

Enhancing Land Management and Strengthening Ecosystem Resilience for Integrated Landscape Restoration and Climate-Resilient Food Systems in Carriacou, Grenada

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10980

Countries

Grenada

Project Name

Enhancing Land Management and Strengthening Ecosystem Resilience for Integrated Landscape Restoration and Climate-Resilient Food Systems in Carriacou, Grenada

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/10/2023

Review completed by PM

3/27/2023

Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

5/11/2023:

The GEF financing for Component 2 in Table B and Component 2 in Annex E of the Portal submission are still not aligned. Please revise.

4/7/2023:

-There are differences between the amounts stipulated in the budget provided in Annex E and in Table B for both Components 1 & 2. Please see below and kindly correct where necessary.

Agency Response

4/13/2023:

The numbers are now corrected in Table B for Components 1 and 2 (updates in yellow highlight)

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

5/11/2023:

Cleared.

3/28/2023:

Not fully.

- As required below the indicator table, please provide additional explanation on targets, other methodologies used, and other focal area specifics (i.e., Aichi targets in BD).

-Please disaggregate the target for CI 3 between agricultural lands (sub indicator 3.1) and grasslands (sub indicator 3.3). Table B indicates interventions in both.

-Please include core indicators (4,6, and 11) targets explicitly in the results framework (Annex a). They are currently missing in the Annex a.

Agency Response

4/13/2023:

- Additional explanation on the methodologies used to derive the core indicator targets is provided under Table E. (updates in yellow highlight)

- The CI 3 has been disaggregated; 3.1 is 125 ha and 3.3 is 125 ha. This is reflected in the Core Indicators Annex F. These are also reflected in the Results Framework. (updates in yellow highlight)

- The core indicators 4, 6 and 11 are now identified in the Results Framework. (updates in yellow highlight)

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

3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

5/11/2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Can the use of the word 'driver' be changed for clarity, as drivers are also used to describe factors that contribute to environmental degradation. Maybe 'enablers' can be used instead.

3/28/2023:

The project does a good job of responding to the LDN targets of the country and very well combines upstream interventions (local government) with downstream field based interventions using participatory methods.

One minor comment on the drivers outlined in the ToC. Are these meant to be drivers of the environmental degradation?

Agency Response

4/13/2023

No, these are not drivers of environmental degradation but rather those elements that are favorable factors to project implementation.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

5/11/2023:

Cleared.

3/28/2023:

Not fully.

On scaling up the text indicates that *The innovation in tools and methods to enhance local technical capacity among farmers, the local community and among technical support staff in government and support organizations will be an essential aspect to successful scaling up and it is expected that persons trained will serve as resource persons to exchange experiences and knowledge within the country and in the wider Caribbean.*

What mechanisms are in place or will be facilitated to ensure this happens?

Agency Response

4/13/2023

The narrative under *The scaling ? up potential* sub-section has been updated to include the means that the PISLM will employ to ensure that the application of project experiences will be scaled to the national level in Grenada and the wider Caribbean. The narrative has been expanded to include how the local governance mechanism for the project will be sustained in the long-term and lend to local to national scaling up, how the capacity development approach will support the process and how the PISLM will expand uptake of the tools and methods in the context of its regional mandate to support national obligations under the UNCCD and how it will complement the work of the GEF-SOILCARE Project. (updates in yellow highlight)

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

5/11/2023:

Cleared.

4/7/2023:

Please see comments below:

-Please revise Output 2.1.2 to read: Package of gender-sensitive SLM approaches/technologies and training?

-Page 57 of the project document states: "Under the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Government of Grenada, along with Parties to the Convention at the 15th Conference of Parties to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, adopted Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) in December 2022. The GBF includes four goals and 23 targets for achievement by 2030. Among these are several targets that are

directly relevant to this project ...? Please include target 23, which is relevant to gender equality.

-Please consider developing a gender action plan to support gender-sensitive reporting and monitoring (Output 2.1.4) and to capture gender dimensions in all project components, in particular, outputs 2.1.1, 2.2.2 and 2.1.3

Agency Response

4/13/2023

- Noted; Output 2.1.2 has been revised to read: *?Package of gender-sensitive SLM approaches/technologies and training??* (updates in yellow highlight)

- Noted; Target 23 (relevant to gender equality) has now been referenced. (updates in yellow highlight)

- The Gender baseline section of Annex U2 (Section 6.0) contains the Gender Action Plan to augment Annex Q, the Gender Strategy and Action Plan. The narrative under *Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* has been updated to reflect how the gender elements are being captured at the output level. (updates in yellow highlight)

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response

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

3/28/2023:

Yes

Agency Response
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
5/11/2023:

Cleared.

3/28/2023:

-Where will the PMU be housed?

-How will ownership of the project by the government be ensured?

Agency Response

- The PMU will be based in Carriacou and will function in liaison with PISLM's country office in St. Georges, Grenada. The text under *Section 6. Coordination* has been updated. (updates in yellow highlight)

- Ownership will be strengthened in the fact that the project will foster a long-standing institutional mechanism in Carriacou that will be internalized within the Ministry of Carriacou and Petit Martinique Affairs as a proposed 'Carriacou Land Management Committee'. Further, this mechanism will be nested within the UNCCD National Coordination Body (NCB)/National LDN Committee as a Sub-committee through under the support of the project (this was already captured under the *Sustainability sub-section* under *Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up*). The narrative under the *Sustainability sub-section* has been updated to further emphasize, and *Section 6. Coordination; Institutional project structure, monitoring, evaluation and coordination* has been updated. (updates in yellow highlight)

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
3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

4/7/2023:

It would be helpful if the agency could clarify the overall budget allocated to KM and communications activities as well as the timeline for the implementation of KM and communications related activities mentioned in Component 2 and in other components. This can be done by including a simple budget table in the KM section and providing a timeline for key KM and communications deliverables.

Agency Response

4/13/2023

The budget allocated to KM and communications are specified in the GEF and co-financing budget under Contractual Services Company, Local Consultants and Trainings, Workshops, Meetings. In terms of the GEF budget (Annex H1), this totals \$168,000. This is constituted by the Communications and Knowledge Management Specialist to provide technical guidance and facilitation at \$25,000 over the course of the project. The development and production of the various knowledge products associated with the on-ground restoration investments and the capacity development resource materials (SLM guidelines, package of SLM technologies) is estimated to cost \$55,000; the Train Trainers in various SLM technologies/practices and stakeholder training on SLM practices is estimated at \$60,000. There are planned workshops to assist in the design of the PA/PE Plan and to present the findings of KAP for \$10,000 and to share the project findings and lessons learned at \$18,000.

The project workplan (Annex I) stipulates the timing for the related activities. The deliverables related to the KM and communications products are identified in Annex J: Key Deliverables and Benchmarks; further clarity is provided on the timing for delivery (by quarter) in Annex J. These relate mainly to the Package of training materials readily available and accessed by stakeholders from Q1 and over project duration, the PA/PE Plan that is launched and implemented from Q3 for project duration and the availability of awareness resources from Q3 over the project duration.

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
3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response
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
5/11/2023:

The budget for the M&E is cleared by the PM.

4/7/2023:

The total amount budgeted for M&E activities represents 13% of the overall budget. Observed M&E budgets during GEF 6 or GEF-7 represented 5% of the GEF-financed portion for projects/programs up to USD 5 million. Please review and try to minimize the allocated portion to M&E.

Agency Response
4/13/2023

Noted. The budget for M&E has been adjusted to \$73,000 (from \$104,000). However, noting that the percentage/ratio typically approximates 5% of the GEF resources based on observed practice, for a relatively small-value MSP, considering the MTR and TE, the costs will be relatively higher (although MTRs are not obligatory for MSPs and could be cost-saving, the proponent considers the MTR a useful management tool). The MTR and TE are hence retained as GEF-financed and the other lines were reduced and shifted to co-finance. The ratio stands at 8% of the overall budget. (updates in yellow highlight)

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
3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/28/2023:

Not fully

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/11/2023:

Thank you. Please add the responses to the portal submission.

3/28/2023:

Please respond to GEF Sec Comments. Please see below for reference.

At PPG please include the following:

-Maintain the strong linkages to LD objective 2-5, linking the project to the national efforts for implementing LDN at the institutional level (governance, monitoring, capacity building etc).

-Adequate baseline data is provided on the level of land degradation and loss of vegetative cover

-Provide a gender analysis looking at the gender dimensions in this sector and region.

-Provide solid plans for private sector involvement in the project.

-Provide a separate climate risk screening for the project.

Agency Response

4/13/2023

- The narrative under *Section 4. Alignment with GEF focal area* has been further updated to reflect the linkages to the LD objective 2-5 (updates in yellow highlight)
- The baseline report on the status of land degradation is included as Annex U2 and provides an account of the status of land degradation.
- The narrative under *Section 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment* has been updated to reflect how the gender elements are being captured at the output level and how gender-sensitive reporting and monitoring is being captured. The Gender Action Plan (Annex Q) is updated that includes the gender dimensions in all project components. The gender baseline report is now provided as Annex U2. (updates in yellow highlight in Annex Q)
- Private sector involvement is further elaborated (inclusion of a summary table) in the *Private Sector Engagement section*. This updated content is also reflected in the Stakeholder Engagement Plan in Annex P. (updates in yellow highlight)
- The climate risk screening is included as part of Annex O. This follows UNEP's Safeguard Standard (SS) 2: Climate Change and Disaster Risks. (updates in yellow highlight)

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/28/2023:

Yes.

Agency Response
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

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

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
5/11/2023:

Please address the follow up comments.

4/10/2023:

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

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/28/2023	4/11/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/7/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/11/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations