

## Integrated Landscape Management for Addressing Land Degradation, Food Security and Climate Resilience Challenges in The Bahamas

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10694

**Countries**

Bahamas

**Project Title**

Integrated Landscape Management for Addressing Land Degradation, Food Security and Climate Resilience Challenges in The Bahamas

**GEF Agency(ies)**

UNEP

**Agency ID**

UNEP: 01859

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Land Degradation

**Program Manager**

Asha Bobb-Semple

# PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

## Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020:

Yes

Agency Response

## Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/30/2020:

Cleared.

10/27/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat, please see additional comments below.

There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as with the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$17,300,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$865,000 instead of \$500,000. Please amend.

10/26/2020:

Cleared

10/19/2020:

Thank you for the responses. Please see additional comments below.

-For GEF financing, we expect projects to have an adequate mix of TA and Investment classified in Table B, in particular if there is site based financing. In addition to Output 2.1.1, please clarify whether or not the intended activities under Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.3.2 are meant to target site level interventions and to deliver tangible results on the ground. If so, please adjust the Financing Type for Component 2 to Investment. If necessary, you may reallocate the TA Outputs/Activities to a different component.

-As the basis of the project is addressing land degradation in productive landscapes, during the PPG phase, please ensure that there is further refinement of Outcome Indicators and Targets to ensure that they are specific and reflect the tangible and sustained results that are expected. Additional suggestions for Outcome 1- Inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms on LDN institutionalized; Outcome 2- No. of farmers trained; Outcome 3-LDN monitoring system operational; Functioning LDN reporting to the UNCCD; Lessons learned on ILM and LDN mainstreamed in land use related decision making and policies.

09/28/2020:

We welcome this project submission from The Bahamas on integrated approach based on LD. However please address the comments below.

#### General

-Overall, please include indicative outcome level indicators. These should include but are not limited to the number of hectares restored/rehabilitated, no. of farmers benefitting, if possible, an estimate on the potential % increase in income of farmers etc.

-We suggest, as far as possible, to provide quantities or numbers to qualify the outputs (especially outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3). It will help the GEF to better assess the value for money of “advisory and support services”, “studies and recommendations”, “suite of tools”, “suite of resources”, “series of events”... .

-We note the level of funds allocated to activities under LD 2.5 amount to close to \$1.7M (Components 1 & 3) which seems relatively high. Can you clarify the basis for these costs? We suggest reducing the level of resources assigned to this objective.

### Component 2

-For the Financing Type, this component should also include Investment together with Technical Assistance, given the heavy focus on field-based activities

-Output 2.2.2- Please clarify this Output. Are the tools going to be developed, adopted or farmers trained to use them?

-Is this an additional 20,000 ha or the 10,000 ha in Output 2.1.1 is included in this figure?

-Please clarify Outcome 2.3.

-Output 2.3.2- Please clarify what is meant by 'eco-social business ventures'?

### Component 3

- This component should include an output dedicated to monitoring of the project
- Output 3.1.2- Regarding the monitoring system, is there already available baseline data?

## **Agency Response**

### 10/27/2020:

There is not proportionality in the co-financing contribution to PMC – it should be around 5% as with the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$17,300,000, the expected contribution to PMC must be around \$865,000 instead of \$500,000. Please amend

**RESP:** *The co-financing to PMC has been adjusted to \$865,000 and the co-financing amount under Component 2 has been adjusted to \$6,935,000*

### 21/10/2020

-For GEF financing, we expect projects to have an adequate mix of TA and Investment classified in Table B, in particular if there is site based financing. In addition to Output 2.1.1, please clarify whether or not the intended activities under Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.3.2 are meant to target site level interventions and to deliver tangible results on the ground. If so, please adjust the Financing Type for Component 2 to Investment. If necessary, you may reallocate the TA Outputs/Activities to a different component.

**RESP:** *Recommendation accepted, and the project now has 4 components. Component 2 is now categorized as Investment under which Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2 remains. The Outcome 2.3 is now within a new Component 3 numbered 3.1 and remains categorized as Technical Assistance. This new Component 3 is captioned 'Incentivizing uptake and replication of SLM and climate resilient agriculture'. The original Component 3 is now listed as Component 4. All required changes are made in Table B. Substantive changes related to this are made in the*

rest of the document; in the Barrier Analysis a new barrier #3 that describes the lack of fiscal incentivization is now included. Under the project component description, Component 2 is modified accordingly (now confined to investment and the related capacity building) with the new Component 3 inserted (related to incentivizing investments). The GEBs associated with the new Component 3 is inserted as a row in the table in that section. Additional changes in the narrative with the revised alignment around 4 components have been made in all the various sections (yellow highlights in the document).

-As the basis of the project is addressing land degradation in productive landscapes, during the PPG phase, please ensure that there is further refinement of Outcome Indicators and Targets to ensure that they are specific and reflect the tangible and sustained results that are expected. Additional suggestions for Outcome 1- Inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms on LDN institutionalized; Outcome 2- No. of farmers trained; Outcome 3-LDN monitoring system operational; Functioning LDN reporting to the UNCCD; Lessons learned on ILM and LDN mainstreamed in land use related decision making and policies.

**RESP:** *Noted that during the PPG there is to be further refinement of Outcome Indicators and Targets. Suggestions on the outcome indicators incorporated into Table B.*

### 16/10/2020

-Overall, please include indicative outcome level indicators. These should include but are not limited to the number of hectares restored/rehabilitated, no. of farmers benefitting, if possible, an estimate on the potential % increase in income of farmers etc.

**RESP:** *Suggestion noted, and updates are provided in Table B. Note however that the % increase in the income of farmers at this PIF submission is a challenge to estimate and proposed that this be analysed during the PPG phase.*

We suggest, as far as possible, to provide quantities or numbers to qualify the outputs (especially outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 2.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3). It will help the GEF to better assess the value for money of "advisory and support services", "studies and recommendations", "suite of tools", "suite of resources", "series of events"...

**RESP:** *Suggestion noted, and updates are provided in Table B and reflected in the narrative under the Project Component descriptions.*

-We note the level of funds allocated to activities under LD 2.5 amount to close to \$1.7M (Components 1 & 3) which seems relatively high. Can you clarify the basis for these costs? We suggest reducing the level of resources assigned to this objective

**RESP:** *The resource assignment was aligned to the estimated component costs associated with Components 1 and 3 given that they contribute to fostering the enabling environment for mainstreaming policy. We have made re-assignment between 1.4 and 2.5 that should maintain intended outcome given that these components are interlinked.*

### Component 2

-For the Financing Type, this component should also include Investment together with Technical Assistance, given the heavy focus on field-based activities

**RESP:** *Note that the PIF includes Investment, however since the bulk of the component's finances will go to TA, TA maintained in portal.*

Output 2.2.2- Please clarify this Output. Are the tools going to be developed, adopted or farmers trained to use them?

**RESP:** *The project will contribute to adaptation of existing tools that are best suited to the agro-ecological conditions of the islands, in consideration of the farming and land management systems that are to be enhanced. There will likely be some level of adaptation in application that will offer opportunities for new approaches, so it is expected there will be development of such approaches. Farmers and stakeholders will be trained to apply these methods. This clarification is made under the Project Component description under Component 2.*

-Is this an additional 20,000 ha or the 10,000 ha in Output 2.1.1 is included in this figure?

**RESP:** *The 20,000 ha is the wider landscape area corresponding to lands that are under agricultural/rural landscapes. The 10,000 ha are within the 20,000 ha. The adjustment is made to core indicator #4 in the Core Indicator table and reflected in Table F.*

Please clarify Outcome 2.3.

**RESP:** *This outcome is anticipated as the stakeholders are enabled, through the project contributions to utilize the methods and tools for the incorporation of SLM and climate resilient approaches into replicable, demonstrable practice that is assisted by provision of grant resources. The grants, to be administered via existing mechanisms, will be informed by business investment plans and information on market access opportunities.*

Output 2.3.2- Please clarify what is meant by 'eco-social business ventures'?

**RESP:** *these are businesses with social ecological focus and benefits. This term has been clarified in a footnote in Table B.*

Component 3

- - This component should include an output dedicated to monitoring of the project

**RESP:** *Suggestion noted, and has been include in Table B with the same included under Component 3 description.*

Output 3.1.2- Regarding the monitoring system, is there already available baseline data?

**RESP:** *Yes there is existing baseline data, however it is collected and archived in an ad-hoc manner with but no systemized data collections that is readily accessible.*

## Co-financing

**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, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/30/2020:

Cleared.

10/27/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat, please see additional comments below.

-Please complete the entry for FAO's co-financing.

-For the co-financing related to government, GEF Agency, private sector, development bank, beneficiaries, we note is classified as "in-kind, recurrent expenditure" which usually refers to operational costs. This is not in-line with the approach in Table B. Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures".

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

During the PPG phase, we expect further details on the specific nature of the cofinancing by Bahamas Agriculture and Marine Science Institute (BAMSI) and Bahamas Agricultural and Industrial Corporation (BAIC) and how this cofinancing is contributing to the generating of GEBs.

09/28/2020:

Not fully. Please consider the following:

-We suggest focusing cofinancing opportunities on the elements that will help to justify the Theory of Change and the proposed result framework. We note the long list of co-financing partners and we expect that all of these co-financing partners will influence the achievement of project objectives and project results. Please, simplify and/or clarify.

-Please also clarify the nature of the cofinancing from Bahamas Agriculture and Marine Science Institute (BAMSI) and Bahamas Agricultural and Industrial Corporation (BAIC).

- During the PPG phase we expect efforts will be made to secure cash/grant/investment mobilized co-financing.

## Agency Response

10/28/2020:

-Please complete the entry for FAO's co-financing.

**RESP:** *At this stage this information is not available and in this regard for the PIF submission the FAO is excluded from the co-financing table, but the country has acknowledged that the FAO will be a collaborating partner. The FAO will be consulted at PPG phase and the co-financing will be ascertained.*

-For the co-financing related to government, GEF Agency, private sector, development bank, beneficiaries, we note is classified as "in-kind, recurrent expenditure" which usually refers to operational costs. This is not in-line with the approach in Table B. Please describe the definition/ approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures".

**RESP:** *In GEF "Guidelines on Co-financing" [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing\\_Guidelines.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf) only "Investment Mobilized" is defined. "Investment Mobilized means Co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures". In defining recurrent expenditure the following definition from <https://meteor.aihw.gov.au/content/index.phtml/itemId/269132> was used "Recurrent expenditure on goods and services in expenditure, which does not result in the creation or acquisition of fixed assets (new or second-hand). It consists mainly of expenditure on wages, salaries and supplements, purchases of goods and services and consumption of fixed capital (depreciation) " All the co-financing is at this stage determined as recurrent expenditure as it covers salaries and purchases of goods and*

(depreciation). All the co-financing is at the stage determined as recurrent expenditure, as it covers salaries and purchase of goods and services. The IA will make an assertive effort to identify additional co-financing during the PPG stage that will result in the 'creation or acquisition of fixed assets'. ...this further description is included following Table C.

### **16/10/2020**

-We suggest focusing cofinancing opportunities on the elements that will help to justify the Theory of Change and the proposed result framework. We note the long list of co-financing partners and we expect that all of these co-financing partners will influence the achievement of project objectives and project results. Please, simplify and/or clarify.

**RESP:** *The Stakeholders table under Section 2 now lists the respective outputs that each stakeholder is anticipated to have a key role in development and delivery. These roles will be further evaluated during the PPG phase.*

-Please also clarify the nature of the cofinancing from Bahamas Agriculture and Marine Science Institute (BAMSI) and Bahamas Agricultural and Industrial Corporation (BAIC).

**RESP:** *These two agencies along with the Ministry of Agriculture are lead supports for agricultural development in The Bahamas and provide, within the scope of their mandates technical support. Their co-financing in this regard will be based on recurrent resources.*

- During the PPG phase we expect efforts will be made to secure cash/grant/investment mobilized co-financing.

**RESP:** *this has been committed to with the partner organizations that have been engaged in the development of the PIF and will be pursued in the PPG phase.*

## **GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

09/30/2020:

Yes

**Agency Response**

**The STAR allocation?**



**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

09/30/2020:

Yes

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

09/30/2020:

Yes. Bahamas has reallocated their STAR financing to the LD focal area.

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

09/30/2020:

N/A

**Agency Response**

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

09/30/2020:

N/A

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

09/30/2020:

N/A

Agency Response

**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

09/30/2020:

N/A

Agency Response

### Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

09/30/2020:

Yes

Agency Response

### Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2020:

Cleared

9/30/2020:

Not fully.

-Please consider including an indicative estimate for Core Indicator 6 given the co-benefits to climate mitigation.

- Please confirm who is included in the 400 beneficiaries. For a project targeting 30,000 ha of agriculture lands under SLM or restored, the number of beneficiaries (400) seems quite low. Please, justify and confirm.

### **Agency Response**

16/10/2020

-Please consider including an indicative estimate for Core Indicator 6 given the co-benefits to climate mitigation.

**RESP:** *This estimate is now included within the Core Indicator set derived from the FAO Ex-Ante Carbon Balance Tool.*

- Please confirm who is included in the 400 beneficiaries. For a project targeting 30,000 ha of agriculture lands under SLM or restored, the number of beneficiaries (400) seems quite low. Please, justify and confirm.

**RESP:** *The beneficiary number was derived based on data of voluntary registrants held by the Ministry of Agriculture. On further consultation, and backed up by discussion with the stakeholders (supported by a 2019 IDB study), that total number of persons involved in the sector is larger and closer to the 1,000 that is now proposed; many are not registered. It is clarified that overall, the project is considering 20,000 hectares as the wider landscape area within which 10,000 hectares will see targeted interventions.*

### **Project/Program taxonomy**

**7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/19/2020:

Cleared

09/30/2020

Not fully. Please consider adding climate resilience to the Taxonomy given the focus of Component 2 of the project.

### **Agency Response**

16/10/2020

Please consider adding climate resilience to the Taxonomy given the focus of Component 2 of the project.

RESP: *Done*

### **art II – Project Justification**

**1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

09/30/2020

Not fully.

-There needs to be some mention of the current situation with COVID in general and specially in relation to the focus of the project.

-Please provide some context as it relates to the private sector, market access issues by farmers and challenges with access to finance/credit which would influence the ability to scale out SLM practices elsewhere.

-The project title includes food security as an important focus of the project. Please, provide elements about food (in)security in The Bahamas in the description, and explain which Output (s) will address this situation.

### **Agency Response**

16/10/2020

There needs to be some mention of the current situation with COVID in general and specially in relation to the focus of the project

There needs to be some mention of the current situation with COVID in general and especially in relation to the focus of the project.

**RESP:** *The influence of COVID19 has been introduced under the Socio-Economic Context section, within the introductory text of the project components and under the Component 2 narrative. This factor was already highlighted as a risk in the Risk assessment, but the narrative has been expanded in consideration of the GEF guidance.*

-Please provide some context as it relates to the private sector, market access issues by farmers and challenges with access to finance/credit which would influence the ability to scale out SLM practices elsewhere.

**RESP:** *Further context on the private sector is included in the barriers section under Barrier #2.*

-The project title includes food security as an important focus of the project. Please, provide elements about food (in)security in The Bahamas in the description, and explain which Output (s) will address this situation.

**RESP:** *Further clarification on the food insecurity issue in the country is included in the Socio-Economic Context section.*

## 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020:

Yes

### Agency Response

## 3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/26/2020:

Cleared

10/19/2020:

Thank you for the responses.

-We note the additional narrative for the ToC, however we have not seen the inclusion of assumptions upon which the causal pathways and expected results have been based. Please refer to the STAP Primer on ToC and include the assumptions in the narrative.

-Regarding the RE technologies for irrigation in the nursery facilities, we will further assess the overall budget including the establishment costs for nurseries at CEO Endorsement.

9/30/2020:

Not fully. Please address the comments below.

#### General

-Given the current context with the global pandemic, please include a brief narrative on how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts created by COVID-19, to deliver GEBs and/or climate adaptation and resilience benefits, and to contribute toward green recovery and building back better in The Bahamas. Is there an opportunity to consider how the project (within the mandate of GEF financing), can assist with any COVID related medium term impacts that may be faced by the country? Are any of the sites selected also hotspots for food insecurity or unemployment that may have been caused by COVID impacts? OR consideration for use of technology for SLM/LDN/sustainable agriculture for the project and in instances of future pandemics? Please refer to the GEF Guidance on incorporating COVID considerations in PIF submissions for further information. This is available on the GEF website here <https://www.thegef.org/documents/project-design-and-review-considerations-response-covid-19-crisis-and-mitigation-future>

-We note the inclusion of the ToC diagram. We also request that a narrative describing the thinking behind the ToC diagram is included. This should include a brief discussion on the causal pathways and assumptions as they relate to the application of SLM/Restoration using an integrated approach to enhance productive landscapes and resilience. Please refer to the STAP guidance on Theory of Change available here <https://www.stapgef.org/theory-change-primer>

- During the PPG we expect the ToC to be further developed and we suggest to make use of the LDN TPP tool as a guide develop LDN aspects of the project.

-We note that there are current challenges with the absence, or very limited fiscal incentives to help transition agricultural systems to integrate more SLM practice (Barrier 1). How is this being addressed by the project or otherwise in the Bahamas? This is an important consideration as it can erode the sustained outcomes of the project.

- The challenges related to land titles is noted (Barrier 2). How will the successes of the project be realized with this barrier? Are there other efforts by the Bahamas to address this?

-We note in Barrier 3 the challenge of past projects and specifically '*There have been other initiatives in the country that have included environmental data management components that are of relevance, however most of these systems have been developed around project-based directives and as a result.*' How will this project be different?

-The lack of interaction with some key-stakeholders (private sector) is mentioned as a potential risk. However, the result framework and

project description does not appear to include support to platforms at national and local level to enhance/strengthen this multi-stakeholder dialogue. We recommend including such platforms in the outputs. If needed, please refer to the STAP publication on the subject (<https://stapgef.org/search/node/stakeholder>)

*-We also note in Barrier 3 that 'Farmers, communities and other beneficiaries are often not engaged in the process of data collection, where there is recognized good potential to mobilize additional data collection support through citizen science approaches. Consequently, there is low buy-in and limited recognition of the importance of data application by stakeholders. The other important element of under this barrier is the general lack of translation of knowledge gained from field data collection into public awareness products to drive behavior change among direct stakeholders and policy makers alike.'* Please indicate how this project will do things differently?

#### Component 1

- Does Bahamas currently have LDN targets? If so, what are they and will the project work towards helping the country to meet those targets.

#### Component 2

- Will the CCM RE interventions mentioned be financed through co-financing?

-Please indicate how the nurseries will be maintained.

-Regarding synergies, such as activities related to soil management, are there plans to collaborate with the Caribbean SIDS SOILCARE project or use lessons learned where possible. This regional Caribbean project will be expected to begin before the Bahamas project.

-As mentioned there are a number of tools and approaches that already exist on SLM and Restoration, and so we would encourage 'adoption' rather than 'development'. Please also refer to a useful global SLM database hosted by WOCAT for tools that may apply to the Bahamas context.

#### Component 3

- Consideration for how the project will utilize existing knowledge from related/similar projects in Bahamas and in the region should also be included in the KM plan.

- We also recommend to explore using monitoring and reporting tools which have been developed by Trends Earth to assist countries to fulfil their obligations under UNCCD.

## Agency Response

21/10/2020

We note the additional narrative for the ToC, however we have not seen the inclusion of assumptions upon which the causal pathway and



-we note the additional narrative for the ToC, however we have not seen the inclusion of assumptions upon which the causal pathways and expected results have been based. Please refer to the STAP Primer on ToC and include the assumptions in the narrative.

**RESP:** *A new narrative is now included on the assumptions in the preamble prior to the project component descriptions.*

-Regarding the RE technologies for irrigation in the nursery facilities, we will further assess the overall budget including the establishment costs for nurseries at CEO Endorsement.

**RESP:** *Noted*

### **16/10/2020**

-Given the current context with the global pandemic, please include a brief narrative on how the project has identified potential opportunities to mitigate impacts created by COVID-19, to deliver GEBs and/or climate adaptation and resilience benefits, and to contribute toward green recovery and building back better in The Bahamas. Is there an opportunity to consider how the project (within the mandate of GEF financing), can assist with any COVID related medium term impacts that may be faced by the country? Are any of the sites selected also hotspots for food insecurity or unemployment that may have been caused by COVID impacts? OR consideration for use of technology for SLM/LDN/sustainable agriculture for the project and in instances of future pandemics?

**RESP:** *The islands of New Providence, Grand Bahama, Abaco have been hard-hit by the pandemic, with the latter two islands having experienced the impacts from Hurricane Dorian. These islands represent hotspots given that they are most populous, and in the case of Grand Bahama and Abaco are responsible for significant agricultural output, and in that context the project can tangibly contribute to COVID19 recovery measures and help build resilience on multiple levels. This narrative has been included under the Socio-Economic Context and has been included under the summary section on the project sites following the policy and legal context section, and in preambular text under the Proposed alternative scenario section.*

We also request that a narrative describing the thinking behind the ToC diagram is included.

**RESP:** *Additional narrative is now included within the first paragraph under the Proposed alternative scenario*

During the PPG we expect the ToC to be further developed and we suggest to make use of the LDN TPP tool as a guide develop LDN aspects of the project

**RESP:** *Noted for application during the PPG phase*

We note that there are current challenges with the absence, or very limited fiscal incentives to help transition agricultural systems to integrate more SLM practice (Barrier 1). How is this being addressed by the project or otherwise in the Bahamas

**RESP:** *This is the aim of the intervention under Component 2 that seeks to provide fiscal incentives through an entrepreneurial support effort. The project will augment ongoing efforts to support the sector, where the Government is placing stepped-up priority on boosting production, recognizing that there had not been specific emphasis on SLM/land restorative approaches that enhance climate resilience. With the recent experiences with Hurricane Dorian and other hurricanes, the shift is now to incorporate SLM/climate smart agriculture in all development efforts moving forward. An insert in the component 2 narrative is included to emphasize the point.*

The challenges related to land titles is noted (Barrier 2). How will the successes of the project be realized with this barrier? Are there other efforts by the Bahamas to address this?

**RESP:** *The project will target lands for interventions where clear title exists or where access to lands is under clear authority as granted to land users to as to avoid challenges with respect to long-term continuity. The project will be strategic in selection of the actual locations that will be further evaluated at PPG phase. This is clarified with new text under the Component 2 description. By way of further background, the Government is in exploratory stages in the creation of a national land registry that will assist with improved land planning and management processes, particularly in respect to Crown lands that are under occupation, that will facilitate granting clear titles to assist access to credit (where security of land tenure can be used as leverage for financing). Crown lands may be leased from the Government for a 21-year period with the option to buy thereafter.*

We note in Barrier 3 the challenge of past projects and specifically 'There have been other initiatives in the country that have included

*environmental data management components that are of relevance, however most of these systems have been developed around project-based directives and as a result! How will this project be different?*

**RESP:** *The project intends to contribute to further mainstreaming of environmental assessment and data gathering efforts into policy-level decision making and learning opportunities, not only within academia but also among the stakeholder community. The Department of Environmental Planning and Protection through its coordinating mandate, and in partnership with the University of the Bahamas will deepen integration with the multiple stakeholders under the project. A key undertaking by the University of the Bahamas will be to create avenues to extend application of the outputs beyond the project through integration into the university curricula and course work, and promote long-term research based on the systems established under the project to ensure future scientists and researchers integrate the contributions into their work. The narrative under the Component 3 description has been updated to reflect this.*

The lack of interaction with some key-stakeholders (private sector) is mentioned as a potential risk. However, the result framework and project description does not appear to include support to platforms at national and local level to enhance/strengthen this multi-stakeholder dialogue. We recommend including such platforms in the outputs.

**RESP:** *This is the intention of output 3.2.3, where dialogues that include the private sector will be facilitated. These events will take various formats, but the project will plan for at least 10 knowledge sharing events for exchanging lessons learned, assist information dissemination and networking among policy and technical support professionals, practitioners and other beneficiaries.*

We also note in Barrier 3 that *'Farmers, communities and other beneficiaries are often not engaged in the process of data collection, where there is recognized good potential to mobilize additional data collection support through citizen science approaches. Consequently, there is low buy-in and limited recognition of the importance of data application by stakeholders. The other important element of under this barrier is the general lack of translation of knowledge gained from field data collection into public awareness products to drive behavior change among direct stakeholders and policy makers alike.'* Please indicate how this project will do things differently?

**RESP:** *The proposed approach described in Component 3 attempts to address this barrier but additional text has been included under the Component description to include the incorporation of citizen science approaches as a means of enhancing engagement and buy-in.*

#### Component 1

- Does Bahamas currently have LDN targets? If so, what are they and will the project work towards helping the country to meet those targets.

**RESP:** *No, the country does not have LND targets. The project will contribute to the establishment of LDN targets. Narrative that clarifies this is included under the Component description.*

#### Component 2

- Will the CCM RE interventions mentioned be financed through co-financing?

**RESP:** *It is expected that they will be funded under the GEF funding in keeping with best practice for integrating green/sustainable technologies. These interventions will be of minor monetary value relative to the overall value of the investments and integrated as part.*

-Please indicate how the nurseries will be maintained.

**RESP:** *The PIF states that nurseries will be operated by the MAMR and the Department of Forestry, but with the operational modalities to be defined at PPG phase; this implies the long-term maintenance. This has been further clarified under the Component 2 narrative.*

-Regarding synergies, such as activities related to soil management, are there plans to collaborate with the Caribbean SIDS SOILCARE project or use lessons learned where possible. This regional Caribbean project will be expected to begin before the Bahamas project.

**RESP:** *Yes, there are plans to collaborate with the Partnership Initiative for Sustainable Land Management as reflected in the draft PIF. There has been further reach-out to the PISLM on this aspect to bring this into consideration. This is now reflected in the text under the Component 2 narrative and under section 'Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects'*

-As mentioned there are a number of tools and approaches that already exist on SLM and Restoration, and so we would encourage

'adoption' rather than 'development'. Please also refer to a useful global SLM database hosted by WOCAT for tools that may apply to the Bahamas context.

**RESP:** *Noted, but also in consideration of comment and response above in that the project will utilize and adapt approaches to the full extent possible. The reference to use of the SLM database hosted by WOCAT has been added under the component narrative under Component 2 and 3 narratives, the section on Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up, and in the knowledge management section.*

#### Component 3

- Consideration for how the project will utilize existing knowledge from related/similar projects in Bahamas and in the region should also be included in the KM plan.

**RESP:** *Text has been included under the Knowledge Management Section*

- We also recommend to explore using monitoring and reporting tools which have been developed by Trends Earth to assist countries to fulfil their obligations under UNCCD.

**RESP:** *This is noted and have made reference to this under Component 3 narrative and the Knowledge Management section.*

#### 4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2020:

Cleared

09/30/2020:

Yes, however there is mention of BD Objective 1-1 in **Section 4-Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies**. This however is not mentioned in Table A. Please clarify.

##### Agency Response

16/10/2020

...there is mention of BD Objective 1-1 in Section 4-Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies. This however is not mentioned in Table A. Please clarify.

**RESP:** *This has been revised; reference removed from narrative*

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

09/30/2020:

Yes

**Agency Response**

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

9/30/2020:

Not fully.

-Given the selection of '1' for the Rio Marker on Climate Change Adaptation, please provide brief details on the expected adaptation and resilience benefits. We expect further information at the CEO Endorsement Stage.

-Please also provide an estimate where possible related to direct CO2 emissions avoided. Please also include brief text explaining the rationale and how the proposed forms of agriculture are going to produce multiple benefits, including in terms of carbon storage and GHG emission reductions. This rationale will be important in explaining that the project is not purely about agriculture or agribusiness, but proposes a path for sustainable agriculture, including conservation and climate smart agriculture.

**Agency Response**

11/10/2020

10/10/2020

Given the selection of '1' for the Rio Marker on Climate Change Adaptation, please provide brief details on the expected adaptation and resilience benefits. We expect further information at the CEO Endorsement Stage.

**RESP:** *A short narrative is now included on the expected adaptation and resilience benefit under the initial introduction of the project sites and under the section Alignment with GEF focal area.*

-Please also provide an estimate where possible related to direct CO2 emissions avoided. Please also include brief text explaining the rationale and how the proposed forms of agriculture are going to produce multiple benefits, including in terms of carbon storage and GHG emission reductions. This rationale will be important in explaining that the project is not purely about agriculture or agribusiness, but proposes a path for sustainable agriculture, including conservation and climate smart agriculture.

**RESP:** *An estimate of the CO2 avoided emissions are now provided; see the data under the Core Indicators. The narrative to explain the multiple benefits has been strengthened under the initial introduction of the project sites, and under Component 2 description.*

## 7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

09/30/2020:

Sustainability

- How will the training activities outlined throughout the different components of the project be institutionalized?

- Will the inter-sectoral ILM Strategy/Framework be anchored in an existing intersectoral mechanism to ensure continuity and scale up? See related comment below.

Scale up

- The project states that 'The Department of Environmental Protection and Planning will exercise its mandate within government to facilitate scaling up the successes of the project throughout the country'. Please give an indication on how this is expected to be carried out.

### Agency Response

16/10/2020

#### Sustainability

- How will the training activities outlined throughout the different components of the project be institutionalized?

**RESP:** *These capacity building opportunities will be institutionalized via embedding within existing capacity building programmes with responsible government agencies, but also with the partner organizations. The University of the Bahamas as an indigenous entity will play a key role in this regard. Text has been included under the Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up and Knowledge Management section.*

- Will the inter-sectoral ILM Strategy/Framework be anchored in an existing intersectoral mechanism to ensure continuity and scale up? See related comment below.

**RESP:** *Yes, that is the intention. The Department of Environment Planning and Protection has the organizational mandate with intersectoral convening power. This clarification is offered in the narrative under Component 1 and also in the section on Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up.*

#### Scale up

- The project states that 'The Department of Environmental Protection and Planning will exercise its mandate within government to facilitate scaling up the successes of the project throughout the country'. Please give an indication on how this is expected to be carried out.

**RESP:** *This point has been adjusted to include the other lead national agency, the Department of Agriculture and the Land Administration Unit of that Ministry where it is anticipated that the DEPP will maintain the policy-level convening platform under the ILM Framework, while the Ministry of Agriculture will play the role in on-ground policy execution. The text under the Scaling – up potential section has been adjusted.*

## Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/30/2020:

Cleared.

10/27/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat, please see additional comments below.

Please upload the maps to the Portal.

09/30/2020:

Yes. We note this has been included in the attached PIF.

-----

### Agency Response

10/27/2020:

Please upload the maps to the Portal.

RESP: *Maps now uploaded*

### Stakeholders

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/30/2020:

Cleared.

10/27/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat, please see additional comments below.

Please provide a description of the stakeholder consultations that took place with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, civil society organizations and private sector entities, as indicated in the Stakeholders section (#2). Please note that the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (Nov 2017) requires that that at PIF stage 'Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...'

09/30/2020:

Yes.

### Agency Response

10/27/2020:

Please provide a description of the stakeholder consultations that took place with Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, civil society organizations and private sector entities, as indicated in the Stakeholders section (#2). Please note that the GEF Policy on Stakeholder Engagement (Nov 2017) requires that at PIF stage 'Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...'

**RESP:** *The description of the consultations that contributed to the PIF development are provided in a new Annex F and a note has been added following the table in Stakeholders Section that points to Annex F.*

## Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

9/30/2020:

Not fully. Please include any gender dimensions here related to land/agriculture. There is not much information in the baseline situation about the inequalities between male and female in the agriculture and food security sectors, and no information on how the project will tackle these inequality aspects.

### Agency Response

16/10/2020

Please include any gender dimensions here related to land/agriculture. There is not much information in the baseline situation about the inequalities between male and female in the agriculture and food security sectors, and no information on how the project will tackle these inequality aspects.

**RESP:** *The inequalities between male and female in the agricultural sector and the broader socio-economic development dimensions are not closely tracked beyond the simple gender split in terms of engagement in the sector. The partner agencies acknowledge this knowledge gap and is something that a more detailed analysis during project preparation will have to consider. The narrative on how this will be assessed includes this issue and how the project may address it.*



## Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

09/30/2020:

-Please incorporate these details on private sector engagement in the project description.

-Are there any agencies/private sector groups that work with market access related to domestic food production and who may be working on complementary activities, that could also be engaged?

### Agency Response

16/10/2020

Please incorporate these details on private sector engagement in the project description.

**RESP:** *The narrative under the socio-economic context and under Component 2 in the project description includes elaboration on private sector engagement.*

-Are there any agencies/private sector groups that work with market access related to domestic food production and who may be working on complementary activities, that could also be engaged?

**RESP:** *The Bahamas Agricultural and Industrial Corporation (BAIC) and Bahamas Agriculture and Marine Science Institute (BAMSI) both purchase food from farmers and market them to hotels and foodstores. These are both quasi government entities. BAMSI also offers limited technical assistance through its Associated Farmer Programme. Bahamas Food Services (Sysco) is a private company that also aids farmers in accessing markets by taking on any liability related to food safety and quality. This information has been included under Component 2 description.*

## Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/30/2020:

Cleared.

10/27/2020:

Following further review by the GEF Secretariat, please see additional comments below.

We note the reference to the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal. Please include some of the specific climate scenario/variability information in the body of the project submission.

10/26/2020:

Cleared.

10/19/2020:

We note the additional text which has been included on mitigation. However we do not see where i) climate change has been identified/specified as one of the risks to the project and ii) nor mention of any other climate related risks beyond major hurricanes. As per STAP guidance ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.STAP\\_C.56.Inf\\_03\\_STAP%20guidance%20on%20climate%20risk%20screening.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.STAP_C.56.Inf_03_STAP%20guidance%20on%20climate%20risk%20screening.pdf)), we expect this screening to take place at PIF stage, with further details to be provided at CEO Endorsement. Please include brief text on the projected climate scenarios or variability related to climate change and how this may impact the project.

9/30/2020:

Not fully.

We suggest reinforcing the screening of climate risks-issues related to climate variability such as drought, unpredictable rainfall patterns and climate vulnerability more generally. This should be considered based on historical climatic conditions and projection scenarios.

and climate vulnerability more generally. This should be considered based on historical climatic conditions and projection scenarios. Different options may be proposed to mitigate these risk.

- The proposed set of interventions in terms of SLM and restoration seem fully justified in a context of high hurricane risks. We suggest reinforcing the demonstration that SLM and landscape restoration contribute to increasing the resilience of production systems.

-We note the inclusion of considerations for COVID. At this stage however, we expect consideration for:

- 1) the risks that COVID-19 poses for all aspects of project design and eventual implementation and how the situation may impact the delivering of Global Environment Benefits. These may include, other potential COVID considerations such as refocus of government priorities to deal with impacts of COVID, realignment of financing etc. You may refer to the GEF COVID Guidance for further information
- 2) Based on this short analysis, please include potential mitigation measures.

## Agency Response

### 10/28/2020:

We note the reference to the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal. Please include some of the specific climate scenario/variability information in the body of the project submission.

**RESP:** *The section under 'Climate change influences' within the 'Causes of Land Degradation' has been modified to include an expanded text that pulls out the relevant historical trends and scenario/forecast on temperature and precipitation regimes (including the projection charts) from the World Bank Climate Change Knowledge Portal information for The Bahamas*  
<https://climateknowledgeportal.worldbank.org/country/bahamas>.

### 21/10/2020

We note the additional text which has been included on mitigation. However we do not see where i) climate change has been identified/specified as one of the risks to the project and ii) nor mention of any other climate related risks beyond major hurricanes. As per STAP guidance ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.STAP\\_C.56.Inf\\_03\\_STAP%20guidance%20on%20climate%20risk%20screening.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.STAP_C.56.Inf_03_STAP%20guidance%20on%20climate%20risk%20screening.pdf)), we expect this screening to take place at PIF stage, with further details to be provided at CEO Endorsement. Please include brief text on the projected climate scenarios or variability related to climate change and how this may impact the project.

**RESP:** *The text in the risks table has been modified to explicitly highlight climate change and climate variability with the scope widened beyond occurrence of extreme events (hurricanes) in the course of project implementation. Drought is indeed a risk and is now cited in the narrative in the context of regional climate model indications (in terms of changes trends in precipitation) and the long-term implications for success in establishment and sustainability of restoration measures and climate smart agriculture interventions. Additional text has been provided in the section Causes of land degradation under the climate change narrative. To note, the screening under the Safeguard Risk Identification Form 'Safeguard Standard 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks', noted that all the criteria (except for the increases of greenhouse gas emissions) were to be considered. It is noted that further details will be provided at CEO Endorsement.*

### 16/10/2020

we suggest reinforcing the screening of climate risks-issues related to climate variability such as drought, unpredictable rainfall patterns and climate vulnerability more generally. This should be considered based on historical climatic conditions and projection scenarios. Different options may be proposed to mitigate these risk.

**RESP:** *Noted, a statement that reflects this guidance is included in the Risk Table.*

- The proposed set of interventions in terms of SLM and restoration seem fully justified in a context of high hurricane risks. We suggest reinforcing the demonstration that SLM and landscape restoration contribute to increasing the resilience of production systems.

**RESP:** *Included in the risk table is a statement on the need during the PPG phase/full project to identify climate change resilient plant materials for rehabilitation of landscapes with the integration of agroforestry and intercropping systems into cultivation that are suitable for projected climate change.*

-We note the inclusion of considerations for COVID. At this stage however, we expect consideration for:

1) the risks that COVID-19 poses for all aspects of project design and eventual implementation and how the situation may impact the delivering of Global Environment Benefits. These may include, other potential COVID considerations such as refocus of government priorities to deal with impacts of COVID, realignment of financing etc.

2) Based on this short analysis, please include potential mitigation measures.

**RESP:** *Noted, the risk statement has been expanded based on the GEF COVID19 Guidance*

## Coordination

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

9/30/2020:

Not fully.

-Is there any opportunity to collaborate with CSIDS SOILCARE project?

## Agency Response

16/10/2020

- any opportunity to collaborate with CSIDS SOILCARE project

**RESP:** *This is noted and already engagement with the PISLM is included as a stakeholder and a prospective role. The reference to the Soil Care Project is now included in the section on Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects*

## Consistency with National Priorities

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

9/30/2020:

As queried in previous comments, does The Bahamas currently have voluntary LDN targets as it relates to their UNCCD plans.

## Agency Response

16/10/2020

- does The Bahamas currently have voluntary LDN targets as it relates to their UNCCD plans

**RESP:** *No, there are no voluntary LDN targets in place however the project will contribute to supporting this process. This clarification is included under Component 1 description and under the Consistency with National Priorities section.*

## Knowledge Management

**Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from**

**relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

9/30/2020:

Not fully

Please indicate how the project will make use of lessons from past or current projects including the SIDS SOILCARE regional project which will start before the Bahamas project.

**Agency Response**

**16/10/2020**

Please indicate how the project will make use of lessons from past or current projects including the SIDS SOILCARE regional project which will start before the Bahamas project.

**RESP:** *In line with above comments the KM section now includes a statement on collaboration with the SOILCARE Project and uptake and use of lessons from other relevant projects.*

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

10/19/2020:

Cleared.

9/30/2020

Not fully.

-We note in the ESS that '*There are issues with squatters in some of the proposed locations that carry out unsustainable land practices that contribute to land degradation. The project may have to seek redress in this regard with local regulatory partners. This issue will need to be evaluated in the full project development*' (Standard 6, Point 6.2).

However the response to GP6 is No. (GP 6-Does the project include a project-specific grievance redress mechanism? . Please clarify.

### **Agency Response**

16/10/2020

-We note in the ESS that '*There are issues with squatters in some of the proposed locations that carry out unsustainable land practices that contribute to land degradation. The project may have to seek redress in this regard with local regulatory partners. This issue will need to be evaluated in the full project development*' (Standard 6, Point 6.2).

**RESP:** *Noted and will be further evaluated during the PPG phase*

However the response to GP6 is No. (GP 6-Does the project include a project-specific grievance redress mechanism? . Please clarify.

**RESP:** *The ESS indicated that at this PIF stage is not considered; this will be informed based on findings during the PPG phase. A statement has been included in the risk table associated with the land tenure issue.*

### **art III – Country Endorsements**

**Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

9/30/2020:

Yes

**Agency Response**

## Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020:

N/A

Agency Response

**EFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/30/2020:

The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

10/26/2020:



The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

10/19/2020:

The PIF is not yet ready for clearance. Please address comments on the Theory of Change, Climate Risks and Financing Type in Table B.

9/30/2020:

The PIF is not recommended for clearance at this time. Please address the comments/questions outlined above.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	9/28/2020	9/30/2020
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	10/19/2020	10/19/2020
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	10/26/2020	10/21/2020
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	10/27/2020	10/27/2020
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	10/30/2020	

## PIF Recommendation to CEO

### Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

#### BRIEF REASONING FOR RECOMMENDATION TO CEO CONTEXT

The Bahamas is an archipelago of 700 islands and cays surrounded by coral reefs and extensive sand flats with a total land area of 15,000 sq. km and population of 373,000. The Bahamas is a globally recognized biodiversity hotspot, with high levels of endemism, with at least 1,111 species of vascular plants, of which 10.6% are endemic and 5.2% are threatened. These natural resources support the agriculture and fisheries sectors which make up 5% of the GDP and about 5% employment. Drives of land degradation include unsustainable agriculture production (both small holder and commercial), deforestation and land conversion (with annual forest cover/extent change across the islands ranges between 5 to 10%), as well as natural climate change influences.

Seven islands in the Bahamian archipelago have been selected as targets for the project given the land degradation challenges identified. These are (1) Abaco, (2) Andros, (3) Cat Island, (4) Eleuthera, (5) Long Island, (6) Grand Bahama and (7) New Providence. These islands are home to most of the country's population and harbours significant natural and biological resources the underpins the economy. Challenges related to the enabling environment also do not facilitate the conditions needed to address land degradation problems or implement the LDN framework. The challenges include fragmented policy and planning and weak institutional capacities, limited decision support resources and knowledge support systems, and insufficient demonstration on the ground to encourage adoption of integrated land management approaches.

**PROJECT OBJECTIVE:** The project proposes to demonstrate the application of integrated landscape management approaches through a strengthened planning process and translated to demonstration of good practice within landscape areas that are subject to degradation, supported by strengthened monitoring and assessment tools for decision making. This, The Bahamas is aiming to achieve through four project components. These include i) Strengthening of the enabling environment for land degradation neutrality through improved policy governance; ii) Demonstrating regenerative agriculture and resilient food production systems, practices and technologies through application of SLM approaches, enhancing capacity among stakeholders to adopt SLM and regenerative climate smart agricultural practices iii) Putting mechanisms in place to incentivize farmers to adopt sustainable approaches to land management (SLM and climate resilient agriculture); and iii) enhancing monitoring and knowledge management systems for LDN assessment and the project overall.

**Global Environment Benefits:** The project aims to restore 10,000 ha of degraded agricultural land; improve the management of 10,000ha land through SLM; deliver climate co-benefits by mitigating the equivalent of 1,516,775 M tCO<sub>2</sub>e over the project lifetime and directly benefit 1,000 persons. In addition, the project will contribute to toward the defining the national LDN targets and mechanisms to monitor the implementation of LDN.

**INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, SCALE-UP** The project intends to introduce innovation in policy and planning processes that specifically addresses sustainable land management and ensure that it becomes mainstreamed into wider national development planning frameworks

addresses sustainable land management and ensure that it becomes mainstreamed into their national development planning frameworks under the guide of an ILM Strategy to be produced under the project. Opportunity for innovation will also be gained in the project's field-based interventions and mechanisms that will be implemented to encourage incentivization of SLM and resilient agriculture. In terms of sustainability, the project is seeking to ensure enduring outcomes through long-term institutional sustainability measures by establishing the ILM Strategy and associated inter-sectoral operational framework as a platform that fosters integrated landscape planning and management in the country. In terms of scale up, the executing agency, The Department of Environmental Protection and Planning (DEPP) will exercise its cross-cutting mandate within government to facilitate scaling up of the successes of the project throughout the country, in close technical and policy cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture, and the Land Administration Unit of that same ministry. The DEPP will maintain the policy-level convening platform under the ILM Framework, while the Ministry of Agriculture will play the role in on-ground policy execution.