

# CSIDS SOILCARE Phase 2 - Caribbean Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) multi-country soil management initiative for integrated Landscape Restoration and climate- resilient food systems

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11390

**Countries**

Regional (Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Dominica, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Kitts and Nevis, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and Grenadines, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago)

**Project Name**

CSIDS SOILCARE Phase 2 - Caribbean Small Islands Developing States (SIDS) multi-country soil management initiative for integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

6/22/2025

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Asha Bobb-Semple

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

FSP

**PIF  
CEO**

**Part I - General Project Information**

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/4/2025

Not fully. Please include drought management in the taxonomy.

Agency Response

29/10/2025

Noted, drought management has been included in the taxonomy

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/4/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**2. Project Summary.**

**a) 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 outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/4/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**3. Project Description Overview**

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- 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?
- c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/4/2025

a) Yes

b) See detailed comments under Question 5

c) Knowledge management and M&E have been captured in the project overview table. Please see comment under question 5 on gender.

d) No the co-financing contribution to PMC is not proportionate compared with the GEF contribution to PMC. If the GEF contribution is kept at 5 %, for a co-financing of \$18,210,000 the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$910,000 instead of \$331,000 (which is 1.8%). Please adjust where possible.

e) Yes.

Agency Response

29/10/2025

b) please see answer below

c) please see answer below

d) Based on the new co-financing total (USD 25,652,000), the cofinancing portion of the PMC has been readjusted to USD 1,221,524

**4. Project Outline**

**A. Project Rationale**

- a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?
- b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the

**private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**

**c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared

8/4/2025

a) Thank you for providing the overall context, however the information provided lacks details at the country level with only a few references to country level policy frameworks. Please provide additional details on the following:

i) information on the current countries in Phase 1 including any changes within their context since the start of Phase 1 and also noting the information related to the new components included in SOILCARE Phase 2.

ii) additional contextual details on the new countries joining SOILCARE.

iii) for all countries provide details on their project sites and the rationale for selecting these sites.

iv) for Phase 1 countries, please include whether or not these sites are building on work from Phase 1 or if they are new sites entirely.

b) The role of the stakeholders in the system has not been described. Please include? Please also expand on the role and barriers associated with the private sector, given the focus of Component 4 and Lessons Learned from SOILCARE Phase 1 (noting the conclusions and lessons cited in the MTR). In addition, specific/named private sector stakeholders (beyond small farmers) have not been named in the Stakeholder table. Please clarify or include.

Please also provide greater details on specific civil society organizations, women and youth groups and their respective role related to project objectives and components as well as more details on the project plans to engage and consult these in project implementation.

c) N/A

Agency Response

29/10/2025

**a)**

i), ii) iii) Noted, please see text inserts in project rationale specific section

iv) Most of the selected intervention sites are new to the program. However, some of the SOILCARE Phase 1 locations have been re-selected, to expand on previous activities and results. Such is the case of Sedge Pond, Greenland Over Hill and Coggins Estate, in the Scotland District of Barbados, Dumfries and Bellevue South in Carriacou - Grenada, Kimbia in Guyana and Holland Estate in Jamaica, which were selected after in-country assessment of potential gains. Explanation on the complementarities has been included in the project alternative subsection and details on the sites and planned activities are provided in Annex E (project maps and coordinates) uploaded as a separate document in the portal.

**b)** The role of stakeholders in the system has been further detailed in the project rationale. For further information please refer to Project Description section *Stakeholder engagement and private sector involvement* and to Annex J: Stakeholder Engagement Plan (uploaded as stand-alone document in the portal). Private sector names have also been added in the table.

Following a review of the national LDN-TSP and PRAIS reports, as well as other relevant national and regional policy documents and regulations, the need to increase private sector investment in agriculture and food production through strategic partnerships with private enterprises, communities, and civil society organizations was identified as a key priority for SOILCARE Phase 2. This priority was duly reflected in the project's design: the limited private investment was recognized as a barrier to achieving LDN in the project rationale, and specific activities, particularly under Component 4, were developed to strengthen private sector engagement.

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) of SOILCARE Phase 1 noted three main aspects regarding the project capacity to effectively engage private stakeholders:

- lack of business representation in the project's planning and decision-making to ensure key services and investment from the private sector are adequate to develop the value chains needed to sustain the alternative livelihoods foreseen
- lack of technical capacity regarding business and finances within the Executing Agency
- the lack of up-to-date land policies and legislation in the subregion that support private and civil society engagement in the development of the restoration economy.

While action is being taken under SOILCARE Phase 1 to address those issues, they have also been considered in Phase 2 design, as per the recommendations of the MTR, which includes increased efforts towards larger and closer private sector and civil society engagement to materialize promotion of alternative livelihoods, through i) its overall approach and organizational structure, including human resources and governance, and ii) targeted actions under components 4 and 5:

i) Overall project design specifically promotes private stakeholder engagement:

SOILCARE Phase 2 applies a more integrated approach that secures the participation of staff from departments responsible for business development, planning, and finance, and private enterprise development (including participation of institutions that work with the private sector to identify funding opportunities lined to LDN), as well as from the private sector and civil society.

Private sector stakeholders, including agribusinesses, financial institutions, and agencies supporting small and micro-enterprises are considered critical for scaling sustainable land management practices and mobilizing investment (see stakeholder table in the Project Description section and in stakeholder engagement plan in Annex J). The project approach encourages their participation in planning, implementation and monitoring, to support value chain development, provide financing for climate-resilient agriculture, and foster innovation in soil and land management, and investment, aligning with the goals of strengthening market systems and promoting environmentally sustainable agricultural production. These actors will thus be considered both beneficiaries as well as agents for sustainable sectoral development that integrates soil and land health in decision making.

Engagement strategies include participation in project decision-making, multi-stakeholder consultations, capacity-building workshops, and targeted outreach to marginalized groups, strengthen ownership, enhance sustainability, and align with regional and global commitments to inclusive development and environmental governance.

The Project Steering Committee and the National Project Committees (currently called National Inter-Agency Advisory Groups - NI-AAG) will include a senior representative from the public and private sectors responsible for business development and finance (see section B1), to guide business-

related activities dedicated to developing the restoration economy in each participating country under component 4 and for policy under component 5.

A qualified business and finance consultant will be recruited to make part of the PISLM/PMU to assess funding options, to oversee the foreseen mobilisation of funds from the GCF, the LDN Fund and the private sector in general, to assist in catalysing private sector investment and, in collaboration with the land and climate experts, to undertake marketing analysis to determine which products have potential to generate income to advance the restoration economy at the sites under C2 and C3. Synergies and information exchanges will be sought with initiatives supporting public-private partnerships (PPP) to establish regenerative agriculture in Latin America and the Caribbean (e.g. Jamaica PPPs have been successful in developing regenerative agriculture through the Jamaica Agribusiness Agency (agro-forestry with breadfruit), and through the Kee Farms network; the GEF-funded project 'Strengthening the Resilience of Agricultural Lands and Forests in Dominica in the aftermath of Hurricane Maria' also has supported PPPs with farmers in landscapes around the Morene Trois Piton National Park, as included in section C).

ii) Targeted actions under components 4 and 5 include multi-stakeholder mechanisms and consultations, capacity-building workshops, and targeted outreach to inform project design, implementation and monitoring. Stakeholders, including private entities, will be invited to assess and provide advice on the marketability of proposed business ideas, and to contribute to the communication of the business benefits of addressing environmental issues (e.g. cost savings, reduced risks) and to support the strengthening of the enabling policy and socio-economic environment for LDN

Specifically, component 4 includes actions specifically addressed to budding young farmers (e.g., via the YARDI and Youth Agri Business Programme, outputs 4.1.2 and 4.1.3), by facilitating access to a dedicated pool of finance to incentivize the uptake of wise land use practices in business operation, with the goal of attaining LDN.

The full deployment of the LDN Transformative Funding Mechanism (TFM), assessed and designed under Phase 1 is expected to mobilise blended financing instruments to fund, de-risk and catalyse public and private finance to build sustainable livelihoods associated with the project's activities under C4. Private entities will be key for the operationalization and capitalization of the LDN TFM. Private sector financing institutions will be invited to be part of multi-stakeholder mechanisms to further promote an enabling environment for investments on LDN.

Using the results from investment initiatives under SOILCARE Phase 1 and 2, and other relevant data and information and advice from private sector financing institutions, high performing investments/bankable projects that are transformative in nature will be brought to the capital market through the mobilization of financing from the private sector and other innovative sources (activity 4.1.1.2) by the LDN Funding Mechanism. FAO as implementing agency will help identify pipeline projects and initiatives from other initiatives at the national and regional levels and support coordination with pre-existing funding mechanisms.

Within component 5, the activity of the RAC/NAT will be a catalyser of private sector involvement through annual Regional LDN/SSM/SLM Research Conferences to provide a forum for Caribbean researchers, scientists, project managers, and the private sector to share research findings and best practices from the work under the CSIDS-SOILCARE and other initiatives across the region.

Capacity development and training led by RACNAT ? although executed jointly with components 1 to 4 ? will include sessions addressed to improve private stakeholders understanding of the benefits of sustainable management and related funding options, as well as enhancing technical skills for soil and climate data use, and SSM and SLM implementation.

At the Regional Policy level, emphasis will be placed on the creation of the structures and the promotion of sub-regional strategies on integrated planning for drought and flood risk mitigation (output 5.2.3) that improve the enabling environment for greater investment in sustainable agriculture and food production. Private entities will be engaged in sub-regional platforms/mechanisms for the coordinated management of drought and flood risk (activity 5.2.3.1).

All this has been explicitly highlighted in the rationale and the project description section, for clarity.

#### **5 B. Project Description**

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) 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?**

**c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**

**e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**

**j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/4/2025

a), c)

Not fully. Please see comments below.

Component 1

i) Output 1.1.3 reference is made to *CIDS-SOILCARE Phase 2 builds on the achievements of the previous project to address this fundamental gap through the creation of an enabling policy framework for data management and sharing within CARSIS* Please clarify what this will entail?

In addition, please provide further details on the Subregional Data Integration and Sharing initiative with the OECS Commission (activity 1.1.3.3). How will this be managed and funded?

ii) Output 1.1.5- What is the plan for further management and maintenance (financial and human resources) of the Caribbean Soil Archive and Data Library.

#### Component 2

iii) Output 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 See question 3 requesting details on the proposed project sites.

iv) Output 2.1.3 - What will be these activities under this output in the SOILCARE countries vs SOILCARE 2, noting that the SOILCARE 1 countries would have received funding to do this previously.

#### Component 3

v) What is the difference between the Small Farmers Drought Mitigation Scheme and the Small Farmers Drought Pilot Scheme? Why only 8 countries for the Drought Mitigation Scheme?

#### Component 4

vi) Output 4.1.1 What lessons and risks experienced in SOILCARE Phase 1 are being applied to this output? What tangible results are expected? How will the private sector financiers be mobilized? What private sector partners are being engaged for this purpose?

vii) Are the youth programs expected to continue beyond the life of the project? Who will maintain and manage the youth programs?

#### Component 5

viii) Component 5 is quite significant in terms of the number of outputs and planned activities. This is particularly noted given the findings of the SOILCARE Phase 1 MTR. Please indicate how this Component will be managed and executed?

ix) It is noted that this component is addressing the barriers associated with the enabling environment (cited in para 24). Please clarify the 'how' of the RAC/NAT facility will be used to inform and influence policy frameworks, dialogue and decision making at the national level and site level. What mechanisms will be used to inform or collaborate sub-national level land use planning committees/ inter-ministerial national level committees where decisions on land use planning and management are taken? If the scale of this barrier is beyond the resources (financial and human) of this project, what specific activities are being undertaken to still realize project results and recommend potential solutions/mechanisms for adoption by countries in the medium to long term to overcome this barrier; has there been an exercise to identify or recommend parallel investments which could complement SOILCARE and assist in addressing these barriers.

x) What linkages will the facility have with existing global platforms which could benefit from SIDS approaches and data such as Trends Earth and WOCAT?

b) Not fully.

i) Please include overall how the project is building on and learning from previous GEF and non-GEF investments.

ii) In addition, specifically how is SOILCARE Phase II learning from and planning to build on the findings, conclusions and recommendations from SOILCARE 1 as defined in the Mid Term Evaluation. Please see below specific references from the MTR for consideration and response.

## **Findings:**

Para 6-. Meanwhile, progress on delivering planned outputs under C2-C4 is behind schedule, indicating the achievement of SLM/SSM/CSA targets is highly unlikely in the time remaining. However, the identification of suitable implementation plans and targets for the 25 pilot sites have not been prepared and adopted by the national project steering committee members to date, demonstrating capacity, co-funding and project oversight constraints in all seven participating countries.

Para 8- . Under these circumstances, the prospects of sustaining the expected results under C2-C4 are considered unlikely, especially as there are no exit strategies in place to date to clarify how they will be funded and consolidated in each country in the post-closure period.

## **Conclusions:**

para 20 -Two main shortcomings affecting relevance and coherence are: first, the risk that local stakeholders have not seen any mobilisation of activities on the ground under C2-C4, which may lead them to question the relevance of the pilot projects if they do not start to deliver results soon, and second, the project design and implementation have not effectively demonstrated the socio-economic value of restoring and conserving ecosystem services. Consequently, important information is not feeding into policy dialogue to inform decision-makers at the subregional, national and pilot site levels with regards to (i) SLM/SSM/CSA representing the best way forward in the transition to LDN, and (ii) that this transition is not an end itself (to meet UNCCD targets), but a means to delivering greener, more inclusive and resilient development that supports pledges to the UNCCD, NDCs and to targets under the CBD's Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF).

Para 21- progress under C2-C4 has been slower than planned, resulting in the lack of operations in all 25 pilot sites selected. The general lack of progress in the seven participating countries on designing site plans and activities for these sites is evident.

Para 23- the lack of up-to-date land policies and legislation in the subregion to guide land-use planning, address land tenure conflicts, and secure private and civil society engagement in the development of the restoration economy, represent significant barriers that need to be removed before SLM/SSM/CSA can be sustained and alternative livelihoods developed

d) No incremental cost reasoning has been included showing the baseline scenario and the added value/incremental benefit of the GEF investment. Please include.

e) Yes

f) See comments under budget.

g) This is not evident. Please include.

h) There is limited information on the engagement potential private sector stakeholders beyond small farmers. Please include.

i) The project indicated some actions that would generate employment opportunities to women and young women, trainings, access to financial services etc. In this case, please respond Yes to the question on Generating socio-economic benefits or services to women under the section Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.

j) Yes

k) No this is not evident. Please include.

l) Yes scaling up opportunities have been outlined

Agency Response

29/10/2025

a),c)

i. Noted, further details have been added in Project Rationale and in Project description (output 1.1.3). A mention to the OECS Regional Integration Through Growth Harmonisation and Technology (RIGHT) Programme has been added to the description of the activity in Project Description and included in Section B1.

ii. Further information on the management and maintenance of the Caribbean Soil Archive and Data Library has been added in output 1.1.5, which is also linked to output 5.1.1. Please refer to both outputs.

## **Component 2**

iv. and v. The activities under Outputs 2.1.1 and 2.1.2 and 2.1.3 have been designed to build on and complement lessons from SOILCARE Phase 1. As now detailed in the Project Alternative subsection and in Annex E, in most instances, for countries that participated in Phase 1, the sites selected for Phase 2 are different from those under Phase 1. Their selection was done participatorily to ensure complementarity, while fitting into the countries' priorities and paying attention to other national and regional initiatives that started after SOILCARE Phase 1 began, or that are expected to start during Phase 2. In a few cases (sites in Barbados, Grenada, Guyana and Jamaica), the locations selected are the same than in Phase 1, with Phase 2 geographically expanding previous results and/or adding new and complementary approaches such as the use of bio inputs and drought-focused management practices.

Additional information on project location sites can be found in the Annex E, uploaded in the portal as separate annex in the documents section.

## **Component 3**

vi. Apologies, that was a mistake and is now corrected. The Small Farmers Drought Mitigation Scheme (SFDMS) is indeed the same as the Small Farmers Drought Pilot Scheme. Therefore, the term "pilot" has been replaced by "mitigation" throughout the document.

At this stage, only 8 countries consider the implementation of on the ground activities for drought mitigation a priority. Nonetheless, all the project parties will benefit from activities at the regional and national level under Component 3 (output 3.1.1 and 3.1.4).

## **Component 4**

vii. Output 4.1.1 responds to the need identified in SOILCARE phase 1 of enhancing inclusive financing and for increased private sector engagement with the deployment of the LDN Transformative Finance Mechanism (TFM). As for expected tangible results, the project will produce a roadmap for the LDN TFM (activity 4.1.1.1), mobilize financing (activity 4.1.1.2) up to a 100% of the TFM annual workplan, and mobilize private sector through the presentation of high-performing, transformative investment opportunities.

Regarding private stakeholder role and engagement, the roadmap of the LDN-TFM (activity 4.1.1.1) will include the identification and design of a medium to long-term strategy for country and regional-scale instruments to engage private bodies, with consideration to large private corporations operating in the region (e.g. Massy Group, Marriott International, Hilton Hotels & Resorts) and to find opportunities for collaboration with existing national mechanisms to channel investment such as citizenship by investment programs. This is included in the description of output 4.1.1. Please also refer to previous comment for more information on stakeholder engagement in general.

viii. The LDN-TMF design will include a designated percentage of its annual work program to be invested in youth-led projects and provide technical support to the development of selected business ideas (output 4.1.1). YABI includes the adoption of fiduciary processes to ensure that the proposed business ideas have high potential for success and future scale up. Implementation of both youth programs will be handled through contracts, with the overall supervision of the Business and

finances consultant of the Executing Agency, with support from the Gender Consultant and the ESS specialist. This is now included in project description.

## **Component 5**

ix. The capacity development in technical and research aspects under Component 5 (output 5.1.1) will be managed by the RAC/NAT Facility, established under Phase 1 and strengthened in Phase 2 to serve as the regional hub for research, training, and policy support. Following the recommendations of the MTR, this includes significantly more numerous and specialised personnel, and a wider scope compared to its current dimensions and functions. The RAC/NAT will be integrated in PISLM structure but collaborate with the University of the West Indies and other Universities in the region.

The Facility will operate under a 10-year strategic plan (Activity 5.1.1.1) including objectives, priority research lines and agenda, human resources and infrastructure needs, financial plan considering public and private funds and investments, organizational structure, targets of performance, knowledge transfer and outreach measures, and strategic partnerships. Governance arrangements will involve the Project Steering Committee, the PISLM Secretariat, regional Universities and research centres, and agencies operating at the sub-regional and global levels. A Director and several Heads of Department, as set in the Strategic Plan. The management strategy will be based on annual workplans with results-based monitoring schemes.

Activities aimed at improving and harmonizing policies on land and climate risks at the sub-regional scale are grouped under outputs 5.2.2 and 5.2.3 and will be managed by the PMU and the PISLM Secretariat, following the lessons learned and approaches taken under SOILCARE Phase 1, which have proven to be successful.

All these arrangements are mentioned in the project document under the rationale section, the project description (output 5.1.1) and the results framework.

x. The RAC/NAT Facility will serve as a science-policy interface, translating research and technical insights into actionable recommendations for national and regional decision-makers, in joint action with the PISLM Secretariat activities under component 5, thus supporting evidence-based policy formulation. It will directly engage with CARICOM's Council for Science and Technology (activities 5.1.1.4) and support the expansion of the Caribbean Soil Support Group to strengthen regional coordination. At the national level, the Facility will support countries in improving data and updating their Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Programmes (activities 5.1.1.2 and 5.2.2.3) through a participatory process that includes gap analysis and the development of model frameworks and cabinet instruments. At the sub-national level, RAC/NAT will provide technical backstopping to land use planning bodies and inter-ministerial committees (activity 5.1.1.2 linked with 5.2.2.3), ensuring that decisions are informed by current data and best practices, and SLM practices.

The RAC/NAT strategic plan (see activity 5.1.1.1) will include plans to secure funds, to build outreach channels and to feed sub-national planning mechanisms that support in improving the enabling environment at the national and regional levels, jointly with the actions on policy frameworks in outputs in 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and 5.2.3. The PISLM Ministerial Council, the Regional Project Steering Committee and the NI-AAG will have a crucial role on this (see role of the RPSC and the NI-AAGs in Section B1).

xi. The RAC/NAT Facility will establish active links with global platforms, sharing region-specific data, methodologies, and innovations from the Caribbean SIDS context. Regionally, the Knowledge Hub integration with the SIDS-SIDS Green Blue Economy Knowledge Hub (SIDS-SIDS KTH), led by UWI-Cave Hill, the Facility will ensure that findings from SOILCARE Phase 2 are accessible to Caribbean and global audiences (output 5.1.3). The RAC/NAT will also support the interoperability

of the CARSIS with global soil and land information systems such as WOCAT and GLOSI (activity 5.1.1.2), among others. Specifically, all the SSM and SLM best practices and lessons learned will be uploaded to the WOCAT database of SLM approaches and technologies, and links will be established for further collaboration (activity 5.1.3.1). Research results will be shared through the participation in international conferences, publication of peer-reviewed research, and global institutions will be invited to participate in regional scientific and technical conferences and events organized by the RAC/NAT (activities 5.1.1.5, 5.1.1.6, 5.1.1.7).

The already existing contacts of the SOILCARE with the Trends. Earth platform will be strengthened, to contribute technical advances specific to the Caribbean and support their application in SIDS in other areas of the globe.

**b)**

i. An extensive table detailing all GEF and non GEF-initiatives the project is building can be found in Annex H ? uploaded as separate document in the portal. Furthermore, an explanation has been added also in the project rationale section (Phase 2 alternative).

ii. As the SOILCARE Phase 1 has been the first project of its kind in the Caribbean region -- a large regional scale soil and land project implemented in 8 countries and with actions at the local, national and regional level -- learnings from its implementation have been numerous. The formulation process in SOILCARE Phase 2 has benefitted from them in different forms. First, regarding the identification of barriers and their scope at the multiple implementation scales. An example of that is the understanding of the practical obstacles for producing and using soil data at a subregional scale. Since not all countries had in-house capacity to produce their own data, data production for producing soil maps under Phase 1 required importing samples to Trinidad and Tobago for laboratory analysis. In the absence of a regional sample import procedure, the different national regulations and policies regarding soil sample imports in the Caribbean countries emerged as an added difficulty to overcome the lack of data. SOILCARE Phase 2 design has those obstacles into account and includes resources for addressing them with a long-run view, to not only streamline data production under the project but also pave the way for future developmental and research endeavours that require soil sample import. A second learning from that process was that, given the decentralized nature of the project, centralizing all analytical activities into 1 single laboratory was operationally slow, and that has been also included in the SOILCARE Phase 2 design by supporting a regional reference laboratory that will support the development of analytical capabilities in the laboratories of the region in the short and longer term, in addition to the upgrading of equipment and materials under the project. CARSOLAN and RAC/NAT are expected to have a major role in that, for which both entities will be greatly strengthened under SOILCARE Phase 2 (see output 1.1.1 and 5.1.1). Learnings regarding how to overcome data-sharing concerns, which have limited the ambition of the project to make data publicly available, have also been considered, and will be addressed by the project under its component 1 (see response to comment 5.a.i).

Further, a crucial lesson from Phase 1 was the need to take precautions to not be over ambitious regarding on-the-ground implementation targets. On-site activities are the most onerous for the project, both in terms of their economic cost and their complexity for implementation, given the diversity of tasks, the larger number of national regulations and stakeholders and the need for intensive monitoring and management. In that regard, several risk mitigation measures have been taken in Phase 2 project formulation, to ensure that targets are realistically designed in relation to the Executing Agency and the countries' capacity to implement. First, the targets have been set after a thorough examination of national LDN-TSP and PRAIS reports. As a reference for decision making, the acreage to be acted upon by the project was set to be not higher than 25% of the country's voluntary targets. For bigger countries, the reference figure was 2,000 ha, although final acreages can be higher in cases in which specific existing projects and programs allow wider scaling out strategies. In fact, both the specific locations and the outscaled acreages were defined in considering also the expected scope of other initiatives (GEF or non GEF, including national programs), for best value for money and increased impact, while minimizing the management workload. Still, given the complexity of a 14-countries project, measures have been included to

support the strengthening of the Executing Agency structure and, specifically, of the management unit.

In that regard, SOILCARE Phase 2 will count with fully dedicated in-country PISLM staff with the necessary technical expertise to follow up on project activities. At the regional level, the technical capacities at PISLM will be also greatly improved, with funds allocated to recruit experts in the main areas of activity of the project, after a full assessment of technical capacities undertaken as part of the project formulation. Activities requiring a specific background or technical expertise that will not be available among the PISLM core staff will be executed as contracts by specialized entities. In addition, increased efforts will be made by the FAO Subregional Office for the Caribbean to channel the large global FAO technical capacity in support to the implementation of the project, as per the Executing Agency requests.

In addition, the design of activities, the results framework and the workplan of SOILCARE Phase 2 embed measures to ensure that issues potentially producing implementation delays are identified and addressed the soonest, including a schedule of milestones and deliverables. It is thus expected that participatory processes and planning of field operations will be faster in SOILCARE Phase 2 compared to phase 1, also considering that, from the work of Phase 1, processes and communication channels are now streamlined.

The on-the-ground implementation of SOILCARE Phase 1 has accelerated since the assessment and submission of the MTR, and operations have started in most of the project sites. The project activity is now visible, and national and local stakeholders are aware of it. Still, the Phase 1 implementation period will be extended (no-cost) to ensure that the on-site interventions will be finalized and that information on impacts will be delivered. While it is expected that monitoring of the effects of practices will continue under SOILCARE Phase 2 (activity 2.1.2.4), the data produced under Phase 1 will serve to outreach and awareness raising purposes. In that regard, one of the first activities scheduled for the no-cost-extension period is the preparation of a joint soil management-climate smart agriculture-livelihoods standardized monitoring tool, that will include collection of socio-economic data and will be systematically deployed in all intervention sites. The information collected will be added to the already available assessment of land degradation and climate risk to form a robust baseline against which the results of the project can be evaluated from different angles, including socio-economic. The monitoring instrument will be also used in all SOILCARE Phase 2 sites, for harmonized information.

The need for stronger and more active National Project Committees (NI-AAGs) is also a lesson learned from the implementation of Phase 1. The Ni-AAGs had up to now limited activity under SOILCARE phase 1. Under the no-cost extension of Phase 1 and within Phase 2, Ni-AAGs will be revitalized, as recommended in the MTR, and have execution and monitoring duties, including more detailed result-based workplans at the national scale, and reporting obligations in front of the Regional Project Steering Committee (see Section B1: Institutional Arrangements and Coordination).

Steps have been taken under SOILCARE Phase 1 to address the lack of up-to-date land policies and legislation in the subregion to guide land-use planning and secure private and civil society engagement in the development of the restoration economy. In fact, support to decision-making and policy formulation at the subregional level has produced notable advances and is one of the bright spots in Phase 1 implementation. The approach to these aspects under Phase 2 will follow a similar strategy based on communication, collaboration and consensus of the parties. In Phase 2, an increased technical support to policy making is foreseen through the RAC/NAT Facility and the Caribbean Soil Support Group (outputs 5.1.1 and 5.2.1), that are expected to act as science-policy interface with regional entities and enable data-driven policy formulation.

This explanation has been included in section C, subsection Lessons learned from past projects.

**d)** noted, incremental cost reasoning is now included in a specific paragraph in the project rationale section.

**f)** see reply in the budget section

**g)** The project design ensures resilience to future changes in drivers and supports adaptive management by embedding flexibility, continuous learning, and stakeholder engagement throughout its implementation. SOILCARE Phase 2 will incorporate scenario planning and risk assessments into its monitoring and evaluation framework to adapt project activities to shifts in climate, socio-economic conditions, and policy landscapes. In addition, diversified strategies, such as nature-based solutions and livelihood options, will be employed where feasible to reduce vulnerability to shocks. Other strategies such as supporting strong stakeholder participation and capacity building to foster local ownership and responsiveness, and alignment with national policies will ensure institutional coherence and long-term sustainability. Information on activities addressed project resilience have been added throughout the project document, and instruments to enable adaptive management are embedded in workplan overall design and as milestones.

**h)** please see response to comment 4.a.b)

**i)** Change made in under Section D - Policy Requirements

**k)** Noted, information has been added in the section titled "Innovation & transformative change, knowledge management, policy coherence and capacity development - Policy Coherence"

## **5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project**

**a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**

**b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**

**c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared

8/5/2025

a) Yes however findings outlined in the MTR of SOILCARE Phase 1 have been noted as indicated below. Please clarify how these challenges will be overcome for SOILCARE Phase II whether within SOILCARE or through external consultants.

### **MTR Findings**

Para 9- Nonetheless, PISLM lacks human resources in some key areas such as on the oversight needed to prepare and apply the abovementioned site plans for the 25 pilot sites chosen under C2-C4, on GIS thematic mapping on soils, results-monitoring and on the management of the complex logistical challenges associated with operations in Caribbean SIDS (CSIDS).

b) Yes

c) No please include.

## Agency Response

29/10/2025

a) Technical capacities in the Executing Agency in general and of the PMU in particular will be strengthened under the project, with technical staff recruited for all the areas of activity of the project (refer to the Budget, for a listing of the technical profiles that will be required and the amounts allocated to them, and ANNEX L - Terms of Reference for Core Staff for details on the tasks, uploaded as separate document in the portal). Activities that are limited in duration and that may require very specific and advanced technical knowledge will be contracted to specialized entities/individuals that have demonstrated previous experience in those areas (please see the Budget). In addition, FAOSLC will facilitate that the large technical capacity of FAO supports a technically sound project implementation and will maintain close communication with the PMU for early detection of outstanding needs.

A further element to enable efficient implementation is that the on-the-ground implementation targets have been carefully set in discussion with the Executing Agency and the countries, so both the executing capacity of the PMU and of the countries has been considered, as well as the project workplan and chronological dependencies between project activities.

c) information has been added

### 5.3 Core indicators

a) **Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?**

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

**Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

## Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/5/2025

Not fully.

i) Please provide an explanation on why the duration of accounting for GHG emission avoided is 30 years and not 20 years as generally suggested in the GEF-8 RMF Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01).

ii) No direct beneficiary is targeted under Indicator 11, unlike what was identified at PIF stage. This seems to be an oversight as per the justification provided. Please adjust.

## Agency Response

29/10/2025

i) Please note that the NEXT tool considers by default a timeframe of 30 years, which makes it adequate for monitoring progresses towards NDCs and for reporting to the UNFCCC. Nonetheless, the NEXT tool can be adapted to project necessities, and it also allows to calculate the GHG

reduction for any period shorter than 30 years. The GHG emission reduction figure in the project document and in the files submitted correspond to 20 years as per the recommendations in GEF RMF Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01). The calculations for this project have indeed considered an implementation period of 5 years and a capitalization timeframe of 15 years, totalling 20 years of accounting.

ii) Apologies, this was an oversight during upload to the submission platform. Target for Core Indicator 11 is 9,390 direct beneficiaries (3,776 women). This has been adjusted in the portal.

#### 5.4 Risks

**a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**

**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 assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

#### Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared

8/5/2025

a) Not fully.

i) The risks are well noted. However the risk of capacity (limited HR to dedicate to the project, staff rotations, limited expertise on soils etc.) at the national level in general and potential impact on project results has not been included. Please consider.

ii) It is unclear whether the rating and description under the Institutional and Policy Innovation Risk category actually reflects project-level innovative features. If not, the related fields should remain unrated; if they do, the link to innovation risk should be clarified.

iii) Please also include an explanation for the overall risk.

b) Yes

c) Yes

#### Agency Response

29/10/2025

a)

i. noted, this risk and respective mitigation measures have been further detailed.

ii. noted, this risk has been set as ?Not rated?

iii. noted, explanation for the overall risk has been included.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/5/2025

Yes however no details have been provided on alignment with UNCCD. Please include the LDN targets for each country and how the project is contributing to these targets.

Please also include details on potential contributions to the KMGBF and UNFCCC (NDCs).

Agency Response

29/10/2025

A table summarizing the project contributions to the countries' LDN targets has been added to section C. Details on potential contributions to KMGBF and UNCCD targets have been also included.

**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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/5/2025

See comment above.

Agency Response

**7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2025

Not fully.

i) Specifically, ESS 8, ESS 8.1 and 8.2. I suggest rephrasing the first part of the text to 'For any activities involving or affecting potentially Indigenous Peoples, FPIC will be upheld?? As it is written now, it is not clear what criteria will be used to 'choose' the applicable activities and Indigenous Peoples rights and FPIC should be respected in any activity that might affect them.

ii) Also, either include the complete analysis for all the ESS criteria in the matrix or explain why some criteria are included and others not (8.1 and 8.3 but 8.2 is not, and so on for other criteria. We note that the whole analysis is included in the ESS excel supporting document).

Agency Response

29/10/2025

i) Noted, see edits made to the 'Environmental and Social Risk Matrix in the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP)' specifically ESS 8.1, 8.3 and 9.1. Re-worded to 'For any activities involving or affecting potentially Indigenous Peoples, the FPIC guidelines will be applied and respected, as outlined in the IPP and Indigenous Peoples will be respectfully engaged in planning and decision-making.'

ii) Please note that, as per FAO Framework for Environmental and Social Management (FESM) and guidelines, the ESMP should analyse the risks (ESS) that the project could trigger, that can be

consulted in Annex F1. This is why the Plan does not include the ESS that have not been activated for this project (e.g. ESS 8.2). However, a clarification on this has been added in the ESMP at pag.30.

## **8 Annexes**

### **Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response  
**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response  
**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response  
**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response  
**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response

## **8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/5/2025

No.

The total PPG amount reported (\$309,995) is higher than the approved PPG at PIF stage (299,995) ? please revise and adjust accordingly.

Agency Response

29/10/2025

Noted, this has been corrected.

## **8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/18/2025

Not fully.

i) The cofinancing letter from the Ministry of Health and the Environment, Antigua and Barbuda lists components totaling USD 838,000, but the stated total is USD 828,000.

ii) Could the agency also clarify what types of in-kind contributions will be provided, similar to the detail given for the Ministry of Planning and Development, Trinidad and Tobago? For other co-financing letters without such details, you may include them in the co-financing description section if updating the letters is not feasible.

#### Agency Response

29/10/2025

i) Noted, amount adjusted from USD 828,000 to USD 838,000 to align with the co-financing letter.

Furthermore, Co-financing letters added for The Bahamas, Belize, Grenada and Trinidad and Tobago. Total co-financing is now USD 25,652,000, this change is reflected in the division of components.

ii) Noted, information on the in-kind contribution has been added

#### **Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2025

Yes

#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/18/2025

Yes

#### Agency Response

#### **Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

- b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**
- c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**
- d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/9/2025

a) Yes

b) Not fully.

i) We note a significant number of indicators. Is there a possibility to merge a few of the indicators.

ii) We also note there are very little qualitative indicators which go beyond numbers but speak to actually change in practices/behaviours and impact. Please incorporate where possible.

c) Please incorporate

d) Yes

Agency Response

29/10/2025

i) and ii) The design of the results framework and specifically the selection of indicators was intended at assessing both implementation progress and impact, to ensure adaptive management, so the number of indicators may be slightly higher than usual. We aimed at tracking the effects of the practices implemented in terms of the improvement in ecosystem services, as we consider that quantification of effects is needed for effective outreach. Nonetheless, some quantitative indicators were merged/removed, while qualitative impact indicators have been added as per ii). The number of indicators has been reduced from 59 to 53.

c) sex-disaggregated indicators have been included where applicable

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/5/2025

Yes

Agency Response

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified**

**sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

Cleared.

8/9/2025

a) Yes

b) The inclusion of a line item to design the LDN Funding Mechanism is noted. However this was already funded under SOLICARE Phase 1, please clarify what additional design activities are required. SOILCARE II should be focused on implementation.

c) Yes however please see comments below.

i) The TORs of the Regional Technical Officer are more managerial than technical in nature ? however, 100% of the costs are charged to the project components. Please consider charging this position to the co-financing resources allocated to PMC or to merge it with the Project Manager position.

ii) The TORs of the Administrative and Logistic Support Officer are either somehow repetitive with other positions (i. e. issues pertaining with TORs for which the Regional Technical Officer will review them, but this officer will ensure that the TORs will be published ; or ensure that selection processes are completed, and contracts are issued on-time for which the Procurement Officer also ensure that contractual processes follow the stipulated procedures); or can also be done by other staff (i.e. review outgoing correspondence and documentation for correct format, grammar, spelling and conformance with FAO Style ? it is really needed a position to review grammar when there is a Project Manager?). Please revise the TORs.

iii) TORs for PILSM Liaison Specialist are missed. Please include for review.

iv) Similarly, other TORs are missed such as National Technical Assistants (one per country ? the individual costs are also missed, though they amount for \$1.4 million)

The TORs are not included in the ProDoc ? please include.

Agency Response

29/10/2025

**b)** Indeed, thanks for noting the oversight. As clearly stated in the narrative and the results framework, the activities related to the LDN-TFM are about deployment of the fund, and not about design, which is undertaken under Phase 1. The amount in that budget line has been allocated to the fine tuning of the fund characteristics in the moment of operationalization and to allow for contingencies during the first stages of deployment, given the uncertainty in global economic and trade context. It needs thus to be understood as a risk mitigation measure. The wording of the relevant budget line has been modified to reflect that with accuracy: *?Implementation and capitalization of the Caribbean LDN Transformative Funding Mechanism?.*

c)

- i. Regional Technical Officer consultant removed from budget and budget adjustments made
- ii. TORs for Administrative and Logistic Support Officer revised in Annex L (uploaded as stand alone document in the documents section)
- iii. TORs included in Annex L
- iv. ToRs, including individual cost (per month), included in Annex L, for: National Technical Assistants, ICT Consultant, Social Safeguard and Indigenous Peoples Specialist.

**Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Additional Annexes**

**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**

**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/14/2025

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO Endorsement.

8/18/2025

The project is not yet technically cleared. Please address the comments above.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	8/18/2025	10/29/2025
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/14/2025	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		