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

Review PIF 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

4/14/2022
Review completed by PM

5/17/2022
Program Manager

Asha Bobb-Semple
Focal Area

Land Degradation
Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/10/2022:

-The project aligns with the LDFA, however there are elements of the submission, eg. Table B which could show a much stronger linkage to LD 2-5.

Agency Response
4/27/2022

- Noted and considered. The narrative under Component 2 that seeks to strengthen the enabling environment for SLM and LDN in accordance with objective LD 2-5 has been enhanced to show a stronger linkage.

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/19/2022:

a. We recognize that the investment is small, which creates limitations, however we encourage the interventions to be as strategic as possible linking to existing institutional efforts related to Grenada's land rehabilitation and LDN Agenda. As presented, Table B, shows strongly to be a single initiative that may take place in isolation, with few opportunities to make catalytic impact and ensure sustainability. We note other elements of the project submission are stronger in this regards, so lease make the necessary revisions to Table B which will eventually reflect in the Results Framework at CEO Endorsement.

b. In keeping with the focus on LD 2-5 please strengthen the institutional elements of the project that may link to national and sub-national intersectoral coordination around LDN, monitoring mechanisms towards LDN, capacity building etc.).

c. Please clearly differentiate within Table B, those investments which are TA and those which are Investment (i.e. interventions on the ground). At the moment the entire project is classified as TA.

d. Please include an indicator linked to the governance aspect of Outcome 2.1

Agency Response

4/27/2022

a. Noted. The narrative has been adjusted to emphasize better the connection of the work in Carriacou to the wider national institutional efforts at the strategic level. Outcome 1 is modified to state explicitly that the restoration is meeting the LDN targeting programme for the country. This is expanded/made more explicit in Section 3

b. The UNCCD National Coordination Body (NCB) is now incorporated into the narrative whereby the local Carriacou organizational mechanism for SLM (to be established under the project) will be nested within the NCB, providing the basis for

long-term institutional sustainability. This is clarified in the Component 2 narrative, Section 7 on sustainability and Section 6 on coordination.

c. The investments are now classified as INV in Table B.

d. Noted. The indicator *?Number of coordination mechanisms for SLM in Carriacou adopted by stakeholders?* linked to the governance aspect of Outcome 2.1 is now included.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022:

Please explore cash/grant co-financing for the project.

Agency Response

4/27/2022

The Grenada Government Farm Labour Support Programme has now been identified as a possible source of cash/grant co-financing; the facility makes direct services available to farmers to offset the costs of labour-intensive field investments. The estimated amount is US$555,000 (reflected as updates in the budget tables), however will be verified at PPG phase.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/20/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response
The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/20/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response
The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response
The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response
Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/20/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response
Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response
Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/20/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Prior to CEO Endorsement please provide a detailed separate climate risk screening.

4/20/2022:

- Please provide a more detailed climate risk screening for the project.

-We note the absence of information on the COVID context, please include.

-Please also include the gender dimensions linked to the project area and sectors of focus.

Agency Response

05/23/2022

Noted; a detailed separate climate risk screening will be prepared during the PPG phase. This has been also made clear in the narrative under Component 1.

4/27/2022

- Further details are now provided under the climate risk screening (criteria 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4) of the SRIF (revised version submitted).

- Noted. The narrative has been elaborated under Sections 1 and 7 includes the COVID context for Grenada to explain the impacts of the pandemic and provides a backdrop against which the project will support recovery efforts.

- The need for gender considerations have been flagged under the Component 1 narrative; it is stated that more detailed opportunity analysis and capture of gender metrics will be undertaken under PPG.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022:

a. Please see comments on Table B under Question 2, Part I and ensure these revisions are also captured in the ToC.

b. Please include in the theory of change the barriers that the project will be addressing, mapping them to the specific components that will be addressing these barriers. Please also include the assumptions.

c. Component 2- How will the project encourage cross-ministerial/sectoral collaboration under the proposed governance mechanism.

d. Assuming that capacity building and public awareness may not be sufficient to encourage continued behaviour change after the project ends, what other mechanisms are in place under this project or otherwise to incentivize the small farmers to continue with SLM practices?

e. Please provide details on how this project will assist with green recovery following the impacts of COVID 19.

f. Gender dimensions have not been fully integrated into the interventions of the project. Please include considering issues around access to land, access to resources and a better representation of women in project decision-making entities.

Agency Response

4/27/2022

a. Noted and these have now been incorporated

b. The ToC diagram has been modified with the barriers now included in the ToC, mapped to the component interventions and the assumptions included at the appropriate nodes in the diagram.

c. The Component 2 narrative and carried through to the *Sustainability* and *Coordination* sections have been amended to more clearly state how the cross-sectoral collaboration will be sustained under the project support and post-project. The role of the National Coordinating Body (NCB) of the UNCCD as the nationally appointed committee to oversee the NAP is now defined relative to the PSC for the project and

how this PSC mechanism will evolve to the local mechanism for Carriacou that will be nested within the NCB.

d. The Government through the Ministry of Agriculture maintains a programme under its Statutory Rules and Orders (SRO) that already supports farmers, and this will be a key instrument that will facilitate sustainability post-project. This is explained under the Sustainability section.

e. Further details on the national strategy on post-COVID pandemic recovery is included in Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities.

f. Well noted. This guidance is now included under section *Gender Equality and Women?s Empowerment* where it is state that it will be more fully developed in the PPG phase.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022

See comment under Part I, Question 1.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/31/2022:

Cleared.

5/23/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

We note that key stakeholders and their roles and responsibilities during PPG have been identified, and a summary of stakeholder consultation in development of the PIF stage is in the Annex F. Please also provide the plans (during PPG phase) for developing a

stakeholder engagement plan, including local communities for use during project implementation.

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022:

-Representatives from the private sector appear to be missing from the stakeholder table. Please include.

-Please include a brief summary on the engagement process to date

-The table is missing the means of engagement during project preparation (PPG), please include.

Agency Response

5/24/2022

Guidance noted. The PPG phase will develop a stakeholder engagement plan, including local communities for use during project implementation. This was noted under the narrative under Component 2 but emphasized under the Stakeholder section.

4/27/2022

- It should be noted that the private sector is quite small in Carriacou and will require analysis during the PPG. The narrative under *Section 4. Private sector engagement* now identifies interests of the retail outlets, hotels/guesthouses and the yachting sector that will take up locally grown produce that may be stimulated under project efforts. Also noted are excursion companies with interests in nature-based tourism. The key private sector organizations are listed in the stakeholder table.

- a short narrative ahead of the stakeholder table elaborates the engagement process. This is building on prior engagements that the Ministry of Agriculture and partners have had with stakeholders leading to shaping of this proposal.

- Further clarifications on the roles are now included and means of engagement during PPG where the narrative was weak/not clear

Gender Equality and Women?s Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022:

-Please indicate if a gender analysis will be completed during the PPG.

-This section includes quite a few gender responsive interventions that are not featured in Table B (at the Outcome or Output level) nor in the project. description, please incorporate.

Agency Response

4/27/2022

- A detailed gender analysis will be conducted during the PPG phase. This statement is now included in the narrative.

- The outcome indicators for Component 2 in Table B now incorporate the gender dimension and specify gender disaggregation

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022:

-The narrative on the potential private sector role and engagement is limited. Please expand with potential ideas that could be explored and solidified during the PPG stage.

Agency Response

4/27/2022

- Noted; the narrative under *Section 4. Private sector engagement* now identifies interests of the retail outlets, hotels/guesthouses and the yachting sector that will take up locally grown produce that may be stimulated under project efforts. Also noted are excursion companies with interests in nature-based tourism. A statement that notes opportunities will be elaborated during the PPG phase is included.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022:

Yes, however please clarify how this project intends to coordinate with the *Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management* project.

Agency Response

4/27/2022

Further clarification on the contribution of the proposed project to the Climate-Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management project has been provided under *Section 6. Coordination*.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

Cleared.

4/20/2022:

Yes. Please include any linkages to Grenada's NDC where applicable.

Agency Response

4/27/2022

Additional information on linkages to the NDC has been included under *Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities*.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?knowledge management (KM) approach? in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project?s/program?s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/31/2022:

Cleared.

5/23/2022:

Please see follow up comment below.

We note that the project has a plan of knowledge management activity such as web-based platforms, regional cooperation and information sharing on best practices and others. These activities are, however, not linked to any Output of ?Indicative Project Description Summary?. Please clarify and include links between knowledge management activities and Outputs of ?Indicative Project Description Summary

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

5/24/2022

Noted. These activities are associated with Output 2.1.2. The title of the output listed in the Indicative Project Description Summary is expanded to make this explicit; that is availability through online knowledge management platforms. This has also been expanded in the narrative under Component 2 in the Proposed alternative scenario.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Part III ? Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/20/2022:

Yes

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/31/2022:

Comments have been addressed, the project is technically cleared.

5/23/2022:

Please address the follow up comments prior to clearance.

5/17/2022:

The project is technically cleared and recommended for PIF approval.

4/20/2022::

Please address the comments above prior to technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

5/17/2022:

At PPG please include the following:

-Maintain the strong linkages to LD objective 2-5, linking the proejct 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 degradaiton and loss of vegetative cover

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

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

-Provide a separate climate risk screening for the project.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/20/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/23/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/31/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval