

# Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using an Integrated Landscape Approach

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

9862

**Countries**

Jamaica

**Project Name**

Conserving Biodiversity and Reducing Land Degradation Using an Integrated Landscape Approach

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

5/25/2019

**Review completed by PM**

12/19/2019

**Program Manager**

Asha Bobb-Semple

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF** ☐

**CEO Endorsement** ☐

**Project Design and Financing**

**1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019 ABS:

Yes

## **Response to Secretariat comments**

### **2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/26/2019 ABS & SW:

Not fully. Please address the questions below.

#### General

- Given the alignment with the Land Degradation focal area which is underpinned by the Land Degradation Neutrality agenda, please indicate how the project will incorporate land degradation neutrality and will contribute to Jamaica's efforts to set or meet its LDN targets. We expect to see this incorporated at least in the LD focused components of the project and in particular in the project strategy. Currently we are not seeing any clear reference to LDN in the project document.

#### Table B

- Output 1.1 (f) and Output 1.5 (d) - please clarify the difference between these two activities and if they will be linked. Please also indicate how financial strategies developed under the NPAS project will inform these activities.

-1.5 – Tourism certification – will the project fund developing the certification program or is it through co-financing? Will it be implemented during the project period?

- The GEF does typically support UNESCO applications. Is this being funded through co-financing? If not can this be explored?

- Outcome 2:

- indicates 'Cockpit Country covering around 75,000 ha under improved management...' The GEF Core indicator sheet makes reference to this area being a newly created Terrestrial Protected Area and Stephney John's Vale Forest Reserve under improved management. Please clarify and ensure the text is aligned in the Indicator Sheet, Table B and the Results Framework.

- there is reference to 33,085 ha designated as forest reserves, is this within the 75,000 ha Cockpit Country area? Please clarify.

-Re the 200 ha of mined lands to be restored, these have been aligned to sub-indicator 3.3. Were these lands used for productive purposes (agriculture/livestock farming) prior to mining? Please confirm if the co-financing will support this activity.

- Of the 12,000 persons to benefit from the project, please indicate how many are small farmers

Output 3.2- makes reference to 'development' of an information management system, however the project document indicates that an existing system will be enhanced. Please clarify.

-Output 2.5 & Annexes 11, & 18- refers to demonstration of water harvesting techniques and greenhouse technologies. These technologies have been demonstrated and tested in previous initiatives (GEF and non-GEF). How is the project building on and scaling up what has already been tested, to facilitate greater reach with small farmers and greater impact on GEBs and livelihoods?

#### Core Indicators

- While we understand that SLM activities and restoration activities (sub indicators 3.1, 3.2, 3.3) will be carried out under the project, if they are taking place within the boundary of the CC Protected Area to be designated under Sub-Indicator 1.1, these activities can only be captured under this sub-indicator. Otherwise we would consider the hectares impacted to be double counted. You may still reflect them separately in Table B and Project Results framework however, but just not on the Core Indicator sheet.

8/28/2019:

Thank you for the responses.

On the mined lands, we confirm that co-financing and not GEF financing should be used for rehabilitation of mined out lands.

Regarding the UNESCO application, given that the GEF does not normally support these activities, we will recommend support in this case as an exception and we encourage Jamaica to continue to explore co-financing.

10/4/2019:

Cleared.

## Response to Secretariat comments

9/25/2019

Changes (ProDoc): Mined out lands: refer Paragraph 61 and Section X TBWB where the cost of restoration of degraded mined out areas has been removed from Budget Note 17 and moved to forest restoration work which was under-funded.

Thank you for the comments:

In terms of the mined-out lands, the project will support a national consultant to undertake an assessment of restoration potential of mined out lands and prepare a suitable restoration plan (for soil rehabilitation, species selection, restoration and farming practices, etc.), providing training on rehabilitation measures to mining companies and local communities, etc. The actual cost of the restoration work would be sought through co-financing from private financing (mining companies) and/or Government budgetary support.

In terms of the UNESCO application, we appreciate GEF support for the preparation of the UNESCO application as an exception. During project implementation, UNDP will continue to explore co-financing for this activity.

7/16/2019

### General

Reference to LDN (changes in the ProDoc: par. 32, page 19):

Please note that Jamaica is in the process of establishing its LDN targets and the project will work closely with the Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) Focal Point of the Ministry of Local Government and Community Development who is already a partner in the implementation of the project. Using land degradation neutrality as a framework, the project will bring together multi-level (national and subnational) stakeholders to address LD issues in Cockpit Country. These stakeholders/institutions are likely to be the same ones that will participate in the LDN target setting for Jamaica. Hence, methodologies, knowledge and lessons learnt from this interaction in the project can inform the LDN target setting process.

As part of the effort to work towards achieving LDN in the project site (Cockpit Country), project preparation undertook a situation analysis of land degradation and assessment of root causes and drivers of LD. The findings formed the basis for the identification of strategic options for reducing LD and ensuring improved and effective land and forest management, and sustainable agricultural systems. These strategic options are critical elements in ensuring that an LDN agenda is incorporated in the project design and strategy as well as for supporting the implementation of an integrated approach for improved biodiversity outcomes and increased community benefits. The strategic options include

- ü Strengthening the Policy, Regulatory and Institutional Framework for SLM and Agricultural Development.
- ü Enhancement of Sustainable and Environmentally Management of Bauxite and Limestone Mining.
- ü Introduction of Sustainable Crop and Livestock Production Practices.
- ü Promotion of the Sustainable Use of the Natural Forest Products.
- ü Sustainable Management of the Expansion of Settlements and Encroachments.

ü Improvements in Community-based Tourism Infrastructure and Management Strategies.

The strategic options identified represent the broad elements of a road map that demonstrates the contribution of SLM, SFM and Agricultural Development Practices to gender-responsive and rights-based conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the Cockpit Country of Jamaica. The road map promotes inclusive growth and development, builds the adaptive capacities of communities, increases the resilience of vulnerable sectors (agriculture, tourism, mining, etc.,) and communities, and optimizes livelihood opportunities with a view to achieving improved biodiversity and increased community benefits within Cockpit Country. It represents a pathway to the achievement of LDN in the Cockpit Country and beyond. It recognizes the need for partnerships for effective delivery of services to the people of the six clusters - that is, working together through complementation of resources. The engagement and participation of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs), local, regional, national and international organizations, the private sector and volunteers in promoting sustainable land and forest management, and agricultural development is therefore part and parcel of the strategy and plan for LDN.

As result of these efforts the following expected results will contribute towards achieving LDN in the Cockpit Country and in Jamaica:

A. Policy and institutional level:

- ü Institutional mechanisms at the national, regional and local/community levels strengthened for the efficient and effective coordination and management SLM, SFM and agricultural development programs within the CC.
- ü Technical Units at the national, regional and local/community levels strengthened and provided with mandates for SLM, SFM and agricultural development program management within the CC.
- ü SLM, SFM and agricultural development practices mainstreamed into national sectoral, regional and local development policies, strategies, plans and budgets.
- ü SLM, SFM and agricultural development considerations integrated into cross cutting issues such as environmental management and gender equality.
- ü Knowledge and information management platform established for monitoring of SLM, SFM and agricultural development.

B. At the ground level:

The implementation of forest and land restoration activities particularly in disturbed areas that are adjacent or close to the boundaries of the existing key biodiversity areas, areas of high conservation values, and connectivity areas, as well as areas within and adjacent to existing forest reserves, are expected to achieve the following results:

- ü Sustainable forest and land management of degraded riparian and steep areas.
- ü Effective conservation measures to enhance improved connectivity within the KBAs (through forest restoration and biodiversity compatible production systems) of the Cockpit County landscape promoted.
- ü Sustainable forest management (ANR) approaches for restoration of disturbed broad leaf forests in priority clusters within the Cockpit County landscape covering 400 hectares using a range of native species implemented successfully.
- ü Privately managed protected areas, including micro-reserves.
- ü Restoration of 200 hectares of mined out lands (including options for agriculture and Biodiversity friendly agro-forestry and climate resilient agriculture promoted within the CC promoted
- ü Drought mitigation measures implemented to include water conservation and management, water harvesting techniques and drainage and water storage systems.
- ü Alternatives to slash and burn agriculture promoted.
- ü Small business enterprises that are economically viable culturally acceptable promoted within the CC.
- ü Interventions to address gaps in value chain and complement and enhance on-going measures implemented.
- ü Sustainable ecotourism initiatives aimed at improving community-based ecosystem services and products in support of community livelihoods and conservation efforts implemented through public-private partnerships.

- ü Community based activities to address threats to forests and biodiversity posed by invasive species promoted.

#### Reference to Table B:

- Output 1.1 refers to the national coordination mechanism that will provide guidance, oversight and advice in relation to the number of activities being undertaken in the project including 1.1 (f) while Output 1.5 (d) refers to the actual undertaking of the action itself, namely the development of the financial sustainability strategy and plan for the Cockpit Country. The two activities will definitely be linked in that the actual development of the Strategy (d) will be supported by guidance, oversight and advice(f).

Under the NPAS Project, model Business and Management Plans were prepared for 8 selected Protected Areas. These plans will be used to inform and guide the development of the Financial Sustainability Strategy and Plan for the Cockpit Country. In addition, an Operational Plan for PA system financial strategy was completed under NPAS that will inform the development of the Financial Sustainability Strategy for Cockpit Country. Also, the National Conservation Trust Fund of Jamaica (NTCFJ) was established under the NPAS Project which will also provide support for the elaboration of the Financial Strategy for the project area.

Output 1.5 – Tourism certification – GEF Funds within the project will fund a national consultant for the development of the certification program rules and procedures and related training actions and consultancy services to identify ecotourism services and products suitable for the area and training of tour operators for operationalization of the program. This activity will facilitate partnership with the Ministry of Tourism to initiate implementation of the program as part of its long-term strategy to promote sustainable economic activity for benefit of local communities. Provisions will be made to secure governmental co-finance from the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Tourism. The project will also actively seek the involvement of the private sector during design of the certification scheme. This will guarantee national ownership of this new certification mechanism. It is expected that the development of the certification program will be accomplished during the implementation of the project with the start of pilot initiatives on the certification by the end of the project period.

UNESCO application – The Ministry of Environment recognizes that high biodiversity value ecosystems are currently threatened by large scale mining and infrastructure development projects. The possibilities to limit the expansion of these sectors into sensitive ecosystems are limited. One option includes providing Protected areas with a new type of protection status. The Ministry has therefore deliberately chosen to explore the possibility to declare the project area as a UNESCO biosphere reserve as part of a strategic move to respond to the rapidly expanding industries which threaten to permanently damage the ecosystems. We understand that this decision was discussed with the GEF Secretariat during the recent council meeting. The intent is to recruit a national consultant (20 days) to develop the UNESCO application, but the project will also explore alternative co-financing for this activity

#### Reference to Outcome 2

- The establishment of the Cockpit Country PA will be supported through the project, mainly through baseline surveys, management and financial sustainability planning, some limited conservation investments and capacity building of staff for improving management effectiveness. The project will support the declaration of the Cockpit Country as a protected area. Hence, the Cockpit Country is going to be a newly created protected area covering around 75,000 ha as reflected in the Indicator Sheet In Table B and the Results Framework, the Cockpit Country is seen as under improved management given the development of the management plan, improved financial manpower resources and conservation investments from existing baseline of 33,085 ha designated as forest reserves with limited management inputs.

Stephney John's Vale Reserve which will benefit from project interventions is already a Forest Reserve and will benefit from improved management.

Forest Reserves with CC PA (changes in the ProDoc, page 73): Yes, 33,085 ha is already designated as FRs and lies within the proposed 75,000 ha of Cockpit Country PA. The existing FRs were declared under the Forest Act that focuses on production e.g. timber extraction and bauxite extraction may be permitted. The Act does not provide sufficient protection for designation of the stricter IUCN categories where necessary, or for the proposed prohibition of bauxite mining. Designation under additional acts (PA system) would allow for the broader landscape level protection/conservation that is the core of the project and for the engagement of the necessary wide range of conservation partners among agencies and user groups in management, conservation and fund raising. The expansion of the area under protection from the 33,085 ha is necessary to secure additional areas around the existing Forest Reserves that support important biodiversity and ecological services.

Mined Areas: The 200 ha of land to be restored will largely be converted to productive purposes (mainly agro-forestry) as this was the situation to a large extent prior to mining. The project will also support rehabilitation to enable conversion to other more productive SLM practices including:

- ü The promotion of agroforestry in which woody perennials are deliberately integrated with crops and/or livestock on the same land management unit;
- ü The implementation of Shade house technologies (aquaponics, hydroponics, and greenhouses) for improving water use efficiency and minimizing losses of water evaporation in the production of crops, as well as for mitigating the 6” depth of the reclaimed bauxite lands; and
- ü The promotion of grass/legume crops as feedstock for the sheep and goats, through grazing in pastures and/or through cut and carry system (zero grazing), including the making of hay and silage

The project will provide approximately USD 246,000 in financing to restore/rehabilitate degraded lands (including 200 ha of mined-out lands. Allocations from co-financing support for this activity will be reviewed during the project Inception Phase.

Beneficiaries: While most of the 12,000 persons to benefit from the project are small farmers, some depend on other livelihood options such as apiculture, ecotourism, etc.

Output 3.2 Information Management (changes in the ProDoc, par. 82, page 45):

The Institute of Jamaica (IOJ) has a web-based database of biodiversity assets. During the project development process, the system was reported to be outdated and few stakeholders accessed the system. The capacity of the database was not yet assessed during project development based on the needs of the project as well as stakeholders. During project implementation, the capacity will be assessed to determine whether a new system will be developed or enhancement of the current one.

Output 2.5 and Annexes 11 and 18 Water Harvesting: Rainwater harvesting, and greenhouse technologies are not new to Jamaica, and the project will build on and scale up based on lessons learnt from a number of projects undertaken in the country. For example, this project will draw lessons learnt from other initiatives such as the Improving Jamaica's Agricultural Productivity (IJAP) Project; The Greenhouse Cluster and Water Harvesting Project under the Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI); the Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership Project; GEF-SGP - Improving the Adaptive Capacity to Climate Change through Rehabilitation and Construction of Water Harvesting Infrastructure in Upper Clarendon and the GEF-funded Rainwater Harvesting Project with Support from Facility (GEF) in St. Elizabeth. Lessons learnt, applied research and best practices from these initiatives will inform the greenhouse and water harvesting technologies used. Hence, the project will build on these technologies instead of re-inventing the wheel. Community buy-in, appropriate technologies for the targeted areas, resources required, maintenance, capacity development and strategic partnerships are essential lessons from these prior initiatives that can support the implementation of rainwater and greenhouse technologies in this project. Additionally, the project will take on board important considerations such as farmer participation, provision of support services, extension, demonstration, capacity building and partnerships to promote these concepts in the project area.

Reference to Core Indicators:



All of the SLM and AD restoration activities will be carried out mostly on community lands (agriculture) and government lands (SFM, etc.) adjacent to the boundary of the proposed CC PA. This is a critical activity to improve productivity of community and other lands and hence defuse pressure on resource extraction within the proposed CC PA as well as create forest linkages with adjacent forested areas outside the PA.

**3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

/20/2019 ABS:

Not fully. Please address the following questions which are related to the budget as well as Annexes 2 & 12

- Please confirm the total number of consultants that will be hired for the project. Annex 12 provides a list of 32 consultants and contractual services, however it is not clear whether or not any of these tasks will be consolidated under fewer contracts. We have a significant concern with the procurement processes that will be required to undertake recruitment at this scale, in addition to the project staff and how this will affect project implementation. We urge consolidation (eg using a Biodiversity Specialist, Agricultural Specialist, Forestry Specialist etc) as much as possible rather than separate contracts.
- Please present the consultancy services (outlined in Annex 12) such that we can differentiate the Outputs to which they are aligned.
- Please clarify the contractual services that have been identified for Government Agencies, who have also been identified as stakeholders to be working contributing to the project. In addition many of the tasks indicate 'promotion of...' What are the specific expected results of these tasks? How are these tasks different from the tasks that are usually conducted by these government agencies?
- Please justify the need for expenditure on specific and different consultants to assist with Apiculture, Slash and Burn, Biomass Briquettes, strengthen capacities in the Herbal sector. Are the local stakeholders such as the Bee keeping Association, Forestry Department etc not in a position to provide guidance on these areas as a contribution to the project?
- Please provide justification for the need for the motor vehicles?
- Budget note 18 Under Component 2 refers to demonstration. Please see note under Question 2

8/28/2019:

Regarding the contractual services for the Forestry Department and Rural Agricultural Development Agency - we are unable support the use of grant funds to contract the services of a government agency to engage in activities that are a part of their normal responsibility. Given that these activities normally fall under the mandate of

these agencies, we expect the grant funding (through procurement by the Executing Agency) to only provide materials, equipment and additional consulting/service support etc. that will be required. In kind contributions of guidance, technical oversight, extension and where possible coordination support by these relevant government agencies can then supplement what the grant funding provides. Please make the adjustments to the procurement plan.

Regarding the motor vehicles, as indicated in the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy- GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, the use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged as such costs are normally expected to be borne by co-finance. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified. We are inclined to provide support for one vehicle. Please explore co-financing for the second vehicle and adjust the budget accordingly.

10/3/2019:

Thank you for making the changes. However, we note that NEPA is still mentioned on page 262 for contractual services related to invasive species. Please adjust.

10/23/2019:

The above comment is cleared.

However following further internal review by the GEF Sec, we note that the consultants (under budget note 4) and referenced in the Governance and Management Arrangements (Section VIII-Project Document), will be dedicated full time to the project. In this case they would be considered project staff and their costs would have to be assigned to the PMC. Alternatively if they are not dedicated full time to the project, the costs can be assigned to the relevant components. Where applicable and as much as possible, please reallocate these charges to the PMC category, to be covered by GEF financing and the cash co-financing that has been identified.

12/10/2019:

The responses are noted.

On a related point, we have however identified a difference between the previous version of the Project Document and the updated version. The Procurement Officer was previously identified as 'contract staff' and has now been identified as 'government staff' under Governance and Management Arrangements (Section VIII-Project Document). Please clarify. In addition there is a line item in the budget to support a Procurement Consultant (budget note 31). Is this the same Procurement Officer? Noting that we would be unable to finance government staff, please clarify.

12/18/2019:

Cleared.

1/9/2020:

Following further review by the Policy team of the GEF, please see additional comments below:

-We note that the tasks (outlined in the TOR) for the National Technical Coordinator are a mix of project management functions as well as technical functions. In keeping with the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy- GEF/C.52/Inf.06/Rev.01, please adjust accordingly the financing for this position among the PMC and the Project Components.

-The Technical Officer (M&E) role has been included in Component 1 only, but we note that a few of the tasks mentioned in the TOR are also aligned with Component 3. Please make the necessary adjustments to assign the costs among the components accordingly.

3/18/2020:

Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

1/27/2020 (RTA: Simone Bauch, PA: Maria Lukina-Lebedeva):

Please Refer to Budget and BN in Section X of UNDP project Document)

- The budget for the NTC has been revised to include financing under PMC and all components based on our assessment of level of time to be spent with project management and technical functions. A significant part of the NTC responsibility would be on technical functions.

Please Refer to Budget and BN in Section X of UNDP project Document

- Similarly, the financing for Technical Officer (M&E) has been split among the 3 components as this officer will be responsible for monitoring all activities of the project.

12/11/2019

Thank you for your feedback. With regards to the Procurement Officer, we have chosen to capture the Government's contribution to the project more clearly and accurately. The Procurement officer is a Government paid project staff who will be engaged to support project implementation.

The procurement consultant is not a government staff but is a consultant hired on a short-term contract with GEF funds to help further detail the TORs for technical consultancies and contractual services to ensure that these adequately reflect the specific requirements of the project. The consultant will further support the definition of specific qualifications and experiences and evaluation criteria so as to (I) ensure best expertise is acquired; (II) contracting is done in a timely manner; and (iii) Acquisition of such expertise is sequenced in a manner to ensure a more effective inputs to the project.

9/25/2019

Changes (ProDoc): In terms of contractual services, refer Procurement Plan in Annex 12 Output 2.3 pages 262 and 263. In terms of motor vehicle refer Section X Budget Note 6 where one of the vehicle costs has been removed and costs under Budget Note 6 reduced from \$70,000 to 25,000 and this amount moved to travel costs BN 3.

In terms of contractual services, the project will not provide grant financing to government agency (FD, RADA, NEPA, etc.) to engage in activities (e.g. forest restoration, SFM and SLM activities) that is part of their regular work. This was erroneously included in Annex 12 and has been now rectified. The project would contract the services from non-government consultancy firms to provide materials, equipment and additional consulting/service support for such works that will be undertaken by local communities. The government agencies will provide guidance, technical oversight and extension support as their co-financing contribution. This is now correctly reflected in the procurement plan (Annex 12).

In terms of the motor vehicle, thank you for agreeing to support the procurement of one vehicle and the second vehicle has been excluded and these funds now included as transport/travel costs.

7/16/2019

#### Consultancy services

Total number of contracts: Agree. At this juncture, these consultancies were kept separate to provide clear guidance to what services are required under each Component/Outcome and Output (as defined in Annex 12). The intention is to condense the consultancies as much as possible. For example, using a firm with diverse expertise instead of individual consultancies to undertake specific work within the project. During the initial part of the project (at the launch/inception workshop) UNDP will support the government and other relevant stakeholders to consolidate these consultancies into a lesser number of contracts to facilitate efficient procurement and management of contracts. This intention has been explicitly included at the top of annex 12.

Differentiating consultancy services to Outputs: Annex 12 in fact differentiates services to Outputs under sub-headings in the Table.

Clarify contractual services for Government Agencies: The contractual services are intended for specific activities on-the-ground such as restoration of degraded broadleaf forests, mined out areas, agro-forestry, ecotourism, etc. with technical support, oversight and extension to be provided by the relevant government agencies (forestry, agriculture, tourism, etc.) as these agencies do not have the staff and resources to undertake these activities beyond their existing work programs. The wording for areas where “promotion of” is used in Annex 12 has been changed. Please see updated Annex 12.

Justify expenditure for specific and different consultants to assist with Apiculture, Slash and Burn, Biomass Briquettes, strengthen capacities in the Herbal sector: The technical areas identified are highly differentiated and specialized thematic areas and the expertise does not reside in any Government agency within the country. In Jamaica, these technical skills are generally limited within the Bee Association, the Forestry Department as well as within the Herbal industry. Hence, there is the need for effective technical support and expertise in developing capacity to achieve the objectives in these areas (Apiculture, Slash and Burn, etc). It is expected that the relevant institutions will provide the necessary coordination and oversight support.

Justification of motor vehicles:

Vehicles are required to carry out the various activities in the field in particular in landscape planning work, undertaking community planning, liaising with parish and sector agencies in delivery of forest restoration, agricultural activities, livelihood activities etc.). This will require coordination with a number of sector and sub-national agencies, NGOs and community organizations covering 5 Parishes that are widely spread through the landscape with distances from one point to the other as far as 250 km. In addition, the terrain, poor road conditions and accessibility dictates the need for specific type of vehicle and dedicated to project activities (Refer budget notes 6 and 18).

Budget Note 18:

It is important to note that rainwater harvesting, and greenhouse technologies are not new to Jamaica, and are important Climate Smart Technologies. In fact, much work has been done in Jamaica by a plethora of institutions such as the Water Resources Authority (WRA), GEF and FAO, to include feasibility studies, pilots and demonstrations, and the development of tools and guidelines. There are many benefits to be derived from the technologies, including:

- ü Increased crop yields
- ü Increased crop quality
- ü Improved land productivity
- ü Extended growing seasons
- ü Enhanced capacity to introduce new crops
- ü Reduced reliance on rainfall or truck-borne water
- ü Reduced cost of production
- ü Increased individual producers' access to irrigation water
- ü Increased water efficiency use efficiency
- ü Contribution to personal and national food and nutrition security
- ü Increase socio-economic wellbeing of producers.

To ensure that producers can derive tangible benefits from the technologies already tested and demonstrated in Jamaica, the project is building on and scaling up these technologies at the farm level based on the lessons learnt. In this context, the project will take on board important considerations such as:

- ü Farmer selection is critical
- ü Site selection is important
- ü The need to involve farmers at all stages
- ü Support services are important – extension, credit, linkage to markets, etc.
- ü The need for a holistic approach to crop husbandry and livestock production
- ü Capacity building and partnership are essential.

Integral to this process is the establishment of demonstration sites on selective farmers' holdings, visitation of other farmers to sites, training of farmers in the relevant technical areas related to water harvesting and greenhouse technologies, and the facilitation of the uptake of these technologies through both financial and technical support provided. Some financial support will be provided for uptake by the project. In addition, the Rural Agricultural Development Authority (RADA) and their relevant regional and local extension officers will provide technical support in the establishment, coordination and management of the demonstration sites, the capacity building of farmers, and the uptake of the technologies.

It is important to note the benefits of these technologies, especially as they relate to the contributions to financial viabilities of the various livelihoods options will be demonstrated.

10/16/2019

Changes in the ProDoc: page 262

Thank you for your comments:

The note in the list of contractual engagements has been modified to remove NEPA.

11/20/2019:

Refer Section VIII (Governance and Management Arrangements), Section X (Total Budget and Work Plan and Budget Notes) and Annex 2 of UNDP Project Document and GEFCEO ER

Thank you for your comment.

We agree that staff assigned for management purposes must be costed under PMC. This was our intent, but we had inadvertently misidentified the full-time National Technical Coordinator as Project Manager, both in the Section VIII (Governance and Management Arrangements) as well as in TBWP of the UNDP Project Document that is now rectified. As you will note from the original TORs in Annex 2 of the Project Document, the task of the Project Manager (now National Technical Coordinator) was to provide technical support for overseeing all components of the project, in particular, the landscape planning process, revision of policies and guidelines, capacity building and for implementation of PA management, SLM and SFM activities, M&E activities and the implementation of the KM component. The responsibility of project day-to-day management will rest with the Project Director (Government staff) with Procurement Officer (Government staff) and Financial Officer that will be supported by the project and costed in the PMC.

All other positions listed under Component budgets are contract positions for provision of technical support, including M&E, field technical coordination support, participatory/gender, etc. Based on the complexity and risk associated with a project of this nature with due consideration for the capacities required to implement the project efficiently and successfully, this structure is strongly recommended by the Government.

**4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019 ABS:

Yes

#### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019 ABS:

Yes.

#### **Response to Secretariat comments**

**6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** N/A

**Response to Secretariat comments**

7. Only for Non-Grant Instrument: Has a reflow calendar been presented?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** N/A

**Response to Secretariat comments**

8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019 ABS:

Not fully.

The project has been aligned to the LD focal area, however there is no reference or linkage made to how the project will assist Jamaica in meeting their Land Degradation Neutrality targets or the process to set these targets. Please include.

8/28/2019:

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments**

7/16/2019

Alignment with LD focal area: Please see answer to Question 2 above (changes in the ProDoc, par. 32, page 19).

Jamaica is in the process of establishing LDN targets. An assessment of the current status, trends and drivers of land degradation is needed to set sound LDN targets, make decisions on possible interventions, forecast changes in land-based natural capital as well as to track progress. The assessment uses a set of three indicators that reflect the land-based natural capital and its associated ecosystem, which are:



- ü Land cover
- ü Land productivity (metric: net primary productivity)
- ü Carbon stocks above and below ground (metric: soil organic carbon).

Land cover provides a first indication of a reduction or increase in vegetation, habitat fragmentation and land conversion. Land productivity offers an indication of ecosystem health and sharpens the focus on ecosystem services. Soil organic carbon denotes overall soil quality.

These indicators have also been recommended as sub-indicators for the indicator 15.3.1, “Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area”, adopted to measure progress towards the SDG target 15.3.

This project information will be utilized in the LDN target-setting process in Jamaica (Please see response to Question 2), as the Cockpit Country is considered a land degradation “hot spots” in country and, therefore a priority area for LDN action. The project will provide valuable information for establishing LDN targets, including the following:

- ü Assessment of the land degradation trends
- ü Identification of root causes and drivers of land degradation
- ü Analysis of the legal and institutional framework of land management.

**9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019 ABS:

Yes

10/23/2019:

Following further internal review by the GEF Sec, we note that there are ineligible expenses in the M&E budget. These include the Project Board Meetings, Knowledge and Learning, NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies. Please reallocate the Audit to the PMC costs and the other items to the appropriate components.

12/9/2019:

Cleared.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

11/20/2019:

Refer Table 5 (Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget) of UNDP Project Document

Thank you for your comment

We agree to your comments and have accordingly moved the cost of Project Board Meetings and UNDP Audit from Component 1 to co-financing under the M&E budget, the former will be funded through government co-financing contribution and the audit will be financed by UNDP.

In terms of the Knowledge Management and Learning, the budget amount reflected in the M&E table for this activity is merely a cross reference to an activity under Component 3 of the project. We consequently removed this amount from the M&E table to reflect the concern that such an expenditure should not be included in the M&E table.

**10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019 ABS:

Yes, however please consider including, how the project will make use of lessons learned and best practices from previous or current projects looking at related issues, such as the NPAS Project funded in GEF 4.

8/28/2019:

The response is noted.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

7/16/2019

#### Lessons from NPAS:

Lessons learned from previous projects, including NPAS Project have informed the design of this project. For example, the diverse activities within the project impels collaboration among a wide range of stakeholders. The lesson is that all stakeholders must be brought on board during the project development phase. A robust participatory and consultative approach involving all relevant stakeholders was adopted during project development.

The project will also involve a number of national and subnational agencies working together. A major lesson learnt from the NPAS Project is that clear responsibilities and roles of involved agencies must be done during project development to avoid confusion during the implementation phase. The main implementing agency and responsible parties were part of the Technical Working Group established to guide the development of the project. A project as ambitious, diversified and

involving multiple partners as this one requires an enabling environment and adequate capacity and partnerships for successful implementation, a key lesson from previous initiatives.

The project also reflects the lesson that while national staff and resources are needed, on-the-ground and community-based activities must be sufficiently staffed and resourced. Hence, the approach taken by the project to include adequate resources to support activities at the national, local and community levels.

Under the NPAS Project, model Business and Management Plans were done for selected Protected Areas. These plans will be used to inform and guide management plan(s) to be done for the Cockpit Country.

#### **Agency Responses**

**11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF stage from:**

#### **GEFSEC**

#### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019 ABS:

Yes

8/28/2019:

Cleared

#### **Response to Secretariat comments**

#### **STAP**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019:

Comments related to how the project will contribute to LDN have not been adequately addressed. Please also see GEF Sec comments under question 2.

8/28/2019:

Cleared

**Response to Secretariat comments**

7/16/2019

STAP:

Contribution of LDN:

Although Jamaica is in the process of establishing its LDN targets, the project will advance LDN in the Cockpit Country. Please see answer to Question 2.

**GEF Council****Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/20/2019:

We have not seen the responses to the following comments from the Council. Please include.

**Germany**

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

- Clarify the role of Maroons and other relevant target groups and stakeholders for achieving the project objective

- The issue of land degradation should be elaborated more prominently in the proposed landscape management approach for conserving biodiversity (refer. To components 1, 2 and 3)
- Component 2 should consider to include the ridge to reef approach as to contribute to supporting connectivity of biodiversity and to reducing land degradation
- Define key ecosystems and the criteria to be applied for their selection; clearly distinguish terminology for planning units and ecosystems
- Include the development of a knowledge management strategy to combine the different components and tools mentioned in 7.
- Revise the proposal to make it more reader-friendly

## **USA**

- 1) This project would be an excellent way to promote the “healthy soil = nutritious food = vibrant communities” concept. It fits in with the objectives of the project, so we recommend the plan of operations consider inclusion of education and outreach activities such as field days, workshops and demonstrations (particularly to young people) that show the importance of life in the soil and how to improve soil health, infiltration rate, organic matter, etc.
- 2) The overall cost of project implementation seems expensive, for this reason, the next project proposal should have a more detailed budget so that the costs and benefits are clear.

8/28/2019:

Thank you for the responses to the comments from the Council. However we have not seen these inserted in the portal under Annex B. We have only seen the responses to the GEF Sec comments and those from STAP. Please insert same.

10/4/2019:

Cleared

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

9/25/2019

The responses to Council comments have been inserted under the Annex B section.

7/16/2019

The response is now included in this resubmission, as follows.

Germany

Role of Accompong Maroons and other relevant target groups and stakeholders

The UN has recognized the Maroons as indigenous and as such the project have considered their rights accorded to indigenous peoples and local communities for the management of their biological assets and the valuable contribution to biodiversity conservation; their participation fulfills commitment for inclusion, etc. Consequently, a “Special Interest” Peoples Plan was developed during the PPG stage to ensure active engagement of the Maroon community in the project and in benefit sharing. The plan includes the following key measures for Maroon participation:

- (i) The Maroon Council is represented on the Technical Working Group (TWG) for the project. The TWG has been active in reviewing and directing the project design process and participated in Inception and Validation meetings. In all these processes, the Maroon Council was well represented and actively involved. The TWG will continue to function through project implementation, with membership of the Maroon Council.
- (ii) Consequently, through the TWG and other measures proposed in the “Special Interest” Plan, the participation of the Maroons in the various fora for decision-making will serve to promote understanding and agreement that biodiversity conservation and livelihoods promotion are the priority objectives that must be assiduously pursued within the partnership. The Maroons have been affirmed as important guardians of the biodiversity and other aspects of the cultural heritage of the Cockpit Country
- (iii) The Accompong (Maroon) Project Cluster, like the others, will decide on the specific conservation and livelihoods activities that will be undertaken, based on feasibility studies and consensus among the community members. On this approach, the Accompong Cluster will be enabled to access allocations from the budgetary resources being designated for these components of the project.
- (iv) Pilot initiatives in climate smart agriculture, in land rehabilitation and in the use of innovative technologies will be made available to the Maroon community.
- (v) An extensive program of capacity building through training, partnership building, and organizational strengthening will be available to the Maroons.

(vi) The Accompong Maroon Council which will be strengthened to facilitate community participation, growth and development, coordinate livelihoods investment opportunities, participate in training and capacity building programs, for example, around support in mainstreaming gender and biodiversity management, social enterprise development and partnership building, and in strengthened organization and management, community outreach and visibility. Given their knowledge of the area (Cockpit Country) it is anticipated that the Maroons will provide knowledge and information to enhance project delivery and effectiveness. Many of the predisposing socio-economic issues are barriers to conservation and must be responded to guarantee project success and sustainability. Local groups are recognized as stewards of their community assets. Their role will be strengthened for local participation and governance at the community level to boost project success and maintain commitments for transparency, accountability, poverty reduction, etc.

#### Elaboration of LD

Component 2: This is no longer applicable as there is no connection between the proposed project site and the coastal ecosystems. The PIF included additional areas north of the proposed project area, including the North Coast Forest KBA, which was found to be untenable due to the various problems and population pressures in this area

#### Define key ecosystems and the criteria to be applied for their selection; clearly distinguish terminology for planning units and ecosystems

Please see above.

#### Include the development of a knowledge management strategy to combine the different components and tools mentioned in 7.

Key ecosystems and criteria to be applied for their selection: These are provided in Annex 14 (key ecosystems) and Annex 17 (criteria for selection of target areas for intervention)

KM management: Annex 6 provides a simplified communication and KM strategy for the project based on which a communication and KM action plan will be prepared under Output 3.1 and KM actions outlined in Output 3.3. The current strategy (Annex 6) segments the various audiences, outlines the key messages and suggest various communication tools to enhance dissemination of knowledge across all components.

Reader-friendly proposal: The project document have gone through an extensive internal (UNDP and Government and stakeholder review) to ensure that the document is readable, clear and applicable to the Jamaican situation. This was confirmed and validated by the Technical Working Group and key government agencies

#### USA

1) Inclusion and education and outreach: This is covered under Outputs 3.1 and 3.3 and includes specific efforts to reach as wide an audience as possible (refer activities 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.5, 3.3.1, 3.3.5, 3.3.8 and 3.3.9.

2) Cost of implementation: During the PPG stage efforts were made to ensure that activities were practical, cost-effective and useful in the Jamaican context. A detailed breakdown of the budget is provided in the UNDP Project Document.

#### **Convention Secretariat**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement** N/A

**Response to Secretariat comments**

**Recommendation**

**12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?**

**Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement**

6/26/2019 ABS:

Not at this time, please respond to the questions above.

8/28/2019:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

10/4/2019:

Not at this time. Please address the comment under Question 3.

10/25/2019

Not at this time. Following further review by the GEF Sec, please address the comments under Questions 3 & 9.

In addition, we note that the UNDP has proposed to play an Execution role with specific aspects of project implementation. Following further review by the GEF Secretariat and in keeping with GEF Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle Policy, we can only approve those cases that are deemed warranted on an “exceptional”



basis. In this case we recommend that the execution function be removed and consideration for a third party (a different agency) to carry out these functions be explored.

12/10/2019:

Not at this time. Please address the comments under Question 3 related to the Procurement Officer.

1/10/2020:

Not at this time. Following further review by the GEF Sec, please address the comments under Question 3

In addition, we note in in Section VIII of the ProDoc - Governance and Management Arrangements, UNDP is assigned to carry out an executing function that can only be done by the executing partner. Para 172 states that.....*“The Senior Supplier role must have the authority to commit or acquire supplier resources required”*. Please revise the text and include the Executing Partner which is the National Environmental and Planning Agency of the Ministry of Economic Growth and Job Creation to perform this function.

3/18/2020:

Cleared. The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

### **Response to Secretariat comments**

01/27/2020 (RTA: Simone Bauch, PA: Maria Lukina-Lebedeva)

Please refer to Para 170 and 176.

The relevant sentence has been removed from Para 172 (Senior Supplier) and included in Para 176 of the National Environment & Planning Agency (Executive).

12/11/2019:

The comments under Question 3 have been addressed.

11/20/2019

In following the GEF Guidelines on Project and Program Cycle Policy, we have removed any DPC from the project and updated the M&E text to reflect this.

**Review Dates**

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief Reasoning for CEO Recommendations**