (\$393, 392)

Output 5.1.4. Regional CCA training program and knowledge management program support (i) mainstreaming of adaptation into SLM policies and plans and (ii) enables CCA and SLM regional institutions to work close together. (\$193,430)

For ABS points of 4/30:

- Indicators have been included
- This has been corrected
- Gender considerations are captured as indicators in the logframe

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/3/2019:

Yes for PIF stage.

FI, 4/30/2019:

It is not clear how co-financing of \$3 M for the SCCF grant has been determined. Please provide a brief explanation.

4/15/2019:

Yes

We anticipate additional co-financing from other sources as indicated in the Incremental cost reasoning section.

Agency Response

Three countries (Dominica, St. Vincent and Barbados) have been removed from project participation including co-financing support.

May 3 2019

As requested by GEFSEC on the 4/16 review, GEF trainings/capacity building have been included in each component and not as a separate outcome. SCCF funds under components will support regional activities to build capacity in the region. It is expected that Countries that do not invest STAR resources will use their co-financing to carry out investments at the country level based on the regional activities.

Cofinancing has been calculated as follows per component:

Component 3: \$1.2m

Component 4: \$1.1m

Component 5: \$0.5m

PMC: \$0.2m

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

ABS, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Adjustment is requested. The last row of Table E shows SCCF mapped to the LD focal area, which is incorrect. It should be Climate Change Adaptation. Please correct this.

ABS 4/30/2019:

No fully.

Table D. Please break out the STAR allocations per country in separate rows and the LD set-aside funding in a separate row. The Table as presented suggests that \$6M is coming from LD set-aside. In all there should be 7 rows (one for each country) and then two additional rows (1 each for the LD set-aside and the SCCF funding). Under the Column heading Programming of Funds- indicate LD STAR or LD Set Aside where applicable.

Please ensure all the details outlined in Tables D and E align with the Letters of Endorsement.

ABS 4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please breakout the country LD STAR allocations and agency fees. These amounts should match what is in the Endorsement Letters. Please also include the LD set aside funding \$1 million (inclusive of fees) in a separate line.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Yes, for CCA. The information shown in Table D for the SCCF is adequate.

Agency Response

Tables A, B, D, E, have been updated. As of today St. Lucia endorsement letter is still pending but it is expected this week.

May 3 2019

Table updated

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/7/2019:

Cleared.

5/6/2019:

Awaiting updated LOEs:

4/30/2019:

Please note the deadline has been subsequently moved to May 7th.

4/15/2019:

Yes for the countries who have submitted LOEs.

Agency Response

We will obtain the revised endorsement letters by the 8th of May.

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required. All letters have were uploaded by due date.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/7/2019:

Cleared.

5/6/2019:

Awaiting updated LOEs.

4/30/2019:

Please note the deadline has been subsequently moved to May 7th.

4/15/2019:

Yes for the countries who have submitted LOEs

Agency Response May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response N/A**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

FI, 4/16/2019:

Yes. A \$1 million SCCF grant, inclusive of fees, will support regional-scale activities to mainstream climate change adaptation and improve capacity in this highly vulnerable region to assess, identify and undertake adaptation measures in the context of sustainable land management.

Agency Response

May 3 2019

Much appreciated

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

Focal area set-aside?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

4/1/2019:

Yes

4/30/2019:

We are recommending US\$1 million from LD set-aside funding to cover regional activities.

Agency Response

May 3 2019

Much appreciated

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response N/A

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

4/15/2019:

Yes

Agency Response May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

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

5/9/2019:

Cleared.

5/8/2019:

The target for CO2 emission reduction is about 5-times higher than average GEF project (for AFOLU). Please revise the Ex-ACT analysis to better reflect the direct impact of project interventions: For example, under avoided deforestation, it is currently assumed that the whole target area of 20,000 hectares will be deforested in "without project scenario".

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared. The CCA Core Indicators and Metadata have been submitted.

ABS, 5/3/2019:

Cleared. At PPG please be consistent with the terminology. The sub-indicator refers to restoration and not afforestation.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Not yet. The Climate Change Adaptation Core Indicators and Metadata have not yet been submitted. Note that this is an excel file that must be uploaded, and that CCA indicators cannot be captured in the Portal's Core Indicators table.

ABS 4/30/2019:

-We note that targets have been included in Table B. Thank you. However they do not match the total core indicators selected in the portal. Indicator 3- 40,000 ha, Indicator 4- 43,000 ha= 83,000 ha. Please adjust. Also ensure alignment with Question 6 on GEBs.

-In addition the number of beneficiaries mentioned in the portal are not reflected in Table B. Please include.

ABS 4/15/2015:

Yes.

Although the project is not utilizing CCM funding, please include an estimated target for emissions avoided benefits for the project.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Not yet for CCA. The agency is requested to kindly submit the excel file for adaptation projects that has (i) Core CCA Indicators and (ii) Metadata. Please note that the CCA indicators are tracked separately from those for the GEF Trust Fund (GEF TF), and should not be included in the Portal's Core Indicator table that contains the Core Indicators for the GEF TF.

Agency Response

May 8 (Operational) revision - GHG emissions have been updated. Revised EX-ACT calculations uploaded.

May 3 2019

Core Indicators uploaded

GEFTF Core indicators have been updated in the portal and now match table B. The project will target 80,000 ha as follows:

- 20,000 ha of avoided deforestation
- 17,000 ha of afforestation activities in degraded lands

- 20,000 ha of degraded lands restored into perennials

- 23,000 ha of Improved crops

Indicators related to beneficiaries have been included in the logframe/results framework of PIF

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

4/15/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

May 3 2019

N/A

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

Part 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

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

ABS 5/3/2019:

Sufficient for the PIF stage. Additional details expected at CEO Endorsement.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Not yet. The PIF still does not fully make the case for use of SCCF resources. Please discuss how the SCCF grant will deliver additional adaptation benefits to the project, in the context of SLM.

ABS 4/30/2019:

Not fully.

-The Biodiversity summary is sufficient for the PIF stage, however we expect additional details at the country level for CEO Endorsement.

-It is not clear where additional information as been included on indigenous peoples and private sector in this section. Please indicate.

ABS 4/15/2019:

Not fully.

-Given the reference to the BD sub-indicator 4.1 and the use of the integrated landscape approach, please provide a bit of context on Biodiversity in this section.

-Gender considerations, indigenous peoples and private sector have not been sufficiently covered in this section. Please provide brief information on the above stakeholders as it relates to this specific context.

-How were the project sites selected? – Are they sites that are the most degraded, have the most co-financing attached, and/or do they bring countries closer to achieving their LDN targets or were there other factors?

FI, 4/16/2019:

Further information is requested on the climate change context.

- 1) Information on the impacts of recent climatic hazards for various Caribbean SIDS has been included. However, the SCCF is intended to support actions that will not only reduce vulnerability to today's stresses, but also to the impacts of future climate change. An additional section, outlining how climate change is likely to impact the Caribbean, is needed.
- 2) Please also discuss informational/data, capacity, institutional or other barriers and gaps that exist regarding climate change impacts and adaptation measures (especially in the context of integrated land management), which this project will seek to address through SCCF resources.

Agency Response

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

May 3 2019

The following text has been included as paragraph 4

The adverse impacts of climate change in the Caribbean and associated vulnerabilities have been well studied (ECLAC 2011,). Climate change poses a severe threat because of the biophysical and socio-economic characteristics of the Caribbean countries. They are particularly vulnerable because they are located in the hurricane belt, their population and infrastructure is concentrated in coastal zones, and they depend on a narrow range of economic activities, namely agriculture and tourism. These conditions make the Caribbean highly susceptible to external shocks, therefore climate change adaptation activities are of key importance to the long term development of the region. The project will also improve the regional capacity of Caribbean SIDS to mainstream adaptation practices and measures into the sub-regional policies and decision-making mechanisms. In particular, policy players and key stakeholders will be trained on CCA and supported on integration of adaptation measures and knowledge dissemination for climate-resilient agriculture.

1) -no response required

2) Integrated: Indigenous people are part of the project in particular in Guyana (see details in the PIF)

Integrated: Private sector participation has been planned (see details in the PIF)

4/16 - Recommendations have been duly included

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Yes for PIF stage.

ABS 4/30/2015:

Cleared.

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

-In the section on government baseline, please include further information on the remaining countries in the project, as it would be useful to know if they already have comprehensive land use planning frameworks to underpin the site-based interventions proposed or if these are currently in development.

Agency Response

Noted and included

May 3 2019

No response required

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

ABS 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Not yet for SCCF. Please ensure that in the Component descriptions, the proposed use of SCCF resources is only for regional-scale activities. This is not currently reflected. Please also describe some of the proposed regional scale adaptation activities, or if not yet known exactly, then please discuss likely/potential regional scale activities that will deliver additional (regional scale) adaptation benefits to the project.

ABS 4/30/2019:

- We note additional inclusions of the private sector in this section. Thank you. We expect additional details at the CEO Endorsement stage and they should be actively engaged during the PPG phase. For example they can be included in the activities to related to project design, if the project is looking at resilient food production systems, there should be a role for agro-processing companies as well as other private sector actors to be involved, as they are a part of the value chain etc.

-During the PPG stage for Output 1.1.2 and 1.1.2, please ensure that data ownership, sharing and maintenance arrangements are considered to ensure sustainability as well as resources (financial and human) to maintain the systems.

- It is not clear how gender considerations have been factored into this section. Please clarify.

-Re Outcome 4- Please clarify if the target areas in the countries selected are key food producing areas for the country as a whole. The justification for these activities targeting 'food production systems' needs to be strengthened.

ABS 4/15/2019:

Not fully.

In addition to the comments under Question 2- Part I – Project Information above please consider the additional comments below:

-Include the targeted hectares of land in this section as well as an estimate of the number of small farmers that will be involved.

-Private sector needs to be featured more strongly in the project description in particular related to Component 1- ensuring their inputs are considered for enabling environment activities, they are included in relevant workshops and trainings, and any platforms/coordinating bodies/partnerships that may be established at the national and regional level, access to data to inform any potential land investments; as well as Component 4 on the food systems.

-Additional details on gender needs to be integrated in the project description.

-The chemicals information mentioned in the Context, should be incorporated in the project description as well.

-Details per Component:

- Output 1.1.2 and 1.1.2- During PPG stage, ensure that data ownership, sharing and maintenance arrangements are considered to ensure sustainability as well as resources (financial and human) to maintain the systems.
- Output 2.1.1- The GEF does not fund rehabilitation of mined lands, but only productive landscapes- forests and agriculture.
- Output 2.1.4- How will these results be disseminated nationally and to other countries not included in the project?
- How are the countries for Components 3& 4 selected? We note that it is only in St Vincent that both components will be implemented. Are there plans to select sites in close proximity or on the same landscape to show the effectiveness of an integrated approach?
- For the countries selected for Components 3 and 4, how will they learn from the interventions of each other?
- The site for St. Lucia under Component 3 is quite small – 10ha? Is this correct?
- Output 4.1.3- Beyond the development of bankable projects for LDN etc, access to financing and suggestions for financial mechanisms involving financial institutions should also be considered.
- Output 5.4.2 indicates a Cooperation Mechanism being established. How and by who will this be managed and maintained? How will it be linked to the regional Soil Partnership mentioned in Component 1?
- - In reference to the attached LD Set aside breakdown, please clarify what is included in the Institutional Strengthening for PISLM?

FI, 4/16/2019:

Not yet for CCA. Please provide additional information on the regional adaptation benefits that are likely to result from the SCCF-supported activities.

Agency Response

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

May 3 2019

The text has been updated (paragraph 96).

No response required

No response required

Yes, these are key producing areas in the countries. Further justification will be provided at ppg stage when project sites are confirmed.

4/16 - Noted and included

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

ABS 4/30/2015:

Cleared.

4/15/2019:

Yes. However please see comments above for Question 1- Part I – Project Information Focal area elements.

Agency Response This has been already responded and adjusted in the PIF

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Please see comment of 4/16. It is not clear how the SCCF resources will help mainstream adaptation benefits at a regional scale in the context of SLM. Which specific regional scale activities are proposed? How will adaptation knowledge and capacity be built at regional scale? Which kind of additional modeling and/or climate projections will be used or developed to help guide the SLM activities?

ABS 4/30/2019:

Cleared with the expectation of additional details at the CEO Endorsement stage.

ABS 4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Note the GEF under the LD focal area does not fund rehabilitation/ restoration of mined lands, only productive landscapes-forests and agriculture.

FI, 4/16/2019:

For SCCF, please include discussion on how the SCCF is bringing tangible, additional adaptation benefits to the this project.

Agency Response

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

May 3 2019

The following text has been added to section 1.5

117. In terms of climate change adaptation, the project will build on existing baseline activities and strengthen regional efforts to address climate change by supporting (i) regional climate modeling/projections that can feed into or inform SLM in the Caribbean; (ii) carry out regional trainings on climate change adaptation (including links to agri (iii) developing regional research/advice about how new adaptation technologies or practices that can inform SLM projects (investments would be done using country's STAR allocations or co-financing), (iv) supporting regional knowledge sharing and exchange on adaptation; (v) developing regional institutional measures to mainstream adaptation in SLM policies and plans; and/or enable CCA and SLM regional institutions to work closer together.

No response required

4/16- Noted for LD restoration. Improving and diversifying livelihoods options for adaptation SCCF

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**

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

ABS 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Not yet. As requested on 4/16, please submit the excel file with CCA Core Indicators and Metadata.

ABS 4/30/2019:

Not fully.

- Please include the CCM GEBs as well.

ABS 4/15/2019:

Not fully.

-Please include the targets from the GEF Core indicators here.

-Please use hectares as the unit of measurement for the expected GEBs for land.

FI, 4/16/2019:

The agency is requested to please submit the CCA Core Indicator targets (and Metadata).

Agency Response

Noted. Data has been included

May 3 2019

Core Indicators/metadata Excel sheet and EX-ACT have been uploaded.

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

ABS 5/3/2019:

Cleared. Sufficient for the PIF stage.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Please discuss how the regional adaptation activities will be sustained and coordinated.

ABS 4/30/2019:

Not fully. There is no mention on the potential for scale up of the LD/SLM/LDN components of the project. Please include.

4/15/2019:

Not fully

Sustainability in terms of financing mechanisms related to Component 4 has not been considered. In addition, the details on how the project could be scaled up should be included.

Agency Response

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

May 3 2019

Adaptation activities will be sustained and coordinated at regional level through enhanced understanding and capacity of decision makers to integrate CSA, Drought Risk Management and resilient diversified Food Systems into regional policy support frameworks and investments so as to generate multiple socioeconomic and environmental benefits (proven through in the ground activities supported by GEF funds)

Enhanced public and private sector collaboration in support of SLM and CSA for climate adaptation and reduced risks

Text has been expanded in section 1.7 (paragraphs 120 to 127)

4/16-

Additional text has been added referring to how the project sustainability

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

5/9/2019:

Cleared.

5/9/2019:

Thank you. Please remove the previous map as it will create confusion.

5/8/2019:

While the project lists 7 SOILCARE countries in the portal, the additional 3 countries should be removed from the map in this section.

5/3/2019:

Cleared.

4/30/2019:

We expect country based maps identifying the project sites at the CEO Endorsement stage.

4/15/2019:

Yes

Agency Response

May 8 - Point taken. Map has been updated.

May 3 2019

Detailed maps including project sites will be developed by CEO Endorsement

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

ABS 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

ABS 4/30/2019:

Not fully.

- It is not clear how the previous comment has been addressed. The inclusion and engagement of the private sector beyond co-financing is a very important criteria for GEF 7 financing. Please include in the list of stakeholders.

-All stakeholders should be consulted/involved in project design. This is not stated clearly.

- Reminder to remove Dominica from the Indigenous peoples section among other areas.
- The farmers organizations should also be involved upstream, not only for site based activities.

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

The private sector (beyond the small farmers) needs to be included in the list of stakeholders. Please adjust and include the role that they will play.

In addition, there is opportunity for the farmers through farmers cooperatives/organizations to provide inputs on many aspects of the project that are not only site based, such as the enabling environment.

Agency Response

May 3 2019

- Please refer to paragraph 129-130
- Included in paragraph 131
- done
- Agreed. This will be done during project preparation.

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

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

4/30/2019:

Yes, however we expect to see the gender considerations also throughout the document. We note some inclusions have been made in the the Project Justification- Root Causes etc, however Table B and the Alternative scenario sections are still not adequate. Please ensure these are improved at the CEO Endorsement stage.

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

The gender context as it relates to land issues, sustainable agriculture, food systems, climate resilience is not adequately covered. Please include.

At the PIF stage in addition to any plans to collect sex-disaggregated data, we expect indicative information on Gender, any measures that will be implemented that consider gender related issues.

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.

May 3 2019

These will be improved at CEO Endorsement stage.

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/30/2019:

Cleared. We expect further details throughout the project document at the CEO Endorsement stage.

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

We expect private sector cooperation and involvement beyond access to financing. Please provide details on other areas in which they will be incorporated into the project including project design. This is also to feature in the project description section and referenced in Table B where appropriate.

Agency Response

Noted and included.

May 3 2019

No further information required.

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

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

4/15/2019:

Yes

Agency Response May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required**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

5/9/2019:

Cleared.

5/8/2019:

Given that the GEF at this time is only requested to and considering funding for the first phase, please revise the first sentence to read 'This is a regional long-term LDN program addressing the countries' commitments and voluntary targets set under the UNCCD and this GEF project has been designed to support the first phase of the LDN program'

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Further information is requested. What are the institutional arrangements to support the mainstreaming of adaptation elements at the regional scale, in the context of SLM? How will it be ensured that the efforts are synergistic with other relevant adaptation initiatives in the region?

ABS 4/30/2019:

Cleared.

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please review the following GEF projects for synergies.

- Jamaica- Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using an Integrated Landscape Approach; SVG- Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using a Ridge-to-Reef Approach; Haiti- Sustainable Management of Wooded Production Landscapes for Biodiversity Conservation ; Resilient Productive Landscapes in Haiti ; St. Lucia- Integrated Ecosystem Management and Restoration of Forests on the South East Coast of St. Lucia; Belize- Integrated Management of Production Landscapes to Deliver Multiple Global Environmental Benefits

In addition, there was or still is an IDB-GEF project in the Yallahs River Watershed. Please indicate if the site interventions for Jamaica will build on this project?

Agency Response

May 8 - Noted and included.

May 3 2019

The following text has been included in section 6 (paragraphs 149-150)

As noted in Output 1.2.2 PISLM will work closely with the Caribbean Community Secretariat through its Sustainable Development Directorate to ensure complementarity and integration of the concepts, Outcomes and outputs which this project promotes. It is anticipated that the PISLM High Level Ministerial Group will play a leading role in this endeavor by providing the policy links with COTED [Environment] and COTED [Agricultural].

Enhanced regional cooperation among Caribbean SIDS for promoting integrated LDN and Climate adaptation strategies will be ensured through the new SIDS-SIDS Cooperation Mechanism on LDN/SLM and CCA (see output 1.2.3). Inter alia this will facilitate access to latest climate change analysis including impacts of climate change to date and models and scenarios of expected trends and potential impacts as a basis for prioritizing interventions. It will also facilitate access to results from evaluations of previous projects including policy development, capacity building and implementation mechanisms so as to learn from past experiences (successes and failures).

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

4/30/2019:

Cleared. At CEO Endorsement we expect to see additional information on the specific country based LDN targets (where available) and how the country based activities will help each country to set or meet their LDN targets.

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please also include the text on the LDN target setting process here.

Agency Response

Noted and included.

May 3 2019

Noted

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

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

FI, 5/3/2019:

Cleared.

FI, 4/30/2019 (SCCF):

Not yet. The new KM section is missing discussion on the adaptation related activities. Please discuss how the adaptation knowledge/skills built by the project will be shared and communicated.

ABS 4/30/2019:

Cleared.

ABS 4/15/2019:

Not fully.

We note that the project has provided an indicative KM approach, however please provide details on how the project will incorporate learning from previous experiences.

FI, 4/16/2019:

Please also discuss knowledge management activities in the context of regional capacity to assess and adapt to risks posed by climate change in the context of SLM, and how such knowledge and capacity can be best shared, communicated and built on. What are some suitable platforms? How will learning be captured?

Agency Response

May 8 (Operational) revision - No response required

May 3 2019

CCA related activities have been included in paragraphs 160 and 161.

160. Climate resilient SLM /SSM practices and land use/production systems and integrated landscape management approaches would be shared and communicated through the Knowledge Hub and exchange of experiences would be facilitated through a consultative platform across actors from local to national and subregional levels (could expand). This process could be supported through exchange visits between projects, national and subregional workshops, materials and curricula development for capacity building and wider diffusion through school and higher education and the elaboration of regional and national strategic plans based on the analysis for example of:

- Policy, regulations and incentive measures for promoting climate adaptation (reducing risks from deforestation, erosion on steep slopes, and other degradation processes and enhancing renewable energy supply). Evidence from participatory monitoring of impacts /benefits in terms of maintained or improved ecosystem services for reliable food production, resilient farm-livelihoods (adaptation) and mitigation co-benefits (reduced emissions) and
- Governance mechanisms and stakeholder processes for enhancing the inclusion of women, indigenous peoples, youth and other marginalised groups and their benefits from enhanced SLM/SSM and CCA,
- and so forth Mid and terminal project evaluations will assess whether the project is on track in terms of expected national, subregional results and global environmental benefits, as well as cost effectiveness and sustainability and the mid term evaluation will reorient the process as needed to ensure that expected results will be achieved, while the terminal evaluation will review the proposals for the projected phase II . This should include a review of the knowledge management and communication strategies.

161. In selected landscapes where activities will be conducted on the ground (supported by GEF funds) the farmer to farmer learning by doing and exchange process through the farmer field school (FFS) approach and networking across FFS groups will help the farming population and wider rural communities in identifying and validating solutions to degradation and climate related problems and barriers at farm and territorial/landscape levels as a basis for enhancing livelihoods and reducing risks.

4/19 -

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

5/9/2019:

Cleared.

5/9/2019:

Please change Mr. Moise Jean-Pierre's position, as he is not the Minister of Environment. You can put GEF Operational Focal Point if you don't have his job title at hand.

5/8/2019:

In Table A below the OFP of Antigua and Barbuda is missing and should be entered. In the same Table A, the name entered for Haiti should be corrected. It should be the name of the OFP who is Mr. Moise Jean-Pierre

ABS 5/7/2019:

Cleared.

ABS 5/3/2019:

We note that new LOEs will be submitted before or by May 7th (am) DC time.

4/30/2019:

Letter of Endorsement for Grenada is also outstanding. It has not been uploaded to the Portal.

4/15/2019:

Not fully.

Please provide endorsement letters for Grenada, St Vincent and the Grenadines, St Lucia and Barbados

Agency Response

LOE for St. Lucia expected this week. Other countries have been removed.

May 3 2019

No response required

May 8 (Operational) revision - Table corrected/updated

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:

The PIF and PPG are technically cleared and recommended for approval.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

FI, 4/30/2019:

- 1) Please provide solid, referenced information on climate change projections for the region. Also please discuss the implications of climate change for sustainable land management in the Caribbean.
- 2) Please discuss how the institutional arrangements for sustainable efforts towards mainstreaming climate change adaptation in SLM in the Caribbean.
- 3) Please provide further information on co-financing for the adaptation-related activities.
- 4) We understand that no beneficiary information was entered for the SCCF Core Indicator at PIF stage, to avoid the risk of double-counting beneficiaries given that the SCCF will be supporting CCA-mainstreaming at a regional scale. However, please engage with GEF Sec prior to CEO Endorsement to determine how beneficiary information can be captured for the SCCF.

ABS 5/3/2019:

-Given the reference to the BD sub-indicator 4.1 and the use of the integrated landscape approach, please provide a bit of context on Biodiversity in this section. The Biodiversity summary is sufficient for the PIF stage, however we expect additional details at the country level for CEO Endorsement.

-Please also include additional details on indigenous peoples and private sector in the Project Justification (Context section)

-We expect country based maps identifying the project sites at the CEO Endorsement stage.

-We expect to see additional information on gender at the CEO Endorsement stage.

- Please include additional information on the specific country based LDN targets (where available) and how the country based activities will help each country to set or meet their LDN targets.

- For Output 1.1.2 and 1.1.2, please ensure that data ownership, sharing and maintenance arrangements are considered to ensure sustainability as well as resources (financial and human) to maintain the systems.

/view Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/15/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/30/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/7/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/9/2019	