**GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL**

**Project Type:**

**Type of Trust Fund: GEF Trust Fund**

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://www.thegef.org/gef/home)



**part i: project information**

|  |
| --- |
| Project Title: Climate Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management |
| Country(ies): | Grenada | GEF Project ID:[[1]](#footnote-1) | 9577 |
| GEF Agency(ies): |   | GEF Agency Project ID: | 4970 |
| Other Executing Partner(s): | Department of Economic and Technical Cooperation (DETC), Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development | Submission Date: | 2/12/2019 |
| GEF Focal Area (s): |   | Project Duration (Months) | 48 |
| Integrated Approach Pilot | IAP-Cities [ ]  IAP-Commodities [ ]  IAP-Food Security [ ]  | Corporate Program: SGP [ ]   |
| Name of Parent Program | NA | Agency Fee ($) | 347,679 |

1. [**Focal Area Strategy Framework and Other Program Strategies**](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/AppData/Local/Microsoft/Windows/Temporary%20Internet%20Files/Content.Outlook/5RRT28VG/refer%20to%20the%20excerpts%20on%20GEF%206%20Results%20Frameworks%20for%20GETF%2C%20LDCF%20and%20SCCF.)**[[2]](#footnote-2)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Focal Area Objectives/Programs** | **Focal Area Outcomes** | Trust Fund | (in $) |
| GEF Project Financing | Co-financing |
| LD-1 Program 2 | Outcome 1.1: Improved agricultural, rangeland and pastoral management | GEF TF | 2,075,910 | 8,967,000 |
| LD-3 Program 4  | Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities based on gender sensitive needs | GEF TF | 634,438 | 3,067,000 |
| BD-4 Program 9 | Outcome 4.1 Improved management frameworks to prevent, control, and manage invasive alien species (IAS).Outcome 4.2 Species extinction avoided as a result of IAS management | GEF TF | 804,295 | 1,757,000 |
| BD-2 Program 4 | Outcome 9.1: Increased area of production landscapes and seascapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management. | GEF TF | 145,132 | 302,000 |
| **Total project costs** |  | **3,659,775** | **14,093,000** |

1. **Project description summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **Project Objective: To operationalize integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing resilience of agricultural system** |
| **Project Components/****Programs** | **Type[[3]](#footnote-3)** | **Project Outcomes** | **Project Outputs** | Trust Fund | (in $) |
| GEF Project Financing | Confirmed Co-financing |
| 1. Systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management at national level |  | Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into land use planning and management practices, and in agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of improved systemic and national institutional capacity for landscapes management for biodiversity conservation.Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for promoting sustainable land management (SLM) evidenced by: i) three cross-sectoral collaboration/agreements established for land use planning and management; ii) five integrated watershed management plans integrating biodiversity conservation, SLM, and climate-smart agriculture (CSA) covering at least 50% of the five prioritized watersheds and operationalized; iii) enhanced capacity of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation and land use management as measured through the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard: *Forestry and National Parks Department: from 36% to 51%; Land Use Division/Ministry of Agriculture and Lands: from 31% to 46%; Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique: from 27% to 42%.*Increased level of awareness among stakeholders in the St. David, St. Andrew, and St. Patrick parishes and in Carriacou and Petit Martinique about biodiversity conservation, SLM, and CSA objectives (measured with Knowledge, Attitude, Practice, and Behavior [KAP/B] Index).(baselines and targets to be determined during the first year of project implementation) | 1.1 **A central geospatial biodiversity, ecosystem, and land use database and monitoring system to be assessed, updated, and operationalized**, **within the national land management policy in the national and legal regulatory framework**, with comprehensive land use survey to support land use planning, baseline terrestrial biological /ecological assessment, assessment of existing key biodiversity areas (KBAs), and a profile of water sources.**1.2 Regulatory, coordination and planning framework strengthened, integrating SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation**, with improved management of Grenada’s 7 KBAs and threatened species of national and global significance (i.e. 2 single island endemics).**1.3 Biodiversity conservation and land use management capacities improved** through training of personnel from the Forestry and National Parks Department, Land Use Division, Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique. Training in biodiversity conservation and SLM skills will be institutionalized within the priority list of the Ministry of Education. |  | 820,407LD-3: 375,512BD-4: 444,895 | 2,550,160 |
| 2. National capacity built to provide financial, technical, and information services for CSA production.  | INV | Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA by 17% from the baseline amount.National-level capacities enhanced for CSA production indicated by: i) Increased area from 140 ha to 300 ha where climate-resilient crops are successfully implemented; ii) between 700 and 910 men farmers annually and 300 and 390 women farmers annually accessing climate-resilient crop varieties and implementing SLM and improved rangeland management. | **2.1 Financial support systems for incentivizing CSA, SLM, and conservation-oriented agricultural practices are strengthened/ established/operationalized**, including microcredit schemes and related certification of agriculture products with CSA criteria integrated.**2.2 Soil and water quality monitoring and advisory programme enhanced.** National capacity to implement an upgraded soil and water sampling and testing programme, with information dissemination to support planning and monitoring of CSA and SLM activities.**2.3 National supply of climate-resilient crop varieties enhanced** through 5 upgraded and climate-proofed government propagation centers (4 in Grenada agricultural districts and 1 in Carriacou), combined with support to farmers field school network with extension officers trained. |  | 558,521LD-1: 373,104LD-3: 185,417 | 2,952,820 |
| 3. Operational-isation of resilient agricultural practices   | INV | 2,400 ha are managed under SLM supporting CSA, as evidenced by: i) change in soil erosion rate from 7.11 tons/ha/year to 6.04 tons/ha/year by project end in steep and upland areas in three prioritized watersheds: La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed, and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed; and ii) change in income level ($/year) of beneficiary households (disaggregated by gender) by project end:- Farmers (crop and livestock production): from $4,400 USD/year to $5,500 USD/year.- Five (5) women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small business: X USD(Baseline and target will be determined and/or confirmed during the first year of project implementation; data will be disaggregated by gender) Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in the management of landscapes covering 960 ha, indicated by: i) 40 ha of bamboo removed in the mid-level strata/riparian zones of the La Sagesse Watershed; ii) at least 1,305 individuals of *Herpestes auropunctatus* (small Indian Mongoose) removed annually from dry forest areas, including key biodiversity areas (KBAs) (Mt St Catherine, Grand Etang, Levera, Perseverance, Mt Harman); iii) Population of endangered species: - Grenada Dove (*Leptotila wellsi*): from 136\* individuals to up to 154 individuals- Grenada Frog (*Pristimantis* *euphronides*): X\*\*Leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys* *coriacea*): X\*\*Hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys* *imbricata*): X\*\*\*Baseline and target to be confirmed during the first year of project implementation; baseline based on Rusk, B. 2017.\*\* Baseline and target to be determined during the first year of project implementation; andiv) Changes in cover (ha) of key ecosystems in five prioritized watersheds:- Dry forest: X- Cloud forest: X- Mangroves: X- Riparian forest: X- Turtle nesting beaches: X(Baseline and target to be determined during the first year of project implementation)2,963 hectares (ha) of landscapes under improved practices9,512 tCO2-eq of greenhouse gas emissions mitigated over 10 years | **3.1 CSA and SLM practices implemented in St David, St Andrew and St Patrick parishes.** This will include: (i) restoration of riparian buffer zones of higher and mid-belt native forest and agroforestry areas degraded by extreme weather events and unsustainable production practices; (ii) adaptive livestock management (e.g. through high protein plants used for fencing and fodder); (iii) adaptive agriculture practices for short crops and dry forest conservation in coastal areas. Demonstrations include 3 protective structures (including shade houses) for adaptive crop production located in different climatic zones, serving as national learning centers/model farms applying variety of crops and cultivation techniques, as well as demonstrating suitable business models for replication.**3.2 Biodiversity conservation expanded and integrated with CSA and SLM measures in La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed, and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed** in: (i) upland watershed areas buffering Grand Etang NP, (ii) lowland to upland riparian zone, and (iii) lowland dry forest areas (i.e., establishment of 1 tropical dry forest coastal site as national park). Landscape level threats to biodiversity reduced through IAS/disease control: i) *Batrachochytrium* *dendrobatidis* (Chytrid fungus) in high mountain strata, ii) bamboo removal in the mid-level strata, and iii) control of *Herpestes* *auropunctatus* (small Indian Mongoose) in Grenada’s coastal dry forest ecosystem encompassing 5 KBAs, with native and endangered biodiversity impacted (i.e. CR Grenada Dove).**3.3 CSA and rangeland management system in Carriacou and Petit Martinique** demonstrated through operationalization of an upgraded propagation center (including climate resilient varieties) and establishment of 2 climate-resilient protective structures.**3.4 Small businesses supported for agroprocessing and agrotourism**, processing climate-smart crops and supporting sustainable rural livelihoods and education on CSA-SLM practices (including women, men, and youth). At least 8 agroprocessing and 2 agrotourism businesses will be supported with technical assistance in production, labeling and marketing of climate smart agricultural products. |  | 1,845,707LD-1: 1,439,675BD-4: 260,900BD-2: 145,132 | 6,979,390 |
| 4. Knowledge management for SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation |  | Knowledge and experiences captured, shared, and encourage widespread adoption of CSA, SLM, and biodiversity conservation practices, indicated by: i) 10 documents on successful experiences about CSA, SLM, and biodiversity conservation practices, and gender mainstreaming disseminated in national institutions and among Ministry of Agriculture and Lands extension centers that serve farmers around Grenada; ii) at least five (one per watershed) sub-national or local institutions that adopt recommendations resulting from SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions by project end.Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation, outcomes and outputs ensures project effectively reaches outlined goals and objectives.  | **4.1 Technical knowledge captured, experiences and lessons learned disseminated, and incorporated into institutional strengthening and capacity-building**. A monitoring system will be developed to learn from the SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions conducted by the project. Lessons learned and good practices will be compiled, collated, and packaged into several formats geared towards specifically targeted groups and audiences, using community groups and/or NGOs to assist in capturing lessons learned and good practices.4**.2. Media products promote outreach and increased public awareness / environmental education of SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation** disseminated through videos, photo essays, fact sheets, case studies, project web platform, training tools, television spots, newsletters, exchange site visits by communities and producers involved, and dissemination at regional events.**4.3. Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation conducted for adaptive management**, including periodic field visits, core indicators assessments, mid-term and final evaluations of project. |  | 260,865BD-4: 53,289LD-1: 154,278LD-3: 53,298 | 939,534 |
| Subtotal |  | 3,485,500 | 13,421,904 |
| Project Management Cost (Direct Project Costs: $70,990)  |  | 174,275BD-4: 45,211LD-1: 108,853LD-3: 20,211 | 671,096 |
| **Total project costs** |  | **3,659,775** | **14,093,000** |

1. **confirmed sources of** [**Co-financing**](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing) **for the project by name and by type**

Please include evidence for [co-financing](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing) for the project with this form.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Co-financing**  | **Name of Co-financier**  | **Type of Cofinancing** | **Amount ($)**  |
| Recipient Government | Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development | Loans | 13,008,350 |
| Recipient Government | Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning and Physical Development | In-kind | 684,650 |
| GEF Agency | UNDP | Grants | 400,000 |
| **Total Co-financing** |  |  | **14,093,000** |

1. **Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies) and the Programming of Funds**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GEF Agency** | **Trust Fund** | **Country** **Name/Global** | **Focal Area** | **Programming of Funds** | **(in $)** |
| **GEF Project Financing** (a) | **Agency Fee** a) (b)2 | **Total**(c)=a+b |
| UNDP  | GEFTF | Grenada    | Biodiversity | n/a | 949,427 | 90,196 | 1,039,623 |
| UNDP | GEFTF | Grenada | Land Degradation | n/a | 2,710,348 | 257,483 | 2,967,831 |
| **Total Grant Resources** | **3,659,775** | **347,679** | **4,007,454** |

a ) Refer to the [Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/gef-fee-policy.pdf)

1. **Project’s Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Core Indicators** | **Expected at CEO Endorsement** |
| 1 | **Terrestrial protected areas** created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares) | 23 |
| 2 | **Marine protected areas** created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares) | NA |
| 4 | Area of **landscapes under improved practices** (excluding protected areas)(Hectares) | 3,860 |
| 5 | Area of **marine habitat under improved practices** (excluding protected areas) (Hectares) | NA |
|  | Total area under improved management (Hectares) | 3,883 |
| 6 | **Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated** (metric tons of CO2e)  | 9,512\* |
| 7 | **Number of shared water ecosystems** (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management | NA |
| 8 | Globally over-exploited **marine fisheries** moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons) | NA |
| 9 | **Reduction**, disposal/destruction, phase out, **elimination** and avoidance of **chemicals of global concern** and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced) | NA |
| 10 | Reduction, avoidance of emissions of **POPs to air** from point and non-point sources (grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ) | NA |
| 11 | Number of **direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender** as co-benefit of GEF investment | Between 1,000 and 1,300 farmers annually (between 700 and 910 men farmers annually and 300 and 390 women farmers annually) |

Provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD) including justification where core indicator targets are not provided.

\* The carbon sequestration estimates have been calculated using the Ex-Ante Carbon-Balance Tool (EX-ACT) Version 7 – Multilingual Edition, which was developed by FAO. The forest type selected for the calculations is Tropical Moist Deciduous Forest, building on a baseline of degraded land in a Wet Tropical climate. The soil type generally consists of fertile Clay Loams derived from volcanic materials, albeit degraded through prior deforestation activity and subsequent overgrazing/ agriculture. The project involves the restoration of 40 ha of degraded forest using native species. Over a period of 10 years, approximately 9,512 tCO2-eq will be sequestered through the project’s intervention (EX-ACT: 2. Land Use Change. 2.2. Afforestation and Reforestation). The FAO EX-ACT result sheet is included as Annex P of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

1. **Project Taxonomy**

Please update the table below for the taxonomic information provided at PIF stage. Use the GEF Taxonomy Worksheet provided in Annex F to find the most relevant keywords/topics/themes that best describe the project.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4 |
| Influencing Models | Transform policy and regulatory environments  |   |  |
| Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making  |  |  |
| Stakeholders | Private Sector | Capital providers, Financial intermediaries and market facilitators, Individuals/Entrepreneurs  |  |
| Beneficiaries/ Local Communities/ Civil Society | Community Based Organization, Non-Governmental Organization, Academia, |  |
| Type of Engagement,  | Information Dissemination, Partnership Consultation, Participation,  |  |
| Communications | Awareness Raising, Education, Public Campaigns, Behavior Change  |  |
| Capacity, Knowledge and Research | Capacity Development |  |  |
| Knowledge Generation and Exchange |  |  |
| Learning | Theory of Change, Adaptive Management, Indicators to Measure Change |  |
| Knowledge and Learning, | Knowledge Management, Capacity Development, Learning |  |
| Stakeholder Engagement Plan |  |  |
| Gender Equality | Gender mainstreaming | Beneficiaries, Women groups, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Gender-sensitive indicators |  |
| Gender results areas | Access and control over natural resources, Participation and leadership, Access to benefits and services, Capacity development, Knowledge generation |  |
| Focal Area/Theme | Biodiversity  | Protected Areas and Landscapes, | Terrestrial Protected Areas, Coastal and Marine Protected Areas, Productive Landscapes  |
| Mainstreaming | Tourism, Agriculture & agrobiodiversity, Certification (national standards), Certification (International Standards) |
|  | Species | Threatened species, Invasive Alien Species (IAS) |
|  | Biomes | Mangroves, Wetlands, Rivers, Tropical Rain Forests, Tropical Dry Forests |
| Land Degradation | Sustainable Land Management | Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands, Ecosystem Approach,Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach, Sustainable Agriculture,Sustainable Pasture Management, Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management, Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques |
| Land Degradation Neutrality | Land Productivity, Land Cover and Land cover change |
| Food Security |  |
| Rio Marker | Climate Change Mitigation 1Climate Change Adaptation 0 |  |  |

**part ii: project justification**

**A. describe any changes in alignment with the project design with the original pif[[4]](#footnote-4)**

A.1. *Project Description*.

1) The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed. NA

2) The baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects.

1. The project will build upon the following baseline scenario:
2. Component 1. Systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management at national level. Government of Grenada’s baseline spending in support of the management of protected areas (PAs), forests, water resource management, and agriculture throughout the country is significant. The Environment Division will spend an estimated $6,130,525 USD from 2014-2018 in coordinating environmental policy, laws and programs; this level of annual expenditure of approximately $1,532,630 USD/year is expected to be maintained during project implementation (2018-2022). In addition to government budget allocations for PA management, the National Parks and Protected Areas (Fees) Order (1992) established fees for persons entering a national park or PA, and fees are also included in Schedule II of the Fisheries (Marine Protected Areas) Regulations. In 2011 the Ministry of Tourism collected $250,000 USD in fees from 6 of the 13 sites that they manage, while the Grenada Tourism Board and the Department of Forestry and National Parks collected approximately $10,000 USD in permit fees. User fees in place for the two existing marine PAs cover about 50% of recurring costs for one and 30% for the other. Currently the Land Use Division manages GIS information related to land cover, soil types, agriculture and PA coverage, much of which is outdated and limited, with no new land use survey data, biodiversity and ecological assessment information, or monitoring and tracking system. With the support of the Global Climate Change Alliance (GCCA) and the Organisation of the Eastern Caribbean States (OECS), and with funding from the European Union, the Government of Grenada (GoG) is implementing the iLAND Resilience Project, which focuses on sustainable development on small island states through SLM for climate change adaptation. As part of this initiative, the GoG recently completed the draft Land Use Policy; it also includes a rainwater harvesting project to mitigate the effects of drought.
3. Component 2. National capacity to provide financial, technical, and information services for CSA production. Government’s total 2016 allocation for Agriculture and Fisheries is $42.2 million USD and includes $32.9 million USD in capital expenditure. The Global Climate Fund (GCF) approved in February of 2018 the project Climate-Resilient Water Sector in Grenada (G-CREWS) for the management of Grenada’s water supply, including integrated natural resource/water resource management for Grenada’s watersheds and SLM practices, which will coincide with this projects implementation. Out of the complete GCF project, co-financing synergies will be particularly established with its components on water demand management and institutional strengthening for a water resource management unit (budgeted to $2.5 million USD). As such, this project will coordinate with the GCF initiative to ensure effective synergies with respect to the promotion of sustainable practices and management in the target areas in all 3 Components of this project (its national impact as well as its focal target areas in St Andrew’s, St David and St Patrick parishes), including the issue of the use of non-treated water sources for agricultural purposes along with regulatory and management aspects.
4. Component 3. Operationalisation of resilient agricultural practices. The National Agriculture Plan is also a key baseline initiative for this project as it outlines strategies and objectives for sustainable climate resilient agricultural production to ensure food security in the face of changing climactic conditions, as well the importance of integrated management of natural resources (including forests, PAs and biodiversity) into the agriculture sector. Other climate smart agriculture initiatives have been initiated in Grenada which this project will build on: Caribbean Agriculture Research and Development Institute (CARDI) has been undertaking cassava (a climate resilient root crop) research and training experimenting with fertilizer regime for enhanced yield, consumer and processing awareness ($150,000 USD annual budget); Grenada Organic Agriculture Movement (GOAM) is promoting increased use and production of organic materials in farming; the Programme on Integrated Climate Change Adaptation Strategies in Grenada (ICCAS, 2013-2018) is funding community level climate change adaptation initiatives, a few of them addressing agriculture and land use practices (UNDP $1.3 million USD) and has established a demonstration site/model farm in Mt Moritz, Beausejour watershed (GIZ $3.1 million USD). The UK Infrastructure Fund’s Feeder Road Project ($10 million USD, 2016-2020) will improve road access to agricultural lands (damaged in Hurricane Ivan), enabling farmers to access abandoned plots. The World Bank/Climate Investment Fund’s Pilot Program for Climate Resilience/ Disaster Vulnerability and Climate Risk Reduction Projects (PPCR/RDVRRP) Project contributes to evaluation and improvement of degraded areas with forest rehabilitation, securing water capacity, and improving watershed management activities, which this project can build upon ($34.3 million USD, 2011-2016). This project builds on the PPCR forest rehabilitation lessons learned of areas that were destroyed by Hurricane Ivan (2004) and Emily (2005) as well as incorporate that project’s development of a forestry nursery at Grand Etang as a propagation center for forest restoration being carried out under this project.The recently created Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning, and Physical Development will be leading the implementation of the OECS Regional Agriculture Competitiveness Project in Grenada (2018-2023) to enhance access to markets and sales for farmers and fishers selected through competition, as well as their allied aggregators and agro-processors, in Grenada though a loan from the World Bank and with a total investment of $8.3 million USD. In addition, the same ministry will be leading the implementation of the Climate-Smart Agriculture and Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP; 2018-2022), which has as its development objective to improve the livelihoods of the beneficiaries through accessing new jobs, starting up businesses, or consolidating new businesses and adopting CSA practices. This $12 million USD investment includes a loan from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), a loan from the Caribbean Development Bank (CDB) ($3 million USD), and investment from the GoG, beneficiaries, and the Grenada Investment Development Corporation.

3) The proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[[5]](#footnote-5) strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project.

The project design is closely aligned to the original PIF. The structure of the project components closely resembles the PIF that was approved by the GEF. A description of the project components is included in Section V: Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. In addition, minor changes were made to the project’s outputs, which do not represent a departure from the project’s strategy as defined originally in the PIF nor will they have an impact on the funds originally budgeted. These changes are described as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| PIF Outputs (Component 1) | Project Document Outputs (Component 1) |
| 1.1 Information management database and monitoring system established and operationalized within a land use planning process, with comprehensive land use survey to support land use planning, baseline terrestrial biological/ecological assessment, assessment of existing of KBAs, and a profile of water sources. A central spatial biodiversity, ecosystem and land use database developed including a Land Use and Biodiversity Monitoring and Tracking Tool, with monitoring programmes developed and initiated.  | 1.1 A central geospatial biodiversity, ecosystem, and land use database and monitoring system to be assessed, updated, and operationalized within the national land management policy in the national and legal regulatory framework with comprehensive land use survey to support land use planning, baseline terrestrial biological /ecological assessment, assessment of existing key biodiversity areas (KBAs), and a profile of water sources.This output was modified considering that the Land Use Division already has a geographic information system (GIS) with information related to land cover, soil types, agriculture, and PA coverage, and instead of establishing a new information management database and monitoring system the project will update and operationalize the GIS as a central spatial information management database for SLM, CSA, and biodiversity and ecosystem conservation within the framework of the national land use policy.  |
| PIF Outputs (Component 2) | Project Document Outputs (Component 2) |
| 1.2 Regulatory, coordination and planning framework strengthened integrating SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation with improved management of Grenada’s 7 KBAs and threatened species of national and global significance (i.e. 2 single island endemics). | 1.2 Regulatory, coordination, and planning framework strengthened, integrating SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation, with improved management of Grenada’s 7 KBAs and threatened species of national and global significance (i.e. 2 single island endemics).The project will not invest in the finalization of draft Land Policy Enabling Act with preparation of the necessary regulations, as this activity is the process of being finalized as part of the of the baseline. In addition, the project will only invest in the development of one management plan for La Sagesse, as the management plan for the Levera is being developed through the GEF project [GEF ID 5069] *Ridge to Reef Approach to Protecting Biodiversity and Ecosystem Functions within and Around Protected Areas* [the R2R Project]) that is currently under implementation. Other activities identified in the PIF related to this output remain the same. |
| PIF Outputs (Component 3) | Project Document Outputs (Component 3) |
| 3.1 CSA and SLM practices implemented in St David, St Andrew, and St Patrick parishes (2,400 ha). This will include: (i) restoration of higher and mid-belt native forest and agroforestry areas degraded by extreme weather events; (ii) adaptive livestock management (e.g. through high protein plants used for fencing and fodder); (iii) adaptive agriculture practices for short crops and dry forest conservation in coastal areas. Demonstrations include 3 protective structures (including shade houses) for adaptive crop production located in different climatic zones, serving as national learning centers/model farms applying variety of crops and cultivation techniques, as well as demonstrating suitable business models for replication. | 3.1 CSA and SLM practices implemented in St David, St Andrew, and St Patrick parishes. This will include: (i) restoration of riparian buffer zones of higher and mid-belt native forest and agroforestry areas degraded by extreme weather events and unsustainable production practices; (ii) adaptive livestock management (e.g. through high protein plants used for fencing and fodder); (iii) adaptive agriculture practices for short crops and dry forest conservation in coastal areas. Demonstrations include 3 protective structures (including shade houses) for adaptive crop production located in different climatic zones, serving as national learning centers/model farms applying variety of crops and cultivation techniques, as well as demonstrating suitable business models for replication.Reference to the extension where CSA and SLM practices will be implemented was removed, and included as part of the related outcome: Land area within 2,400 ha is managed under SLM supporting CSA. |
| Output 3.2 Biodiversity conservation expanded and integrated with CSA and SLM measures in La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed in: (i) upland watershed areas buffering Grand Etang NP and Mt St Catherine’s (proposed) NP, (ii) lowland to upland riparian zone, and (iii) lowland dry forest areas (i.e. establishment of 2 tropical dry forest coastal sites as national parks). Landscape level threats to biodiversity reduced through IAS/disease control: i) Batrachochytrium (Chytrid fungus) in high mountain strata, ii) bamboo removal in the mid-level strata, and iii) control of Herpestes auropunctatus (small Indian Mongoose) in Grenada’s coastal dry forest ecosystem encompassing 5 KBAs, with native and endangered biodiversity impacted (i.e. CR Grenada Dove). | 3.2 Biodiversity conservation expanded and integrated with CSA and SLM measures in La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed, and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed. in: (i) upland watershed areas buffering Grand Etang NP, (ii) lowland to upland riparian zone, and (iii) lowland dry forest areas (i.e. establishment of 1 tropical dry forest coastal site as national park). Landscape level threats to biodiversity reduced through IAS/disease control: i) *Batrachochytrium* (Chytrid fungus) in high mountain strata, ii) bamboo removal in the mid-level strata, and iii) control of *Herpestes* *auropunctatus* (small Indian Mongoose) in Grenada’s coastal dry forest ecosystem encompassing 5 KBAs, with native and endangered biodiversity impacted (i.e. CR Grenada Dove).Instead of establishing two tropical dry forest coastal sites as national parks, only one site covering 23 ha (the La Sagesse Local Area Planning site) will be strengthened by establishing it as a national park. The second site originally considered (the 123-ha Levera National Ramsar Site) will be established as a national park though the GEF R2R Project currently under implementation. The project proposed herein will focus on the operationalization of the management plan for the Levera site. |
| PIF Outputs (Component 4) | Project Document Outputs (Component 4) |
| 4.3.Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of project implementation conducted, including through periodic field visits, tracking tool assessments, mid-term, and final evaluations of project.  | 4.3. Monitoring and evaluation of project implementation conducted for adaptive management, including periodic field visits, core indicators assessments, mid-term and final evaluations of project.This output was reworded to emphasize how M&E will support adaptive management, and to eliminate reference to the tracking tools as the project will instead use core indicators according to new GEF7 guidelines. |

1. Direct Project Costs (DPCs) were added to the budget (following consultation with the partner and / or depending on the results of the HACT evaluation, if this was the case) to enable UNDP to provide the necessary support to the Government of Grenada in the implementation of the project.

4) [Incremental](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/incremental_costs)/[additional cost reasoning](http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1325) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, and [co-financing](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/co-financing).

1. There was an increase in cofinancing ($400,000 USD) that does not imply changes in incremental/additional cost reasoning of the project. In addition, there were changes in the sources of the cofinancing, which will come primarily from the Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning, and Physical Development as part of two loans to the GoG, one from the IFAD and the Caribbean Development Bank (*Climate-Smart Agriculture and Market Access Program*), and one from the World Bank (*OECS Regional Competitiveness Project*). These changes adhere to the recent restructuring within the GoG that resulted after Grenada’s General Election held in March 2018. The Ministry of Finance, Economic Development, Planning, and Physical Development replaces the Ministry of Agriculture, Lands, Forestry, Fisheries, and Environment as the project’s Executing Partner.

5) [Global environmental benefits](http://www.thegef.org/gef/GEB) (GEFTF)

1. Although there were no changes to the incremental/additional cost reasoning and approach, there some slight changes to the global environmental benefits to be delivered, which are highlighted below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Current Practice** | **Alternatives to be promoted by the project** | **Expected GEBs** |
| **Integrated Landscapes – National level** |
| Continued ineffective land use planning and watershed management processes, due to lack of centralized information management system and updated ecological and biological information and prevailing gaps in policies, legislation and supporting regulations (including an outdated PA System Plan and complete lack of regulation of water sources for non-treated water use in agriculture), continues lead to degradation of land and water resources, deforestation, forest fragmentation and biodiversity loss. Continued lack of systemic and institutional capacity for landscape management and biodiversity conservation prevails, limiting mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation into sector policies and actions, including the agricultural sector.  | Land use planning decision-making is informed and supported through:a) Current and accessible ecological and biological information managed in a centralized database that enables tracking and monitoring of ecological and land cover changes, including changes due to climactic changes and events.b) Completed, harmonized and implemented policy, planning and regulatory frames (including an updated PA System Plan, National Drought Management Policy that incorporates non-treated water use for agricultural sector and watershed management plans for target areas).Improved capacity building processes for biodiversity conservation and integrated land use management that is integrated into government’s ministerial education system. | **BD:** Improved management of landscapes covering *960 hectares*, maintaining globally important diversity and ecosystem services. Strengthened protection of BD from an updated system plan and a strengthened PA estate (establishment of the 23-ha La Sagesse Local Area Planning site as a national park), mainstreamed biodiversity into legislative and regulatory framework and strengthened institutional capacity for BD management and BD assessment techniques. (*Area no longer includes the 123-ha Levera Ramsar site, which is being established through the GEF R2R Project and is thus reduced from 1,389 to 960 ha.*)**LD-3**: The adoption of integrated natural resource management practices across the broader landscape (in forest lands and neighboring agricultural / grazing landscapes) covering 1,480 hectares, contributing to: (1) maintaining the functions and sustainability of natural ecosystems and agroecosystems (e.g., through ensuring sustainable levels of offtake and the application of agricultural practices that protect soil capital), and (2) flows of ecosystem goods and services, thus reducing negative impacts on BD. (*Area of landscape under SLM in production systems reduced from 3,135 to 2,400 ha under sustainable agroecological systems; the difference resulted from a more detailed analysis conducted during the PPG using land use data and expert opinion rather than the percent estimates used during the PIF stage, for the flowing production systems within the prioritized watersheds: i. agriculture (including food crops, tree crops, and crops-livestock); ii. rangeland, iii. forestry; and iv) mixed systems.*)500 ha of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations (*unforeseen at the PIF stage*)40 hectares of land restored leading to 9,512 tCO2-eq sequestered over 10 years (*GEB not accounted at the PIF stage*) |
| **Climate Smart Agriculture and Sustainable Land Management** |
| National capacities for support services: Continued lack of national capacity to provide effective information, technical and financial services, accessible to producers in a user friendly way and with climate risk criteria and guidance integrated. Operational CSA capacities and practices by producers: Continued agricultural production practices and uncontrolled cattle grazing without applying CSA and SLM techniques, resulting in further degradation of land and water resources, cumulative effect of climactic events in watersheds and biodiversity loss. Continued limited mainstreaming and integration of biodiversity conservation into land management planning for key BD, with lack of BD incorporated into integrated watershed or natural resource management, inadequate coverage of dry forest protection and little intervention with invasive species such as mongoose and invasive bamboo continues to invade watersheds and riparian zones. | National level financial support systems that incentivize SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation are strengthened / established / operationalized. National level capacities in climate early warning and information systems, soil and water quality monitoring, quarantine to prevent IAS and pests, and upgraded and climate proofed propagation centers support CSA production and climate resilient agricultural varieties for food security.Degraded watershed areas are actively managed and restored for habitat integrity and biodiversity, incorporating climate resilient and biodiversity friendly agricultural production (including irrigation techniques, soil and water conservation measures, use of climate resilient crops and shade houses), as well as sustainable rangeland management practices. Communities and farmers access to CSA capacity building opportunities increase, with support of demonstration sites that are national learning centers for CSA (with production business model for replication, and national support systems - see above).Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed into integrated watershed management and CSA and SLM practices, including incorporating biological riverine corridors into watershed management plans, reducing species and landscape level threats to biodiversity (IAS) and legal establishment of 2 dry forest PAs in watershed lowland areas with demarcation, management plans and institutional level operations supported. | **LD-1**: Increased financing for SLM and CSA by 17% from the baseline amount. (*Target for increased financing reduced from 20%* *to 17% based on a realistic assessment of resources flowing to SLM from diverse sources anticipated by the Government of Grenada/Ministry of Agriculture.*)Increased land area under climate-smart agriculture practice with improved climate risk management system.**BD**: Securing of the long-term conservation status of globally important forest habitats in the project area, covering: (1) at least 1040 ha dry tropical dry forest ecosystem and its biodiversity (lower watersheds, 5 KBAs, potential *Leptotila wellsi* habitat); (2) 620 ha (indicative) of watershed riparian zone; (3) improved conservation of 2 globally threatened species (Grenada Frog *Pristimantis euphronides,* Grenada Dove *Leptotila wellsi*) through control of IAS/disease; and (4) nesting sea turtle beaches protection enhanced through improved enforcement. (*No change*)The project’s target watersheds include biodiversity of global significance and extend into the Grand Etang and proposed Mt St Catherine Forest Reserve, both KBAs. Endemics found in the upper watersheds include: (1) endangered endemic Grenada Frog (Mt St Catherine); (2) 6 of Grenada’s 7 restricted range bird species (Green-throated Carib *Eulampis holosericeus*, Antillean Crested *Hummingbird Orthorhyncus* cristatus, Caribbean Elaenia *Elaenia martinica*, Grenada Flycatcher *Myiarchus nugatory*, Lesser Antillean Bullfinch *Loxigilla noctis,* Lesser Antillean Tanager *Tangara cucullata -* Grand Etang FR, likely Mt St Catherine, TBD by biological assessment, component 1); (3) endemic plants (Grand Etang Fern (*Danaea sp.)* and the Cabbage Palm (*Oxeodoxaoleracea*) and one tree species (*Maythenus grenadensis*). Lowland biodiversity significance includes: (1) threatened tropical dry forest ecosystem (including 5 KBAs); (2) mangrove in all 3 watersheds and the RAMSAR wetland site in St Patrick. Grenada Bank endemics found in these watersheds also include the tree boa (*Coralis grenadensis*). |

6) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

1. An updated description of the project’s innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling-up is included in Section V. Results and Partnerships (South-South and Triangular Cooperation [SSTrC] and Sustainability and Scaling-Up) of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

*A.2.* *Child Project?* If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

No

A.3. *[Stakeholders](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/Public_Involvement_Policy.Dec_1_2011_rev_PB.pdf)*. Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment. Please refer to Annex F of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

1. The successful implementation of the project will largely depend on the effective communication and coordination with the multiple project stakeholders and the implementation of mechanisms to ensure these stakeholders’ participation. The key national and sub-national stakeholders include the Forestry and National Parks Department, the Environment Unit, the Land Use Division, the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, the Ministry of Tourism, the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Works (Physical Planning Unit), and NAWASA, among others. At the local level, the most relevant stakeholders are the parish governments (St. David, St. Andrew, and St. Patrick), organizations of small- and medium-size farmers, producers’ associations (e.g., nutmeg and cocoa), women’s groups, and local communities. Private sector agencies and financial institutions will play an active role in the project by promoting sustainable production and CSA, supporting marketing strategies for sustainable and certified products, and facilitating access to financial incentives for farmers. The extensive stakeholder consultations and engagement that began during the PPG phase will be continued throughout project implementation. To achieve this the project will make use of several mechanisms, including: a) Project Inception Workshop, where the project will be presented to both direct stakeholders and the public; b) Project Board: will be comprised of representatives of the governmental agencies, private sector, and special interest groups and will be responsible for approving the work plans, participation in the recruitment processes, and provide overall strategic guidance to the project; c) Project Management Unit (PMU): responsible for the implementation of the stakeholder engagement plan, communications plan, gender action plan, grievance redress mechanisms, and M&E; d) Communications and Dissemination of Information: the PMU will implement a stakeholder’s communication plan to ensure communication with all stakeholders using a variety of methods (meetings telephone calls, listserv, WhatsApp, etc.), will hire the services of communication specialists to achieve the objectives of the plan, and will have active knowledge management with the documentation of processes and lessons learned, which will be shared with all stakeholders; e) Local Committees to facilitate local stakeholder participation: will be established at the Parish or watershed level for the three parishes where project activities will be implemented and in Carriacou and Petit Martinique through which the project will share approaches and strategic actions with local stakeholders; f) Gender Action Plan: will secure the involvement of both genders, but especially women who are often marginalized and whose participation in agricultural and natural resource-based activities is low compared to men; g) Grievance Mechanism: will be established and published so that all stakeholders are aware of its existence, allowing the documentation of any potential grievances and ensuring they are addressed in a timely manner; h) Activities, Training, and Engagement Plans: will use a participatory approach that is rights-based and integrates the perspectives of all stakeholders using bottom-up approaches and integrating the different views of local stakeholders and beneficiaries; and i) Decentralized M&E: including meetings with the local committees, interviews with direct beneficiaries, local and national participatory workshops, and meetings with special groups such as women to verify indicators. A Communications Knowledge Management Expert will be hired on a part-time basis who will be responsible for developing the project communications strategy at the project outset and coordinating its implementation across all project components, among other activities. The Communications Expert will work closely with the M&E Expert on knowledge management and M&E aspects of the project.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

[ ] Consulted only;

[x] Member of Advisory Body; contractor;

[ ] Co-financier;

[ ] Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body;

[ ] Executor or co-executor;

[ ] Other (Please explain)

*A.4.* [*Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.*](http://www.thegef.org/gef/policy/gender) Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment (Please refer to Annex G of the GEF-UNDP Project Document)

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women’s empowerment? (yes [x]  /no[ ] ) If yes, please upload gender action plan or equivalent here.

|  |
| --- |
| **Gender Action Plan** |
| **Component 1**: Systemic and institutional capacity for integrated landscape management at the national level. |
| **Output 1.1.** A central geospatial biodiversity, ecosystem, and land use database and monitoring system to be assessed, updated, and operationalized within the national land management policy in the national and legal regulatory framework. |
| Gender-related activity | Indicator | Target | Baseline | Budget (USD) | Timeline  | Responsibility |
| Provide Gender equality sensitization training to major project stakeholders including policy makers and local level stakeholders for gender mainstreaming in the project. | Level of understanding among policy makers and local level stakeholders of gender issues  | 100% of participants achieve a 75% score in the post training test as a demonstration of their understanding of the same | 0% | 5,000 | *Year 1* | Project Gender ExpertGender Bureau,Division of Gender and Family AffairsMinistry of Social Development, Housing, and Community Development |
| Develop gender responsive tools for the collection of relevant gender-specific data on land use, biodiversity, natural resources management and ecosystem services use in project watershed areas to inform a gender responsive analysis of project watershed areas | Availability of gender responsive tools for the collection of data  | A suite of gender responsive data collection tools developed | No tools have been developed | 25,000 | *Year 1* | Gender ExpertLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| Conduct a participatory gender responsive analysis of land use, biodiversity, natural resources management and ecosystem services use in project watershed areas in Grenada | Number of gender responsive analysis completed of land use, biodiversity, natural resources management and ecosystems services benefits in project watershed areas | 5 watershed areas with gender responsive analysis of land use, biodiversity, natural resources management and ecosystems services benefits (La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed, Carriacou, and Petit Martinique) | Gender responsive analysis does not exist at the watershed level | *Year 1* | Gender ExpertLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| Conduct gender responsive training and capacity building for the collection of gender specific data and use in the development of policies to build national and local/watershed capacity. | Number of gender responsive training events for the collection of gender specific data in support of project activities  | At least 4 training events: 2 national level (e.g., Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, agricultural statutory bodies) and 2 at the local/watershed level (community-based and producer organizations, private sector) | 0 | *Year 1* | Gender ExpertGender Bureau,Division of Gender and Family AffairsMinistry of Social Development, Housing, and Community Development |
| Include sex disaggregated data for the five prioritized watersheds into the project supported information management database | Percent of sex disaggregated data by sage, diversity of women and men, community, income levels, social status, cultural factors, land tenure, natural resources and ecosystem uses for the five prioritized watersheds included in the information management database | 100% of gender responsive data collected, included in the information management database | 0% (information management database has not been developed) | *Year 1* | Gender ExpertLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| **Output 1.2.** Regulatory, coordination, and planning framework strengthened, integrating SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation. |
| Input gender responsive socioeconomic indicators into the PASP development | Gender responsive PASP addresses the different needs and vulnerabilities of women and men and with mechanism to promote their participation in its implementation | Gender-responsive PASP developed | PASP has not been developed | 5,000 | *Year 1* | Gender ExpertForestry and National Parks DepartmentPA Planning Expert |
| Include gender considerations into the management plan for La Sagesse PAs | Number of management plans that address women and other socially vulnerable groups’ needs, and with mechanisms to promote women’s participation and the sustainable use and conservation of dry forest | One (1) gender-responsive management plan for prioritizes dry forest site/PA | Management plan have not been developed | 2,500 | *Years 1 and 2* | Gender ExpertForestry and National Parks Department |
| Identify and develop gender indicators for the management plan for La Sagesse dry forest site/PA as well as for monitoring and evaluation purposes | Number of management plans with gender responsive indicators | One management plans with gender responsive indicators developed | Management plans have not been developed |
| Include gender considerations in the National Drought Management Policy and related legislative instruments  | Gender responsive National Drought Management Policy  | Gender responsive National Drought Management Policy developed | National Drought Management Policy and related legislative instruments have not been developed | 5,000 | *Years 1 and 2* | Gender ExpertLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| Include gender considerations into the management plans for project prioritized watersheds | Number of management plans for prioritized watersheds which address women and men, and other socially vulnerable groups’ needs, and with mechanisms to promote women’s participation and the sustainable use and conservation of dry forest/PAs | Five (5) gender-responsive watershed management plans: La Sagesse, Great River and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick watersheds and 2 island watershed management plans for Carriacou and Petit Martinique | 0 (watershed management plans have not been developed)  | 2,500 | *Years 1 and 2* | Gender ExpertLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| Establish watershed-level committees (La Sagesse, Great River, and Levera/Levera Pond/St. Patrick watersheds and Carriacou and Petit Martinique) with women representation | Level of women participation in watershed-level committees/  | A minimum of 50% female membership and female participation in leadership in watershed-level committees | Watershed-level committees not established  | 500 | *Year 2* | Gender ExpertLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| **Output 1.3.**Biodiversity conservation and land use management capacities improved through training of personnel in biodiversity conservation and land use management. |
| Develop materials to document women experiences and to raise public awareness about women/s needs expectations regarding SLM, biodiversity conservation and CSA | Percent of training and public awareness materials and curricula produced that include women’s experiences and information disaggregated by gender | A minimum of 30% of training materials, public awareness materials, and curricula developed in SLM, biodiversity conservation, and CSA include women experiences information disaggregated by gender | Training materials not developed | 5,000 | *Year 1* | Communication and Knowledge Management ExpertGender Expert |
| Ensure that the selection of attendees for outreach training includes women | Percent of women participation in all training  | A minimum of 30% of the training recipients are females | Recipients not selected  | No associated cost | *Year 1* | Project TeamLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| Provide training and outreach in communities that is conducive to women’s participation, including possible assistance with childcare  | Percent of training events in communities with child care assistance being provided if needed | A minimum of 50% of the training conducted in communities with childcare assistance if needed | Training not commenced | 2,000 | *Years 1 to 3* | Project TeamLand Use Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| **Component 2**: National capacity built to provide financial, technical, and information services for CSA production. |
| **Output 2.1.** Support systems for incentivizing CSA, SLM, and conservation-oriented agricultural practices are strengthened/established/operationalized. |
| a. Conduct a gender analysis of CSA, SLM and conservation oriented agricultural practices segment of the value chain.b. Conduct a market analysis and develop an action plan to ensure that women have access to incentives to promote CSA, SLM, and conservation-oriented agriculture practices | Proportion of women with access to microcredit, certification of agriculture products, and markets | Minimum of 40% of beneficiaries of incentives and access to markets to promote CSA, SLM, and conservation-oriented agriculture practices are women | Access to incentives and markets for agriculture products as a result of the project yet to commence | 3,000 | *Years 2 to 4* | Company providing certification-related servicesFinancial Expert |
| **Output 2.2.** Soil and water quality monitoring and advisory programme enhanced. |
| Provide support for strengthening of capacities among youth environmental NGOs to engage in undertake land management and climate change resilience projects  | Percent of women beneficiaries from support to youth environmental NGOs | A minimum of 30% of beneficiaries are young women | Support for youth environmental NGOs yet to commence | 1,250 | *Year 1* | SLM Specialist |
| Disseminate soil test results/soil nutrient content farmers and technical extension service providers for crop production planning. | Percent of women farmers benefiting from soil test results/soil nutrient content information to improve crop production planning | A minimum of 30% of beneficiaries are women | Analysis of soils and nutrient content yet to commence | 750 | *Year 2* | SLM Specialist |
| Provide training to farmers, and community groups in loan management and in propagation techniques, maintenance, and documentation | Percent of women farmers benefiting from training | A minimum of 30% of beneficiaries are women | Training not commenced | 8,250 | *Years 1 to 3* | Company providing training services with support from project Gender Expert |
| **Output 2.3.** National supply of climate-resilient crop varieties enhanced. |
| Conduct demonstration activities in propagation stations enhanced by the project and supply climate-resilient crop varieties | Number of women benefiting annually from demonstration activities and supply of climate-resilient crop varieties | Between 210 and 300  | Training not commenced | 5,000 | *Years 1 to 3* | Extension Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands |
| **Component 3**: Operationalization of climate-resilient agricultural practices. |
| **Output 3.1.** CSA and SLM practices will be implemented in St. David, St. Andrew, and St. Patrick parishes.  |
| Gender-related activity  | Indicator  | Target  | Baseline  | Budget (USD)  | Timeline  | Responsibility  |
| Support the implementation of CSA and SLM practices, including women farmers, in St. David, St. Andrew, and St Patrick parishes  | Level of participation of women in the implementation CSA and SLM practices | A minimum of 30% of beneficiaries implementing CSA and SLM practices are women | Beneficiaries not selected  | 98,000 | *Years 2 to 4* | CSA/SLM SpecialistGender Expert  |
| Training of small farmers for the implementation of SLM/CSA activities, including women | Percent of women farmers benefiting from training | A minimum of 30% of beneficiaries are women | Training not commenced |
| **Output 3.3.** CSA and integrated rangeland management system in Carriacou and Petit Martinique demonstrated.  |
| Support the implementation of CSA and rangeland management initiatives, including women farmers, in Carriacou and Petit Martinique | Level of participation of women in CSA and rangeland management initiatives  | A minimum of 30% of beneficiaries are women | Recipients not selected  | 65,340 | *Years 2 to 4* | CSA/SLM SpecialistGender Expert  |
| Training of small farmers, including women farmers, for the implementation of CSA and rangeland management initiatives | Percent of women farmers benefiting from training | A minimum of 30% of beneficiaries are women | Training not commenced |
| **Output 3.4.** Small businesses will be supported for agroprocessing and agrotourism, processing CSA crops, and supporting sustainable rural livelihoods and education on CSA-SLM practices (including women, men, and youth). |
| Support ten small community-based businesses agroprocessing and agrotourism businesses in their CSA and SLM initiatives, which will contribute to the adaptation of farming systems to climate change, among other benefits | Number of grants benefiting women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small business | 5  | 0  | 153,000 | *Years 1 to 3* | Multi-stakeholder group selection committee |
| Capacity building and support for women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small business receiving technical assistance in production, labeling, and marketing of CSA products and collaboration with and support of community-based and producer organizations | Number of women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small business receiving technical assistance | 5  | 0  | 51,000 | *Years 1 to 4* | Company to improve the competitiveness of small community-based businessesGender Expert |
| **Component 4**: Knowledge management for SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation.  |
| **Output 4.1.** : Technical knowledge captured, experiences and lessons learned disseminated, and incorporated into institutional strengthening and capacity-building.  |
| Gender-related activity  | Indicator  | Target  | Baseline  | Budget  | Timeline  | Responsibility  |
| Integrate women’s experiences into knowledge products that will incorporate institutional strengthening and capacity building initiatives, for continued institutional and private sector learning and activity implementation | Percent of knowledge products reflecting women’s portrayal and lessons learnt featuring women’s experiences  | 100% | No knowledge products developed | 5,640 | *Years 1 to 4* | Communication and Knowledge Management ExpertGender Expert |
| Establish a monitoring system to learn from the SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions, including gender-based indicators  | Monitoring system to learn from the SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions | Monitoring system includes gender-based/SMART indicators | Monitoring system not developed | 10,800 (estimated as 25% of the salary of the project M&E Expert) | *Year 1* | Communication and Knowledge Management ExpertGender Expert |
| **Output 4.2.** Media products will promote outreach and increased public awareness/environmental education of SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation. |
| Ensure that the materials produced encourage the use of inclusive gender-neutral language and that women are depicted | Percent of materials produced use inclusive language with depictions of women | 100%  | Media products not produced | 5,640 | *Years 1 to 4* | Communication and Knowledge Management ExpertGender Expert |
| **Output 4.3.** M&E of project implementation conducted for adaptive management.  |
| Monitor indicators in the project results framework, including gender related indicators data disaggregated for men and women | Level of women participation in monitoring and evaluation activities | 100 % of project M& E activities with women participation | None, project M&E activities have not started | 10,800 (estimated as 25% of the salary of the project M&E Expert) | *Years 1 to 4* | Gender ExpertM&E Expert |
| Gender ExpertM&E Expert |
| Ensure a proportionate number of men and women respondents are included in the project surveys and robust baseline data collected, where possible | Gender ExpertM&E Expert |
| Establish during the mid-term and final evaluations and other M&E activities, differentiated spaces for consultation and dialogue, only with female referents on the one hand and male referents on the other | 2,915 (determined as 50% of the cost of MTR and TE workshops and travel costs or M&E Expert)  | *Years 1 to 4* | Independent EvaluatorsM&E Expert |
| *Total budget allocation (USD):* | 473,885 |  |

If possible, indicate in which results area(s) the project is expected to contribute to gender equality:

[ ]  closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

[x]  improving women’s participation and decision making; and or

[x]  generating socio-economic benefits or services for women.

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators? (yes [x]  /no[ ] )

* Change in income level from $4,400 USD /year to $5,500 USD/year by project end in households that farm (crop and livestock production) in the prioritized watersheds, with beneficiaries disaggregated by gender.
* At least 210 men farmers and 90 women farmers accessing climate-resilient crop varieties and implementing SLM and improved rangeland management.
* Five (5) women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small businesses supported by the project in their CSA and SLM initiatives.

*A.5 Risk.* Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

1. An updated description of the project’s risk is included in Annex H: UNDP Risk Log of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

*A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.* Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

1. Institutional arrangements are described in Section IX: Governance and Management Arrangements of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. In addition, an updated description of the coordination with other relevant GEF-financed and other initiatives is included in Section V. Results and Partnerships of the UNDP-GEF Project Document.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 *Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

1. The project will provide monetary and non-monetary benefits to the local stakeholders, including community members, small-scale farmers, and owners of small businesses who participate in agroprocessing and agrotourism independently of their conditions, and will result in the following: a) implementation of CSA and SLM practices and rangeland management in farms in the prioritized watersheds and an increase in the income level of participating farm households; b) technical support to small farmers to access loans under favorable conditions; c) support for the certification of local products for domestic and international markets, including support for the commercialization of certified and non-certified SLM/CSA products; and d) improved competitiveness of 10 small businesses (eight agroprocessors and two agrotourism businesses) and their suppliers implementing CSA/SLM initiatives, including access to a grant instrument to support their activities. The project has a strong training component that will benefit the following: a) staff from the Forestry and National Parks Department and Land Use Division, and the Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique in biodiversity conservation and land use management, including agricultural technicians in the Ministry of Agriculture and Lands; b) student/youth practicums for the collection of baseline data for key indicator species and availability of water resources and changes in land use/land cover; c) small farmers for the implementation of SLM/CSA activities, rangeland management systems, soil and water management, and biodiversity conservation in the five prioritized watersheds, as well as for the certification process, and management and planning skills (record-keeping systems for certification/accreditation process); and d) food processing businesses to implement good hygienic practices and food safety systems (Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points/ISA [HACCP/ISO] 22000) to comply with certification standards.
2. The recovery and restoration of riparian buffer zones using local vegetation species will prevent soil erosion and reduce contaminant loading into the streams, which will contribute to avoiding the contamination of water bodies and ecologically sensitive areas as well as water drinking sources, providing a healthier environment for local communities. Through the conservation and sustainable use of key ecosystems (e.g., riparian forests, agroecosystems, and coastal wetlands and beaches), ecosystem services will be enhanced (nutrient cycling, shoreline stabilization and coastal erosion control, carbon stocks, climate regulation, and habitat for biodiversity) with a positive impact on the well-being of the communities in the five prioritized watersheds. The project will directly benefit at least 210 men farmers and 90 women farmers accessing climate-resilient crop varieties and implementing SLM and improved rangeland management. In addition, the renovation of five national propagation stations, which will provide CSA material and will serve as demonstration and training sites for the implementation of best SLM practices, indirectly benefiting between 700 to 1,000 farmers annually. Finally, project training activities are expect to benefit at least 460 people.

A.8 *Knowledge Management.* Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and  plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

1. Project Component 4: Knowledge Management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservation outlines the knowledge management strategy for the project. This strategy includes specific outputs regarding how best practices will be documented and experiences will be shared with other biodiversity initiatives using new and existing information-exchange platforms. This will include: a) capturing technical knowledge and disseminating experiences and lessons learned, and incorporating them for institutional strengthening and capacity-building; and b) developing media products to promote outreach and increased public awareness/environmental education of SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation. In addition, the results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through a number of existing UNDP information-sharing networks and forums. A description of the knowledge management approach for the project is provided in Section V: Results and Partnerships of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, etc.:

1. The project builds on several ongoing initiatives being carried out by the GoG and is consistent with the Government’s priorities as set out in national policy documents and plans and projects. The Grenada Agriculture Policy sets forth the goal of ensuring an enabling environment that facilitates growth and the optimal use of the country's resources in the agricultural sector in a sustainable manner. The project will support the agricultural sector policy and plans that incorporate biodiversity: The National Agriculture Plan’s (2005) strategic objectives recognize the need for protected forests for integrated natural resource management (INRM; including water and biodiversity) as well as CSA. The Grenada National Water Policy outlines optimal and sustainable use of the country’s water. This project builds on and supports Government’s prioritization of integrated water resource management (IWRM) outlined in the Water Resources Management Unit and Action Plan for Implementation of the Grenada National Water Policy (2012). Project support for integrated watershed management supports the implementation of this Action Plan and the framework of IWRM as a best practice process, and mainstreaming biodiversity into the integrated watershed landscape in this project will further support this management framework and demonstrate biodiversity mainstreaming considerations into watershed management in the water sector.
2. The project also furthers the Grenada Declaration, where Grenada, at the 2006 8th Meeting of the Conference of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP 8) pledged to effectively conserve at least 25% of its near-shore marine area and at least 25% of its terrestrial area by 2020 and contribute to the sustainable livelihoods for its people and the protection of the world’s biodiversity. This project also supports the 1999 Cabinet-approved Forest Policy for Grenada, Carriacou, and Petit Martinique, whose objectives include to conserve species, ecosystems, and genetic diversity, and to maintain and enhance forest ability to provide goods and services sustainably and optimize contribution of forest resources to the social and economic sectors (proposed for updating under the GEF R2R Project). The project also focuses on the formal designation of one proposed PA outlined in Grenada’s PASP (2009-2014), furthering protection of globally threatened coastal dry forest. The National Strategic Development Plan (2007), which proposes that environmental considerations should be integrally linked to national development, identifies the need to link livelihoods and environmental sustainability, and advocates for better enforcement of laws to protect biodiversity. In addition, the Tourism Master Plan (1997) and the National Environmental Policy and Management Strategy (NEMS, 2005) supports Grenada’s commitment to the 2000 St. George’s Declaration of Principles for Environmental Sustainability, including, but not limited to, achieving the long-term protection and sustained productivity of the region’s natural resource base and the ecosystem services it provides, which this project further supports. The project clearly aligns with Grenada’s climate change policies and plans, including Grenada's National Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy (2014-2018), for which climate change adaptation is a pillar, as is the Cabinet’s decision that climate change considerations are integral to the new (2003-2021) National Physical Development Plan.
3. The proposed project also directly supports Grenada’s efforts to comply with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) through addressing priority actions in the 5th Report (Aichi Targets) and the draft National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP, 2015). This project contributes to the Aichi Targets by mainstreaming biodiversity into government and civil society through integration into the agricultural sector (Targets #1 and 2); reducing pressures on biodiversity through increasing effective management of agriculture and forestry (Target #7); further safeguarding threatened species, ecosystems, and ecosystem services through strengthening the PA estate by establishing a tropical dry forest coastal site as national park, i.e., the La Sagesse Local Area Planning; reducing threats to biodiversity and species of global significance and (IAS/disease) (Targets #11 and 12); and restoring and safeguarding essential ecosystem services through improved integrated watershed management (Target #14). The project also promotes the objectives of the newly aligned National Action Plan (NAP, 2015) to support the UNCCD, which seeks to prevent land degradation, restore 10% of degraded land by 2020, and mitigate the effects of drought and other climatic shocks using an integrated approach for land degradation reduction and drought mitigation. This project also supports Grenada’s commitments to the RAMSAR Convention (entered into force in Grenada on 22 September 2012), by supporting the management of Grenada’s sole RAMSAR site at Levera. Project objectives and actions also support the 2006 (revised) St. George’s Declaration of Principles for Environmental Sustainability, whose overall aim is to foster equitable and sustainable improvement in the quality of life in the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS) region.
4. The project is relevant to, and will contribute to, several of the SDGs: Goals 1, 5, 8, 13, and 15. The project will also contribute to the United Nations Multi-Country Sustainable Development Framework in the Caribbean (UN MSDF; 2017-2021), in particular with Strategy Area 4 Outcome: Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place.

**C. Describe the budgeted m &e plan:** The budgeted M&E plan is included in Section VIII: Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.

**PART iII: certification by gef partner agency(ies)**

1. **GEF Agency(ies) certification**

|  |
| --- |
| **This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies[[6]](#footnote-6) and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agency Coordinator, Agency Name** | **Signature** | **Date****(MM/dd/yyyy)**  | **Project Contact Person** | **Telephone** | **Email Address** |
| Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator. | Adriana_signature.png | 11/23/2018 | Dominique Roby, EBD UNDP GEF |       | Dominique.roby@undp.org |
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**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

|  |
| --- |
| **This project will contribute to the following Sustainable Development Goal (s):** Goal 1 – End poverty in all its forms everywhere; Goal 5 – Achieve gender equality and empower all women and girls; Goal 6 – Ensure access to water and sanitation for all; Goal 8 – Decent work and economic growth; Goal 13 – Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts; and Goal 15 – Sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, halt biodiversity loss. |
| **This project will contribute to the following country outcome included in the UNDAF/Country Programme Document (UN MSDF):** Strategy Area 4 Outcome:Policies and programmes for climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and universal access to clean and sustainable energy in place. |
| **This project will be linked to the following output of the UNDP Strategic Plan:**1.4.1 Solutions scaled up for sustainable management of natural resources, including sustainable commodities and green and inclusive value chains. |
|  | **Objective and Outcome Indicators** | **Baseline**  | **Mid-term Target** | **End of Project Target** | **Data Collection Methods and Risks/Assumptions** |
| **Project Objective:** To operationalize integrated agroecosystem management through mainstreaming biodiversity conservation in the production landscape and increasing resilience of agricultural system  | Mandatory indicator 1: Number of new partnership mechanisms with funding for SLM/CSA solutions and for biodiversity and ecosystem services at national and/or sub-national level by project end | 0 | 0 | A least 2(Target will be confirmed during the first year of project implementation) | Document content analysis Signed agreements/MOU |
| Risks: Project team and Implementing Partner fail to engage new project partnersAssumptions:Willingness by decision makers to incorporate objectives of biodiversity conservation and SLM in production landscapes |
| Mandatory indicator 2: Number of direct project beneficiaries with increased livelihoods created through CSA, SLM, and rangeland management in the project prioritized landscapes, disaggregated by sex, as a result of the project GEF7 Core Indicator 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment | 0 | Male: between 245 and 319 annuallyFemale: between 105 and 137 annually (Target will be validated during the first year of project implementation) | Male: between 700 and 910 annuallyFemale: between 300 and 390 annually(Target will be validated during the first year of project implementation) | Farmer and household surveys/interviews (unstructured and/or semi structured) Updated Gender Action PlanUpdated GEF7 Core Indicators |
| Risks: Landowners are reluctant to incorporate SLM or CSA activities on their private lands, in the lack of land use zoning and regulationsAssumptions: Government officials and farmers and producer organization in the prioritized watersheds will be actively engaged in CSA, SLM, and biodiversity conservation activities. |
| Indicator 3: Number of integrated watershed management plans integrating biodiversity conservation, SLM and CSA covering at least 50% of the 5 prioritized watersheds and operationalized | 0 | 2 | 5 | Document content analysis Approved management plans and implementation reportsUpdated Stakeholder Engagement Plan |
| Risks: Project team fails to engage stakeholders for participatory plan development1. Assumptions:
2. Interest from the central government, private sectors and farmers in integrated watershed management
 |
| **Component 1:** Systemic and institutional capacity increased for integrated landscape management at the national levelOutcome 1.1: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in land use planning and management practices, and in the agricultural sector policies and legislation, as a result of improved systemic and national institutional capacity for landscapes management for biodiversity conservationOutcome 1.2: Strengthened systemic and institutional capacity for promoting SLM  | Indicator 4: Number of cross-sectoral collaboration/ agreements established for land use planning and management | 0 | 1 | 3 (signed Memorandum of Understanding with three of following: Ministry of Education; Grenada Tourism Authority; Ministry of Works/Physical Planning Unit; and Solid Waste Management Authority(Target will be confirmed during project implementation) | Document content analysis Signed agreements |
| Risks: Project team and Implementing Partner fail to engage key project partnersAssumptions: Continued political will to strengthen the national governance framework to integrate SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation |
| Indicator 5: Change in the capacity of key government institutions for biodiversity conservation and land use management as measured through the UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard | Forestry and National Parks Department 16 (36%) Land Use Division 14 (31%)Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique: 12 (27%) | Forestry and National Parks Department 43% Land Use Division 38%Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique: 34% | Forestry and National Parks Department 51% Land Use Division 46%Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique: 42% | UNDP Capacity Development Scorecard: focal group interviews |
| Risks: Knowledge drain and implementation capacity constraints at government due to the staffing limitationsAssumptions: Sampling efforts are optimalBeneficiaries apply additional knowledge acquired |
| Indicator 6: Change in the level of awareness among stakeholders in the St. David, St. Andrew, and St. Patrick parishes and in Carriacou and Petit Martinique about biodiversity conservation, SLM, and CSA objectives as measured through the KAP/B Index | To be determined during first year of project implementation | To be determined during first year of project implementation | To be determined during first year of project implementation | KAP/B Index updates: individual/group questionnaires |
| Risks: Some of the target population is not receptive to the awareness activities and can soon forget about biodiversity conservation, SLM, and CSA benefitsAssumptions: Design of index and sampling efforts are optimal |
| **Component 2:** National capacity built to provide financial, technical, and information services for CSA productionOutcome 2.1: Increased financing for supporting SLM and CSA at the national level Outcome 2.2: National level capacities enhanced for CSA production | Indicator 7: Financing for supporting SLM and CSA nationally   | 6,000,000 USD[[7]](#footnote-7)   | 6,600,000 USD | 7,200,000 USD (17% increase)[[8]](#footnote-8) | Individual and/or focal group structured interviews and document content analysisGovernment financial/funding reports (Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Agriculture and Lands, etc.) |
| Risks: Target to may not be achieved because of decreasing national budgets and donor fundingAssumptions: There is interest by the Government and donors investments in SLM and CSA  |
| Indicator 8*:* Area (ha) within the watersheds of Great River, La Sagesse and St. Patrick where climate resilient crops are successfully implemented | 140 ha | 180 ha over the baseline  | 300 ha over the baseline | Field and farmer surveysProject and field reports |
| Risks: Landowners are reluctant to incorporate CSA activities on their private lands, in the lack of land use zoning and regulationsAssumptions: There is willingness by farmers to adopt CSA practicesEnvironmental variability within normal rangeSampling efforts are optimalIn country capacity to implement CSA |
| Indicator 9: Number of women benefiting annually from demonstration activities and supply of climate-resilient crop varieties | 0 | Between 210 and 300 | Between 210 and 300 | Household gender-based surveys/interviews (unstructured and/or semi structured) Updated Gender Action Plan Project reports |
| Risks: Gender barriers are difficult to overcome limiting women participation Assumptions: Continued interest from women to participate in the projectDemonstration and propagation centers timely upgraded and operating normally  |
| **Component 3:** Operationalization of resilient agricultural practices Outcome 3.1: Land area within 2,400 ha is managed under sustainable land management supporting CSA, evidenced by: and increased household income level with beneficiaries disaggregated by gender.Outcome 3.2: Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha | Indicator 10: Soil erosion rate (ton/ha/year) in steep and upland areas in three prioritized watersheds: La Sagesse Watershed, Great River Watershed and Levera/Levera Pond/St Patrick Watershed | 7.11 ton/ha/year[[9]](#footnote-9)(Baseline and targets to be confirmed during the first year of project implementation) | 6.57 ton/ha/year | 6.04 ton/ha/yr. | Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE) 1.06 (www.ars.usda.gov; assessment method will be confirmed during project implementation)Project and field reports  |
| Risks: Extreme climatic events and hazards jeopardize the SLM measures introducedAssumptions:Willingness by the farmers to incorporate environmental sustainability criteria/ Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) as part of their production activities. Sampling/measurements are optimal |
| Indicator 11: Income level ($/year) of beneficiary households (disaggregated by gender) by project end | Farmers (crop and livestock production): 4,400 USD Five (5) women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small business: X USD(Baseline and target will be determined and/or confirmed during the first year of project implementation; data will be disaggregated by gender)  | Farmers (crop and livestock production): 4,400 USD Five (5) women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small business: X USD | Farmers (crop and livestock production): 5,500 USD Five (5) women-owned agroprocessing and agrotourism small business: X USD | Household surveys/interviews (unstructured and/or semi structured)Projections made based on the Grenada Census of Agriculture 2012.(Methodology for data gathering will be revised during the first year of project implementation)Project reportsGender Action Plan |
| Risks:Climate change jeopardize the SLM measures introduced and consequently cause declines in agricultural production and livelihoodsThe time frame of the project is too short to shift people from their current livelihood activitiesGender barriers are difficult to overcome limiting women participationAssumptions: Interest from farmers in adopting CSA and sustainable production practiceThere is interest from women owners to incorporate CSA and SLM practices as part of their businessesOptimal sampling |
| Indicator 12: Change in area affected by major IAS species (bamboo and small Indian Mongoose) in six prioritized sites by end of project:a) Bamboo removed in the mid-level strata/riparian zones of the La Sagesse Watershed b) Removal *of Herpestes auropunctatus* (small Indian Mongoose) annually from dry forest areas including KBAs (Mt St Catherine, Grand Etang, Levera, Perseverance, Mt Harman)  | 0a) Bamboo: 0 hab) Small Indian Mongoose: 0 individuals | X% reduction(Targets to be defined during the first year of project implementation)a) Bamboo: 15 hab) Small Indian Mongoose: of at least 1,305 individuals removed | X% reductiona) Bamboo: 40 hab) Small Indian Mongoose: at least 1,305 individuals removed  | Bamboo: field/plot surveysSmall Indian Mongoose: Participatory trapping (e.g., cat live traps)Baseline assessment reportsField survey reports  |
| Risks: Areas cleared of IAS are rapidly recolonized by the same speciesAssumptions: Removal of IAS is cost-effectiveSampling efforts are optimal |
| Indicator 13: Population of endangered species  | Grenada Dove (*Leptotila wellsi*): 136 individuals\*Grenada Frog (*Pristimantis euphronides*): X\*\*Leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*): X\*\*Hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*): X\*\*\*Baseline and target to be confirmed during the first year of project implementation; baseline base on Rusk, B, 2017.\*\* Baseline and target to be determined during the first year of project implementation | Grenada Dove (*Leptotila wellsi*): 136 individualsGrenada Frog (*Pristimantis euphronides*): XLeatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*): XHawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*): X | Grenada Dove (*Leptotila wellsi*): Up to 154 individualsGrenada Frog (*Pristimantis euphronides*): XLeatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*): XHawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*): X | Grenada Dove: censuses using territory mapping/spot mapping[[10]](#footnote-10)Grenada Frog: seasonal visual counts and acoustic detection; trappingSea turtles: Individuals/nest nightly visual counts and patrolsField survey reports  |
| Risks: Lack of interest from government to further protect endangered species and their habitat (dry, coastal scrub-woodland, sandy beaches)Assumptions: Conservation efforts are effectiveOptimal sampling |
| Indicator 14: Changes in cover (ha) of key ecosystems in five prioritized watersheds | Dry forest: XCloud forest: XMangroves: XRiparian forest: XTurtle nesting beaches: X (Baseline and target to be determined during the first year of project implementation) | Dry forest: XCloud forest: XMangroves: XRiparian forest: XTurtle nesting beaches: X | Dry forest: XCloud forest: XMangroves: XRiparian forest: XTurtle nesting beaches: X | Change Detection Analysis (baseline will be determined using existing satellite imagery within the Land Use Division obtained in 2017).Project reports and maps |
| Risks: Lack of Government and stakeholders to conserve critical ecosystemsAssumptions: No changes in land use/Land cover change Optimal sampling |
| Indicator 15 (GEF7 Core Indicator 4): Area (ha) of landscapes under improved practices | 0 | 890 | 2,963 | Land use surveys in prioritized watersheds Grenada) and in Carriacou and Petit MartiniqueField reportsUpdated GEF7 Core Indicators |
| Risks: Changes to the use of lands and resourcesAssumptions: There is willingness by farmers to incorporate environmental sustainability criteria as part of their production activities |
| Indicator 16 (GEF7 Core Indicator 6): Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent) | 0 | 0 | 9,512[[11]](#footnote-11) | Updated FAO Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) Updated GEF7 Core Indicators |
| Risks: changes in land use/coverAssumptions: Environmental variability within normal ranges |
| **Component 4:** Knowledge management for SLM, CSA and biodiversity conservationOutcome 4.1: Increased adoption of practices as a result of the dissemination of knowledge and best practices developed under this project. | Indicator 17: Number of documents on successful experiences about CSA, SLM and biodiversity conservation practices, and gender mainstreaming disseminated in national institutions and among Ministry of Agriculture and Lands extension centers that serve farmers around Grenada  | 0 | 5 | 10 | Document content analysis Project documents and reportsDocuments with project lessons learned |
| Risks: NAAssumptions: Wide-ranging and timely dissemination |
| Indicator 18: Number of sub-national or local institutions that adopt recommendations resulting from SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions by project end | None, as the project has not yet begun implementation |  | At least 5 (one per watershed) | Document content analysis Surveys/interviews with local authoritiesLand use planning documents  |
| Risks: Limited interest in replicationAssumptions: Wide-ranging and timely dissemination of project results and lessons learned |

**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).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewer’s comments** | **Responses** | **Reference in CEO Endorsement Document**  |
| **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement (FSP)/Approval (MSP): January 5th, 2017** |
| *3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?*This is largely a land degradation project that is looking at the landscape approach, which requires an integration of varying activities and a look at various drivers. The resubmission appears to have addressed the key drivers of the local context. In the PPG phase we expect that these will be expanded in greater detail and infused into the Theory of Change. It does help that the implementing agency hosts the Environment and Agriculture mandates in one Ministry.In terms of scale and use, in the PPG phase, please consider the potential use of the database as a point of reference when prospecting for new sites for foreign investment related to tourism, mining or other sectors and should therefore be promoted widely.In the PPG phase, It would also be useful to consider how the project can link with SGP (Small Grants Program) for replication in other watersheds using community level projects/interventions. | Deforestation and fragmentation of forests, non-sustainable agriculture, and forest fires are among the main human-induced drivers of land degradation in Grenada. Governance, policy, and institution limitations are among the main underlying causes for land degradation in Grenada. A description of the drivers of land degradation in Grenada is provided in Section III: Development Challenge of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. The project will address drivers of land degradation at the national level in particular by building upon the existing Land Use Division GIS and its information and databases related to land cover, soil types, and agriculture. A LiDAR survey that was recently completed under the Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project supported by the World Bank that is used to develop thematic data, including vegetation cover and land use maps, will be used to update the GIS and databases. In addition, the project will contribute to the development of a national drought management policy that is harmonized with proposed policies under the UNCCD, and will improve the land use management capacities within the Land Use Division/Ministry of Agriculture to manage and implement relevant sustainable actions/solutions to reduce land degradation, as well as capacities to monitor and evaluate them (Component 2). At the watershed/local level, the project will implement CSA and SLM practices in St. David, St. Andrew, and St Patrick parishes, and CSA and integrated rangeland management in Carriacou and Petit Martinique (Component 3). The entire range of activities to be implemented are included as part of the description of Outputs 3.1 and 3.3 in the GEF-UNDP Project Document and will specially address human-induced drivers of land degradation. Finally, technical knowledge regarding SLM will be systematized and experiences and lessons learned disseminated to facilitate replication and scaling-up (Component 4). This strategy is part of the project’s Theory of Change.As suggested, the updated Land Use Division GIS and databases are being recommended to be used by the GoG as a point of reference when scoping for new sites for foreign investment related to tourism, mining, or other sectors.On the other hand, the GEF/UNDP-supported SGP in Grenada is funding small community initiatives that address deforestation, land and soil degradation, and CSA, including rainwater harvesting and exploring the use of liquid fertilizer from the Sargassum seaweed, upon which this project can build. During the PPG, contact was established with Mrs. Simone Lewis, National Coordinator for SGP in Grenada, who participated in the 2-day Project Results Framework as part of the process for building synergies with the SGP (see Annex M: List of People Consulted During Project Development). In addition, as part of the support provided to 10 small businesses (agroprocessing and agrotourism businesses), the project will establish a grant instrument with the objective of supporting their CSA and SLM initiatives. The decisions to award funds will follow a similar structure as the GEF/UNDP SGP model, including grant approval process, programmatic and operational risk management, among other aspects. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section III, Section IV, Section V, Annex M |
| *4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?*During the PPG, please consider synergies with additional background work done, on the FAO produced Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) Country Profile https://ccafs.cgiar.org/publications/climate- smart-agriculture-grenada#. WBikAWyQyUk ; and The Japan Climate Change Project (regional), which may have activities, related to water resources management and sustainable agriculture. http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view\_file.cfm?doc\_id=84256[http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/projects/environment\_and\_energy/japan- caribbean-climate-change-partnership.html](http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/projects/environment_and_energy/japan-%20caribbean-climate-change-partnership.html) | Thank you for the suggestion. The paper was used as a reference in the development of the UNDP-Project Document. Citation: World Bank, CIAT, CATIE. 2014. Climate-Smart Agriculture in Grenada. CSA Country Profiles for Latin America Series. Washington, DC: The World Bank Group.The project will also build synergies with the Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J-CCCP; 2015-2019), which is designed to strengthen the capacities of countries in the Caribbean to invest in climate change mitigation and adaptation technologies, as prioritized in their Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMAs) and National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). The J-CCCP has UNDP as an implementing partner, which will facilitate cooperation and exchange of information. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section III |
| 5*. Are the components in* *Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?*During PPG, please take these comments into account:1.2 - i) the length of time it may take to develop legislative instruments and ensure that the relevant stakeholders responsible for moving these instruments through the system are involved from the beginning; ii) is there a legislative instrument backing the PA System Plan, as without this it may have little power iii) Community based organizations to assist with co-management of the watershed plans to ensure active support from the community level.2.1 - Please consider the need to possibly build the capacity of small farmers to be able access the financial and certification schemes (for e.g. training on putting together a loan application or business proposal etc.)Component 3 is very heavy in terms of the number of activities in various locations. In the PPG phase, please clearly identify a robust project management framework that will be able to implement all of these activities within the projected time frame.3.1 - There are many activities outlined in this Output. For better clarity, please consider adding a table outlining which activities would be undertaken in each of the watersheds and under each of the agricultural strata.3.2 Please consider including a map, highlighting the specific areas where the interventions outlined in Output 3.2 will be located.3.4- Please indicate if any of the proposed organizations received SGP support. In addition, whether or not there will be complementary support from a business support organization (e.g. a small business development agency or anything of that nature).Component 4- Please consider using community groups/NGOs to assist in capturing and share knowledge.In addition to the previous comments for the PPG, please keep in mind the continued development of SMART indicators for the conservation activities undertaken that are specific and provide more detail than hectares alone can. Also, please focus on the establishment of IAS programs that are sustainable and include provisions for their long-term implementation beyond the life of the project when necessary. | Output 1.2i) At the PIF stage, the project proposed the finalization of the draft Land Policy Enabling Act with preparation of the necessary regulations and the development of a National Drought Management Policy and related legislative instruments supported. The Land Policy Enabling Act has been completed as part of the baseline; accordingly, the project will only focus on the development of the National Drought Management Policy. During consultations held in the PPG phase with different top government officials, it was indicated that this is feasible during the life of the project (i.e., 4 years).ii) The existing legislation backing the PA System Plan is quite well defined. The 1990 National Heritage Protection Act; the 1991 National Parks and Protected Areas Act Implementation of the National Parks and Protected Areas Act; the Fisheries Act and Marine Protected Area Regulations; and the Forest, Soil, and Water Conservation Act currently provide the legislative tools to manage the system of parks and PAs. A summary of the relevant legislation is included as Annex O of the GEF-UNDP Project Document.iii) Watershed management plan development will include detailed environmental and socioeconomic characterizations of each watershed, including gender analysis of women’s use of natural resources and ecosystems services and their participation and leadership in decision making, as well as detailed mapping of community-based organizations. It will also support the establishment and/or strengthening of their watershed committees, including training to support data collection and management needs and making use of developing transferrable skills that support evidence-based decision-making, following the experience in the creation of a PA committee through the R2R Project (GEF ID 5069), and the active involvement of existing water management groups such as the Grenada Water Stakeholder Platform (GWaSP). Watershed committees will include representation from community-based organizations to assist with co-management in the implementation of watershed plans to ensure active support from the community level.Output 2.1As suggested, the project will build the capacity of small farmers to access the financial and certification schemes. In particular, training will be delivered for Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) certification of products for domestic markets and will include: a) gender-responsive participatory design of an appropriate training program on PGS; and b) training of farmers and provide technical support to farmers in practices to comply with certification. Underrepresentation of women farmers in the value chain will be addressed through specialized training programs identified through the needs assessment conducted as part of the gender analysis of the value chains.Component 3The management framework for the implementation of the proposed activities under Component 3 includes: a) Project Board, which will be composed of public, private, and civil society (including the Inter Agency Group of Development Organizations [IADGO], a network of local development organizations in Grenada), which among other things will review the project progress, and provide direction and recommendations to ensure that the agreed-upon deliverables are produced satisfactorily according to plans; IADGO will also serve as Senior Beneficiary and will be responsible for ensuring that the implementation of activities at all stages is monitored so that they meet the beneficiary’s needs and are progressing towards that target; b) Project Management Unit: composed of the Project Manager, a Gender Expert, a Communications Expert, an M&E Expert, a Safeguards Expert, and a Financial/Administrative Assistant who will ensure the timely and effective implementation of all project activities; and c) National Consultants and Experts: the project will rely on qualified National Consultants and Experts to provide technical support for the completion of activities under Component 3 (Annex C of the GEF-UNDP Project Document includes an overview of the technical consultancies that will support the implementation of activities under Component 3).Output 3.1As suggested, for clarity, a table was added as part of the description of Output 3.1 in the GEF-UNDP Project Document, which outlines the activities that would be undertaken in each of the watersheds and under each of the agricultural strata.Output 3.2As suggested, maps were included in the GEF-UNDP Project Document highlighting the specific areas where the interventions outlined in Output 3.2 will be located.Output 3.4The GEF/UNDP-supported SGP (Grenada) is funding small community initiatives that address deforestation, land and soil degradation, and CSA, including rainwater harvesting, upon which this project can build. The following organizations related to the project have received SGP support: Grenada Cocoa Association, T.A. Marryshow Community College (TAMCC), St Patrick Environmental and Community Tourism Organisation (SPECTO), Grenada Organic Agriculture Movement (GOAM), Petit Martinique Women in Action, and Minor Spices Co-operative (MSC). During the project implementation, a complete social and economic assessment of the five watersheds prioritized by the project will be completed, and which will allow the identification of additional organizations.In addition, a partnership with a local business development agency (e.g., the Grenada Investment Development Corporation [GIDC]) will be established to provide complementary support to improve the competitiveness at least 10 registered small agribusinesses (including agroprocessors and agrotourism businesses, and their suppliers) implementing CSA/SLM initiatives.Component 4As suggested, knowledge and experiences regarding CSA, SLM, biodiversity conservation practices, and gender mainstreaming will be captured with support from community groups and/or NGOs, including the development of media products, with assistance from community groups and/or NGOs, including women’s groups that contribute to identifying case studies and developing thematic reports related to gender mainstreaming for technical personnel and for community and producer organizations.SMART indicators were developed with the participation of multiple stakeholders during the 2-day workshop in Grenada, which were later validated during the project validation workshop. Multiple reviews by project stakeholders of earlier drafts of the GEF-UNDP Project Document provided additional opportunities to define the final set of indicators that were included in the Project Results Framework, such as the indicator about the status of the population of the endangered Grenada dove (*Leptotila wellsi*).The project will establish baselines to assess the status of IAS and threats to biodiversity in selected locations within the prioritized watersheds, will conduct cost assessments for their control, and will define a financial strategy to address sustainability concerns for IAS-related activities under the project. Baseline studies will provide the information to determine where is it more cost-effective to undertake IAS control activities. Control activities will have a demonstrative approach and will be integrally conceived with the learning and participation initiatives of the different projects to facilitate replication and scaling-up. The project will build on past and current initiatives in the control of IAS, including the GEF R2R Project (GEF ID 5069), where the removal of invasive bamboo is being piloted and lessons learned from this initiative will be incorporated as part of the sustainability of activities for the control of IAS. Participatory community science and youth engagement (through the IMANI program, a government-sponsored skills and training program for youth) will be a key tool in providing capacity through the Vector Control Unit for the control of the small Indian Mongoose (*Herpestes auropunctatus*), which will add to sustainability of the IAS activities. Sustainability will also come from incorporating control activities and practices into the different planning and policy tools of the project such as the PA System Plan, watershed management plans, and PA management plans, whose implementation will continue beyond the life of the project. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results |
| **STAP Scientific and Technical screening of the Project Identification Form (PIF). Date of screening:** **May 14, 2017** |
| 1. STAP recommends the Resilience, Adaptation Pathways and Transformation Assessment (RAPTA) Framework. RAPTA is a tool designed to support the application of resilience concepts during project planning and implementation. Using an integrative approach and close stakeholder engagement, RAPTA will assist the project proponents to describe and assess the social-ecological systems, and identify the need to adapt, or transform, based on the risks and shocks (e.g. climate risks) that may affect the system. STAP would be pleased to advise on the application of the RAPTA in the project design and implementation. The RAPTA guidelines can be found at: http://stapgef.org/rapta-guidelines | RAPTA approaches to project design were integrated into this GEF-6 Project by encouraging a thorough system analysis and design of options and implementation pathways. As outlined in the RAPTA Framework, the Project implemented a multi-stakeholder participatory engagement process with diverse knowledge, building solutions to diverse problems working across diverse scales and sectors. The Project gathered new information and technical data through technical reviews, extensive multi-stakeholder engagements processes/consultations, information that was essential to understanding the social-ecological systems and the development challenge that the Project seeks to address through its interventions to improve biodiversity conservation, reduce land degradation, and support gender inclusive sustainable livelihoods. In particular, and as outlined in the RAPTA System Assessment Phase, the Project identified and addressed information and capacity gaps at both the institutional and producer/farmers levels, as well as barriers to adaptation to potential risks and anticipated changes (i.e., limitations in the capacities of national governmental institutions to support biodiversity conservation, SLM, and CSA in the target landscapes; and increased frequency of extreme climatic events), gaps which in turn would influence decision making for biodiversity conservation SLM and CSA activities. During the design phase, information gathered supported, for example, the selection of activities that will be undertaken in each of the prioritized watersheds and under each of the agricultural strata (upper lands, lower lands, and coastal areas) considering the type of land degradation (e.g., flooding, climate variability, poor cultivation practices, etc.). The Project design enhances the availability of knowledge / decision making tools and capacities for enhancing CSA and SLM techniques and biodiversity conservation practices, both at the institutional level (e.g., Output 1.1, Output 1.3, and Output 2.2) and producer level (e.g., Output 3.1 and 3.3), supporting resilience to changing risks / shocks. The Project design provides the know-how to adapt to changes, both ecological and socio-economic, and demonstrate benefits of CSA, SLM and their post production use for enhancing sustainable livelihoods.This is further demonstrated through, for example, 1) carrying out a detailed baseline environmental and socio-economic / livelihood assessment for each prioritized watershed during year 1 of Project implementation to gather data to support gender responsive needs of producers and to incorporate climatic projections and preparedness to extreme events through climate early warning systems, 2) to enhancing capacity of government Extension Officers to respond to both the socio-economic and environmental risks and integrate CSA/SLM into their direct outreach activities with producers that responds to these needs and risks, and into annual work plans that will support sustainability of Project interventions; and 3) Project support for upgrading government propagation centers to support and demonstrate climate resilient practices and serve as national learning centers for all farmers and community members for CSA / SLM and climate resilient low-cost technologies that enhance production and support sustainable livelihoods. The Project’s knowledge management intervention will also be an iterative intervention process based on outputs for capturing and sharing knowledge, experiences, and lessons learned, and for encouraging widespread adoption of CSA, SLM, biodiversity conservation practices, and gender mainstreaming and for the monitoring of success of Project interventions. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships |
| 2. STAP also recommends for the project developers to work with stakeholders to evaluate alternative options and devise pathways for project implementation, including identification of indicators for key outputs and outcomes. RAPTA provides guidance on developing implementation pathways. | Project development included multiple consultations with project stakeholders at the local and national levels. Governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders were consulted through individual meetings, and an inception mission to Grenada was conducted from November 6-10, 2017 by the PPG team/project developers during which meetings and consultations were held with various stakeholders; governmental, nongovernmental, and community groups; and farmers. In addition, the team met collectively with governmental, quasi-governmental, nongovernmental, and civil society groups, NGOs, and CBOs, including farmers’ groups and cooperatives as well as a member of the private sector. From February 19-23, 2018, the project team conducted a second mission and a 2-day Project Results Framework Workshop with the objectives of 1) developing the Project Results Framework through a participatory process, including the validation of project outputs and identification of indicators using baseline information, targets, verification mechanisms, and assumptions; and 2) outlining the project activities for each output and implementation mechanisms and participation. During the validation workshop held on June 20, 2018, the project’s implementation mechanisms were further discussed and agreed upon. The Stakeholder Participation Plan for the project was developed considering the various stakeholders’ views, and agreements were reached that will be incorporated into the project. Annex F of the GEF-UNDP Project Document provides more information about the Stakeholder Engagement activities conducted during the PPG, and Annex M includes the list of the stakeholders who were consulted.  | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Annex F, M |
| 3. UNDP also may find the following paper of interest: Holdschalg, A. et al. (2016). "Caribbean island states in a social-ecological panarchy? Complexity theory, adaptability and environmental knowledge systems". Anthropocene 13. 80â€“93; which is based on a study in Grenada that stresses the importance of cross-scale connections of social-ecological systems in order to produce knowledge and information that allows a system to be resilient, based on opportunities to adapt or transform. | Thank you for the suggestion. The generation and dissemination of knowledge will include a monitoring system to learn from the SLM, CSA, and biodiversity conservation interventions conducted by the project, improving national, sub-national, and local technical capacities to plan, implement, and scale-up climate-resilient agricultural techniques and integrate biodiversity conservation into land use practices. This systemization of knowledge will occur at several levels, including at the project management level, stakeholder involvement and management level, and during the implementation of project activities to document good practices and knowledge generation at the local level. This, together with the compiling of lessons learned and good practices, including lessons learned and experiences from gender mainstreaming, and the communication of lessons learned using community-oriented media products and with the participation of community groups and/or NGOs, will allow integrating diverse knowledge systems, the role of experiences, as well as local/institutional learning. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results/Component 4 |
| 4. STAP notes that Grenada is implementing Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) targets. STAP encourages UNDP to link this project with Grenada's LDN planning. STAP suggests that UNDP take note of the LDN framework recently completed by the Science-Policy Interface of the UNCCD, which describes the scientific basis and principles for implementing LDN: <http://knowledge.unccd.int/knowledge-products-and-pillars/land-degradation-neutrality-ldn-conceptual-framework/spi-publication> | As suggested, the project activities will be linked with Grenada’s Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) planning process that is being led by the Land Use Division. Accordingly, the project will contribute to achieving the following national voluntary national targets: a) increase the fertility and productivity of 580 ha of croplands by 2030; b) transform 800 ha of abandoned croplands into agro-forestry by 2030; implement soil conservation measures on 120 ha of land by 2030; c) rehabilitate 100 ha of degraded forests in Grenada and Carriacou by 2030; e) increase forest carbon stocks by 10% by 2030; and e) rehabilitate 100 ha of Degraded Rangeland in Carriacou by 2030. Also, a description of the LND process in Grenada is described in Annex O: Legal and Institutional Framework (Land Degradation Policy Legal, and Institutional Framework) of the GEF-UNDP Project Document. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results/Output 3.1, Annex O |
| 5. In project preparation, STAP would like the proponents to provide further detail of the shade structures and their application and purpose. It is not clear what they are shading, and why they would be impervious to rainfall (they are stated as collecting water). Could shade trees be an effective alternative? | Protective shade structures will be installed as a research unit for testing the performance of new climate-resilient crop varieties. Shade houses will serve as protective structures against extreme rainfall and heat levels. Some vegetables, for example, are intolerant to high heat levels and also excessive rainfall, which tends to drown them at the seedling stage. The shade houses will protect these and other crops against these extremes. In addition, protective structures (including shade houses) will be used as demonstration sites for adaptive crop production located in different climatic zones, which will serve as national learning centers/model farms, applying a variety of crops and cultivation techniques, as well as demonstrating suitable business models for replication. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results/Output 3.1 |
| 6. STAP recommends conducting a market analysis (international and local markets) for the commercial crops the project intends to grow, certify, and sell (Component 3). In particular, it would be valuable to detail how the project will incentivize the demand for value-added projects in local and/or international markets. | The project will conduct a market analysis of domestic products and exports of Grenadian-certified climate-smart agroproducts as part of the activities under Output 3.4. This includes an analysis of mechanisms to incentivize the demand for value-added projects in local and/or international markets. The results of the analysis will be shared with small businesses and the government to support market development strategies. The project will build on this analysis to initiate concrete actions to incentivize demand from local and international markets for climate-smart, sustainable produce by building partnerships with local tourist hotels for direct sourcing of Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS)-certified organic produce. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results/Output 3.4 |
| 7. STAP encourages UNDP to embed learning about the impacts of certified agricultural products. STAP's advisory document on "Environmental Certification and the GEF" indicates the evidence on certification programs needs to be strengthened. Further information on how to design the project so that learning about certification is captured is available in STAP's advisory document: http://www.stapgef.org/node/1583. In addition, the project should specify the impact pathways through which certification will achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management. This will strengthen the monitoring of achievement of global environmental benefits, and meeting the project objective. | As part of the evaluation design of the certification of agriculture products/CSA, the project will include actions to learn about the impacts of certified agricultural products based on the recommendations included in the “Environmental Certification and the GEF – A STAP Advisory document.” STAP recommendations were considered in defining project activities related to certification of agriculture products/CSA, which will include: a) training of lead farmers to ensure compliance with certification schemes; b) conducting a market analysis to identify sufficient demand-side interest in certified products, including developing baseline information on production capacity, local skills, processing infrastructure, and marketing channels; c) selection of catchment areas that ensure sufficient supply-side interest; and d) identify among the economically feasible sub-sectors of production, those with higher potential and with an emphasis on value-added activities, including certification.A feasibility assessment conducted during the PPG phase with support from the International Trade Centre (ITC) and further consultations with farmer organizations indicated that the most suitable certification for these domestic markets is likely to be Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS), which have already been piloted by the Grenada Organic Agriculture Movement (GOAM). The activities for supporting PGS through the project include training of farmers and lead farmers in practices to comply with SLM and biodiversity conservation. In addition, an ex ante evaluation design will be undertaken to identify and collect data on the key factors that affect the outcomes to be measured, including the key environmental benefits produced by the certification scheme (reduction of farm pollution, increased cover cropping and habitat for biodiversity, reduced soil erosion); these data will contribute to the understanding about pathways of impact on biodiversity conservation and SLM. The project will also explore the feasibility for the implementation of third-party/international certification as a complement to PGS; a similar approach will be used in case third-party/international certification is used. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results/Output 2.1. |
| 8. Identifying initiatives, or organizations, in Grenada working on biodiversity and climate-smart agriculture will facilitate upscaling of learning and knowledge from on-going and past efforts. To complement the information in the PIF on coordinated initiatives, STAP suggests this paper that lists institutions and policies on climate smart agriculture in Grenada: http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/documents/CLIMATE\_SMART\_GRD.pdfThe paper should be useful for component 1(strengthening regulatory frameworks/enabling environment) and component 4 (on knowledge management). | Thank you for the suggestion. The paper was used as a reference in the development of the UNDP-Project Document. Citation: World Bank, CIAT, CATIE. 2014. *Climate-Smart Agriculture in Grenada*. CSA Country Profiles for Latin America Series. Washington, DC: The World Bank Group. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section III |
| 9. In addition, STAP encourages UNDP to draw from the experience and learning of the research program "Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security" (CCAFS) https://ccafs.cgiar.org/ to develop the components. CCAFS tools may also be valuable for the project. This includes the CSA programming and indicator tool: <https://ccafs.cgiar.org/csa-programming-and-indicator-tool#.WP-KZvnyuUk> | Thank you for the suggestion. The design of a central geospatial biodiversity, ecosystem, and land use database and monitoring system built upon the existing Land Use Division GIS will also consider the use of CSA-related tools such as the Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS) CSA programming and indicator tool. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results/Output 1.1 |
| 10. In component 3, STAP recommends using native species for the tree nurseries. If this is not possible, STAP recommends conducting a risk assessment of invasive alien species. | The project will replace the invasive bamboo in selected riparian areas with native species such as the Grenadian Gouti Tree (*Maytenus grenadensis*), the Grenadian Towel Plant (Rhytidophyllum caribaeum), *Lonchocarpus broadwayi*, and *Cyathea elliotti*, and will provide nursery seedlings of these and other native species as part of the effort to strengthen existing government facilities and the development of a forestry nursery at Grand Etang as a propagation center for forest restoration using native species. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results/Component 3 |
| **Comments submitted by council members on the GEF MAY 2017 Work Program** |
| **Canada** |
| The number of beneficiaries is mentioned under some project components. The total number of people that will directly benefit from the project should also be included in the results framework, and monitored and reported on. An estimated target is requested. | The project will directly benefit at least 210 men farmers and 90 women farmers accessing climate-resilient crop varieties and implementing SLM and improved rangeland management. In addition, the renovation of five national propagation stations, which will provide CSA material and serve as demonstration and training sites for the implementation of best SLM practices, will benefit between 700 to 1,000 farmers annually. As suggested, the total number of people who will benefit directly from the project is included in the Project Results Framework and is part of the new GEF 6 Core Indictors. | Part I: Project Information/Section B, Section EPart II: Project Justification/A.7 Benefits  |
| Project co-financing is slightly low – does the project proponent anticipate generating further co-financing? | There was an increase in project cofinancing by $400,000 USD; accordingly, the total project cofinancing is $14,093,000 USD (3.85:1 ratio). | Part I: Project Information/ Section C and signed co-financing letters |
| **Germany** |
| In-depth information on the existing policy and institutional context, such as on legislation, regulations and instruments in place, could facilitate measuring threats, analyzing underlying causes and could indicate gaps in the existing frameworks. In order to secure sustainable outcomes and impacts of the project Germany suggests considering the inclusion of such database in the design of the final proposal. | Included as suggested. Please refer to Annex O of the UNDP-GEF Project Document. | UNDP-GEF Project Document, Annex O |
| In order to increase the sustainability of the project (component 2.1 and 3.1, 3.2., 3.4. and component 4), Germany suggest outlining how communities and especially agricultural producers will be involved to secure active participation of all stakeholders. | Project development included multiple consultations with project stakeholders, including agricultural producers and producers groups. An inception mission to Grenada was conducted from November 6-10, 2017 by the PPG team/project developers, during which meetings and consultations were held with various stakeholders including producers’ organizations (Grenada Agriculture Farmers Organization, GARFOR Farmers Group, Grenada National Organization of Women, Grenada Cocoa & Nutmeg Associations, and Grenada Ecological Research and Resilience Organization) and agricultural producers in the St. Andrew’s Watershed. From Feb 19-23, 2018, the project team held a second mission and a 2-day Project Results Framework Workshop with the objective of developing the Project Results Framework through a participatory process, including the validation of project outputs and the identification of indicators, and to outline the project activities for each output and implementation mechanism and participation of agricultural producers, among other stakeholders. During the validation workshop held on June 20, 2018, the project’s implementation mechanisms and the participation of agricultural producers were further discussed and agreed upon. The Stakeholder Participation Plan for the project was developed considering the stakeholders’ views, and agreements were reached with the agricultural producers and producers’ organizations consulted for their participation in Component 2 (Outputs 2.1, 3.1, 3.2, and 3.4) and Component 4, as well as Component 1 (development of watershed management plans and participation watershed management committees). The details of this participation are included in the description of the activities related to project components in the GEF-UNDP Project Document; Annex F provides further information about the Stakeholder Engagement during the PPG and Annex M includes the list of the agricultural producers and producers organizations consulted.  | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results, and Annexes F and M |
| Specific activities within the watersheds are dependent on micro-conditions, including microclimate and other factors such as soil types and gradient, which would dictate the crops and methodologies for CSA used. Preliminary data on these could be used to present more concrete information on the nature of the interventions within each of the watersheds. Germany suggests that the full proposal should be supplemented by additional maps of the project region (vegetation types, watersheds, socioeconomic indicators) in order to further assist in prioritization of activities within each watershed. | Additional maps of the project region (vegetation types, watersheds, socioeconomic indicators) are included in Annex L of the GEF-UNDP Project Document: Target Landscape Description; this information was used to further assist in prioritization of activities within each watershed. The development of a watershed management plan (Output 1.2) will provide additional baseline environmental and socioeconomic information for the prioritization of activities within each watershed. | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships/ Expected Results,Annex L |
| A close coordination with other relevant ongoing activities and initiatives is strongly recommended. Supporting the STAP recommendations, Germany additionally suggests analyzing information provided under the following links and considering possible synergies in the final project proposal: CATS Programme on: Marine Interventions including Lionfish (http://caribbeancats.org/index.php/components/coastal\_and\_marine/moliniere- beausejour/ ),Climate Smart Agriculture and Waste water management (customized biogas digesters)(http://caribbeancats.org/index.php/Grenada/Composting/. http://caribbeancats.org/index.php/low-chemical-agricultural-practices/ http://caribbeancats.org/wordpress/wp-content/plugins/download- attachments/includes/download.php?id=2759 ),Water quality monitoring and training (http://caribbeancats.org/index.php/water- quality-assessment-in-the-moliniere-beausejour-watershed/). | Thank you for the suggestions regarding the Caribbean Aqua-Terrestrial Solution (CATS) Programme, which was implemented by the German Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) between 2013 and 2017. The project will conduct a thorough assessment of the national soil fertility and water quality testing capacity (Output 2.2), giving due consideration to past assessment reports and building upon past experiences as the water quality assessment in the Moliniere-Beausejour Watershed completed as part of CATS. The project will also support the establishment of a central composting unit for the production and distribution of organic manure among participating farmers (Output 3.1); lessons learned from the CATS Programme will be considered, which piloted composting-activities with the North-East Farmers’ Organisation (NEFO), which operates in some the project’s priorities watersheds.  | GEF-UNDP Project Document, Section V. Results and Partnerships |

 **Annex C: status of implementation of project preparation activities and the use of funds[[12]](#footnote-12)**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

|  |
| --- |
| PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **130,000** |
| ***Project Preparation Activities Implemented*** | ***GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount ($)*** |
| ***Budgeted Amount*** | ***Amount Spent To date*** | ***Amount Committed*** |
| Projet Preparation Activities for the design of full project document for “Climate Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management” | 130,000 | 130,000 | 0 |
| **Total** | **130,000** | **130,000** | **0** |

**annex D: calendar of expected reflows (**if non-grant instrument is used**)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA

**Annex E: GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet**

 **Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Ha (achieved at TE)** |
| n/a | 23 |  |  |

*Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the two sub-indicators (1.1 and 1.2) for that stage.*

**1.1 Terrestrial protected areas newly created**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Total Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Total Ha (achieved at TE)** |
| n/a | n/a |  |  |

*Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all individual PAs reported in the next table, for that stage.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name of Protected Area** | **WDPA ID** | **IUCN Category** | **Total Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Total Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Total Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Total Ha (achieved at TE)** |
| La Sagesse Local Area Planning  | 14188 | Local Area Planning is a national designation with no reported IUCN Management Category. The project will establish the site as a national park (IUCN Management Category II). | 23 | 23 |  |  |

**Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Ha (achieved at TE)** |
| n/a | 3,860 |  |  |

*Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the four sub-indicators (4.1, 4.2, 4.3 and 4.4) for that stage.*

**4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (qualitative assessment, noncertified)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Qualitative description at PIF** | **Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Qualitative description at CEO ER** | **Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Qualitative description at MTR** | **Ha (achieved at TE)** | **Qualitative description at TE** |
| 960 | Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha, indicated by: (i) active management of riparian and gazette and management of dry forest conservation areas; (ii) reduction of IAS threats to biodiversity in dry forest areas; and (iii) stable or improved population and distribution of Grenada Dove. | 960 | Biodiversity conservation mainstreamed in management of landscapes covering 960 ha, indicated by: (i) active management of riparian and gazette and management of dry forest conservation areas; (ii) reduction of IAS threats to biodiversity in dry forest areas; and (iii) stable or improved population and distribution of Grenada Dove. |  |  |  |  |

*Add rows as needed.*

**4.2 Area of landscapes that meet national or international third-party certification and that incorporates biodiversity considerations**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Type of Certification at PIF** | **Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Type of Certification at CEO ER** | **Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Type of Certification at MTR** | **Ha (achieved at TE)** | **Type of Certification at TE** |
| n/a | n/a | 500 | Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS) for domestic markets; Grenada Bureau of Standards (GBS) accreditation; Organic, Fair Trade, and/or Rainforest Alliance (third party certification) |  |  |  |  |

*Add rows as needed.*

**4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  **Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Description of Management Practices at PIF** | **Ha (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Description of Management Practices at CEO ER** | **Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Description of Management Practices at MTR** | **Ha (achieved at TE)** | **Description of Management Practices at TE** |
| 3,135 | Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes) | 2,400 | Sustainable agroecological systems: agricultural and rangeland management practices supporting CSA, forestry and mixed systems |  |  |  |  |

*Add rows as needed.*

**Core Indicator 6: Greenhouse gas emissions mitigated (metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GHG emission type** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (expected at PIF)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (expected at CEO ER)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (expected at MTR)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (expected at TE)** |
| **Lifetime direct project GHG emissions mitigated** | n/a | 9,512 |  |  |
| **Lifetime direct post-project emissions mitigated** |  |  |  |  |
| **Lifetime indirect GHG emissions mitigated** |  |  |  |  |

*Figure at a given stage must be the sum of all figures reported under the first two sub-indicators (6.1 and 6.2) for that stage.*

**6.1 Carbon sequestered or emissions avoided in the sector of Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GHG emission type** | **Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (baseline at PIF)** | **Ha (expected at CEO ER)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (baseline at CEO ER)** | **Ha (expected at MTR)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (above baseline at MTR)** | **Ha (expected at TE)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (above baseline at TE)** |
| **Lifetime direct project GHG emissions mitigated** | n/a | n/a | 40 | 9,512 (to be confirmed during project implementation)  |  |  |  |  |
| **Lifetime direct post-project emissions mitigated** | n/a | n/a | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |
| **Lifetime indirect GHG emissions mitigated** | n/a | n/a | TBD | TBD |  |  |  |  |

**6.2 Emissions avoided**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GHG emission type** | **Ha (expected at PIF)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (baseline at PIF)** | **Ha (expected at CEO ER)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (baseline at CEO ER)** | **Ha (achieved at MTR)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (above baseline at MTR)** | **Ha (achieved at TE)** | **Metric tons CO2-eq (above baseline at TE)** |
| **Lifetime direct project GHG emissions mitigated** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |
| **Lifetime direct post-project emissions mitigated** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |
| **Lifetime indirect GHG emissions mitigated** | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |  |  |

**6.3 Energy saved (megajoules)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Intervention** | **MJ (expected at PIF)** | **MJ (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **MJ (achieved at MTR)** | **MJ (achieved at TE)** |
| n/a | n/a | n/a |  |  |

*Add rows as needed.*

**6.4 Increase in installed renewable energy capacity per technology (megawatts).**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type of Renewable Energy** | **MW (expected at PIF)** | **MW (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **MW (achieved at MTR)** | **MW (achieved at TE)** |
| [biomass, geothermal,ocean, small hydro, solar photovoltaic, solar thermal, wind power, and storage] | n/a | n/a |  |  |

*Add rows as needed.*

**Core Indicator 11. Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Total number (expected at PIF)** | **Total number (expected at CEO Endorsement)** | **Total number (achieved at MTR)** | **Total number (achieved at TE)** |
| **Women** | n/a | Between 300 and 390 women farmers annually |  |  |
| **Men** | n/a | Between 700 and 910 men farmers annually |  |  |
| **Total** | n/a | Between 1,000 and 1,300 farmers annually |  |  |

**Annex F: GEF Project Taxonomy Worksheet**

Use this Worksheet to list down the taxonomic information required under Part I, item F by ticking the most relevant keywords/ topics/themes that best describe this project.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** |
| [x] **Influencing models** |  |   |   |
|  | [x] **Transform policy and regulatory environments** |   |   |
|  | [x] **Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making** |   |   |
|  | [ ] **Convene multi-stakeholder alliances** |   |   |
|  | [ ] **Demonstrate innovative approaches** |   |   |
|  | [ ] **Deploy innovative financial instruments** |   |   |
| [x] **Stakeholders** |  |   |   |
|  | [ ] **Indigenous Peoples**  |   |   |
|  | [x] **Private Sector** |   |   |
|  |  | [x] Capital providers |   |
|  |  | [x] Financial intermediaries and market facilitators |   |
|  |  | [ ] Large corporations |   |
|  |  | [ ] SMEs |   |
|  |  | [x] Individuals/Entrepreneurs |   |
|  |  | [ ] Non-Grant Pilot |   |
|  |  | [ ] Project Reflow |   |
|  | [x] **Beneficiaries** |   |   |
|  | [x] **Local Communities** |   |   |
|  | [x] **Civil Society** |   |   |
|  |  | [x] Community Based Organization  |   |
|  |  | [x] Non-Governmental Organization |   |
|  |  | [x] Academia |   |
|  |  | [ ] Trade Unions and Workers Unions |   |
|  | [x] **Type of Engagement** |   |   |
|  |  | [x] Information Dissemination |   |
|  |  | [x] Partnership |   |
|  |  | [x] Consultation |   |
|  |  | [x] Participation |   |
|  | [x] **Communications** |  |  |
|  |  | [x] Awareness Raising |  |
|  |  | [x] Education |  |
|  |  | [x] Public Campaigns |  |
|  |  | [x] Behavior Change |  |
| [x] **Capacity, Knowledge and Research** |  |  |  |
|  | [ ] **Enabling Activities** |  |  |
|  | [x] **Capacity Development** |  |  |
|  | [x] **Knowledge Generation and Exchange** |  |  |
|  | [ ] **Targeted Research** |  |  |
|  | [x] **Learning** |  |  |
|  |  | [x] Theory of Change |  |
|  |  | [x] Adaptive Management |  |
|  |  | [x] Indicators to Measure Change |  |
|  | [ ] **Innovation** |  |  |
|  | [x] **Knowledge and Learning** |  |   |
|  |  | [x] Knowledge Management |  |
|  |  | [ ] Innovation |   |
|  |  | [x] Capacity Development |   |
|  |  | [x] Learning |   |
|  | [x] **Stakeholder Engagement Plan** |   |   |
| [x] **Gender Equality**  |  |   |   |
|  | [x] **Gender Mainstreaming** |  |   |
|  |  |  [x] Beneficiaries |  |
|  |  |  [x] Women groups |   |
|  |  |  [x] Sex-disaggregated indicators |   |
|  |  |  [x] Gender-sensitive indicators |   |
|  | [x] **Gender results areas** |  |   |
|  |  | [x] Access and control over natural resources |  |
|  |  | [x] Participation and leadership |   |
|  |  | [x] Access to benefits and services |   |
|  |  | [x] Capacity development |   |
|  |  | [x] Awareness raising |   |
|  |  | [x] Knowledge generation |   |
| [x] **Focal Areas/Theme** |  |   |   |
|  | [ ] **Integrated Programs** |  |  |
|  |  | [ ] Commodity Supply Chains ([[13]](#footnote-13)Good Growth Partnership)   |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Sustainable Commodities Production |
|  |  |   | [ ] Deforestation-free Sourcing |
|  |  |   | [ ] Financial Screening Tools |
|  |  |   | [ ] High Conservation Value Forests |
|  |  |   | [ ] High Carbon Stocks Forests |
|  |  |   | [ ] Soybean Supply Chain |
|  |  |   | [ ] Oil Palm Supply Chain |
|  |  |   | [ ] Beef Supply Chain |
|  |  |   | [ ] Smallholder Farmers |
|  |  |   | [ ] Adaptive Management |
|  |  | [ ] Food Security in Sub-Sahara Africa      |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Resilience (climate and shocks) |
|  |  |   | [ ] Sustainable Production Systems |
|  |  |   | [ ] Agroecosystems |
|  |  |   | [ ] Land and Soil Health |
|  |  |   | [ ] Diversified Farming |
|  |  |   | [ ] Integrated Land and Water Management |
|  |  |   | [ ] Smallholder Farming |
|  |  |   | [ ] Small and Medium Enterprises |
|  |  |   | [ ] Crop Genetic Diversity |
|  |  |   | [ ] Food Value Chains |
|  |  |   | [ ] Gender Dimensions |
|  |  |   | [ ] Multi-stakeholder Platforms |
|  |  | [ ] Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Sustainable Food Systems |
|  |  |   | [ ] Landscape Restoration |
|  |  |   | [ ] Sustainable Commodity Production |
|  |  |   | [ ] Comprehensive Land Use Planning |
|  |  |   | [ ] Integrated Landscapes |
|  |  |   | [ ] Food Value Chains |
|  |  |   | [ ] Deforestation-free Sourcing |
|  |  |   | [ ] Smallholder Farmers |
|  |  | [ ] Sustainable Cities |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Integrated urban planning |
|  |  |   | [ ] Urban sustainability framework |
|  |  |   | [ ] Transport and Mobility |
|  |  |   | [ ] Buildings |
|  |  |   | [ ] Municipal waste management |
|  |  |   | [ ] Green space |
|  |  |   | [ ] Urban Biodiversity |
|  |  |   | [ ] Urban Food Systems |
|  |  |   | [ ] Energy efficiency |
|  |  |   | [ ] Municipal Financing |
|  |  |   | [ ] Global Platform for Sustainable Cities |
|  |  |   | [ ] Urban Resilience |
|  | [x] **Biodiversity** |   |   |
|  |  | [x] Protected Areas and Landscapes |   |
|  |  |   | [x] Terrestrial Protected Areas |
|  |  |   | [x] Coastal and Marine Protected Areas |
|  |  |   | [x] Productive Landscapes |
|  |  |   | [ ] Productive Seascapes |
|  |  |   | [ ] Community Based Natural Resource Management |
|  |  | [x] Mainstreaming |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Extractive Industries (oil, gas, mining) |
|  |  |   | [ ] Forestry (Including HCVF and REDD+) |
|  |  |   | [x] Tourism |
|  |  |   | [x] Agriculture & agrobiodiversity |
|  |  |   | [ ] Fisheries |
|  |  |   | [ ] Infrastructure |
|  |  |   | [x] Certification (National Standards) |
|  |  |   | [x] Certification (International Standards) |
|  |  | [x] Species  |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Illegal Wildlife Trade |
|  |  |   | [x] Threatened Species  |
|  |  |   | [ ] Wildlife for Sustainable Development |
|  |  |   | [ ] Crop Wild Relatives |
|  |  |   | [ ] Plant Genetic Resources |
|  |  |   | [ ] Animal Genetic Resources |
|  |  |   | [ ] Livestock Wild Relatives |
|  |  |   | [x] Invasive Alien Species (IAS) |
|  |  | [x] Biomes |   |
|  |  |   | [x] Mangroves |
|  |  |   | [ ] Coral Reefs |
|  |  |   | [ ] Sea Grasses |
|  |  |   | [x] Wetlands |
|  |  |   | [x] Rivers |
|  |  |   | [ ] Lakes |
|  |  |   | [x] Tropical Rain Forests |
|  |  |   | [x] Tropical Dry Forests |
|  |  |   | [ ] Temperate Forests |
|  |  |   | [ ] Grasslands  |
|  |  |   | [ ] Paramo |
|  |  |   | [ ] Desert |
|  |  | [ ] Financial and Accounting |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Payment for Ecosystem Services  |
|  |  |   | [ ] Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting |
|  |  |   | [ ] Conservation Trust Funds |
|  |  |   | [ ] Conservation Finance |
|  |  | [ ] Supplementary Protocol to the CBD |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Biosafety |
|  |  |   | [ ] Access to Genetic Resources Benefit Sharing |
|  | [ ] **Forests** |  |   |
|  |  | [ ] Forest and Landscape Restoration |  |
|  |  |  | [ ] REDD/REDD+ |
|  |  | [ ] Forest |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Amazon |
|  |  |   | [ ] Congo |
|  |  |   | [ ] Drylands |
|  | [x] **Land Degradation** |   |   |
|  |  | [x] Sustainable Land Management |   |
|  |  |   | [x] Restoration and Rehabilitation of Degraded Lands  |
|  |  |   | [x] Ecosystem Approach |
|  |  |   | [x] Integrated and Cross-sectoral approach |
|  |  |   | [ ] Community-Based NRM |
|  |  |   | [ ] Sustainable Livelihoods |
|  |  |   | [ ] Income Generating Activities |
|  |  |   | [x] Sustainable Agriculture |
|  |  |   | [x] Sustainable Pasture Management |
|  |  |   | [x] Sustainable Forest/Woodland Management |
|  |  |   | [x] Improved Soil and Water Management Techniques |
|  |  |   | [ ] Sustainable Fire Management |
|  |  |   | [ ] Drought Mitigation/Early Warning |
|  |  | [x] Land Degradation Neutrality |   |
|  |  |   | [x] Land Productivity |
|  |  |   | [x] Land Cover and Land cover change |
|  |  |   | [ ] Carbon stocks above or below ground |
|  |  | [x] Food Security |   |
|  | [ ] **International Waters** |   |   |
|  |  | [ ] Ship  |   |
|  |  | [ ] Coastal |   |
|  |  | [ ] Freshwater |  |
|  |  |  | [ ] Aquifer |
|  |  |  | [ ] River Basin |
|  |  |  | [ ] Lake Basin |
|  |  | [ ] Learning |   |
|  |  | [ ] Fisheries |   |
|  |  | [ ] Persistent toxic substances |   |
|  |  | [ ] SIDS : Small Island Dev States |   |
|  |  | [ ] Targeted Research |   |
|  |  | [ ] Pollution |  |
|  |  |  | [ ] Persistent toxic substances |
|  |  |  | [ ] Plastics |
|  |  |   | [ ] Nutrient pollution from all sectors except wastewater |
|  |  |   | [ ] Nutrient pollution from Wastewater |
|  |  | [ ] Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Plan preparation |   |
|  |  | [ ] Strategic Action Plan Implementation |   |
|  |  | [ ] Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction |   |
|  |  | [ ] Large Marine Ecosystems |   |
|  |  | [ ] Private Sector |   |
|  |  | [ ] Aquaculture |   |
|  |  | [ ] Marine Protected Area |   |
|  |  | [ ] Biomes |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Mangrove |
|  |  |   | [ ] Coral Reefs |
|  |  |   | [ ] Seagrasses |
|  |  |   | [ ] Polar Ecosystems |
|  |  |   | [ ] Constructed Wetlands |
|  | [ ] **Chemicals and Waste** |  |   |
|  |  | [ ] Mercury |  |
|  |  | [ ] Artisanal and Scale Gold Mining |   |
|  |  | [ ] Coal Fired Power Plants |   |
|  |  | [ ] Coal Fired Industrial Boilers |   |
|  |  | [ ] Cement |   |
|  |  | [ ] Non-Ferrous Metals Production  |   |
|  |  | [ ] Ozone |   |
|  |  | [ ] Persistent Organic Pollutants |   |
|  |  | [ ] Unintentional Persistent Organic Pollutants |   |
|  |  | [ ] Sound Management of chemicals and Waste |   |
|  |  | [ ] Waste Management |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Hazardous Waste Management |
|  |  |   | [ ] Industrial Waste |
|  |  |   | [ ] e-Waste |
|  |  | [ ] Emissions |   |
|  |  | [ ] Disposal |   |
|  |  | [ ] New Persistent Organic Pollutants |   |
|  |  | [ ] Polychlorinated Biphenyls |   |
|  |  | [ ] Plastics |   |
|  |  | [ ] Eco-Efficiency |   |
|  |  | [ ] Pesticides |   |
|  |  | [ ] DDT - Vector Management |   |
|  |  | [ ] DDT - Other |   |
|  |  | [ ] Industrial Emissions |   |
|  |  | [ ] Open Burning |   |
|  |  | [ ] Best Available Technology / Best Environmental Practices |   |
|  |  | [ ] Green Chemistry |   |
|  | [ ] **Climate Change** |  |  |
|  |  | **[ ] Climate Change Adaptation** |  |
|  |  |  | [ ] Climate Finance |
|  |  |  | [ ] Least Developed Countries |
|  |  |  | [ ] Small Island Developing States |
|  |  |  | [ ] Disaster Risk Management |
|  |  |  | [ ] Sea-level rise |
|  |  |  | [ ] Climate Resilience |
|  |  |  | [ ] Climate information |
|  |  |  | [ ] Ecosystem-based Adaptation |
|  |  |  | [ ] Adaptation Tech Transfer |
|  |  |  | [ ] National Adaptation Programme of Action |
|  |  |  | [ ] National Adaptation Plan |
|  |  |  | [ ] Mainstreaming Adaptation |
|  |  |  | [ ] Private Sector |
|  |  |  | [ ] Innovation |
|  |  |  | [ ] Complementarity |
|  |  |  | [ ] Community-based Adaptation |
|  |  |  | [ ] Livelihoods |
|  |  | [ ] **Climate Change Mitigation** |  |
|  |  |  | [ ] Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land Use |
|  |  |  | [ ] Energy Efficiency |
|  |  |  | [ ] Sustainable Urban Systems and Transport |
|  |  |  | [ ] Technology Transfer |
|  |  |  | [ ] Renewable Energy |
|  |  |  | [ ] Financing |
|  |  |  | [ ] Enabling Activities |
|  |  | [ ] **Technology Transfer** |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Poznan Strategic Programme on Technology Transfer |
|  |  |   | [ ] Climate Technology Centre & Network (CTCN) |
|  |  |   | [ ] Endogenous technology |
|  |  |   | [ ] Technology Needs Assessment |
|  |  |  | [ ] Adaptation Tech Transfer |
|  |  | [ ] **United Nations Framework on Climate Change** |   |
|  |  |   | [ ] Nationally Determined Contribution |
|  |  |   | [ ] Paris Agreement |
|  |  |  | [ ] Sustainable Development Goals |
|  |  | **[x] Climate Finance (Rio Markers)** |  |
|  |  |  | [x] Climate Change Mitigation 1 |
|  |  |  | [ ] Climate Change Mitigation 2 |
|  |  |  | [ ] Climate Change Adaptation 1 |
|  |  |  | [ ] Climate Change Adaptation 2 |

**ANNEX G: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEW (**from GEF Secretariat).

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Comment** | **Response** | **Reference in CEO Endorsement Document and Project Document** |
| We note that the GEB for SLM has been reduced from the PIF stage by 1655 ha (3135 to 1480ha). Given the scale of the project and the aligned funding, this is a notable reduction. Please consider targeting additional hectares.  If this is not feasible, please clarify the intended use of the additional funds under this component if the target hectares have been cut by half. | As suggested, the GEB target for SLM was increased to 2,400 ha as follows: 25 ha in the coastal low-belt of the La Sagesse watershed (St. David Parish); 60 ha in the mid-belt of Ludbur-Mirabeau in the Great River watershed (St. Andrew Parish); 40 ha in Snell Hall and Madays of the St. Patrick watershed (St. Patrick Parish); and 2,275 ha in Spring Gardens in the high-belt of the Great River Watershed (St. Andrew Parish). Core Indicator 4: Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas) was updated accordingly. | CEO Endorsement Document:PART I: Project Information: B. Project Description Summary; E. Project’s Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators; Annex E: GEF 7 Core Indicator WorksheetUNDP Project Document: V. Results and Partnership, Expected Results; Annex B: GEF-7 Core Indicators |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Output: 1.1 - Who will be responsible for managing, maintaining and updating this database at project completion? How will the project ensure such a database is actually used by the targeted ministries? | The Land Use Division of the Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry & Fisheries of Grenada will be responsible for managing, maintaining, and updating this database at project completion. Also, the Land Use Division is the clearinghouse for land use-related information in Grenada; this was considered during the formulation of the project and was the main reason why instead of establishing a new information management database and monitoring system as was originally proposed in the PIF, the project will contribute to updating and operationalizing the existing GIS within the Land Use Division as a central spatial information management database for SLM, CSA, and biodiversity and ecosystem conservation. This adds to the ongoing effort in Grenada to strengthen the Land Use Division; for example, the Disaster Vulnerability Reduction Project funded by the World Bank and the Climate Investment Fund, which will provide topographic and ecosystem maps, land use data, cadastral data, etc. for Grenada. To ensure that the targeted ministries use the database, the project includes the development of a coordination mechanism to support data-sharing with the appropriate data-sharing protocols and security in place. In addition, data-sharing agreements will be established and institutional systems within the targeted ministries will be emplaced, which will contribute to ensuring that the database is actually used by the targeted ministries. The project will also make use of the Project Board, which includes representatives from several of the target ministries, to inform them about the database and promote its use. | UNDP Project Document: V. Results and Partnership, Expected Results |
| Output: 1.2 - If the PA estate is being expanded, please include these hectares as new PAs? The new PA at La Sagesse is quite small which may make it difficult to manage from the perspective of financial sustainability. Is the plan to make it part of a larger PA, use community management, or another strategy to address this issue? | As clarification, the PA estate is not being expanded; instead the project will strengthen the protection status and management of one of the PAs by supporting the establishment of the La Sagesse Local Area Planning (WDPA ID 14188) as a national park (IUCN Management Category II). The Local Area Planning is a national designation with no reported IUCN Management Category. By establishing the PA at La Sagesse as a national park, additional protection will be provided to the last patches of natural habitat/dry forest of the critically endangered Grenada Dove. The project will also support the development of a management plan for the national park, which will include exploring options for the financial sustainability of the PA through community management. Such options may include sustainable cattle grazing and controlled hunting of crabs and other wildlife (these activities are currently practiced in the state-owned lands within the site on a squatting basis), and generating income through bird watching, which is also an activity at the La Sagesse site. Reference to the strengthening rather than to the expansion of the PA estate was clarified in the CEO Endorsement Request document and the UNDP Project Document. | CEO Endorsement Document:PART II: Project Justification: 5) Global environmental benefits (GEFTF)UNDP Project Document: IV Strategy; V. Results and Partnership, Expected Results. |
| Output: 1.3 - Many behavior change campaigns do not have the desired outcomes, particularly for the environment. What may appeal to environmentalists may not resonate with the target populations. How will the awareness campaign be **tested prior to** roll out and measure its success? | The awareness campaign will be developed and tested in one of the targeted parishes, and its effectiveness will be measured using a Knowledge, Attitude, Practice, and Behavior (KAP/B) Index. Such prior testing will allow fine-tuning messages and communication tools before the campaign is fully rolled out to ensure its effectiveness with the target audience. The design of the KAP/B Index will follow UNDP’s experience in Saint Lucia as part of the Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership (J-CCCP). This has been incorporated into the project and includes a related indicator in the project results framework. In addition, a baseline and targets for the KAP/B Index will be determined during the first year of project implementation. | CEO Endorsement Document:PART I: Project Information: B. Project Description Summary; Annex A: Project Results FrameworkUNDP Project Document: V. Results and Partnership, Expected Results; VII. Project Results Framework |
| Output: 2.1 - Other GEF projects could provide ideas on creative systems of collateral. | The project will also consider the use of solidarity groups where members act as reciprocal guarantors; this alternate for collateral was successfully implemented in the Groundnut Basin Soil Management and Regeneration Project in Senegal (GEF Project ID 2511). | UNDP Project Document: V. Results and Partnership, Expected Results |
| Output: 2.2 - Where will the germplasm be kept and maintained? Is the germplasm seed or other materials? | The germplasm includes all planting materials, and a substantial amount will be kept in established plots from which all types of vegetative planting materials can be extracted when needed. A portion of the seeds will be stored in the five propagation stations (Boulogne, Mirabeau, Maran, and Ashendeen in Grenada and Belair in Carriacou), while the other part will be maintained onsite (e.g., farms). The project will support the propagation stations by improving the facilities to store plant material and making them climate-resilient. Please note that this will be achieved as part of Output 2.3; Output 2.2 is related to enhancing a soil and water quality monitoring and advisory programme. | UNDP Project Document: V. Results and Partnership, Expected Results |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Output: 3.1 - It would also be worth while to look at the work of CIPAV in Colombia that has worked on natural storm water management techniques as well as agrosilvopastoral systems that use high protein trees for fodder (GEF ID 3574). | As suggested, the following has been added as part of the activities to be considered through Output 3.1: The project will consider lessons learned from the implementation of the GEF project *Mainstreaming Biodiversity in Sustainable Cattle Ranching* (GEF ID 3574) regarding the use of agrosilvopastoral systems that combine trees, shrubs, and various herbaceous plant species to improve the sustainability and productivity of farms combining agriculture and cattle production, while creating an environment that is vastly more hospitable to biodiversity and is carbon-friendly. This may entail fodder banks planted with high densities to obtain foliage (leaves and green branches) for animal feed as well as for improving water quality and flow regulation in micro-catchments evidenced through reduced contamination and sedimentation levels. In addition, reference has been made in the UNDP ProDoc regarding partnerships/coordination with other current and previous related GEF initiatives. | UNDP Project Document: V. Results and Partnership  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Output: 3.2 - The GEF has a very specific strategy on IAS. Sustainability is very important for the long term success of IAS programs. While the GEF offers limited support for control activities, our focus is on the establishment of systems, programs, and financing mechanisms that will provide for long term control of the species that is having impact on threatened species. Please make sure that the activities align with this strategy. Specifically for Bd control, more and more evidence is showing how many species can be carriers of Bd (birds, reptiles, etc). Has testing been done for the presence of Bd already in the area? Are there monitoring programs of the frog populations that would provide notice of an outbreak? | The activities proposed for IAS have been adjusted to align with the GEF strategy for IAS, which includes the following: a) conducting a critical situation analysis for a more in-depth review of the national legislation and policies for IAS management and identifying key stakeholders currently engaged in IAS management to assess their current level of coordination and collaboration and needs to improve coordination mechanisms; b) identifying options for sustainable funding to combat IAS; c) recommending strengthening of the legal and policy framework for the prevention, management, and control of the three IAS targeted; and d) raising awareness among stakeholders (the public and private sectors as well as the general public) about the threats and impact of IAS and new controls and regulations.Regarding the chytrid fungus, evidence of declining frog populations due to the presence of *Bactrachochytrium dendrobatidis* first emerged at the Grand Etang area (St. Andrew Parish) in 2007. This was confirmed by Harrison et al. (2011)\* who tested three species (including the endangered Grenada Frog) in four locations in 2009. *B.* *dendrobatidis* was found on all four sites for all three species. The authors concluded that chytrid fungus might pose the most imminent threat to the Grenada Frog as this species is found only at high elevations like the Grand Etang area where temperature and moisture regimes are ideal for the chytrid fungus. Currently, there are no monitoring programs of frog populations that would provide notice of an outbreak. As such, the project will conduct an initial assessment and monitoring of the population of the endemic Grenada Frog that will serve as a basis for proposing a long-term mitigation strategy that may include a more permanent monitoring program of the frog populations, identifying mechanisms of disease suppression and adaptive management in field trials with natural populations.\* Harrison B, Berg CS, Henderson RW (2011). The Grenada Frog (*Pristimantis euphronides*): An endemic species in decline and the combined effects of habitat loss, competition, and chytridiomycosis. *IRCF Reptiles & Amphibians*, 18, 66–73. | UNDP Project Document: V. Results and Partnership, Expected Results |
| Please clarify the inclusion of the gender action plan under the M&E Budget. This has created a very high M&E budget for a $3.6M project. The gender-based activities, which will contribute to the project achieving its objectives, should be included in the regular project budget.  | The gender-based activities are included in the regular project budget; the M&E Budget was modified accordingly and a note was made indicating this change. The total M&E Budget is now $103,000 USD (GEF: $103,000; Co-financing; $40,000). | UNDP Project Document: VIII. Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan |
| Please include the new PA hectares in the appropriate core indicator. | As mentioned previously, the project does not include new PA hectares; instead the project will strengthen the protection status and management of one the PAs by supporting the establishment of the La Sagesse Local Area Planning (WDPA ID 14188) as a national park (IUCN Management Category II). As suggested, reference is included in Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (hectares). | CEO Endorsement Document:E. Project’s Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators; Annex E: GEF 7 Core Indicator WorksheetUNDP Project Document: Annex B: GEF-7 Core Indicators |
| Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?Yes. Please see comments above on the Gender Action Plan. | Please see the response to comments above on the Gender Action Plan/M&E Budget. |  |

1. Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on [*GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF*](https://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/document/GEF6%20Results%20Framework%20for%20GEFTF%20and%20LDCF.SCCF_.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF , no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project’s consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives
 and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target(s)](http://www.thegef.org/gef/content/did-you-know-%E2%80%A6-convention-biological-diversity-has-agreed-20-targets-aka-aichi-targets-achie) the project will directly contribute to achieving. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, and SCCF [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. Local Funding: Support to Soil and Water Conservation; Grant Funding: a) Climate Change Mitigation & Sustainable Livelihoods Project (Forestry, b) GEF R2R Project, c) German GIZ Integrated Climate Change Adaptation Strategies (ICCAS), d) EU GCCA/OECS Climate Change Adaptation and Sustainable Land Management Project, e) USAID Funded Climate Change Adaptation Program (CCAP), f) Moroccan funded Soil Fertility Mapping Project, g) World Bank Funded Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR/DVRP) Project, and h) IFAD/CDB Funded Market Access and Rural Enterprise Project. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. New funding sources may include: a) World Bank Regional Competitiveness Project, b) IFAD/CDB Funded Climate Smart Agriculture and Rural Enterprise Programme (SAEP), and c) Annual local budget allocation for soil and water conservation activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Estimated base on: a) An integrated approach to land and water Resources Management in the Caribbean: <http://www.fao.org/docrep/004/Y1717E/y1717e21.htm>; b) Soil Erosion by water in the Tropics: <https://www.ctahr.hawaii.edu/oc/freepubs/pdf/RES-024.pdf>; c) Soil erosion in the humid tropics: A systematic quantitative review: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167880915000468>; and d) Soil erosion in the humid tropics with particular reference to agricultural land development and soil management: <http://hydrologie.org/redbooks/a140/iahs_140_0221.pdf>. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See Rusk, B. 2017. Long-term population monitoring of the Critically Endangered Grenada Dove (Leptotila wellsi) on Grenada, West Indies. The Journal of Caribbean Ornithology Special Issue: Status of Caribbean Forest Endemics Vol. 30(1):49–56. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. Carbon sequestration estimates have been calculated using the Ex-Ante Carbon-Balance Tool (EX-ACT) Version 7 – Multilingual Edition, which was developed by FAO. The forest type selected for the calculations is Tropical Moist Deciduous Forest, building on a baseline of degraded land in a Wet Tropical climate. The soil type generally consists of fertile Clay Loams derived from volcanic materials, albeit degraded through prior deforestation activity and subsequent overgrazing/ agriculture. The project involves the restoration of 40 ha of degraded forest using native species. Over a period of 10 years, approximately 9,512 tCO2-eq will be sequestered through the project’s intervention (EX-ACT: 2. Land Use Change. 2.2. Afforestation and Reforestation). The FAO EX-ACT result sheet is included as Annex P. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to 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. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)