

Sustainable Soil and Land Management in Petite Martinique, Grenada

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID 12273
Countries Grenada
Project Name Sustainable Soil and Land Management in Petite Martinique, Grenada
Agencies UNEP
Date received by PM 1/20/2026
Review completed by PM
Program Manager Asha Bobb-Semple
Focal Area Land Degradation
Project Type MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

3/23/2026

Cleared.

3/4/2026

Not fully.

-12,841 metrics tons of CO2e are estimated in Core Indicators, but the Rio Marker value in Climate Change Mitigation is 0 - please ask the Agency to re-assess.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

Rio Marker for Change Mitigation changed to 1.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

3/23/2026

Cleared.

2/21/2026

Yes mostly. Please disaggregate the expected GEBs.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

The expected GEBs have been disaggregated. This is now in a separate paragraph under the Project Summary.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

3/23/2026

Cleared.

2/21/2026

a) Yes

b) Yes. Please change Component 1 to Investment and Component 2 a mix of TA & Investment

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

Component 1 has been changed to Investment and Component 2 to mix of TA and investment.
3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes for the KM and M&E components.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

3/23/2026

Cleared.

3/4/2026

a) We note that there is limited cash co-financing for the planned activities. At PPG please provide details on how the in-kind co-finance will contribute to project outputs.

-M&E represents 13% of the subtotal - for project up to \$5 million, the recommended percentage is 5% - please revise.

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

a) This is noted; these details on how the in-kind co-financing will contribute to project outputs will be provided in the full design during the PPG. Indeed, there is limited cash co-financing. This will however be further considered during the full design.

M&E has been adjusted to \$26,000 at the recommended 5%; see the updated Indicative Project Overview table.

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

3/4/2026

a) Although the context and drivers are very well described, the justification for the approach taken is missing/limited. Please expand

b) Please expand

c) Please indicate how the project is building on the baseline

d) Not fully.

i) Please describe the different roles and interest of key stakeholders, including civil society and local communities and plans to engage and consult these in project development

ii) Please also expand on the role of the private sector.

-

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

a) The rationale for the approach taken is now expanded under Project Description section, following the discussion on the key enabling drivers that includes emphasis on the indications of worsening climate stressors, desire to maintain economic productivity and social stability on Petite Martinique, with an explanation that the approach is in alignment with the national level approach to LDN, that also draws on replication of the work on Carriacou.

b) A narrative the resilience to future changes in the drivers has been added to the Project Description section in association with the theory of change description.

c) The narrative on how the project is building on the baseline, is further elaborated under Section ?Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project? where the ongoing programmes of the Ministry of Agriculture, the Ministry of Carriacou and Petite Martinique Affairs are noted.

d) i) A table has been inserted on the roles / interests of the key stakeholders under Section D Stakeholder Engagement. ii) The role of the private sector has been expanded under that same table ? the main business enterprises of interest have been identified. It should be noted however that the scale of private sector engagement is quite narrow, given the small number of private sector entities on that island. Stakeholder engagement will be more fully explored during the full project design under the PPG phase.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

2/21/2026

Yes. The project is well thought out and very well covers integrated planning at the landscape level, avoidance of land degradation and rehabilitation of land and governance mechanisms.

Please see one comment below:

- Please consider mechanisms to encourage replication of the projects approach on other islands of Grenada

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

The narrative under Section Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project has been expanded to describe the mechanisms for replication. This will be built around PISLM's role as the Caribbean support mechanism for the UNCCD where the utility of the investment on Petite Martinique (as well as on Carriacou) will have value in the transfer of approaches that are suited for other micro-islands in the Caribbean and other SIDS, and over semi-arid environments on the larger islands that are particularly drought-prone and subject to land degradation triggers that are typical to these environments.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

2/21/2026

No please provide a brief analysis as of the Business as Usual and the added value of the GEF investment.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

The narrative under Section A (where the has been augmented to include an analysis as of the Business-as-Usual scenario and the added value of the GEF investment.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

2/21/2026

Please include in the implementation arrangements in the write up.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

A short description of the implementation arrangements is now included in Section on Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

2/21/2026

Please include in the note below the core indicator table an explanation of the targets for sub-indicator 4.1. This seems to be missing.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

Core indicator 4.1 as it concerns Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity, this sub-indicator not deemed as relevant to the context in Petrite Martinique as CI 4.3 where the focus is to be more on the nexus with agricultural production.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

Cleared.

3/31/2026

The Environmental and Social risk category under the Key Risks section continues to be rated as Low, whereas the Annex SRIF indicates a Moderate Safeguards rating. Both ratings should be consistent. Please adjust either of the two ratings accordingly.

3/4/2026

a), b), c) Not fully.

i) The rating under the Environmental and Social risk category (currently low) should be the same as the rating under the key risk table, Environmental and Social Safeguards (ESS) risk, as per the GEF risk appetite GEF/C.66/13.

ii) Please explain how the overall risk was identified.

Agency's Comments

04/08/2026

The rating under Risk Category 'Environment and Social' in the 'Risks to Achieving Outcomes' table has been adjusted to 'moderate' to be consistent with the SIRF assessment. The relevant areas in the narrative in the table have been suitably amended (green highlight).

03/11/2026

i) The PIF was assessed by UNEP's Gender and Safeguards Unit and the proposed project was rated at moderate risk. The updated SRIF (signed) now accompanies the PIF.

ii) The explanation of how the overall risk was derived is now explained in the table.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

2/21/2026

Yes there is potential, however please provide a brief analysis of a) and b)

c) Yes through the integrated landscape restoration plan and the local governance mechanism.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

A further elaboration is given under Section Project Description to explain how the project is integrated, durable, and transformative and on the potential for innovation and scaling-up. Some of the narrative on the project durability is provided in the 'futures narratives' that follows the theory of change discussion. On scaling up possibility, further elaboration has been provided under the section Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments
2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

8.3 Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments
2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments
8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments
2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments
Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments
2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments
Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

3/31/2026

Cleared.

3/4/2026

See comment above.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

This has been addressed as per comment above.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

2/21/2026

Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

4/15/2026

The project is cleared and recommended for PIF and PPG approval.

4/2/2026

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

2/21/2026

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

Agency's Comments

04/08/2026

Consistency between the SIRF and the rating under the Environment and Social risk category in the Risks to Achieving Outcomes table addressed.

03/11/2026

Consider updates to the PIF (yellow highlights).

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

3/4/2026

In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please ensure that the GAP aligns with the project components. Please ensure that in the development of the results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting. Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.). Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

Agency's Comments

03/11/2026

This is noted for the full project design.

Review Dates

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Review

2/22/2026

3/4/2026

4/2/2026

4/15/2026

Agency Response