

CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multicountry soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10195

Countries

Regional (Barbados, Antigua and Barbuda, Belize, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti, Jamaica, St. Lucia)

Project Name

CSIDS-SOILCARE Phase1: Caribbean Small Island Developing States (SIDS) multicountry soil management initiative for Integrated Landscape Restoration and climate-resilient food systems

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

12/11/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF ☐

CEO Endorsement ☐

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/19/2021:

Yes

Agency Response No response required

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

All comments cleared.

4/29/2021:

Thank you for the revisions and additional information provided. We have a few follow up comments and note that a few of the previous comments have not been addressed or no response has been provided in the review sheet. Please see below:

i) A number of assessments will be carried out under Components 2,3, & 4. Please clarify why these were not conducted during the PPG stage.

ii) Component 1: We note the information provided on the changes to the PIF, re the inclusion of the original Output 1.2.1 (*Legal and Institutional Framework for SLM, SSM, and Climate Smart Agriculture strengthened, and Mainstreaming strategies designed and integrated into national Policies, land use planning and financing mechanisms at national and sub-regional levels*) in Component 5. It is not clear from the Outputs currently listed in Component 5, where this is reflected. All of the Outputs refer to regional level activities. Please include or clarify?

-In addition how is the project anchoring the work of Component 1, at the National Level to ensure the information it is integrated and used in national level planning and policy frameworks?

iii) Component 4- Please see comment under the Core Indicator question in reference to the SLM indicator for this component.

iv) *Component 5?* Outcome 5.1- Please revise the output (5.1.1) to be more specific and to indicate the area in which capacity will be developed.

SCCF Comments:

v) Rather than replicate the wording of the GEFTF-funded outputs, please adjust the SCCF language (for the same outputs) to focus only on climate resilience and adaptation. (Language for the SCCF outputs and GEFTF outputs does not need to be the same for each component, so please try to tailor more specifically to adaptation elements of the sub-component.)

vi) Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2: The SCCF grant can only be used for regional activities (identification of climate resilience measures and technologies, regional capacity

building/trainings on climate resilience, regional adaptation policy support, including mainstreaming climate change adaptation in development policies, standards, regulations and plans; climate modeling and modeling of impact of climate change on land management and food crops, etc.). Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 need to be revised to remove proposed on-the-ground adaptation actions at selected locations, which states in the ProDoc that the demonstration models will be ?from a selected number of participating countries?. As the SCCF grant is only for regional-scale activities, it cannot be used by some countries and not others. However, if Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 will simply inform the demonstration activities by undertaking assessments, analyzing data, etc., then please adjust the wording of these SCCF outputs in Table B to reflect this.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

Targets and Indicators are difficult to identify.

- Please clearly identify what is a target and what is an indicator for each Outcome. (For example -Outcome 3.1 *"SLM and CSA measures adopted on 20,000 ha of arable lands contributing to increase crop productivity; enhanced resilience by reducing vulnerability and improving ability to adapt to stresses and pursuing lower emissions"* is listed as an Indicator, however this is more of a target; A second bullet is *"Increased productivity and livelihood associated with sustainable and resilient agriculture: ? Capacity development ? Public-private ventures."* However it is not clear if this is a target or indicator, how it will be measured, it should be quantified or made more specific.)

-Please apply the SMART principles for the targets and indicators, quantifying them where possible and ensuring that they are measurable.

-Please also ensure that the targets and indicators for all the field-based activities refer to the # of hectares and rather than the % of sites.

-In addition to the targets listed, please include a target for the number of farmers to benefit from the relevant field-based interventions under the relevant Outcomes.

-Please ensure all changes are also reflected in the Results Framework.

-A number of assessments will be carried out under Components 2,3, & 4. Please clarify why these were not conducted during the PPG stage.

Component 1

-A very important Output of this component was to make the link to LDN i.e. allowing countries to use the information to inform LDN planning (which is the Avoid step in the LDN mitigation hierarchy). The following Output has been removed. (*Output 1.2.1. Legal and Institutional Framework for SLM, SSM, and Climate Smart Agriculture strengthened, and Mainstreaming strategies designed and integrated into national Policies, land use planning and financing mechanisms at national and sub-regional levels*). Please clarify how this will be covered. Additionally, there is now only one Outcome but the allocation to this Component is more. Please clarify.

Component 3

-The SCCF Outcomes, Outputs and Targets are the same as the GEF. Please see additional comments below.

Component 4

-As stated above the SCCF Outcomes, Outputs and Targets are the same as the GEF. Please see additional comments below.

-Please clearly distinguish indicators from targets. Please also clarify if the 20,000 ha is the same as in Component 3.

-How is 'innovative agriculture being defined'?

Component 5

?Outcome 5.1- Please specify in what area will capacity be developed. Please revise the output (5.1.1) to be more specific.

2/19/2021 FI:

Revision is requested. Please adjust the language for the SCCF-financed sub-components in Table B. As currently written, their regional nature is not clear. Also, as entered in Table B, their focus on mainstreaming climate resilience is not clear; several sub-components mapped to SCCF in Table B seem to be supporting SLM and LDN rather than mainstreaming adaptation to climate change within those activities.

Specifically:

Component 3 (SCCF):

Output 3.1.1: Please clarify the regional adaptation element of this Output. Please also ensure that the wording for SCCF components is focused on enhancing/mainstreaming climate resilience, and not only on managing climate risks to SLM activities. (Agencies are expected to manage climate risks for all projects, as part of project due diligence.)

Output 3.1.2: Please clarify the regional nature of this Output. Also, please ensure that all SCCF-financed sub-component outcomes and outputs have a focus on climate resilience (and not SLM, LDN or general environmental and social benefits).

Output 3.1.3: Please further clarify in the narrative text (i) the regional nature and (ii) the climate resilience angle of this sub-component.

Output 3.1.4: Please clarify in the narrative text how the HNVI will enhance climate resilience across this regional project.

Component 4:

The text for the Component in Table B, and most of its Outcomes and Outputs, does not mention climate resilience. Please clearly identify and include the regional activities in support of mainstreaming climate resilience.

4.1.3: The sub-component wording in Table B is vague; please sharpen. In the narrative text for 4.1.3 (i) there seems to be an assumption that agricultural technologies are the same as technologies to enhance climate resilience. While this may bear out to be true in some cases, it should not be assumed; (ii) there is reference to 'funding research' on adaptation technologies. Will the outcomes of this research be applied to this regional project?

Component 5: the same comment applies as for Component 4. Please clarify the language for the SCCF-financed sub-components in Table B.

Agency Response

May 18 2020

i) During project preparation, field assessments were done to verify the site selection and to collect socio-economic information. The assessments that will be done under components 2, 3, and 4 will: (a) build on the soil data that will be collected and analyzed under Component 1; (b) be used to define the field-level investment plans under each component (including selection of technologies and approaches); and (c) involve project beneficiaries and other stakeholders in the collection and design of such investments

ii) See page 65, paragraph 147 (Output 5.3.1). In addition, a new indicator has been added in the logframe to reflect changes in national level policy and legal frameworks.

Regarding how the project is anchoring the work of Component 1 to ensure information is integrated and used at national level, please see Page 43, paragraphs 88 and 94. National soil data will support policy decision making at the local level as well as at the regional level.

iii) OK, comment on Core Indicators is addressed below

iv) Output 5.1.1 now reads:

Capacity of Stakeholders strengthened to (i) undertake national soils surveys, (ii) apply climate resilient methods and approaches (iii) apply Risk Assessment and CC adaptation best practices for Agriculture

Also, please refer to paragraph 135, which states that:

In this regard, capacity will be built in a number of areas relevant to sustainable soil and land management, including, inter alia: collection of soil samples and their analyses; the training of Extension Officers (in agri-related areas supportive to the project's activities inclusive of Climate Smart Agriculture methods and approaches); farmers, field and laboratory technicians and soil scientists (at the academic level).

v) With respect to SCCF components in the portal, the language of the outcomes has been adjusted in the portal to be more tailored to the adaptation elements of the subcomponent

vi) Table B has been revised. We take note that SCCF grant can only be used for regional activities. Climate resilient measures will be integrated in model farms (financed by GEFTF) and the information gathered will be used to form the basis of the regional guidelines which will guide farmer in transitioning to climate smart agriculture at the regional level (with SCCF funds).

Please See paragraph 116, which reads

To assist farmers in addressing this reality, SOILCARE will use Climate Smart Agriculture to build climate resilience within the regional agricultural sector. This will be done firstly, through supporting a number of Demonstration Model Climate-Smart Agriculture Farms, from a selected number of participating countries. The information and data derived therefrom will then be used in mainstreaming climate resilience, regionally, by building institutional capacity and in support of policy development and application at the regional and national levels. This component will in the main, target small farmers. However, climate resilience measures and practices will be mainstreamed into all CARICOM regional policy frameworks, that are applicable to its Member States

See also Outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. on pg. 53. The title of the Outputs have been modified to address the issue raised. The change has also been done in the Logframe. Output 3.1.1. and 3.1.2 now read:

Output 3.1.1: Climate Change Implications Assessed and Validated at the farm and landscape levels and the Results used and promoted to support climate resilient and viable/ productive farming systems and value chain integration at the regional level.

And 3.1.2.

Output 3.1.2: Climate Resilience Measures Integrated into Model Farms and the Information Gathered Use to Form the Basis of the Regional Guidelines which will Guide Farmers in Transitioning to Climate Smart Agriculture Production at the Regional Level:

The regional adaptation element of this Output will be reflected in regional policy and institutional changes, with the view of integrating climate resilience as a standard practice in agricultural planning, policy development and also at the operational level, as the basis for mainstreaming. Previous to the project, there was a lack of regional and relevant specific climate resilient data, on which to plan. With SOILCARE and the generation of climate resilient related data and approaches; regional agriculture will transformed to include climate resilience.

Also refer to para: 121.

In order to transfer the knowledge (e.g. data and information etc.) emanating from the Model Farms will be used in capacity building of Extension Officers and Extension Unit in the respective participating countries, to mainstream climate resilient agriculture. It will also be integrated into regional and national agricultural planning processes, thus ensuring that climate resilience is mainstreamed..

April 2020

These extensive comments have been addressed with the redesign of the project results framework (Annex A) which is reflected in Table B and Section 1a (3) Alternative scenario.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response n/a

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021:

Corrections have been made. Cleared.

6/10/2021:

The issue outlined previously on the co-financing and the letters remains. There remains an entry in the portal for Jamaica for the Ministry of Local Government and there is an entry for Antigua from Ministry of Environment with no corresponding letter. Please revise.

4/29/2021:

Thank you for the updates. Please see follow up comments below.

i) There are now 2 entries in the portal from Antigua for the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Environment, but we are not seeing a letter from the Ministry of Environment. Please revise.

ii) There is an entry in the portal for Jamaica from Ministry of Local Government with no financing indicated. Please include an amount and co-financing letter or the entry would need to be removed.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

Please revise the co-financing letters from Antigua and Barbuda, Grenada and Haiti to specifically indicate cash/grant co-financing for the requisite amounts as indicated in the portal.

2/19/2021 FI:

Please describe below Table C how the co-finance of \$4.912 M for the SCCF grant was estimated.

Agency Response

June 17 2021

Erroneous entries for Jamaica and Antigua have been deleted.

May 17 2021

- i) The two entries of Antigua and Barbuda have been addressed
- ii) Entry from Jamaica (local government with no co-financing) has been deleted

April 2021

Ne w cofinancing letters were procured, but the governments decided that the grant cofinancing should instead be labeled as in kind. This has been adjusted in the portal (i.e., the funds are no longer considere investment mobilized).

-cofinancing has been estimated proportionally by component.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021:

Cleared.

6/10/2021:

All comments are cleared.

There appears to be many different entries in the portal (Annex E) for the budget. Please delete the duplications.

4/29/2021:

Thank for the additional information. Please see follow up comments below.

-Overall please ensure the that budget inserted in the portal is consistent with the separate budget document uploaded to the portal.

-On the budget notes. The note Capacity development is not fully explained. A one off payment for the institutional capacity of PISLM will come from participating countries (US\$100,000). How will the remaining funds be utilized? Additionally, the Capacity Development budget line has a lumpsum of \$435,000 in the uploaded budget and \$485,000 in the budget inserted in the portal. Please revise.

-The Livelihoods and Gender Expert is not included in the budget inserted in the portal or the budget notes. Please include.

-Please clarify the role of the National Project Assistants? If they have project management/execution functions they would be considered a part of the project management unit and their costs would have to be covered under the PMC. If they are national project focal points/technical officers, carrying out technical functions, please adjust the titles accordingly.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-Table D is adequate and we expect the inclusion of Barbados once this amendment is approved.

Project Budget

-Please include the budget table in the portal as well.

-Please include budget notes describing what is included/being covered by the following budget line items- *Sub-contract to CSO Farmer Groups; Training; Capacity Development; Laboratory supplies and consumables (fees for soil testing); Sub-contract to UWI: Internship to Research Facility; Research, Advisory & Capacity Building Facility; Staff Travel & Transport.*

--The budget does not appear to include the Livelihoods and Gender Expert. Please clarify or revise. We note this is Item 1209 in the procurement plan.

-The budget does not appear to include the PISLM Liaison Officer, please clarify.

-Vehicle for Antigua and Barbuda- In keeping with the GEF Program and Policy guidelines, costs for motor vehicles are expected to be covered by the co-financed portion of project management costs. Please revise the budget accordingly.

-It would be helpful to know in the budget, if any of the specific line item with no funding allocation from GEF funds, will be covered by co-financing. Inclusion of a column for co-financing would be helpful in this regard.

Appendix 2- Procurement Plan

-Please confirm procurement costs for Items 1204 & 1206

-Please clarify the Procurement Item 2201

-There is no financing for Item 4204, please clarify

Agency Response

June 17 - Duplicated tables have been deleted.

May 17, 2021

- Budget copied into the portal is consistent with budget uploaded

- Budget and budget notes have been amended in excel file

- Livelihoods and gender expert included in the budget

- National project assistants are technical officers carrying out technical functions, therefore their title was changed to " National Technical Assistant"

April 2021

-Budget table is included in the portal and the full excel workbook has been added as a document.

-Gender expert is included in component 2

-PISLM liaison officer is in line 14 of the budget

-Vehicle has been removed

- Cofinancing sheet has been included in the excel workbook
- 1204 and 1206 are consultants
- 2201 are contracts with local organizations covered by cofinancing
- 4204, the project will not purchase new equipment

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021

Please include the PPG expenditure in the portal submission.

Agency Response
May 17 2021

No response required

April 2021

Done

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/17/2021:

Cleared

6/10/2021:

-The target for Core Indicator number for GEF 6, doesn't appear to align with what is in the FAO Ex-Act Sheet. Please double check and revise.

-Comments cleared for SCCF.

4/29/2021:

Please see follow up comments below, some of which are previous comments which have not been addressed.

i) A note explaining the changes since PIF stage (for the core indicators) has not been provided. Please provide an explanation in the portal on reasoning behind the changes to the targets aligned with sub-indicators -3.1, 3.2, 4.3, 4.1.

ii) No breakdown has been provided on the categories of beneficiaries for GEF Core Indicator Target 11- Please include this information.

iii) In reference to the note on the core indicators (also related to the indicator in Table B). Please clarify what is meant by *20,000 ha Adapted Land Use/ Food Production Systems established?* Given the main focus of GEF investments to deliver global environmental benefits (GEBs), we recommend to rephrase or incorporate the language referenced in the Indicator 4.3 which refers to sustainable land management being applied on productive landscapes. This language should be reflected throughout the project document in the Outputs and Indicators associated with the target. An example of suitable text would be - *20,000 ha under SLM that meet LDN criteria and to support adapted land use/food production systems*. This will be important for GEF's internal accounting of results.

iv) We are unable to locate the FAO Ex-Act Sheet. Please upload to the portal.

SCCF:

Adjustments are requested:

v) At the top of the excel table (Core Indicators section), please do not over-write the PIF-stage indicator values that had been provided. Please enter the CEO endorsement stage target indicators in the column to the right of the PIF stage ones. (The next two columns are for reporting at MTR and TE.)

vi) At PIF stage, Core Indicator 3 had a value of '3', i.e., the project proposed to mainstream adaptation in 3 regional policies/plans. At CEO endorsement stage, a value of '0' has been entered. Please correct this by entering a non-zero value, as the ProDoc states (for Outcome 5.3) that: 'Resources leveraged from the SCCF contribution have been allocated to mainstreaming adaptation into regional and sub-regional policies and strategies'.

vii) Please fill in the Meta-information excel sheet.

2/19/2021

Not fully.

- As per the Portal guideline please include an explanation of the targets (how are they being accounted) and clarification for the changes in the targets since PIF stage.
- Please also provide a breakdown of the project beneficiaries.
- Please check the Core indicator totals in Annex B and ensure they are consistent with the Core Indicator table in the Portal. We note differences for Core Indicators 3, 4, & 6.
- Please include the FAO Ex-Act tool worksheet for the Emissions avoided calculations.

2/19/2020 FI:

Please advise where we may find the CEO Endorsement stage SCCF results framework, which needs to be submitted as an excel file.

Agency Response

June 2021

Addressed

May 17 2021

i) There has been a reduction in the target areas since the PIF, from 80,000 ha to 55,000 ha. The assessment during the project preparation phase showed that the preliminary target during project concept (PIF) was over estimated. The new target (55,000 ha) is more realistic given the level of resources, and the renewed commitment of project stakeholders in the context of COVID-19. Project targets have been adjusted as follows:

Core indicator	PIF	PRODOC
3.1	20,000	20,000
3.2	17,000	9,000
4.1	20,000	6,000
4.3	23,000	20,000

ii) breakdown of beneficiaries by gender is provided under Core Indicator 11

iii) Adapted Land Use/Food systems This refers to areas of food production systems where the project will intervene to make them more resilient and adapted to climate change. The indicator has been changed to:

Number of hectares where adapted food production systems and alternative livelihood options are implemented, with a target of 20,000 hectares in 5 countries.

iv) EX-ACT sheet uploaded into the portal

v) The SCCF tracking tool has been corrected.

vi) This has been corrected. Core indicator 3 value remains at 23?.

vii) Meta-information filled in SCCF tracking tool

April 2021

Core indicators have been clarified as follows and included in both the Core Indicator Worksheet and SCCF Tracking Tool:

? 15,000 hectares of degraded lands rehabilitated and ecosystem services restored in Barbados (2,000 ha), Grenada (2,000 ha), Guyana (4,000 ha), Haiti (5,000 ha) and St. Lucia (2,000 ha) (Core Indicator 3.1).

? 20,000 hectares of agricultural lands converted into Climate Smart Model Farms in Barbados, Grenada, Guyana, Haiti and St. Lucia. The 20,000 ha of Model Climate

Farms accounted for in Core Indicators (15,000) and SCCF Tracking Tool (5,000) in a way proportional to available funding

? 20,000 ha Adapted Land Use/ Food Production Systems established creating Alternative Livelihood Options in Barbados, Belize, Grenada, Jamaica and St. Lucia. The 20,000 ha of resilient food systems accounted for in Core Indicators (17,000) and SCCF Tracking Tool (3,000) in a way proportional to available funding

? Avoidance/capture of an estimated 35 million tonnes of CO₂-eq over a period of 20 years

? 5,900 direct beneficiaries (2400 women). Project beneficiaries include 1000 individuals that will be trained on CC adaptation best practices for agriculture (Outcome 5.2) accounted for in the SCCF Tracking Tool

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

Thank you for the information provided.

We note that a full climate change risk assessment will be conducted during the project. Prior to CEO Endorsement we will require the following information:

Referenced material on climate projections and scenarios for the region and targeted countries.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-All changes to specific outcomes and outputs are to be detailed with explanations as to why they have been changed. Please include in this section, further details on specific changes per Outcome and Output. Please also include here the major change that is being proposed, which has been the inclusion of an additional country to the project and the reasoning behind this change. You may include a note that the Amendment request has been submitted.

-Please include a separate and specific sub-section on the regional and national level barriers related to the problems that are faced by the target countries and in the context of achieving LDN and SLM. This would help to assess the basis on which the ToC is built.

-The vulnerabilities and impacts related to climate change are not well framed. Please also include climate projections and scenarios for the region and targeted countries. We expect a climate risk assessment and inclusion of mitigation measures. Please see 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

-What is the context as it relates to COVID and the impact on the land based activities or areas where livelihoods are dependent on productive landscapes? Please include this information in the context.

-The description of the project sites includes a mix of information on drivers of environmental degradation, problems and solutions/possible interventions. This does not allow a proper understanding or assessment of the actual sites- their environmental and socio-economic characteristics, environmental and land degradation problems, drivers of these problems (both natural and anthropogenic). Equally important is the scale of the targeted sites- the number of hectares and the number of farmers who utilize these landscapes (we note this information has been provided for some sites but not for all). Please update this section to include this information clearly and exclude the site-based solutions and interventions, which should only be in the Alternative Scenario section.

-Project site in Jamaica- Please indicate if the targeted areas are productive landscapes, clarify the land degradation challenges of this site as well as the drivers of this degradation.

-Project site Haiti- Please clarify the reasoning behind the selection of this landscape. As written, it appears to be a protected area and not an area that is currently considered a productive landscape. What are the issues with land degradation and the drivers of this degradation?

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

Material on climate change projections and scenarios is referenced on paragraph 23 (page 21)

April 2021

Section 1.1a (1) Global environmental or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers has been extensively edited.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

The previous comment may have been missed. Please provide a response in the review sheet and include the relevant information in the portal submission.

2/19/2021:

Please indicate how the project will build on or utilize the baseline scenario/projects identified.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

Please refer to paragraph: 83.

SOILCARE is probably the first regional integrated intervention aimed at promoting sustainable land management within the overall context of LDN and climate change resilience in Caribbean SIDS. It therefore marks a fundamental departure from many of the previous GEF interventions in Caribbean SIDS on land degradation related issues, most of which have been single country interventions. Notwithstanding, it however draws heavily on the projects highlighted in the baseline, in particular, the outputs of the

LDN Target Setting Process by incorporating some of the priority areas, so identified in that project, as Project Implementation Sites. Integral to SOILCARE is the consideration of a number of fundamental concepts and processes including, *inter alia*, sustainable soil management and in particular the collection and enhancement of information and data on Soil Carbon, the assessment of land degradation within the context of a landscape perspective; the advancement of climate resilience through different pathways including via climate smart agriculture and the testing, development and dissemination of environmentally and climate sensitive methods, approaches and technologies; the provision of training in climate resilient approaches at all levels, including farmers, community members; agriculture extension officers as well at the academic level. The project also seeks to make a significant contribution to enhancing the policy framework at both the national and regional levels by mainstreaming sustainable soil and land management as well as climate resilient measures in the agriculture sector. To this end, it recommends to the Caribbean Community and its Member States the enactment of mechanisms that support an enabling environment related to finance, for LDN to occur such; the reduction of degradation-associated subsidies (negative cost); enhance supporting measures restoration and rehabilitation degraded lands within the overall context of a landscape approach; climate resilient considerations agricultural credit schemes and other similar measures and measures to deter finance of degradation associated activities. Of the eight participating countries, only one, Antigua and Barbuda, will not have National Implementation Sites where specific activities will be undertaken. Antigua and Barbuda's field based intervention will be undertaken only to support the soil survey being undertaken in Component 1. This was the choice taken by the Government of Antigua and Barbuda. An overview of the proposed alternative scenario follows

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

Thank you for the revisions and updates. Please see follow up comments below.

i) The ToC could be made more clear.

- For clarity and consistency, please include the Outcomes as they are stated in other sections of the Project Document (Table B etc).

-We also do not see the linkages/causal pathways (i.e. lines connecting) the barriers and the Outcomes that are intended to address these barriers. Please include lines connecting the barriers to the specific Outcomes that are intended to address the barriers within the scope of the project.

-We also note that activities have been included in the ToC and not Outputs. However, we do not see activities related to policy and planning level interventions. Please include.

-Are there any assumptions internal to the project that can be included. Such as behaviour change of farmers, or other persons to be trained, data sharing protocols implemented and followed etc.

We unfortunately do not see how the following initial comments have been addressed, nor is there a response in the review sheet:

ii) Output 2.1.3- How will cash-for-work be operationalized on the ground? What will be the basis for encouraging behaviour change beyond provision of cash? How will this modality be sustained after the project ends? Please, include these considerations in the write up.

iii) Component 3

- For the selected sites, please indicate the no. of ha to be targeted and the no. of farmers;

-What support will be provided for the implementation of the Strategic and Marketing Plans- capacity support, financial support? Is this the same thing as the Strategic and Marketing Strategy?

- In terms of the criteria for selecting sites- what exactly falls into the category 'unused land'? The LD focal area specifically targets productive landscapes- forest land or agricultural land.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-We note the inclusion of the ToC in the attached Project Document. Please note the following points:

- It is difficult to determine the causal pathways of the ToC with the absence of Drivers (of the environmental degradation challenges) and the arrows/lines showing how the various Outputs would contribute to the expected outcomes.

- It would also be helpful to number each Output and Outcome so that their linkages can be easily identified.

- The assumptions are typically listed in positive language as the expectation is that certain conditions are in place which will help to ensure the success of the project. These can also include assumptions that are internal to the project. Please review the STAP guidance on the ToC and revise as appropriate - [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_STAP_C.57_Inf.04_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_0.pdf)

[documents/EN_GEF_STAP_C.57_Inf.04_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_0.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_STAP_C.57_Inf.04_Theory%20of%20Change%20Primer_0.pdf)

- Please also include a narrative description on the Theory of change

- Both the ToC diagram and narrative are to be included in the portal submission under the section (Alternative Scenario) and ideally as an introduction to the description of the project components.

- Please include COVID recovery considerations in project implementation. You may refer to the GEF Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics (which was shared with Implementing Agencies).

-Antigua and Barbuda does not appear to be listed as a target site for any of the field based interventions. Please confirm. If so, why is this the case?

-A number of assessments are being conducted during project implementation (Output 1.1.3, 2.1.1, 3,1,1 & 4,1,1). We would have expected most of these to have been conducted with the PPG funds so that they can inform the implementation of targeted interventions. Please indicate why some of these activities were not conducted during the PPG stage?

Component 1

- Output 1.1.1 -How is the architecture outlined here going to support/feed into what happens at the national and local levels?

- Output 1.1.2-More details on how this will feed into the national level planning and reporting system is needed? How is the project facilitating this important step to ensure it translates to national level action?

Component 2

- What was the criteria for the selection of the targeted sites; For each site please indicate the no. of ha to be targeted and the no. of farmers to benefit;

- Please also name the country for the 2nd site listed.

Output 2.1.1

- Please indicate who are the stakeholders that will be a part of this participatory process?
- Please clarify what is meant by ?Intervention Plans?? Are these Integrated Land Management plans? SLM Plans? Local Land Use Plans?

Output 2.1.2 & 2.1.3

- How will the target beneficiaries be involved in these Outputs? Will NGOs and CBOs be engaged to assist with community engagement? Will extension support officers play a role? Please include this information in the write up.

Output 2.1.3

- What types of land rehabilitation mechanisms will be implemented.
- Please provide additional information on the cash for work modality and how it will be operationalized on the ground? What will be the basis for encouraging behaviour change beyond provision of cash? How will this modality be sustained after the project ends? Please, include these considerations in the write up.

Output 2.1.4

- It is not clear how this will facilitate scaling out. Please provide details on how other SIDS will be able to access and make use of this information.

Component 3

- For the selected sites, please indicate the no. of ha to be targeted and the no. of farmers.
- Please provide a more comprehensive description of Outcome 3.1
- CSA in the Caribbean is not new. How is SOILCARE building on and making use of past and current CSA interventions?
- What support will be provided for the implementation of the Strategic and Marketing Plans- capacity support, financial support? Is this the same thing as the Strategic and Marketing Strategy?
- In terms of the criteria for selecting sites- what exactly falls into the category 'unused land'? The LD focal area specifically targets productive landscapes.

Component 4

- For the selected sites, please indicate the no. of ha to be targeted and the no. of farmers.
- Please clarify the criteria for selection of these sites
- Please provide some information on the Barbados site
- Beyond developing projects to target specialized funds, what other private sector collaboration options will be explored for more sustained support? What other financing mechanisms will be explored?

Component 5

- Output 5.2.1- What mechanisms will be put in place to facilitate sharing of information to other related SLM/LD projects in the region?

-For an example of a knowledge sharing platform, we recommend consulting with IW-LEARN which is a global knowledge sharing model/platform for International Waters related projects <https://iwlearn.net/>

- Output 5.4.1- How will the SIDS LDN Transformation Funding mechanism be operationalized? Will it be linked to Output 4.1.2?

- We also recommend exploring other innovative financing mechanisms and models such as PES, the Caribbean Biodiversity Fund, and other domestic and regional resource mobilization options

- Related to this, recommendations to CARICOM should also include mechanisms that support an enabling environment related to finance, for LDN to occur such as - i) reduce degradation-associated subsidies (negative cost); ii) include restoration/rehabilitation and landscape approach considerations under agricultural credit schemes; iii) deter finance of degradation associated activities.

2/19/2021 FI:

Before providing descriptions of the project components, please include a paragraph summarizing the proposed approach of the project, as an alternative to the baseline and constraints described earlier. Please include within it some discussion on the project's rationale and approach to mainstreaming climate resilience in regional aspects of this project.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

i) the TOC has been made clearer as follows:

-Outcomes have been included in the TOC. Sometimes, due to space, the text has been reduced.

-Causal linkages have been included

-We have included Outputs rather than activities. Policy and planning level interventions have been included.

-Key Assumptions have been included

ii) Regarding the cash-for-work scheme, please refer to paragraph 114

iii) The hectares (and estimated beneficiaries from this component) have been added to the target sites in Component 3. This is also consistent with the targets in the results framework (See page 111) which state:

A total of at least 20,000ha hectares of agricultural lands converted into farms that employ climate resilient and sustainable soil management/farming practices as follows:

Barbados: 3,000 hectares

Grenada: 3,000 hectares

Guyana: 4,000 hectares

Haiti: 7,000 hectares

St. Lucia: 3,000 hectares

The project will support local farmers by providing capacity support (training on business plan development, basic management training, crop selection, price assessments, market identification, linkages to agri-processors and existing markets such as state funded services, tourism sector and restaurants). Financial support will be provided under output 3.1.2.

- Finally, please see paragraph 118 for the reference to unused lands. These are productive lands that are currently not in production.

April 2021

The extensive comments have been addressed with the revision of the logframe and the revision of sections 1.1a(1) to 1.1a(3).

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-Thank you for the information provided in this section. However, please indicate how the project is aligned with the selected LD Focal Area objectives and the SCCF Objectives.

-For the LDFA, the project has selected Objectives LD 1-1- Maintain or improve flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain food production and livelihoods through Sustainable Land Management (SLM); 1-4- Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses and increase resilience in the wider landscape; 2-5- Create enabling environments to support scaling up and mainstreaming of SLM and LDN and CCA-2.

-The objective on the Impact Programs is not meant to relate to this project, but only for the projects that are included in the Impact Programs.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Please refer to paragraph 159.

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

-Please include in the incremental reasoning the policy, planning, capacity, and financial aspects of the project. The field based aspects currently included in the table can be merged into one.

-In addition the **Table: Benefits associated with alternative resource management and production systems promoted by project** is not legible (the table has been uploaded as text which is distorted). Please reinsert in the portal.

2/19/2021:

-Thank you for the information provided. Please organize the information per project Component, so that we can clearly see the added value of the GEF investment. Please also include the incremental reasoning for the SCCF funding.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

-Done. Please see table on page 69.

-Done table is uploaded again in the portal

April 2021

Please refer to paragraph 160

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

No.

Please provide details on the projects expected contributions to GEBs per the targets outlined in the Core Indicator sheet.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

This section has been edited to account clearly for core indicators and SCCF indicators. Numbers have been reflected in the core indicator worksheet and SCCF worksheet.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-We note the detailed information provided on the innovative nature of this project.

-How will all of the Networks and Groups created by the project be sustained?

-Please provide details on how the project will facilitate scaling of SLM interventions in support of LDN implementation at the country level. How will the KM activities and the regional governance activities be used to facilitate scale to other non-SOILCARE countries and scale at the national level in the participating SOILCARE countries?

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Please refer to paragraphs 169 and 173

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Yes for the regional map.

We note that there is reference to the individual country maps. Please indicate if you are able to upload these to the portal.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Project site maps have been included in section 1

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response N/A

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-Re the PISLM High Level Ministerial Group- Please indicate which sectors these Ministers cover. Environment and/or Agriculture or a mix of the two?

-Please include the private sector stakeholders who have been consulted during project preparation and those that will be engaged or involved in project implementation.

-Given the dual focus on climate change resilience for this project, the list of stakeholders provided for support during project implementation, does not appear to represent this group. There are stakeholders at the national level that could be involved as well as regional level- Climate Studies group from UWI or the 5Cs? Please include as appropriate.

-We note that a stakeholder engagement plan has not been prepared, please provide additional details on how the stakeholders will be engaged and means of dissemination of information to the stakeholders listed. Please refer to the GEF Guidelines of Stakeholder Engagement https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.55_Inf.08_Guidelines_Stakeholder_Engagement.pdf

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Please refer to paragraphs 175, 179-181

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

The beginning of the Gender section with the questions is missing in the portal submission. Please include.

-In keeping with the GEF Programming and Policy Guidelines we expect a gender analysis to be completed during the PPG stage. It is not clear from the submission what is the current context in the target countries as it relates to Gender. Please include additional details on the context as it relates to Gender in Section 1a) of the Project Description.

-We note there are opportunities to be more explicit on gender responsive activities in particular in the field-based components (2-4). Please include.

-Please review the Results Framework and consider additional gender sensitive indicators.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Gender Action Plan has been uploaded. Paragraph 185 presents the main findings of the gender analysis.

Gender sensitive indicators have been included in the results framework.

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Not fully

Please also provide some information on the current context/challenges related to the private sector. We do not have a sense of the barriers that the project is seeking to overcome as it relates to the private sector. Please include this information in the section 1a) of the Project Description.

-As mentioned in the comments under Part II ? Project Justification Q.3, beyond exploring the possibility of private sector involvement through engagement of Funds, will the project be exploring mechanisms for sustained private sector support from regional/national financial institutions. If so please indicate what they may be.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Please refer to paragraph 188

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021

A climate risk assessment has been provided. Cleared.

6/10/2021:

-In keeping with the recommendations from STAP for actions to be taken prior to CEO Endorsement and based on comments provided by the Secretariat (April 29, 2021) it is not clear where additional information has been provided on the climate risks. We note that a full climate risk assessment will be conducted during project implementation, however at this stage we will require a preliminary assessment. Responses to the comments below will help in this regard, in addition to any other details that can be provided.

-Please include in the risk table details on the specific risks related to climate change and climate variability.

-On Climate change we note the inclusion of key questions in the risk table. Please provide preliminary information in this section on how the project will address these questions in particular as it relates to mitigation options.

4/29/2021:

It is not clear how the initial comments have been addressed nor is there a response in the review sheet.

-Please include in the risk table further specific details on the risks related to climate change and climate variability.

-On Climate change we note the inclusion of key questions in the risk table. Please provide some initial information (in the risk table) on how the project will address these questions in particular as it relates to mitigation options.

-COVID-Please provide additional details on the specific mitigation measures that will be taken by the project should COVID have implications on project implementation

(e.g. unavailability of consultants/project staff, reduction in expected co-financing, restriction of movement between countries etc).

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

- Climate Change:

-As indicated under Part II ? Project Justification Q.2 , please provide more comprehensive information on the risks related to climate change and climate variability.

-We note the inclusion of key questions in the risk table. Please provide some information on how the project will address these questions in particular as it relates to mitigation options.

-COVID-Please provide additional details on the specific mitigation measures that will be taken by the project should COVID have implications on project implementation (e.g. unavailability of consultants/project staff, reduction in expected co-financing, restriction of movement between countries etc). Please refer to the GEF COVID guidance.

Agency Response

June 17 2021

Additional information on climate change was included in paragraphs 24-25, 28-29, and 31/32.

Climate risks were included in the first and last line of the risk table.

In addition, a preliminary climate screening has been prepared (see attached document)

May 17, 2021

-Done. Risks related to climate change and variability have been included. Please see table on page 86-87.

- additional information has been included on how the project will address key questions included in the risk table.

- Regarding COVID, please see paragraph 188 and the Risk Table Summary

With respect to COVID-19 all the participating countries have put in place a number of Protocol to which the project will adhere. Currently, however, one of the implications of COVID-19 is the restrictions of travel between the participating countries. Should this continue it will have implications for the implementation of some project activities. It is hoped, however, that by the time field-based activities under the project are about to commence at the national level in the participating countries, a significant portion of the population would have been vaccinated

April 2021

Please refer to paragraph 190 and the updated risk table.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-Please provide a list of relevant national level GEF projects with which SOILCARE will be coordinating with/seeking to build on/seeking to coordinate.

-Thank you for the comprehensive description on the institutional arrangements.

-Regarding, Pg 107 Pro Doc- Annex I indicates? *Provide the PISLM Liaison Office at the University of the West Indies, St. Augustine Campus, Trinidad and Tobago and the National Project Offices in each of the participating countries ? Will PISLM set up physical national project offices or designate national project officers? If the latter where will these persons be housed?*

2/19/2021 FI:

Will representatives of the climate change adaptation community be on the Regional Project Steering Committee? What are the institutional arrangements to support the mainstreaming of adaptation elements at the regional scale, in the context of SLM? How will it be ensured that the efforts are synergistic with other relevant adaptation initiatives in the region?

Agency Response

-List of GEF projects has been added.

-The project will establish SOILCARE project office in the office of the UNCCD focal point (paragraph 206)

-National climate change officers will be part of the national steering committees (paragraph 206)

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

-The information in the portal is not fully consistent with the information in the project document under this section.

-In addition please include in the portal submission specific information on each country's LDN targets and which specific targets the project is contributing to for each country. LDN implementation on the ground is the basis for the LD financing of this project, so this information is vital.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

Please provide further information on how the project may be assisting countries to meet their specific LDN targets. Please include information on the LDN targets for each country and which specific targets the project is contributing to.

-Please also indicate how the project may be contributing to commitments/plans/strategies related to the UNFCCC and the Aichi Targets under the CBD.

2/19/2021 FI:

Please also discuss whether addressing climate change impacts and mainstreaming climate resilience is a national priority for these countries.

Agency Response

May 17,2021

-OK. Information in the portal is now consistent with the prodoc

-LDN targets have been included for each country

April 2021

Please refer to paragraphs 209-211

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared for SCCF.

4/29/2021:

SCCF follow up Comments:

Please also discuss the value and role of the ?PISLM/SOILCARE Regional Research, Advisory and Capacity Building (RAC) Facility on New Adaptation Technologies? in knowledge-sharing for this project.

2/19/2021:

Not fully.

-Please indicate how the project will be making use of existing knowledge coming from the LDN TSP, and other national level SLM and LD related projects.

2/19/2021 FI:

-Other than the last sentence and some bracketed text, there is no mention of the value-add this project brings in mainstreaming climate resilience, or how knowledge in that regard will be shared or exchanged. Please include.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

Done. Please see paragraph 215

April 2021

Please refer to paragraph 212 for LDN TSP

Please refer to paragraphs 219-220 for climate resilience

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 CEO Endorsement Request

2/19/2021

Yes

Agency Response No response required

Monitoring and Evaluation

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

Audits are not eligible M&E costs, please include under the PMC.

2/19/2021:

Yes.

However please clarify what is meant by ?Implicit in cost??

Agency Response

May 17,2021

Done.

April 2021

Implicit costs refer to when the activity will be carried out by the PISLM Regional Project Unit (i.e. project coordinator or other staff)

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Please discuss how this project will deliver benefits in the context of COVID-19 and building back better / green recovery.

Agency Response

May 16, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Please refer to paragraph 245 in the PRODOC

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/19/2021:

No. Please see below.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

-Please include Core Indicator 6 in the Results Framework.

-Please reinsert the results framework in the portal. The current table is distorted.

2/19/2021:

-Overall, please make the targets measurable and quantifiable where possible.

-Please ensure the GEBs are reflected prominently as targets in the results framework rather than means of verification. (In particular for Outcomes 2.1, 3.1 & 4.1)

-For Outcome 4.1- please clarify and include the GEBs related to this Outcome? We see the targets mainly include improvement plans. Are there any field based targets?

-Please double check the uploaded results framework in the portal as it is distorted.

2/19/2021 FI:

- As is the case for Table B, the adaptation-mainstreaming-focused items need to be identified much more distinctly, especially for Components 3 and 4. (Please don't refer to 'CSA' as a substitute for climate-resilience; the SCCF sub-components/outputs should make direct reference to climate resilience).

- For Output 5.1, the table states (near bottom of page 86 of ProDoc): 'Results of the investment made to support Regional Climate Modelling and Projections for SLM available to Policy Makers and other stakeholders?'. Can you please point us to where in Table B and the project results framework there is reference to the regional climate modelling and projections for SLM?

Agency Response

May 16, 2021

- Core Indicator 6 included as outcome indicators under 2.1 and 3.1

-Results framework reinserted in the portal

April 2021

The results framework and logframe (Table B) have been revised to include SMART indicators, including the reflection of GEBs. The new version was uploaded into the portal.

Explicit references have been made to climate resilience, including specific indicators.

Climate modeling (CMA) is now reflected in the outcome indicator. Specific output indicator on best practices is included under 5.1.1

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

-Please include the Matrix of responses to final GEF Sec comments, that were provided at PIF review stage prior to Council Approval. See section in PIF review sheet -

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

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

No response required

April 2021

Please refer to PRODOC annex C

1) Please provide solid, referenced information on climate change projections for the region. Also please discuss the implications of climate change for sustainable land management in the Caribbean.	Please refer to PRODOC Section 1, paragraphs 23-31
2) Please discuss how the institutional arrangements for sustainable efforts towards mainstreaming climate change adaptation in SLM in the Caribbean.	

<p>3) Please provide further information on co-financing for the adaptation-related activities.</p>	<p>Cofinancing for climate change adaptation activities comes in part from in-kind contribution from participating Ministries as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -work under the Soil Fertility Mapping for Durable Agriculture in Antigua and Barbuda -In kind contribution under the World Bank Grenada Pilot Program for Climate Resilience -In-kind contribution from the National Agriculture Research and Extension Insitte and University of Guyana -The Disaster Vulneratibility Reduction Programme in St Lucia
<p>4) We understand that no beneficiary information was entered for the SCCF Core Indicator at PIF stage, to avoid the risk of double-counting beneficiaries given that the SCCF will be supporting CCA-mainstreaming at a regional scale. However, please engage with GEF Sec prior to CEO Endorsement to determine how beneficiary information can be captured for the SCCF.</p>	<p>SCCF activities are implemented under components 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p>Indicators for SCCF were calculated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Component 3, 20,000 ha of Model Climate Farms accounted for in Core Indicators (15,000) and SCCF Tracking Tool (5,000) in a way proportional to available funding - Component 4: 20,000 ha of resilient food systems accounted for in Core Indicators (17,000) and SCCF Tracking Tool (3,000) in a way proportional to available funding -Project beneficiaries include 1000 individuals that will be trained on CC adaptation best practices for agriculture (Outcome 5.2) accounted for in the SCCF Tracking Tool
<p>-Given the reference to the BD sub-indicator 4.1 and the use of the integrated landscape approach, please provide a bit of context on Biodiversity in this section. The Biodiversity summary is sufficient for the PIF stage, however we expect additional details at the country level for CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>This is discussed under the subsection Baseline Conditions in the National Project Sites, paragraphs 52-81. In particular, Grenada (paragraph 62), Haiti (paragraph 75-78) and Barbados (paragraph 81) describe the national parks and protected areas where the project will take place.</p>

-Please also include additional details on indigenous peoples and private sector in the Project Justification (Context section)	Please refer to PRODOC section 2 (Stakeholders)
-We expect country based maps identifying the project sites at the CEO Endorsement stage.	Maps are included as part of the text in paragraphs 52 to 81
-We expect to see additional information on gender at the CEO Endorsement stage.	Please refer to Section 3 (Gender) of the PRODOC
- Please include additional information on the specific country based LDN targets (where available) and how the country based activities will help each country to set or meet their LDN targets.	LDN targets are discussed in project sites (paragraphs 75-78) per country when available and in section 7 (Consistency with national priorities).Project sites were selected based on priorities set under the LDN Target Setting Programme
- For Output 1.1.2 and 1.1.2, please ensure that data ownership, sharing and maintenance arrangements are considered to ensure sustainability as well as resources (financial and human) to maintain the systems.	Point taken. Data will be prepared and owned by the participating countries. Component 1 goes describes in details the activities needed to ensure adequate data management.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021:

Cleared.

6/10/2021:

We unfortunately do not see the Council Comments in the portal, only those from STAP. Please upload.

4/29/2021:

Please include the Council comments and responses in the portal.

2/19/2021:

Matrix of responses to Council comments are not attached. Please provide responses to the comments from the Council members from the Germany and USA.

Agency Response

June 17 2021

Addressed

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/10/2021:

Cleared.

4/29/2021:

Please see the climate change comments mentioned above, which still need to be addressed.

All other comments have been addressed.

2/19/2021:

The following comments have not been adequately addressed (similar comments are provided throughout the review sheet):

- The theory of change

- Inclusion of barriers in the project description; and removal of project solutions in the section on problems.

- How the project will use the baseline and build on the lessons

- Clear articulation of the GEBs (those under the core indicators) as well as others

- Gender analysis

- Climate risk assessment

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

Please see responses above (climate risk).

April 2021

1) Please provide solid, referenced information on climate change projections for the region. Also please discuss the implications of climate change for sustainable land management in the Caribbean.	Please refer to PRODOC Section 1, paragraphs 23-31
2) Please discuss how the institutional arrangements for sustainable efforts towards mainstreaming climate change adaptation in SLM in the Caribbean.	Please refer to paragraphs 23 to 28
3) Please provide further information on co-financing for the adaptation-related activities.	<p>Cofinancing for climate change adaptation activities comes in part from in-kind contribution from participating Ministries as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-work under the Soil Fertility Mapping for Durable Agriculture in Antigua and Barbuda-In kind contribution under the World Bank Grenada Pilot Program for Climate Resilience-In-kind contribution from the National Agriculture Research and Extension Insitte and University of Guyana-The Disaster Vulneratibility Reduction Programme in St Lucia

<p>4) We understand that no beneficiary information was entered for the SCCF Core Indicator at PIF stage, to avoid the risk of double-counting beneficiaries given that the SCCF will be supporting CCA-mainstreaming at a regional scale. However, please engage with GEF Sec prior to CEO Endorsement to determine how beneficiary information can be captured for the SCCF.</p>	<p>SCCF activities are implemented under components 3, 4, and 5.</p> <p>Indicators for SCCF were calculated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Component 3, 20,000 ha of Model Climate Farms accounted for in Core Indicators (15,000) and SCCF Tracking Tool (5,000) in a way proportional to available funding - Component 4: 20,000 ha of resilient food systems accounted for in Core Indicators (17,000) and SCCF Tracking Tool (3,000) in a way proportional to available funding -Project beneficiaries include 1000 individuals that will be trained on CC adaptation best practices for agriculture (Outcome 5.2) accounted for in the SCCF Tracking Tool
<p>-Given the reference to the BD sub-indicator 4.1 and the use of the integrated landscape approach, please provide a bit of context on Biodiversity in this section. The Biodiversity summary is sufficient for the PIF stage, however we expect additional details at the country level for CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>This is discussed under the subsection Baseline Conditions in the National Project Sites, paragraphs 52-81. In particular, Grenada (paragraph 62), Haiti (paragraph 75-78) and Barbados (paragraph 81) describe the national parks and protected areas where the project will take place.</p>
<p>-Please also include additional details on indigenous peoples and private sector in the Project Justification (Context section)</p>	<p>Please refer to PRODOC section 2 (Stakeholders)</p>
<p>-We expect country based maps identifying the project sites at the CEO Endorsement stage.</p>	<p>Maps are included as part of the text in paragraphs 52 to 81</p>
<p>-We expect to see additional information on gender at the CEO Endorsement stage.</p>	<p>Please refer to Section 3 (Gender) of the PRODOC</p>

- Please include additional information on the specific country based LDN targets (where available) and how the country based activities will help each country to set or meet their LDN targets.	LDN targets are discussed in project sites (paragraphs 75-78) per country when available and in section 7 (Consistency with national priorities).Project sites were selected based on priorities set under the LDN Target Setting Programme
- For Output 1.1.2 and 1.1.2, please ensure that data ownership, sharing and maintenance arrangements are considered to ensure sustainability as well as resources (financial and human) to maintain the systems.	Point taken. Data will be prepared and owned by the participating countries. Component 1 goes describes in details the activities needed to ensure adequate data management.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response N/A

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/29/2021:

Cleared.

2/19/2021:

Yes however please insert PPG expenditure table in the portal submission.

Agency Response

May 17, 2021

no response required

April 2021

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To Date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Signature of LOA	34,700	34,700	
- Report from Inception Workshop - Revised workplan from each project outcome	44,600	44,600	
Completed baseline assessment	33,500	33,500	
- Draft FAO-GEF PRODOC - Validation Workshop	26,000	26,000	
- Final Draft of FAO-GEF PRODOC for internal review and submission to GEFSEC - Final report for LOA	34,700		34,700
	173,500	138,800	34,700

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/19/2021:

Yes

Agency Response No response required

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Not applicable

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response Not applicable

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO endorsement.

6/10/2021:

The project is not yet ready for CEO Endorsement. Please address the comments above.

4/29/2021:

The project is not yet ready for CEO Endorsement. Please address the comments above.
Please also note the (offline) email response to the Amendment request.

2/19/2021:

The project is not yet ready for CEO Endorsement. Please address the comments above.

12/14/2020:

Project review not conducted as yet. OFP Endorsement Letter for Barbados and
Notification of Major amendment to be submitted.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/14/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/19/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/10/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/17/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations