

Youth4Agri: Implementing Nature-based Solutions (NbS) in Productive Landscapes in Agriculture in Saint Lucia

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

12354

Countries

St. Lucia

Project Name

Youth4Agri: Implementing Nature-based Solutions (NbS) in Productive Landscapes in Agriculture in Saint Lucia

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

5/22/2026

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Celine Augereau ep Coisy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

MSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared

05/22/2026

a)

- The project can meet conditions for BD FA fundings. The GEF 8 BD FA programming directions can support biodiversity mainstreaming in productive sectors. The BD targeted needs to be globally significant, described, and justified by the agency. Support to agriculture can be provided in a landscape approach sensitive to ecological values of land-use planning, by improvement of practices to be more biodiversity positive, in order to protect this BD of global importance. Currently the assessment of the ecological values and the landscape approach needs to be demonstrated. The globally significant BD targeted by the project needs to be demonstrated, in the areas targeted. The drivers of BD degradation needs to be clearly identified to understand how the project will address them and reverse the trend of degradation.

- The project is a MFA project but there is no indication of how the project is aligned to the LD FA. Please clarify how the project will address LD challenges.

b) Cleared.

The theory of change does not address the need to reduce pressures on the drivers of degradation in order to better preserve and restore biodiversity.

Agency's Comments

i) The project has been substantially revised to strengthen the biodiversity and land degradation rationale and demonstrate alignment with the GEF-8 Biodiversity Focal Area. Additional information has been incorporated throughout the document to better describe Saint Lucia's biodiversity values, biodiversity and land degradation challenges, and the key drivers of ecosystem degradation, including habitat transformation, unsustainable agricultural practices, soil erosion, declining soil productivity, pollution, and loss of ecosystem functions. The barriers section has also been revised to more clearly identify the underlying institutional, knowledge, and financing constraints that limit the adoption and scaling of biodiversity-positive and land-restorative practices. In addition, the project has been reframed to position youth as a key mechanism for driving uptake, scaling, and long-term sustainability of nature-positive solutions within productive landscapes, thereby contributing to biodiversity conservation and sustainable land management outcomes.

ii) The PIF has been revised to clearly demonstrate alignment with the Land Degradation Focal Area and Saint Lucia's commitment under the United Nations Conventions to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). Additional information has been incorporated on the country's land degradation challenges, including unsustainable agricultural practices, soil erosion, declining soil productivity, loss of ecosystem functions, and pressures on watershed systems, drawing on the findings of Saint Lucia's Land Degradation Neutrality Setting Programme (2018). The document now explains more clearly how project interventions will promote to sustainable land management through nature-positive agricultural approaches that improve soil health, enhance land productivity, and contribute to national efforts to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality by 2030. The barriers, theory of change, project rationale, and alignment sections have been revised accordingly to strengthen the land degradation dimension of the project.

b)The theory of change has been edited to address how project interventions will address the drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation. The revised Theory of Change now links the adoption of nature-positive agricultural practices to reducing environmental pressures associated with unsustainable agriculture practices and improving

sustainable land management outcomes. It also more clearly positions youth as a mechanism for driving the uptake and scaling of biodiversity-positive and land-restorative practices within agro-ecological landscapes. It clearly highlights the need to reduce pressures on the drivers of degradation to better preserve and restore biodiversity.

2. Project Summary

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared.

05/22/2026

Not cleared. The summary does not clearly establish the values of biodiversity targeted by the project, either the drivers of loss in the precise sites targeted; in particular, the impacts of the current agriculture. The only reference to BD is the Caribbean hotspot, which is too large to justify significance which is needed to benefit for BD fundings. Please complete the summary giving elements of the BD context, and its attachments to main areas of BD in St Lucia. The summary needs to describe the integrated landscape approach that needs to be implemented (main ecological corridors, watershed, forest, activities and dynamic ...), and how the project's components will address drivers of BD loss.

The sites targeted need to be precise and the solutions proposed justified by the need to be transformative. The project needs to be anchored in the local context and its biodiversity issues.

Please also include LD related challenges.

Agency's Comments

The project summary has been revised to clearly define the biodiversity values in Saint Lucia, identify country-specific drivers of biodiversity loss, including agricultural, commercial and residential development, high sediment loads and agricultural chemicals, identify country-specific drivers of land degradation, including poor agricultural practices, deforestation, and the removal of natural forests for intensive agriculture, and soil erosion, and anchors the project within priority national ecosystems and landscapes.

The revised summary also outlines the integrated landscape approach, including key watersheds, forest systems, and ecological corridors, and explains how project components will address biodiversity loss drivers through transformative, context-specific interventions.

3 Indicative Project Overview

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

05/22/2026

a) Not cleared. The project objective is not fully aligned with BD FA programming directions. Please correct the objective by adjusting to the biodiversity strategy.

b) Not cleared. Please see comments on the ToC and adjust to the margin the components. The landscape approach, values of BD to be preserved, and quality of the BD need to be included in the project components and descriptions to understand the logical process to contribute to Objective 1 of GEF 8 BD FA Programming directions "To improve conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of natural ecosystems".

- Component 1: can be aligned with the BD FA by promoting changes in production practices and sustainable use of biodiversity. It will enable also the monitoring of the ecosystem. But, please, improve the narrative and outputs. Explain what BD components will be monitored. Detail how the activities planned will improve quality of the BD targeted.

- The project is a useful initiative to involve youth more in the country's goals/plans for nature positive development. However, there is a disconnect with the project and what maybe planned or happening at the national level. Component 1 in particular could be strengthened to include how the youth could be better incorporated into existing policy decision making processes and governance frameworks related to the project's intent. This consideration is recommended.

- Component 2: can aligned by promoting new business agricultural systems more biodiversity positive. Please improve narrative and outputs.

Currently the narrative is mainly focused on agricultural improvement but there is no links or demonstration on how this logical pathway will preserve and improve the globally significant BD targeted.

The field based interventions mentioned are quite vague and could benefit from additional details.

Agency's Comments

a) The project objective has been revised to better align with BD FA programming directions and the biodiversity strategy. The objective now reads *"To enable sustainable management of agro-ecological landscapes, by empowering youth in agriculture to adopt and scale biodiversity conservation and land degradation neutrality practices."* This revision strengthens integration of biodiversity conservation within agro-ecological systems, aligns with land degradation neutrality principles, and supports long-term sustainability through youth empowerment.

b) The Theory of Change and its narrative have been revised to better align with GEF's BD and LD FA priorities and clearly demonstrate the contribution to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of ecosystems.

A landscape approach is now embedded by identifying the eight (8) productive agricultural landscapes targeted, integrating biodiversity conservation and SLM. Biodiversity values are incorporated through nature-positive practices, biodiversity-friendly value chains, and land degradation neutrality actions.

- Component 1 has been strengthened by improving the narrative on governance, monitoring, and sustainable use of biodiversity. Amendments to the component include:

i. An output, with associated activities, that institutionalize youth participation in national biodiversity and SLM decision-making

ii. An output, with associated activities, for the establishment of a national repository and data monitoring protocol, including youth-led data collection, for the monitoring of biodiversity and land degradation

iii. Specification of proposed activities focused on nature-positive actions and technologies, to be implemented as field interventions to reduce agricultural pressures on biodiversity and land degradation.

- Component 2 has been refined to strengthen the linkage between agriculture and biodiversity conservation and land degradation neutrality outcomes. It now highlights the promotion of innovative, biodiversity-positive agricultural business systems and value chains that actively reduce biodiversity loss and enhance ecosystem health, rather than focusing on conventional agricultural improvement.

The ToC also addresses the need for stronger alignment with national processes by embedding youth within existing governance frameworks, policy cycles, and reporting mechanisms, ensuring coherence with national biodiversity objectives.

Overall, the revised ToC clarifies the logical pathway from youth engagement and sustainable agriculture to biodiversity conservation and land degradation neutrality.

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared

05/22/2026

•The gender dimension is integrated in the project approach and is cross cutting all the components. It could be better precise in the different components description and there is scope to improve the reflection of gender perspectives:

- i) Please ensure that the findings from the gender analysis (at PPG stage) informs the preparation of the Gender Action Plan and that key elements of the GAP are reflected in the project components.

- ii) Please ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting.

- iii) Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.).

- iv) Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

•Knowledge has a dedicated component and is really targeting young people, learning and transmissions.

- Monitoring is also included and funded. Please consider whether the M&E budget, which is currently 5.5% of the GEF project funding, can be reduced in line with the portfolio average of 5% for projects of this size.

Agency's Comments

a) The gender dimension has been revised as follows:

- A. Project Rationale - Project approach states that:

- i) *The findings from the gender diagnosis and analysis to be undertaken during the Project Preparation (PPG) phase, will directly inform the design and preparation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP), ensuring that identified gender gaps and priorities are systematically translated into targeted actions across all project components*

Findings will inform a comprehensive GAP, inclusive of indicators and a budget, and its key actions will be explicitly integrated into the design, implementation, and expected results of each project component to ensure coherence and accountability

- ii) *The project results framework will include specific, measurable gender-responsive and sex-disaggregated indicators aligned with the GAP to facilitate systematic monitoring, evaluation, and reporting on gender equality outcomes.*

- iii) *Adequate financial and human resources will be allocated to support the implementation of the GAP, including dedicated budget lines, capacity-building activities, and technical support. Mechanisms for coordination, accountability, and continuous learning will be established to ensure effective execution, including adaptive management processes that respond to monitoring findings and emerging gender-related challenges throughout the project lifecycle*

- B. Project Description ? Theory of Change - Project's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) states that:

- iv) *The monitoring and evaluation framework will ensure that gender-specific results, including progress on the implementation of the GAP, are systematically captured and reported through Project Implementation Reports, Project Progress Reports, Mid-Term Reviews and the Terminal Evaluation*

b) N/A

c) The M&E budget was reduced from 5.5% (\$43, 167) to 5% (\$39,238), in line with the portfolio average for the projects' size.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared.

05/22/2026

a) Fundings for Component 2 seem very low compared to the many activities planned. Please consider increasing GEF funding or co-financing, maybe with a better balance with knowledge component 3.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) Yes, cleared.

Agency's Commentsa) The budget for Component 2 has been carefully reviewed and revised. The allocation has been increased from USD 50,000 to USD 103,929, ensuring sufficient resources for effective implementation. This adjustment was made to better align the financial allocation with the breadth and complexity of the planned interventions under this component.

b) N/A

c) N/A

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

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

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared.

05/26/2026

a) This project is BD and LD fundings. Please improve description of the environmental context, situation of St Lucia BD in the global context, and in the area targeted by the project.

Drivers of BD loss are not well explained and the logical of the project to address them and to contribute to Objective 1 of BD FA, is not obviously presented.

b) Not cleared. Barriers are described but no enablers are identified. Please complete.

Agency's Comments

a) Revisions have been incorporated throughout the text to strengthen the environmental context, including Saint Lucia's biodiversity in the global context and within the project area. The drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation are now more clearly explained, and the project logic has been clarified to better demonstrate alignment with BD and LD objectives.

b) Thank you for the feedback. Enablers have now been identified and incorporated alongside the barriers to provide a more balanced and complete assessment.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Cleared. Yes the project by improving environmental and agricultural skills of the new generation will create resilience.

05/26/2026

a) No. Please complete

b) Please see comments above and on ToC and revise the project.

c) Not cleared. The paragraph is currently empty. Please complete.

d) Not cleared. Please complete with stakeholders involved in BD conservation. The relevant stakeholders and their roles related to project objective and components should be better described. In addition, please clarify which civil society and local community groups and organizations that were consulted and plans to engage and consult these in project development.

Agency's Commentsa) Section A. Project Rationale - Project approach has been revised to include an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options. The text is as follows:

The selection of this approach responds to key limitations observed in existing interventions in Saint Lucia and across the Caribbean. Traditional agricultural development approaches have often relied on top-down extension models and input-driven intensification, which, while supporting short-term productivity gains, have not adequately addressed the underlying drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation, including unsustainable land use practices, weak knowledge systems, and limited engagement of youth.

In contrast, this project adopts a youth-centered, integrated landscape approach that directly targets the drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation within agricultural systems. By positioning youth as the primary drivers of transformation, the project ensures that biodiversity conservation and land restoration are embedded within the next generation of farmers, enabling sustained, long-term change. This is fully aligned with regional priorities under CARICOM initiatives such as the 2025 by 2025+5 agenda, which highlights the need to increase youth participation in agriculture to ensure sustainable and resilient agri-food systems. Across the Caribbean, declining youth engagement in agriculture has been identified as a key constraint to innovation, productivity, and environmental sustainability, reinforcing the relevance of this approach.

Furthermore, the combined use of nature-positive agricultural practices and resource-efficient production systems (e.g. hydroponics, aquaponics, controlled-environment agriculture, and water-efficient systems) has been selected over conventional expansion-based approaches, as it allows for increased productivity without placing additional pressure on natural ecosystems or contributing to further land degradation. This is particularly important in the context of Saint Lucia's limited land availability and highly interconnected ecosystems. Through this approach, youth farmers are enabled to drive the transformation of agricultural systems by adopting and scaling practices that simultaneously conserve biodiversity, restore soil health, reduce erosion and land degradation, and maintain ecosystem functions within productive landscapes, contributing to both environmental restoration and sustainable livelihoods."

b) The ToC and the overall PIF has been revised (see response to 3.1 b) above). In addition, Section A. Project Rationale - Project approach includes text regarding the project's resilience to future changes in the drivers, as follows:

The approach is also designed to remain resilient to future changes in key drivers, including climate variability, evolving land use pressures, and market fluctuations. By building the adaptive capacity of youth farmers, promoting diversified and resource-efficient production systems, and strengthening knowledge and support systems, the project enhances the ability of agricultural systems to respond to shocks and stresses while maintaining biodiversity conservation and land restoration outcomes over time. By embedding these capacities, knowledge, and practices within youth, who represent the future of the agricultural sector, the project ensures that biodiversity conservation and land degradation responses are sustained, adapted, and scaled over the long term."

c) The text for the section was inadvertently not included during upload to the portal. Strengthened text has now been included in the portal to provide a more comprehensive description of how the project will build upon and complement ongoing and planned investments. Additional references have been included to relevant GEF and non-GEF initiatives, including SOILCARE (GEF-8), AdaptFor-Saint Lucia (GCF), the UNEP-CANARI nature-based solutions project (GEF), the Agriculture SASAP, the Adaptation Fund agriculture resilience project, the Canada-FAO climate-smart agriculture initiative,

and the CARICOM Youth in Agriculture Strategy. The revised text also clarifies synergies, complementarity, and the project's additionality in supporting biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, climate resilience, and youth engagement.

d) Thank you for the comment. The text in Section A. Project Rationale - Project stakeholders was revised to include a more comprehensive identification of stakeholders involved in biodiversity conservation, with clearer descriptions of their respective roles in relation to the project objectives and components. The text also specifies the civil society organizations and local community groups that were consulted during the development of the PIF and further clarifies the approach and plan for their continued engagement and consultation throughout project development.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

a) Cleared

b) Cleared.

05/26/2026

a) Not cleared. The current ToC is stating that agriculture threatens biodiversity but the ToC itself intends only to maintain, improve and restore the agroecological systems, and does not target the drivers of BD loss. Please see comments above and improve the project narrative

b) Not cleared. See comments on 3.1b)

- Component 1:

- There is no analysis of bad incentives harmful to BD, or on policy coherence to support BD positive practices in agriculture. Please consider improving the outcome 1.1 addressing the national legal and political framework. Please also consider identifying land use planning issues, related to and integrated landscape approach that could be integrated in the project

- Please consider describing the BD to be monitored.

- Component 2:

- Please consider exploring if a Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting (NCAA) exercise is feasible at local level to help improve government engagement.

Agency's Comments

a) We have revised the ToC (see response to 3.1 b) above) and overall project narrative to clearly articulate how the project not only supports the maintenance, improvement, and restoration of agroecological systems, but also contributes to addressing key drivers of

biodiversity loss and land degradation, including unsustainable agricultural practices. These changes ensure better alignment between the stated threats and the project's intended outcomes.

b) We have revised the ToC (see response to 3.1 b) above). In addition:

i) Component 1:

- An activity has been added to Component 1 (output 1.1.2) to review the national land planning framework and to submit a proposal of improvement that addresses identified harmful incentives to youth-led land stewardship and biodiversity conservation and considers youth priorities. Such proposal will integrate the plans to scale best practices prepared under output 1.1.1
- Output 1.1.2 has been revised to include a commitment to establish a national repository and data monitoring protocol for biodiversity and land degradation, and demonstration sites to validate and scale practices.

ii) i) Component 2:

The GEF-funded (US \$3M) project "Valuing Nature and Nature-based Solutions (NbS) for Sustainable Blue and Green Pathways" being led by the Caribbean Natural Resources Institute (CANARI) and the Department of Sustainable Development, during the period 2025-2030, integrates natural capital accounting into tourism, agriculture, and urban planning, with direct interventions in Laborie and Choiseul. The proposed project will complement the ongoing activities of the NbS project by providing data for valuation calculations and will support the adoption and scaling of biodiversity-friendly and land-restorative agricultural practices among youth and farming communities in Laborie and Choiseul districts (see additional details on complementary projects in sub-section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects").

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared.

05/26/2026

Not cleared. Please complete the project document consistently

Agency's Comments The PIF has been revised to reflect the incremental/additional cost reasoning in line with *GEF/C.31/12* by clearly describing the baseline scenario, the project's approach in comparison to other potential options, and demonstrating how GEF resources generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) that would not occur otherwise.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

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

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

c) Cleared.

05/26/2026

a) Cleared.

b) NA

c) Not cleared. There doesn't appear to be any baseline mentioned. What other projects, is this project building on and learning from? Is there any connection or linkages to other projects such as SOILCARE? Please complete the project document because this paragraph is currently empty.

d) Cleared.

Agency's Comments

a) N/A

b) N/A

c) The section "Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Projects" (p. 35), has now been significantly expanded to provide a clearer description of the baseline and the project's coordination with ongoing GEF-financed and non-GEF financed initiatives. Specific linkages have now been added with GEF-funded SOILCARE Project and its forthcoming Phase 2, highlighting how the project will build upon existing investments in soil health and sustainable land management through youth engagement, capacity development, and scaling of nature positive agricultural practices. Additional coordination and complementarity have also been described with the AdaptFor Saint Lucia Project (GCF), the UNEP-CANARI nature-based solutions project (GEF), the Agriculture SASAP, the Adaptation Fund agriculture resilience project, the Canada-FAO climate smart agriculture initiative, and the CARICOM Youth in Agriculture Strategy. The revised text clarifies how existing investments and ongoing initiatives will be leveraged through coordination, complementarity, and knowledge exchange to maximize additionality and avoid duplication.

d) N/A

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

b) Cleared.

05/26/2026

a) Cleared.

b) Not cleared. Target for CI 4 is very low considering the budget. Please consider improving.

- The GEBs are very low and 4.1 may not be the most suitable as no management plans or land use planning is mentioned in the project.
- The project claims for LD2 alignment, however no restoration GEBs (CI 3) have been selected.

Agency's Comments

a) N/A

b) The target for Core Indicator 4 has been increased to 274.8 hectares and 247 additional hectares have been allocated to Core Indicator 3, as follows:

i) The sub-indicator 4.1 has been replaced by 4.3, which is more closely suited to the activities planned under the project. The target for sub-indicator 4.3 is now 274.8 hectares, of which 24.8 hectares corresponds to direct activities in the demonstration sites and 250 hectares to improved management in annual croplands as part of scaling plans developed under output 1.2.1.

ii) Additional 247 hectares that will be subject to improved management as per the scaling plans that will be developed under output 1.2.1 correspond to currently not cultivated and degraded cropland areas that will be restored through the implementation of perennial agroforestry. That acreage has been allocated to Core Indicator 3, sub-indicator 3.1.

N/A

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

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

N/A

5.6 RISKS

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

c) Cleared.

05/26/2026

a) Cleared

b) Cleared

c) Not cleared.

- i) Please ensure further consultations with schools, youth groups, community-based organizations about their priorities and needs to promote sustainable agriculture in Saint Lucia and integrating results of the consultations in the project design during the PPG.

- ii) Please consider engaging with youth partners such as schools, youth groups, community-based organizations not only as beneficiaries but also as partners of the project and a part of project governance mechanism.

Agency's Comments

a) N/A

b) N/A

c) The table "Risks to achieving outcomes," specifically the Environment and Social risk category, has been edited to include the following text:

i) Participation of youth, who are the primary targeted beneficiaries of this project, will be promoted through consultation with project partners to secure their engagement in the project activities. Further consultations will be conducted with schools, youth groups, and community-based organizations to identify their priorities and needs related to promoting sustainable agriculture in Saint Lucia, and the results of these consultations will be systematically integrated into the project design during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

ii) Youth partners, including schools, youth groups, and community-based organizations, will be engaged not only as beneficiaries but also as active project partners and represented, where feasible, within project governance and coordination mechanisms.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

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

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

c) Cleared.

05/26/2026

a) Currently the project design and ToC need to be corrected and improved to ensure the project to be durable and transformative.

b) Yes, the project can be up scaled at the national level.

c) Not cleared. See comment on component 1, paragraphs 3.1 and 5.1, and the need to better assess bad incentives and develop policy coherence.

Agency's Comments

a) The ToC was revised to ensure that the project is durable and transformative. See responses above to 1b), 3.1, 4.2 and 5.1

b) N/A

c) See responses to 3.1, 3.2 and 5.1

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared

05/26/2026

- The project can be fully aligned with objective 1 of the BD FA, but need to be revised. See comments above, on integrated landscape approach and globally significant BD.

- There is no indication of how the project is aligned to the LD Focal Area, even though funds have been assigned to LD 1 and LD2. Please clarify the purpose of the project and justify LD programming fundings.

Agency's Comments

The PIF was revised to fully align with Objective 1 of the BD FA ? see responses above to 1a, 2, 3.1, 4.2 and 5.1b.

The PIF has been revised to demonstrate alignment to the LD focal area. Specifically, 247 hectares that will be subject to improved management as per the scaling plans that will be developed under output 1.2.1 correspond to currently not cultivated and degraded cropland areas that will be restored through the implementation of perennial agroforestry. That acreage has been allocated to Core Indicator 3, sub-indicator 3.1.

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared.

05/26/2026

Not cleared.

The link to the national plans/strategies around LDN and UNCCD commitments has not been made. Please complete.

Agency's Comments The section has been revised to strengthen alignment with national and regional priorities, strategies, and commitments. Additional references have been included to Saint Lucia's Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Programme (2018) and commitments under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), including linkages to sustainable land management, soil health, land productivity, and national efforts to achieve Land Degradation Neutrality by 2030. The revised text also further clarifies alignment with regional frameworks, including CARICOM's Community Agricultural Policy, CARICOM's Environmental and Natural Resources Policy Framework, OECS Biodiversity and Ecosystem Management Framework, and relevant multilateral environmental agreements.

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

Cleared.

05/26/2026

Currently the project does not have any activities to improve land-use planning, so target 1 should not be tagged.

Agency's Comments The project activities, under Component 1 has been revised to include a review of the national land planning framework and to submit a proposal of improvement that addresses identified harmful incentives to youth-led land stewardship and biodiversity conservation and considers youth priorities (output 1.1.2). Such proposal will integrate the plans to scale best practices prepared under output 1.1.1

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

05/26/2026

Cleared

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A
Annex B: Endorsements

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

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

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments
Annex C: Project Location

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments
05/26/2026

Cleared.

Agency's CommentsN/A

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

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

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's CommentsN/A

9 GEFSEC Decision

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

Secretariat's Comments

06/11/2026

All comments have been addressed. The project is recommended for technical clearance.

05/26/2026

The project is not yet ready. Please address the comments to clear alignment with GEF BD and LD focal areas. When resubmitted, the project will be fully revised.

Agency's Comments Thank you for your comments. The PIF has been revised to ensure clear alignment with the GEF BD and LD focal areas.

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

Secretariat's Comments

- Please consider using same wording in the ToC diagram than in the project components, outcomes and outputs to avoid confusion.

- Gender:

- i) Please ensure that the findings from the gender analysis (at PPG stage) informs the preparation of the Gender Action Plan and that key elements of the GAP are reflected in the project components.

- ii) Please ensure that in the development of the project results framework, gender-specific indicators are included to facilitate monitoring and reporting.

- iii) Please indicate measures to facilitate and support the implementation of the GAP (e.g., budgets, regular monitoring, adaptive management, etc.).

- iv) Please make a reference to include in PIRs, MTRs and TE, reports on gender-specific results, including the implementation of the Gender Action Plan.

- Risks:

- i) Please ensure further consultations with schools, youth groups, community-based organizations about their priorities and needs to promote sustainable agriculture in Saint Lucia and integrating results of the consultations in the project design during the PPG.

- ii) Please consider engaging with youth partners such as schools, youth groups, community-based organizations not only as beneficiaries but also as partners of the project and a part of project governance mechanism.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	6/2/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/11/2026	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)