



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 PIF 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

10/19/2023

Review completed by PM

12/12/2023

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

FSP

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

a) Yes

b)

-Please correct the classification of the project to LDFA instead of MFA

-There are a number of key words missing from the taxonomy which are relevant to the project, such as drought mitigation, resilience among others. Please include.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

a- No response required

b- Noted, the project classification and taxonomy have been updated

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

1/25/2024:

Cleared

11/27/2023:

Please ensure the CI targets match those in the core indicator table.

10/31/2023:

-Please provide a summary of the expected results.

Agency's Comments

12/12/2023

CI Targets match those in the core indicator table in the PIF document as well as in the GEF portal

LOGFRAME PIF SENT ON 24 NOV		CI TABLE PIF DOC SENT ON 24 NOV		GEF PORTAL LOGFR
	<p>- CI3: 28,000 ha of croplands, rangelands and forests restored</p> <p>- CI4: 70,000 ha of landscapes under improved practices</p> <p>- CI11: 6,900 direct beneficiaries from GEF interventions</p>	2.1	inc	achieve L
		stra	pla	Indicators
		imp	int	- CI3: 28,000 croplands, rangelands, forests re
		De	(DS	- CI4: 70,000 landscap improved
				- CI11: 6,900 beneficia GEF inter

1	Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares)	
2	Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use (Hectares)	
3	Area of land restored (Hectares)	28,000 ha
4	Area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding protected areas)(Hectares)	70,000 ha
5	Area of marine habitat under improved practices (excluding protected areas) (Hectares)	
6	Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO2e)	
7	Number of shared water ecosystems (fresh or marine) under new or improved cooperative management	
8	Globally over-exploited marine fisheries moved to more sustainable levels (metric tons)	
9	Reduction, disposal/destruction, phase out, elimination and avoidance of chemicals of global concern and their waste in the environment and in processes, materials and products (metric tons of toxic chemicals reduced)	
10	Reduction, avoidance of emissions of POPs to air from point and non-point sources (grams of toxic equivalent gTEQ)	
11	Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment	6,900

11/23/2023

- Noted. A summary of the expected results has been included in this section

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

- a) Yes
- b)

-There should be a cleared differentiation between the expected Outputs of SOILCARE II and SOILCARE 1. The added value of the latter should come out more strongly here and in the project description?

- Please include the expected GEBs for each Component in particular field based interventions.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

a- No response required

b -Noted. An effort has been made to differentiate results from Soilcare 1 and 2. This is made clear in the logframe and in section B. The following paragraphs were added:

29. Component 1 of SOILCARE II will allow countries not included in Phase I to implement baseline activities needed to operationalize Land Degradation Neutrality in each country, including laboratory assessments and national soil surveys. The new participating countries will build on the tools and approaches developed and field tested by SOILCARE 1 countries to ensure that by the end of Phase 2 all participating countries have completed their baseline assessments, allowing them to design and implement strategic interventions for addressing the rehabilitation of degraded lands in support of the attainment of LDN under components 2, 3 and 4. These baseline data will also strengthen the capability of CSIDS to manage soil, land and land resources and water to combat drought and flood through LDN; and promoting the adoption of validated approaches and technologies to combat LDN

83. Sufficient and reliable financial resources are central to ensuring countries can achieve their LDN commitments. During SOILCARE I, under component 4, the program is expected to produce a detailed structure and operational modality to turn the LDN Transformative Funding Mechanism into a reality. The expectation is that during SOILCARE II, this funding mechanism will be capitalized and become operational, resulting in the financing of sustainable land management interventions.

-Noted. GEBs are now reflected in the project components as core indicators

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

11/27/2023

Cleared and acceptable for PIF stage. At CEO endorsement stage, please ensure the gender dimensions are adequately incorporated.

10/31/2023:

Yes however for gender, please ensure women's and/or gender experts' engagements in Output 2.1.3. Please ensure gender considerations are captured in risk and vulnerability assessment under Output 3.1.1. Incorporate gender dimensions in outputs related to capturing knowledge and learning and capacity-building (e.g. Output 5.1.1, 5.1.4, 5.1.2)

Agency's Comments

12 /12 /2023

Duly noted

11/23/2023

Noted. Gender considerations have been included both in the logframe and Section B. This will be developed further during the PPG phase and budgeted accordingly

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

10/31/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency's Comments

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

10/31/2023:

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared

10/31/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) We note the connections made to SOILCARE 1 and SIDS-SIDS Green Blue Economy Knowledge Transfer Knowledge Hub (SIDS-SIDS KTH), however there is little reference

to other regional or national projects that may have similar initiatives. These include GEF investments to set up various national conservation trust funds in many of the participating countries as well as other regional models such as the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund, KM and learning initiatives that have been developed under other regional projects, such as those related to International Waters or Chemicals and Waste. How is the project learning from these?

d) No. Please include, ensuring to cover a description of their anticipated role and contribution to the outcomes of the projects in the Project description, as well as providing a list of stakeholders who were consulted during the development of this PIF, giving dates and a description of the meetings. This also includes responding to the questions in Section D ? on the role of private sector.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

a- No response required

b- No response required

c- The project will build upon the achievements of the work done in the countries that have established Trust funds under the Caribbean Biodiversity Funds, Caribbean Challenge Initiative, and its own Transformative Fund which structure and operations modalities are being worked on. Specifically, SOILCARE II will pilot investments in SSM, value chain improvement and alternative livelihood initiatives with a specifically focus on youth and with gender perspective (Output 4.1.2) and design investment plans (Output 4.1.3). Lessons learned and experiences from approaches to capitalization, SOILCARE II and other investments, would be discussed and analyzed at regional forums to deduce a feasible approach for CSIDS.

Further, the work done in SOILCARE I focusing on LDN, Landscape Restorations, SSM, SLM supports and contributes to the work being done in the countries under the 2020 Goal, to effectively conserve and manage at least 20% of the marine and coastal environment by 2020. The existing trust funds provide fully functioning financial mechanisms that provide reliable funding to conserve and sustainably manage the marine and coastal resources and the environment over the long term. SOILCARE II's work will complement these activities in the terrestrial environment.

d- Noted. The table of stakeholders and dates of consultation has been included in the PIF.

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

a) Yes

b) Please see questions/comments below.

-Do any of the participating countries have national drought plans and if not will the regional work targeting drought provide guidance in this direction?

-Output 4.1.1- LDN Fund- We note reference to the text on '*a request is being made in this project document for a contribution from the GEF Non-Grant Instrument of a ratio of three times the contribution of the participating countries*'. Please note the NGI window follows a different submission process through a call for proposals.

-Component 5 refers to policy work at the regional level, will there be any additional policy work at the national level in this phase?

-Output 5.1.1. *Innovations in Agriculture Systems essayed by the RAC/NAT Facility*. What are the sustainability plans for the facility?

-Output 5.1.3- *Youth Innovation Agricultural Development Initiative Designed* - We expect to see greater emphasis in the planned training around a context of sustainable agricultural practices and by extension the importance of SLM/SSM. Please include.

-Output 5.2.1, 5.2.2, 5.2.3- What specific activities are envisioned under these outputs?

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

a- No response required

b-

-Grenada is the only country with a national drought plan. These plans are urgently needed in all the other countries because the impacts of climate change is resulting in unpredictable weather patterns. CIMH Drought Outlooks is helping to bring more awareness to the threat and impacts of drought on livelihoods and food security.

-Apologies for the mistake. The project will not request NGI resources.

Instead, countries have agreed to use STAR resources to help capitalize the LDN Transformative Fund. Section 4.1.1 no longer refers to NGI.

-Yes, the project will support the preparation of national drought plans (component 3) and management/investment plans (component 2) for the target sites. There will also be an analysis of national land policies and if needed/requested support can be provided for its update. The target is to support 6-8 countries develop their National Land Policies (eg. Belize is updating its NLP with SOILCARE 1).

-In the long term, the RAC/NAT should be sustained from the services it provides to the private sector. The project will design an exit strategy including long term sustainability plans for RAC/NAT facility. Specifically, PISLM would engage in commercial farming with crops that have a high market demand. The commercial scale farming would be done in collaboration with the Private Sector to ensure a readily available market. PISLM will be using a new technology that would be available for large scale high output for shrimp and fish. Training and capacity building would also be undertaken at the facility via online and in-person modules as paid programmes. The facility will be working closely with both governmental and non governmental agencies to ensure that new technologies for adapting to climate change are streamlined.

-Noted. All of the countries have identified the important role of youths in agriculture can play in both transferring knowledge on LDN, SSM, SLM ensuring the correct land management practices are implemented on farms.

Grenada has a Youth in Agriculture Initiative funded by the Caribbean Development Bank that will be reviewed to ascertain its impacts. The focus will be on training at the secondary and tertiary level agricultural sciences schools and colleges. Granting of scholarships specifically focused on SSM, SLM, LDN and land resources managements will be given priority as well as use of remote sensing and GIS technology for decision support

Youth programmes would be encouraged through outreach programs, training and capacity building and networking with young entrepreneurs and financial institutions to implement bankable projects.

The facility will undertake research as well as test existing technologies on crops of interest outlined by the region.

- The following activities have been included under outcome 5.2

1. 1. Review of each country existing LDN Targets to bring them more in line with current needs.
2. 2. Assessment of each country's status in achieving LDN targets to address bearing in mind 2030 goal.
3. 3. A Review of existing Land policies to determine if policy coherence is required. (Belize is reviewing their National land policy under Phase 1 to include LDN, SSM, SLM).
4. 4. Development of a Model Regional LDN Policy (SSM, SLM) and draft legislation that countries can use as a template to develop their own policies.
5. 5. Presentation of the draft to regional Soil Support Group for review and approval
6. 6. Ratification at COTED of Draft Framework and Policy.
7. 7. Support 6-8 countries to develop national land policies
8. 8. Training in writing national drought plans.
9. 9. Support countries to develop National Drought Plans and policies including obtaining Cabinet approval.

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

Please strengthen this narrative in particular within the context of SOILCARE 1.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted. A brief section on "Incremental Reasoning" was included at the end of section B

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

11/27/2023:

a) b) As the FAO knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an "exceptional" basis. We strongly encourage the FAO to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

10/31/2023:

- a) Not fully. Please include.
- b) The LoEs do not present FAO as the executing partner, neither there is a letter of support from OFPs for this. Please remove any mention for FAO to execute the project.
- c) Yes. We note the collaboration with the SIDS Knowledge Hub.
- d) Yes

Agency's Comments

12/12/2023

Duly noted

11/23/2023

a- Noted. Its been clarified that the project will be executed by PISLM (like in SOILARE I). At the request of the countries, FAO may play a minor role (not more than 2 or 3 percent of project resources) in project execution. This FAO execution will be limited to activities leading to the transfer of capacity to national experts and institutions on the application of relevant tools such as the LDN Decision Support System, NEXT, RECSOIL or the Climate Risk Toolbox

b- Revised LOEs include FAO as executing partner, though with a limite role. The main executing partner is PISLM

c- No responser required

d- No response required

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared

10/31/2023:

- a) Please include details on how you are accounting for the core indicator targets
- b) Please consider increasing the core indicator targets in particular for sub-indicator 4.3 and given the size of the overall investment.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

a- Done. The following text was included under the CI Table:

The detailed assessment of target sites and their precise measurement (in areas) will be done during the project preparation phase (PPG phase). Budget limitations do not allow us to carry out field visits at this stage in each of the countries. Therefore, it was assumed that each country will restore at least 2,000 ha with GEF resources (including low-cost activities such as assisted natural regeneration aligned with avoiding and reducing degradation in the LDN hierarchy) and will sustainably manage 5,000 ha of productive lands (including areas for which management plans have been developed as per GEF policy). Given that it is not clear what type of intervention will be implemented at this stage, it is not possible to reliably calculate GHG emissions (Core Indicator 6). Nonetheless, this will be done during the PPG phase

b- Core Indicator Targets have been revised

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

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

10/31/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency's Comments

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

Cleared

11/27/2023:

10/31/2023:

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Please expand on how the focus and approach of the project can facilitate policy coherence at the regional and national level.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

a- No response required

b- No response required

c- noted. details have been included in the PIF

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

-Please only refer to the alignment of the project with the FA objectives to which the project is responding.

-Please also consider including LD Objective 3.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted, will focus on LD 1 and LD 3 as suggested

-Done, this is reflected in the budget tables

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared. At CEO Endorsement please indicate how the project can help countries to meet commitments under other MEAs.

10/31/2023:

Please provide details on alignment with national priorities and plans.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted and included as annex to account for the 14 participating countries

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

Please indicate whether or not the project is indirectly contributing to any GBF targets.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

The proposed project will contribute to the following GBF targets, though their precise contribution will need to be evaluated during the PPG phase:

- the SOILCARE program will support participatory integrated biodiversity inclusive spatial planning and effective management processes addressing land use change, while respecting the rights of indigenous peoples and local communities (GBF Target 1). The key metric here will be in the cases where intensification and/or other sustainable practices are reducing conversion pressure on nearby high biodiversity areas.

- Under component 2, SOILCARE II will support restoration of degraded ecosystems, with benefits for biodiversity as well as for the provision of ecosystem services to food systems (GBF Target 2).

-Improved management practices along the length of the value chain (such as low external input agriculture and pollution-free processing) will reduce pollution risks and the negative impact of pollution (GBF Target 7).

-SOILCARE II will promote the increased application of biodiversity friendly practices, such as sustainable intensification, agroecological and other innovative approaches, so that target areas (including those under agriculture, pastures and forestry) are managed sustainably (GBF Target 10).

-SOILCARE II will apply nature-based solutions and ecosystem-based approaches that restore, maintain and enhance nature's contributions to people, including ecosystem functions and services (GBF Target 11); the agricultural approaches promoted by the IP will for example benefit soil health and may also provide pollination benefits

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

Not fully. Private sector, stakeholder engagement and ESS information will be needed. Please upload/provide.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted. Informations have been included, in the PIF and as an annex.

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

Secretariat's Comments

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

No

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Apologies for the oversight. The table of stakeholders consulted has been included

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

11/27/2023:

Cleared

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

Not fully.

-The following tables- GEF Financing Table and Indicative Focal Area elements needed to be amended to align with the intent of the project as a LD FA project, by selecting the relevant LD Objectives.

-Please also consider selecting LD Objective 3 which focuses on Drought.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted. The portal has been updated

-Noted, objective 3 has been added

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

10/31/2023:

See comment above.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

10/31/2023

N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

10/31/2023:

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

12/12/2023:

Cleared.

11/27/2023:

Outstanding letters are to be submitted.

10/31/2023:

FOcal area set aside request is expected. LOEs will have to be revised accordingly.

Agency's Comments

12/12/2023

Noted. All of the 14 endorsement letters from the OFP of the recipient countries have been received and uploaded under one single pdf document in the "Documents" module of the GEF portal

11/23/2023

Noted. All LOEs have been revised to include focal area set aside and address comments below on the structure of the letters

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

11/27/2023:

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

10/31/2023:

Yes. However please explore investment mobilized financing at the CEO Endorsement stage.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted, but no response needed. We will explore investment mobilized during the PPG phase.

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

12/12/2023:

Cleared

11/27/2023:

Outstanding letters to be included.

10/31/2023:

1) Only 7 of 14 OFP letters have been submitted. In absence of many letters of Endorsement (Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Vincent and the Grenadines, and Trinidad and Tobago), it is not possible to review the figures in the General Project Information Table, neither the GEF financial tables. When all letters are complete and submitted, we can provide a full assessment of the financials.

2). Out of the submitted letters: (i) all removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: "Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?" - per the attached email back in March when we were aiming to constitute June 2023 Work Program, Agencies were informed that LoEs "with modifications cannot be accepted and will be returned?". While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project; (ii) excepting Antigua and Barbuda, the rest did not include in the table whether the Land Degradation allocated resources were from the

STAR or the Set-Aside; (iii) however, the letter from Antigua and Barbuda used a template that merged both fees (GEF Project Financing + PPG), so we cannot guess how much is allocated by the OFP to each portion; (iv) the letter from Suriname did not include the final amount in the paragraph before the table; (v) while most letters allocate a total amount of 20.3 million, others have a different amount that varies from 15.7 million to 19.4 million.

3) Please also ensure the set-aside funding is reflected in the letters

Agency's Comments

12/12/2023

Noted. All of the 14 endorsement letters from the OFP of the recipient countries have been received and uploaded under one single pdf document in the "Documents" module of the GEF portal

11/24/2023

Noted. New LOEs are being signed as LD Set Aside funding is being requested. New letters address issues highlighted by GEFSEC.

As of today (11/24/2023 at 2:30 pm CET) we received 11 out of 14 letters, we are missing the ones of Bahamas, Grenada and Jamaica.

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/12/2023:

Cleared.

11/27/2023:

Outstanding letters to be included.

10/31/2023:

The letters are not compiled as a single document, and 7 OFP letters are pending. In addition, the project is likely to include set aside funding, which will need to be included in all letters.

Agency's Comments

12/12/2023

Noted. All of the 14 endorsement letters from the OFP of the recipient countries have been received and uploaded under one single pdf document in the "Documents" module of the GEF portal

11/24/2023

Noted. A single document compiling all letters has been updated into the portal. The 11 out of the 14 that we received.

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

Secretariat's Comments

3/22/2024:

Thank you. This was an oversight. Cleared.

3/21/2024:

The LOE for Grenada still needs to be corrected.

1/25/2024:

Please double check the entry for Grenada.

The PIF Table shows Grenada with 700K from BD STAR allocation and 800K from LD STAR allocation, while in Grenada's LoE the 1.5 million are all from LD STAR Allocation. Please make the adjustments where necessary.

12/12/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

Note the expected request for set-aside funding will need to be included in all letters.

Agency's Comments

3/22/2024

Please note that the Granada LOE that was uploaded on March 1st has the same amounts as the other 13 letters and they reflect the table of source of funds in the portal. See pictures below:

FAO	GET	Barbados	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,500,000.00
FAO	GET	Dominica	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	2,000,000.00
FAO	GET	Grenada	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	800,000.00
FAO	GET	Guyana	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,500,000.00
FAO	GET	Haiti	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	598,435.00
FAO	GET	Jamaica	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,500,000.00
FAO	GET	St. Kitts and Nevis	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	2,000,000.00
FAO	GET	St. Lucia	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,500,000.00
FAO	GET	St. Vincent and Grenadines	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,500,000.00
FAO	GET	Suriname	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,000,000.00
FAO	GET	Trinidad and Tobago	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	1,498,687.00
FAO	GET	Bahamas	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	191,600.00
FAO	GET	Belize	Land Degradation	LD STAR Allocation	40,873.00
FAO	GET	Belize	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	40,874.00
FAO	GET	Belize	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	40,872.00
FAO	GET	Grenada	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	700,000.00
Total GEF Resources(\$)					18,719,741.00

Belize	GEFTF	FAO	CC STAR Allocation	56,844	5,515	655	58	40,872
Dominica	GEFTF	FAO	LD STAR Allocation	1,802,813	162,252	32,051	2,884	2,000,000
Grenada	GEFTF	FAO	LD STAR Allocation	721,126	64,901	12,820	1,153	800,000
Grenada	GEFTF	FAO	BD STAR Allocation	630,985	56,788	11,218	1,009	700,000
Guyana	GEFTF	FAO	LD STAR Allocation	1,352,109	121,689	24,039	2,163	1,500,000
Haiti	GEFTF	FAO	BD STAR	598,434	48,548	9,500	863	598,435

3/01/2024

Thank you. A new LOE for Granada has been uploaded to match the portal entry.

11/23/2023

Noted. All LOEs include LD Set Aside resources requested.

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 CommentsN/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

10/31/2023:

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

1/25/2024:

Please note that the environment and social section of the Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation in the Portal is still 'low'. Please change it to 'Moderate' as well.

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

The project overall ESS risk is classified as moderate (D. Policy Requirements, page 50). However, there is no environmental and social screening report attached. Please provide environmental and social screening report. In addition, 1) please provide clear next step during the PPG including further environmental and social risk assessment and management plan. Also, the 'Risks to Project Preparation and Implementation' section (page 47) said Environment and social risk as 'low'. 2) Please make them consistent and correct.

Agency's Comments

3/01/2024

Please see that the risk is now 'Moderate'

11/23/2023

Noted. The project ESS risk is rated as Moderate, not Low and this has been corrected in the word version of the PIF. The ESS screening report as well as the Climate Screening report have been uploaded into the portal.

1- During PPG, a social and environmental risk assessment and risk management plan will be developed. This is a standard procedure in accordance with FAO rules.

2- ESS risk is Moderate and is now consistent in the document

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

Please correct the RIO marker selections to align with the focus of the project and the programming objectives selected. At the moment there minimal rationale for selecting '1' for Biodiveristy and Climate Change Mitigation.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted. Project will focus on LD, therefore RIO markers for BD and CC are moved to Zero

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

11/27/2023:

Cleared.

10/31/2023:

No please see comment above on taxonomy.

Agency's Comments

11/23/2023

Noted. This has been corrected to include appropriate keywords

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

3/22/2024

The comment dated 3/21/2024, was an error. The project is recommended for technical clearance.

3/21/2024

The LOE still needs to be corrected.

1/25/2024:

Please address the follow up comments on the STAR allocation amount for Grenada and the ESS Risk rating for the project.

12/12/2023:

The PIF is technically cleared.

10/31/2023:

Not at this time. Please address the comments above.

Agency's Comments

3/22/2024

Please see comment above.

3/01/2024

A new endorsement letter has been uploaded and the ESS risk is now Moderate.

11/23/2023

Noted. All comments have been addressed and the PIF has been resubmitted for your consideration

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/31/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/27/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/12/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/22/2024	