



# GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project  
 TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Capacity Building for Sustainable Financing Mechanisms/Sustainable Land Management in Dry land Forest Ecosystems and Cattle Ranching Areas			
Country(ies):	Cuba	GEF Project ID:	9301
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	3807
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Science and Environment (CITMA)	Submission Date:	March 2, 2017
GEF Focal Area (s):	Land Degradation	Project Duration (Months)	48
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Commodities <input type="checkbox"/> IAP-Food Security <input type="checkbox"/>	Corporate Program: SGP <input type="checkbox"/>	
Name of Parent Program	Country Pilot Partnership (CPP) "Supporting Implementation of the Cuban National Programme to Combat Desertification and drought"	Agency Fee (\$)	128,250

## A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
LD-3: Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape	3.1 Support mechanisms for SLM in wider landscapes established 3.2 Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities 3.3 Increased investments in integrated landscape management	GEFTF	1,425,000	36,050,000
<b>Total project costs</b>			1,425,000	36,050,000

## B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

<b>Project Objective:</b> Increase availability and uptake of sustainable financing for SLM to incentivize integrated land management practices for the maintenance of essential ecosystem services.						
Project Components	Financing Type	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in \$)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Mechanisms and capacities for sustainable financing consolidated at national level	TA	55,000 producers throughout Cuba, of which at least 35% are women, have had direct benefit/support from at least one financing scheme (project indicator O1)  <b>GEF-6 LD3 Indicator 3.3:</b> Increased resources flowing to INRM and other land uses from divers sources: - 25% increase in budget allocation to sustainable land management activities by local production entities throughout Cuba	<b>1.1 Guidance and strategy materials for the development, administration and application of incentive mechanisms:</b> - Manual of existing financial mechanisms to support SLM (e.g. FNMA and FONADEF) and of procedures for accessing them, developed, disseminated and periodically updated to guide institutions' advice to producers and serve as baseline for improvements - Strategy documents developed and operationalised for the definition or modification of new or existing SLM incentives, and their application, based on characteristics of target populations,	GEFTF	95,220	2,408,898

		<p>(cooperative farms, State Firms and Production Units) (project indicator O2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 20% increase in level of budget allocated nationwide to SLM activities, from USD49.8 to USD60.0 million (project indicator 1.1)</li> <li>- 108% increase in level of funding channelled from existing financing mechanisms to SLM nationwide, from USD144,375,600 to USD300,000,000 (project indicator 1.2)</li> <li>- USD24 million channelled from new direct financing mechanisms to SLM nationwide (project indicator 1.3)</li> </ul> <p>Increased awareness in institutions at national level of the existence, objectives and functioning of the proposed financial mechanisms in support of SLM, and the application of the incentives and procedural instruments (project indicator 1.4)</p>	<p>willingness and ability to pay, and transaction costs.</p> <p><b>1.2. Financial mechanisms to support SLM developed and applied for diverse conditions and beneficiaries</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Administrative provisions for existing financing mechanisms modified (e.g. including SLM contribution as eligibility criterion, broadening options for capitalization to ensure sustainability)</li> <li>- Non-returnable finance mechanism for carbon capture in forest lands designed</li> <li>- Scheme for Payment for Environmental Services based on water quality designed, and applied by INRH</li> <li>- Credit mechanisms designed and applied with favourable interest rates and grace periods for SLM practices (e.g. invasive species control)</li> <li>- Proposals of modified rules for duty paid on equipment and inputs developed for regulatory approval, to facilitate import of inputs for SLM (e.g. biodigesters, drip irrigation systems, electric fences)</li> <li>- Improved procedures and conditions for insurance of producers practising SLM, negotiated with insurance companies and MFP</li> <li>- Differential pricing mechanisms for crops produced in accordance with SLM, including certification mechanisms for SLM-compatible farms, developed with MFP and MINAGRI and tested on pilot sites</li> </ul> <p><b>1.3. Improved regulatory and technical instruments for certifying compliance with conditions for incentive mechanisms developed and applied, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Technical specifications of compliance criteria</li> <li>- Technical methodologies for determining compliance (e.g. regarding levels of soil erosion and water quality).</li> </ul> <p><b>1.4. Training, guidance and awareness-raising programmes developed and implemented, regarding:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The existence, objectives and functioning of proposed financial mechanisms</li> <li>- Application of the incentives and of the procedural instruments proposed above</li> </ul>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

2. Sustainable funding mechanisms demonstrated and validated at local level	TA	<p><b>GEF-6 LD3 Indicator 3.3:</b> Increased resources flowing to INRM and other land uses from divers sources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 2,910 producers in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas (of which at least 35% are women) receive direct benefits from at least one financing mechanism (up from baseline of 83) (project indicator 2.1)</li> <li>- 30% increase in level of budget assignation by local production entities in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas to activities in support of SLM, from US\$5,555,000 to US\$7,200,000 (project indicator 2.1)</li> </ul> <p>Increased knowledge and awareness among target institutions and their members at local level, regarding the application of the financial instruments proposed under Outcome 1 (project indicator 2.3)</p>	<p><b>2.1 Financial incentive mechanisms and procedures fine-tuned for application at local level in target areas,</b> generating lessons for further national application</p> <p><b>2.2. Training, guidance and awareness raising programmes for the application of financial incentives generated under Component 1,</b> developed and applied among institutional actors in target areas.</p> <p><b>2.3. Programmes for developing capacities and awareness among producers in target areas for obtaining and applying SLM incentives, on:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Options of incentive opportunities for different needs and conditions</li> <li>- Requisites and procedures for gaining access to the incentive mechanisms</li> <li>- Financial planning and management of incentives</li> </ul>	GEFTF	94,900	2,400,804
3. Producers in Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas with technical capacities to take advantage of financial support for applying SLM practices	TA/IN V	<p><b>GEF-6 LD3 Indicator 3.1:</b> Demonstration results strengthening cross-sector integration of SLM</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 1,000 producers (of whom at least 35% are women) adopting practices on grazing lands to counter land degradation (up from baseline of 150) (project indicator 3.2)</li> <li>- 5,900 producers (at least 35% women) adopting practices on forest lands to counter land degradation (up from baseline of 200) (project indicator 3.2)</li> </ul> <p><b>GEF-6 LD3 Indicator 3.2:</b> Application of integrated natural resource management (INRM) practices in wider landscapes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 80% and 75% of producers (men and women) in Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas respectively receiving TA on SLM practices (up from baseline of 10% and 2%)</li> </ul>	<p><b>3.1. Programme developed and applied for training institutional actors and producers on SLM, including:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Formulation and dissemination of manuals and extension materials for extension agents</li> <li>- Inclusion of technical recommendations in curricula of training institutions for extension agents</li> <li>- Programme developed and applied for training producers on SLM, including materials and facilities, focused especially on livestock and forestry management in dry areas</li> <li>- Awareness raising plan for fire protection developed and applied, aimed at producers and the general population</li> </ul> <p><b>3.2. Spatial plans for pilot sites/farms developed by producers and their organizations with project support,</b> in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ensure that management practices are matched to spatial variations in site conditions</li> <li>- Take into account spatial flows of environmental goods, services and impacts.</li> </ul> <p><b>3.3. Tree nurseries in target municipalities established and managed</b></p>	GEFTF	1,117,220	28,263,706

	(project indicator 3.1) 4,040ha increase in the area benefiting from SLM (project indicator 3.3) 4% reduction in erosion rates (project indicator 3.4) 15,000ha of forest ecosystems restored (project indicator 3.5) 20 rainwater harvesting systems (project indicator 3.6) Milk yield up from 1,300 to 2,200l/ha/year as a result of SLM measures (project indicator 3.7) 20 farms (1,367ha) with SLM of soil, water and forest resources (project indicator 3.8) Increased knowledge of extension agents in technical aspects of proposed SLM practices (project indicator 3.9)	<b>with project support</b> , in order to accelerate reforestation activities, accompanied by: - Technical support from State Forest Service - Technical and financial management plans - Development of sustainability strategies <b>3.4. Menu of SLM options in the target areas validated and systematized</b> for nationwide dissemination with support from subsequent CPP projects			
Subtotal				1,307,340	33,073,408
Project Management Cost (PMC)			GEFTF	117,660	2,976,592
<b>Total project costs</b>				1,425,000	36,050,000

### C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount (\$)
Recipient Government	Ministry of Agriculture (Soils and Fertilizers Department)	Grants	12,000,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Agriculture (Forestry and Wildlife Division)	Grants	24,000,000
GEF Agency	United Nations Development Programme	Grants	50,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			36,050,000

### D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in \$)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee <sup>a)</sup> (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (c)=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	Cuba	Land Degradation	(select as applicable)	1,425,000	128,250	1,553,250
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>					1,425,000	128,250	1,553,250

a ) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

## E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	20,407 hectares (targets for project indicators 3.3, 3.5 and 3.8)

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No

## PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

### A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on: 1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed; 2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects, 3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area<sup>1</sup> strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project, 4) [incremental/additional cost reasoning](#) and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and [co-financing](#); 5) [global environmental benefits](#) (GEFTF) and/or [adaptation benefits](#) (LDCF/SCCF); and 6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

1. **GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:** As originally conceived in the CPP Programme Document, the project was intended to contribute to Strategic Objective 1 of the GEF Focal Area Strategy for Land Degradation under GEF-3, namely to foster system-wide change through the removal of policy, institutional, technical, capacity and financial barriers to SLM focusing at the country level. There has been no change in this focus. The project remains relevant to GEF strategies for LD under GEF-6, and will contribute to objective LD-3 (Integrated Landscapes: Reduce pressures on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape).

2. **The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:** No change from CPP Programme Document.

3. **The baseline project and the problem it seeks to address:** No significant change from CPP Programme Document: the economic context has become more favourable for the application of sustainable financing mechanisms in support of SLM, given the increasing diversification of the economy.

4. **Incremental reasoning:** As originally proposed in the CPP Programme Document, at national level this project will strengthen national capacity to develop and apply sustainable financing mechanisms for SLM, thereby addressing CPP Barrier 3 (Limited development of financing and incentive mechanisms for SLM); and at local level it will introduce into the CPP the theme of forest ecosystems, specifically those in dry land areas which are at particular risk from degradation processes. This will allow it to contribute to the overall CPP Goal that “Reduced land degradation will allow Cuba to achieve its goals for sustainable development and increased food security”. It will thereby also contribute to Programme 4 under GEF-6 LD3, on scaling-up sustainable land management through the landscape approach, through its investments in demonstrating scaleable SLM practices, and developing capacities and funding mechanisms at local, landscape and national levels to support the scaling-up of the practices.

5. The objective of the project will be achieved through actions structured under 3 complementary and interdependent components. Actions under Component 1 will focus on the development and consolidation of mechanisms and capacities at national level for the sustainable financing of sustainable land management practices; actions under Component 2 will focus on developing capacities in the Guamuha and Cauto intervention areas for the delivery and use of sustainable financing mechanisms; and actions under Component 3 will focus on ensuring that producers in these

---

<sup>1</sup> For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which [Aichi Target\(s\)](#) the project will directly contribute to achieving.

two intervention areas have the technical capacities necessary for them to apply the sustainable land management production systems that will be the object of the financial mechanisms.

Baseline	Alternative	GEF Increment	Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs)
<p>Land degradation is recognized as a major problem at all levels; There are major investments in incentive mechanisms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Agricultural extension and funding mechanisms (e.g. FONADEF and FNMA).</li> <li>- Direct promotion of SLM and combat of soil degradation (e.g. PNMCS, \$32,200,000/year).</li> <li>- Forestry protection, forest investments and management of existing forest lands (\$189,000,000/year)</li> <li>- Management of hydrological resources (\$258,400,000/year)</li> </ul> <p>But:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Investments are not sufficient to ensure landscape-wide SLM</li> <li>- Existing mechanisms do not adequately reflect and respond to the diverse ways in which environmental costs and benefits flow from land degradation, and the diverse types of relations between the multiple actors involved.</li> <li>- Producers are not well prepared to develop projects in order to obtain credit or financial support for SLM.</li> <li>- Farmers do not have adequate technical capacities to apply the SLM practices that the mechanisms are intended to support</li> <li>- Even if the required portfolio of mechanisms were developed, regulations, mechanisms and capacities are lacking for institutionalizing and applying them.</li> </ul> <p>With the result that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The most appropriate mechanisms are not necessarily chosen for given scenarios, resulting in inefficiency and ineffectiveness in delivering SLM benefits;</li> <li>- The magnitude and nature of the incentives does not adequately reflect the magnitude and nature of the LD processes or the corresponding flows of environmental effects.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Institutions have the awareness, capacities and mechanisms required to sustain the provision of financial and material support for SLM to farmers, through a range of financial instruments, once the potential of the systems and the responsiveness of the farmers has been demonstrated.</li> <li>- Financial incentives are designed and targeted in such a way as to optimize the generation of GEBs, by responding specifically to the nature and magnitude of current flows of costs and benefits</li> <li>- Through modifications to design and eligibility criteria for incentives, and the harmonization of approaches and criteria between institutions and instruments, farmers and institutions will apply an ecosystem approach to SLM rather than considering soil, water and forest resources separately.</li> </ul>	<p>GEF incremental investments under Components 1 and 2 will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased availability among institutions and producers to financial instruments to support SLM, tailored to address different types of LD, and suited to diverse local conditions and producer types</li> <li>- Modifications of existing and design of new financial instruments to favour the incorporation of considerations of sustainability and an integrated landscape vision into SLM, and the nature and magnitude of flows of environmental costs and benefits from land degradation</li> <li>- Increased capacities in institutions to provide producers with ongoing technical support for the application of SLM practices.</li> </ul> <p>GEF incremental investments under Component 3 will result in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The demonstration of the potential of selected SLM practices to generate GEBs, and of the responsiveness of producers to such financial and material support.</li> <li>- The development of technical capacities among producers to apply SLM practices that are susceptible to incentives</li> </ul>	<p>20,407ha will be subject to sustainable land management in production systems, resulting in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4% reduction in soil erosion rates (project indicator 3.4)</li> <li>- Reduced GHG emissions from crop and livestock activities</li> <li>- Increased accumulation of soil organic matter</li> <li>- Sequestration of carbon</li> <li>- Maintenance of habitats for biodiversity in the agricultural landscape.</li> </ul>

6. The **baseline analysis** has been updated and made specific to this project, as has the cofinancing. The cofinancing amount is larger than estimated in the CPP Programme Document with an increase from \$18,000,000 to \$36,050,000. This is in line with the provisions of the CPP Programme Document, which foresaw that the cofinancing ratio for the successive CPP projects was expected to increase progressively: this reflects the success of the CPP projects to date in developing ownership of the CPP and commitment to SLM on the part of national institutions. Despite the availability of such a large volume of cofinancing, without incremental GEF support this will not necessarily result in SLM outcomes: the cofinancing from the Department of Soils and the Forestry Directorate consists mostly of baseline investments in incentives for land and forest management, and GEF funds are necessary to support the mainstreaming of SLM approaches into them, for example through pilots of specific resource management practices aimed at tackling the degradation issues in the target locations (such as management of livestock in dry zones, and fire management).

#### A.2. Child Project

7. This is Project 3 of the Country Pilot Partnership on Sustainable Land Management which was approved in 2005, and will contribute to the overall CPP Goal that “*Reduced land degradation will allow Cuba to achieve its goals for sustainable development and increased food security*”. Its focus on financial instruments will complement and build on the emphases of the other projects, as part of the integrated programmatic approach of the CPP. The 5 sequential sister projects of the CPP are as follows:

- **Project 1** (Years 1-5: 2008-2013): **Capacity Building for Planning, Decision Making and Regulatory Systems & Awareness Building/Sustainable Land Management in Severely Degraded Ecosystems** (in *Guantanamo*, aiming to halt land degradation and rehabilitate salinized and eroded areas in dry lands and xeric scrub regions, and in *Pinar del Rio*, on monitoring of extreme climatic events such as droughts and hurricanes).
- **Project 2** (Years 3-7, 2015-present): **Capacity Building for Information Coordination and Monitoring Systems/SLM in Areas with Water Resource Management Problems** (in *Havana-Matanzas* focusing on sustainable use of ground water, in *Pinar del Rio* on strengthening resistance to drought and other extreme climatic events in agricultural lands, in *Guantanamo* on replicating demonstration activities, conserving rainwater and testing high efficient irrigation systems, and in *Cauto River Basin* on Sustainable management of water resources, drought prevention and management of water reserves for SLM)
- **Project 3** (Years 5-8): **Capacity Building for Sustainable Financing Mechanisms / Sustainable Land Management in Dry land Forest Ecosystems and Cattle Ranching Areas** (in *Villa Clara* focusing on improved SLM techniques in a premountainous ecosystem, with dry forest & livestock, and in *Cauto River Basin* on sustainable management of dry forest resources, integrated forest farms and water regulations).
- **Project 4** (Years 7-10): **Validation of SLM Models at Landscape Scale** (in *Cauto River Basin* focusing on replication of demonstration activities in micro watersheds, and in *Guantanamo Guaso Basin* focusing on soil management and irrigation in agricultural land)
- **Project 5** (Years 1-10, 2008-present): **Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of Cuba CPP.**

8. Coordination with the other GEF-funded CPP projects will be assured through Project 5 (Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of the CPP): furthermore, this project will have a shared management structure (including the same Steering Committee) as the CPP as a whole and its other constituent projects.

A.3. **Stakeholders.** Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes  /no)? and indigenous peoples (yes  /no)?

9. Please also refer to the section on stakeholder engagement in Part IV of the Project Document, and Annex 5 below.

Stakeholder	Roles in the Project
Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment (CITMA)	Responsible for supervising processes of environmental evaluation of each proposed investment.
Ministry of Agriculture (MINAG)	MINAG, with its delegations at provincial and municipal levels, is a key implementation partner, in terms of local facilitation of access to actors, networks and resources, as well as the integration of new and improved instruments for sector planning during and after the

Stakeholder	Roles in the Project
	project. Supervision and control of the execution of the Project in accordance with institutional roles.
Environment Agency (AMA/CITMA)	Supervises and controls the execution of the Project in accordance with institutional roles, and will be responsible for the facilitation of operational procedures with UNDP and cofinancing sources.
Directorate of Environment (CITMA)	Development, improvement and control of strategies, plans and programmes for the protection of the environment and the rational use of natural resources and priority ecosystems, with special attention to the integrated management of hydrological catchments, bays and coasts, mountain zones and protected areas. Controls the implementation of the SNAP, the National Strategy for Environmental Education and the National Monitoring System.
Ministry of External Commerce and Foreign Investments (MINCEX)	Approval, supervision and y control of the execution of Project activities in accorDance with institutional mandates.
National Centre for Protected Areas (CNAP/CITMA)	Member of the Coordination Board of the project. Contributes experience in SLM in PAs in the mountain massif and Cauto basin, in the development of the SNAP.
Corps of Forest Guards (CGB/MININT)	Takes action in the event of contraventions of regulations on forestry heritage, wildlife, hunting and other specific issues related to environmental infractions, and imposes fines and other measures within its faculties. Key actor in the Early Warning System for forest fires, developing actions that lead to detection and information on damage to forest resouces, wildlife and the environment in general.
Institute of Meteorology (INSMET/CITMA)	Will provide technical and information assistance, allowing in a more complete and rational manner: 1) The application of projects and programmes; 2) greater and more precise knowledge on the part of decision makers and the population in general on the impacts of climate change; 3) the existence of a group of local actors trained in the identification of measures, actions, targets and objectives for the development of strategic plans for adaptation to climate change, particularly drought.
Institute of Physical Planning (national, provincial and municipal levels)	Contribution to harmonization of development plans and land use plans.
Institute of Soils (IS/MINAG)	Interested in the strengthening of the network for the monitoring and evaluation of soils and water quality for agriculture, the promotion of the establishment of sustainable agricultural practices, and training of actors involved in SLM at different levels.
Ministry of Education (MINED)	Provision of human resources for carrying out training activities in local communities.
Directorate of Forestry, Flora and Wildlife (MINAG)	Halting processes of desertification, and rehabilitation of degraded lands through the promotion of forest resources and the establishment of forests in management of water in catchment basins and hydroregulatory strips. Contribution with cooperation of FONADEF
IAgric (MINAG)	Coordination of project actions in MINAG. Contribution to the siting, characterisation and monitoring of water use related to agricultura in the Project intervention areas, selection of efficient irrigation technologies, specific irrigation technologies for the crops established in the demostration areas and water management. Provision of information on the situation with drainage and technologies applied for its improvement, as well as procedures for soil recovery.
National Institute for Water Resources	Coordination and implementation of the Project. Creation and strengthening of technical and professional capacities, for improved use and management of water resources and infrastructure. Strengthening of information and monitoring systems, dissemination, training of stakeholders, implementation of technologies for water harvesting.



Stakeholder	Roles in the Project
National Association of Small Farmers (ANAP)	As a movement that motivates the farming community to carry out conservation and preservation of natural resources and the implementation of SLM principles. Extension and use of its training centres for SLM.
Territorial delegations of CITMA and Environment Units (UMA)	Coordination of Project activities with provincial actors. Coordination of the creation of new management strategies and their implementation. Responsible for coordinating and implementing the monitoring and evaluation system for the Project. Supervision and control of the use of Project resources.
Territorial delegations of MINAG	Participation in the development of economic incentives related to the use of forest goods and services, including coffee. Contribution to the creation of technical capacities for SLM.
Representatives of provincial governments (Local Organs of Popular Power, Municipal Administration Council)	Support to Project actions, coordination and information to different provincial actors. Support to the process of decision-making. Consolidation and strengthening of integrated territorial management.
National Enterprise for the Protection of Flora and Fauna (ENPFF) (national enterprise with provincial establishments and protected areas)/MINAG	Responsible for the administration of some PAs in the target areas of the Project, Hanabanilla. Creation of capacities, execution of Project activities, creation of infrastructure.
Credit and Service Cooperatives (CCS), Agricultural Production Cooperatives (CPA), Basic Units of Cooperative Production (UBPC)	Adequate development of productive SLM activities in the areas of influence of the project.
Institute of Ecology and Systematics (IES/CITMA)	National coordination of the technical and financial implementation of the Project. Direction and supervision of Project execution. Provision of specialists and technicians for systematic and ecological studies, workshops, courses and training activities.
Institute of Tropical Geography (IGT/CITMA)	IGT contributes to INFOGEO with training on environmental zoning and participatory community-based strategies and the development and implementation of GIS.
National Museum of Natural History (MNHN/CITMA)	Support to human and material for environmental education, dissemination and communication activities related to SLM.
Local and Community Development Centre (CEDEL/CITMA)	Formation, development and training of social actors at local level with its experiences. Participation in the results and products in which Local Organs of Government will be involved.
National Institute of Agroforestry Research (INAF/MINAG)	Member of the Coordination Board of the Project. Provision of specialists and technicians for research, activities related to the forest estate, workshops, courses and training activities.
Villa Clara Environmental Study Centre (CESAM/CITMA)	Provision of specialists and technicians for research, BD monitoring in the Massif, workshops, courses and training activities.
Holguín Centre for Environmental and Technological Research and Services (CISAT/CITMA)	Provision of human and material resources for the coordination and execution of training, environmental education, research and monitoring.
Eastern Centre for Ecosystems and Biodiversity (BIOECO/CITMA)	Provision of human and material resources for the coordination and execution of training, environmental education, research and monitoring.
Provincial universities involved in the project, and municipal university centres (MES)	Provision of human and material resources for the coordination and execution of training, environmental education, research and monitoring.
National and Provincial Botanic Gardens (MES/CITMA)	Provision of human and material resources for the coordination and execution of training, environmental education, research and monitoring. Breeding of endemic species.
Cuban Association of Agricultural and Forestry Technicians	Support to local and community development. Training of technicians and farmers. Agrarian extension. Diffusion and exchange of experiences on SLM in agrarian activity through

Stakeholder	Roles in the Project
(ACTAF)	publications and events.
Cuban Association for Animal Production (ACPA)	Promotion of the adoption of sustainable production technologies compatible with SLM.
Cuban Botany Society (SOCUBOT)	Support with programmes and actions to the promotion of values for plant conservation in SLM and divulgation of project results.
Cuban Zoological Society (SOCZOO)	Support with programmes and actions to the promotion of values for studies and conservation

A.4. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment.* Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes  /no )?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes  /no )?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women 35%, men 65%)? <sup>2</sup>

10. Cuba has generally favourable conditions with regard to gender equity; women participate strongly in social and productive areas, making up 50% of the labor force and 60% of technical personnel, including in the agricultural sector. In some areas, such as urban agriculture, women predominate. Nevertheless, the project will enhance women's participation in forest farms and cattle farms participating in pilot sites and intervention areas. Particular emphasis will be placed on engaging poor women and any who may currently be insufficiently included in resource management and in the distribution of corresponding benefits, and on monitoring the impacts of the project on them. Women have a particularly relevant participation in the forestry nurseries.

11. The project will be gender responsive: all of its capacity development activities will be specifically tailored to the needs of women, and women will be fully represented in project-related decision-making structures, including the participation of the Cuban Women's Union in the Project Steering Committee. As a result, at least 35% of those receiving improved support from financing mechanisms and applying improved SLM practices will be women (reflecting the proportional participation of women in the sector as a whole).

12. The quantitative targets of this project in relation to these benefits are as follows:

- 55,000 producers nationwide, of which at least 35% are women, will have received direct benefit/support from at least one financing scheme
- 2,910 producers in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas, of which at least 35% are women, will have received direct benefits from at least one financing mechanism
- 80% of producers in Guamuhaya and 75% in Cauto intervention areas (men and women) will be receiving technical assistance on SLM practices

13. The project will make use of prior experiences gained through Project 1 of the CPP and other national experiences and international projects.

14. Gender considerations will be evaluated in detail using national Branch Norm NRAG 300:2014 on Gender, Terms and Definitions, which was produced through Project 1 with the participation of different institutions including the Quality Department of MINAG, the Directorate of Agricultural Information of MINAG, the Federation of Cuban Women (FMC), the National Association of Small Farmers (ANAP) and UNDP. This Norm presents definitions with a management systems approach, with the aim of achieving a continuous improvement and self-evaluation in relation to gender equity, as well as the identification and reduction of gap in gender equity, through the application of compensatory mechanisms that favor equality of opportunities and gender equity.

---

<sup>2</sup> Same as footnote 8 above.

15. The project will also use the Manual of Procedures for SLM, which is adjusted from the methodology applied by the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) of the Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) project. In the socioeconomic characterization of each of the intervention sites, gender issues will be analysed and reflected in the management plans. Another tool to be used will be the “Instruction for carrying out spatial land use plans in accordance with the principle of SLM”, which was developed by the Directorate of Land Use Planning of the Institute of Physical Planning (IPF) applied in practice by Project 1, and takes into account gender considerations under Subsystem 1 on Population and Human Settlements.

16. A number of non-governmental organizations will also make important contributions to the promotion of gender equity in the intervention sites, including the Federation of Cuban Women (FMC), the ANAP, the Cuban Animal Production Association (ACPA) and the Cuban Association of Agricultural and Forestry Workers (ACTAF). The project will use the gender strategies of ANAP, approved in 2005, and the Ministry of Agriculture. ACPA has also made important advances in this regard, with a gender strategy that is applied in all of its structures. It has also introduced a Prize for Rural Women, as an incentive for the outstanding performance of women in scientific, technical and practical aspects, which the project will support.

17. The project “Development of the Forest Sector in Cuba” in cooperation with CIDA, has developed a methodological guide for the application of the sector gender strategy, which will be used and adapted in the intervention sites of the project.

18. The project will also build on the project “Programme for Local Support to the Modernisation of the Agricultural Sector in Cuba” (PALMA), which is generating a demonstrative experience for the country, aimed at promoting management with gender equity in small and medium scale food security units. This initiative is called Gender Equality for Management of the Quality of Food Security (IGECSA), which brings together shared interests of the Federation of Cuban Women, MINAG and ANAP, and has commenced application in 10 agricultural sector entities in three municipalities of the country, including Jiguaní in Granma Province, which is one of the municipalities where this project will work directly.

Component	Gender Action Plan
<b>1:</b> Mechanisms and capacities for sustainable financing consolidated at national level.	- Ensure participation in training workshops on financial mechanisms by gender promoters from the different national institutions involved in the project, to guarantee women’s access to financial mechanisms and to include gender mainstreaming mechanisms in local development projects.
<b>2:</b> Sustainable funding mechanisms demonstrated and validated at local level	- Activate gender promoters from different organizations in the territories to give continuity to programmes of work with the objective of promoting and improving gender relations in the forest sector at all levels of the institutional structure.
	- Awareness raising and training workshops for gender promoters in the intervention areas, to guarantee women’s access to financial mechanisms.
	- Detect capacity strengthening needs among women and men in accordance with their involvement in family agricultural production, in order to improve their performance and increase the benefits from increased production of foodstuffs.
<b>3:</b> Producers with technical capacities to take advantage of financial support for applying SLM practices	- Define a gender baseline in the demonstration sites, through surveys and censuses.
	- Identify and promote opportunities for equitable employment and self employment, linked to agricultural food systems.
	- Identify and apply mechanisms to guarantee increased participation of women in activities of training, technical assistance and extension.
	- Improve conditions of life of women through technologies such as the use of biogás for cooking leading to reductions in the use of electricity and the extraction of firewood.

**A.5 Risk.** Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation

Project risks					
Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
Decline in policy commitment to the use of economic incentives to support sustainable land management	Political	<b>Probability: 2</b> (commitment has been expressed at the highest political levels) <b>Impact: 4</b> (economic incentives are central to the logic of the project, and decisions on their use are highly dependent on central policy commitment)	Actions under Component 1 will focus on raising and maintaining awareness of the potential of economic instruments to generate and internalize environmental benefits of national and global importance  Actions under Component 3 will demonstrate to policy makers the effectiveness of incentives in supporting the generation of nationally-important environmental benefits	CITMA, MEP	Reducing
The availability of financial resources for incentives may be affected by variations in the budgets of individual institutions	Financial	<b>Probability: 3</b> (the bases for Government revenue streams are increasingly diversified and buffered against external shocks) <b>Impact: 3</b> (the use of diversified incentive models, including public and private sources, gives room for flexibility and adaptation to fluctuations in individual sources)	Under Component 1 the project will ensure that a wide range of incentive models are available to producers in order to limit the implications of reductions in the availability of resources through any of them.	CITMA, MEP	Reducing
Producers' receptivity to participating in economic incentive schemes may be constrained by concerns over difficulties with compliance and administration, and conflicts between environmental and productive priorities	Operational	<b>Probability: 2</b> (openness at policy level to economic alternatives is largely reflected in the increasing diversity of technical and financial models applied by producers) <b>Impact: 4</b> (the application of the model is highly dependent on producer receptivity)	Under Component 1, the project will invest in tailoring financial instruments to farmers' needs and conditions  Under Component 3, the project will invest in developing awareness among farmers regarding the benefits of participating in incentive schemes, and the potential for compatibility between financial, productive and environmental benefits	CITMA, MINAG	Reducing
If inadequately carried out, the location of some proposed project activities within protected areas might result in increased pressure on PA values (SESP Risk 1).	Environmental	<b>Probability: 2</b> (project activities will be located in PAs but will have low probability of causing environmental impacts) <b>Impact: 4</b> (if environmental impacts do occur, they would affect environmental values of great global and local importance)	The proposed actions will be carried in full conformity with the management plans of the PAs in question, and under the close supervision of the National Centre for Protected Areas (CNAP)	CITMA, MINAG	Reducing
The project will involve plantation development and reforestation, with the potential to displace natural ecosystems and	Environmental	<b>Probability: 2</b> (plantation development and reforestation will occur but the probability of environmental impacts is low)	Native species will be used for plantation development and reforestation. Species selection, management practices and location will be in accordance with the protocols of the Forestry	CITMA, MINAG	Reducing

Project risks					
Description	Type	Impact & Probability	Mitigation Measures	Owner	Status
contribute to the spread of invasive species (SESP Risk 2)		<b>Impact: 4</b> (if natural ecosystems were displaced and invasive species spread increased, the environmental implications would be significant)	Directorate and in no cases will plantations be established in ecologically sensitive areas.		
Climate change exceeds the coping range of the proposed production systems so that the financial incentives are no longer sufficient to make them viable and attractive, and the undermines the relevance of the incentives by changing the flows of environmental costs and benefits on which their design was based.	Environmental	<b>Probability: 5</b> <b>Impact: 2</b> (CC would increase the importance and economic justification of protecting flows of environmental services through the use of incentives, but in some cases might undermine the ability of producers to pay back returnable incentives)	Under Component 1, CC resilience will be included as one of the criteria for eligibility to access incentive mechanisms Under Components 2 and 3, support by the project to capacities among producers and extension agents will include capacities for adaptive management of production systems in response to CC.	CITM A, MINA G	Increasing

**A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.** Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

19. There will also be close collaboration and coordination with UNDP/GEF Project 4846 “A Landscape Approach to the Conservation of Threatened Mountain Ecosystems”, which is implemented by the Institute of Ecology and Systematics (IES) in CITMA. The target areas of this Project have been selected in discussion with Project 4846, specifically in the case of the Guamuhaya massif, and the actions of this Project in the landscapes adjoining those of Project 4846 will contribute to the connectivity sought by that project. Collaboration will include the interchange of information, experiences and lessons learned, especially with regard to Guamuhaya where the two projects are adjacent to each other; the selection of resource management and production systems will be coordinated between the two projects in order to maximize complementarity and compatibility and to optimize flows of environmental services and other benefits between the areas of the two projects; and interactions with local and regional institutions covering both of the projects’ areas will be coordinated in order to maximize cost-effectiveness and consistency.

20. UNDP/GEF Project 9429 “Incorporating Multiple Environmental Considerations and their Economic Implications into the Management of Landscapes Forests and Production Sectors in Cuba” is of particular relevance to this project, given its common focus on financial instruments, and in particular there are opportunities for collaboration in relation to the scaling up of financial mechanisms across additional areas of the country. The generation through project 9429 of capacities and information regarding the economic valuation of ecosystem goods and services will feed directly into development of sustainable financing mechanisms through this project; while the technical knowledge generated through this project on SLM in dry land areas will feed into the promotion by project 9429 of an integrated landscape-wide approach linking these SLM aspects with BD and SFM.

21. This Project will be located in the same Implementation Unit as the National Coordination Unit of Project 4846, the National Environment Agency (AMA), while Project 9429 which is based in the National Centre for Protected Areas also belongs to the same ministry (CITMA), which will make coordination easier. Furthermore, the Country Pilot Partnership, through its Project #5 “Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of the Country Pilot Partnership on SLM in Cuba”, will enter into working agreements to establish a legal platform allowing the Annual Plans of Operation of the Project to be jointly reviewed and their activities to be consolidated.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage:

A.7 *Benefits*. Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCAF/SCCF)?

22. As explained in the CPP Programme Document, this project, along with the other CPP projects, will have very significant socioeconomic benefits, in terms of increased food production, increased access to water supplies and reduced vulnerability to environmental shocks. It is estimated that production of staple crops will increase in the intervention areas by between 30 and 75% by the end of the 10-year period of the CPP, resulting in increased incomes and food security. Increases in the extent and improvements in the quality of vegetation cover will also result in reductions in the vulnerability of the population to environmental shocks such as hurricanes and droughts. These changes will be accompanied by increased employment opportunities (particularly for women), improvements in human and social capital (for example strengthened individual capacities and awareness), improved living conditions and reductions in rural-urban migration.

23. These socioeconomic benefits will be spread across a wide range of stakeholder groups, but will be of particular importance for the poor. Despite the social safety nets provided by the centrally-planned system in Cuba, the poor tend to be particularly vulnerable to environmental shocks such as hurricanes and droughts, and will therefore benefit most from reductions in such vulnerability expected from the programme. At the same time, the promotion of low-input land management practices will be particularly attractive to the poorer sectors of the population who typically have limited ability to invest in inputs. The project will also have particular benefits for women, given their high levels of participation in agricultural activities.

A.8 *Knowledge Management*. Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

B. Description of the consistency of the project with:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities*.

24. **National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions:** There has been no significant change from CPP Programme Document. The approach of the project is even more opportune and relevant now to the national policy context than when the CPP as a whole was first formulated, more than 10 years ago, given the significant changes that have occurred in the policy context in Cuba since that time, including the following:

- The State has become less involved in administering resources directly and has moved towards a more regulatory role, with an increased emphasis on decentralization;
- There has been a gradual shift away from an approach based on control towards one based on economic incentives; many farmers are not accustomed to this approach, and are not adequately prepared to take advantage of the opportunities represented by the incentives;
- There is greater flexibility in the economic policy framework of the country to the non-state sector of the economy, which opens up a wider range of options for the generation of models for financial sustainability and economic incentives for SLM.
- There is a greater emphasis on individual and private forms of tenure and production, which has implications for the profile of the target population.

## C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:

25. The project results as outlined in the project results framework will be monitored annually and evaluated periodically during project implementation to ensure the project effectively achieves these results. Measurement of

project results, together with learning and knowledge sharing, will be coordinated at Programme level with the support of CPP Project 5 (Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation of the CPP).

26. Project-level monitoring and evaluation will be undertaken in compliance with UNDP requirements as outlined in the [UNDP POPP and UNDP Evaluation Policy](#). Additional mandatory GEF-specific M&E requirements (as outlined below) will be undertaken in accordance with the [GEF M&E policy](#) and other relevant GEF policies.

27. In addition to these mandatory UNDP and GEF M&E requirements, other M&E activities deemed necessary to support project-level adaptive management will be agreed during the Project Inception Workshop and will be detailed in the Inception Report. This will include the exact role of project target groups and other stakeholders in project M&E activities including the GEF Operational Focal Point and national/regional institutes assigned to undertake project monitoring. The GEF Operational Focal Point will strive to ensure consistency in the approach taken to the GEF-specific M&E requirements (notably the GEF Tracking Tools) across all GEF-financed projects in the country. This could be achieved for example by using one national institute to complete the GEF Tracking Tools for all GEF-financed projects in the country, including projects supported by other GEF Agencies.

#### **M&E Oversight and monitoring responsibilities:**

28. Project Manager: The Project Manager is responsible for day-to-day project management and regular monitoring of project results and risks, including social and environmental risks. The Project Manager will ensure that all project staff maintain a high level of transparency, responsibility and accountability in M&E and reporting of project results. The Project Manager will inform the Project Board, the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF RTA of any delays or difficulties as they arise during implementation so that appropriate support and corrective measures can be adopted.

29. The Project Manager will develop annual work plans based on the multi-year work plan included in Annex A, including annual output targets to support the efficient implementation of the project. The Project Manager will ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality. This includes, but is not limited to, ensuring the results framework indicators are monitored annually in time for evidence-based reporting in the GEF PIR, and that the monitoring of risks and the various plans/strategies developed to support project implementation (e.g. gender strategy, KM strategy etc..) occur on a regular basis.

30. Project Board: The Project Board will take corrective action as needed to ensure the project achieves the desired results. The Project Board will hold project reviews to assess the performance of the project and appraise the Annual Work Plan for the following year. In the project's final year, the Project Board will hold an end-of-project review to capture lessons learned and discuss opportunities for scaling up and to highlight project results and lessons learned with relevant audiences. This final review meeting will also discuss the findings outlined in the project terminal evaluation report and the management response.

31. Project Implementing Partner: The Implementing Partner is responsible for providing any and all required information and data necessary for timely, comprehensive and evidence-based project reporting, including results and financial data, as necessary and appropriate. The Implementing Partner will strive to ensure project-level M&E is undertaken by national institutes, and is aligned with national systems so that the data used by and generated by the project supports national systems.

32. UNDP Country Office: The UNDP Country Office will support the Project Manager as needed, including through annual supervision missions. The annual supervision missions will take place according to the schedule outlined in the annual work plan. Supervision mission reports will be circulated to the project team and Project Board within one month of the mission. The UNDP Country Office will initiate and organize key GEF M&E activities including the annual GEF PIR, the *independent mid-term review* and the independent terminal evaluation. The UNDP Country Office will also ensure that the standard UNDP and GEF M&E requirements are fulfilled to the highest quality.

33. The UNDP Country Office is responsible for complying with all UNDP project-level M&E requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP. This includes ensuring the UNDP Quality Assurance Assessment during implementation is undertaken annually; that annual targets at the output level are developed, and monitored and reported using UNDP corporate systems; the regular updating of the ATLAS risk log; and, the updating of the UNDP gender marker on an annual basis based on gender mainstreaming progress reported in the GEF PIR and the UNDP ROAR. Any quality

concerns flagged during these M&E activities (e.g. annual GEF PIR quality assessment ratings) must be addressed by the UNDP Country Office and the Project Manager.

34. The UNDP Country Office will retain all M&E records for this project for up to seven years after project financial closure in order to support ex-post evaluations undertaken by the UNDP Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) and/or the GEF Independent Evaluation Office (IEO).

35. UNDP-GEF Unit: Additional M&E and implementation quality assurance and troubleshooting support will be provided by the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor and the UNDP-GEF Directorate as needed.

36. **Audit**: The project will be audited according to UNDP Financial Regulations and Rules and applicable audit policies on NIM implemented projects.

**Additional GEF monitoring and reporting requirements:**

37. Inception Workshop and Report: A project inception workshop will be held within two months after the project document has been signed by all relevant parties to, amongst others:

a) Re-orient project stakeholders to the project strategy and discuss any changes in the overall context that influence project strategy and implementation;

b) Discuss the roles and responsibilities of the project team, including reporting and communication lines and conflict resolution mechanisms;

c) Review the results framework and finalize the indicators, means of verification and monitoring plan;

d) Discuss reporting, monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities and finalize the M&E budget; identify national/regional institutes to be involved in project-level M&E; discuss the role of the GEF OFP in M&E;

e) Update and review responsibilities for monitoring the various project plans and strategies, including the risk log; Environmental and Social Management Plan and other safeguard requirements; the gender strategy; the knowledge management strategy, and other relevant strategies;

f) Review financial reporting procedures and mandatory requirements, and agree on the arrangements for the annual audit; and

g) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings and finalize the first year annual work plan.

38. The Project Manager will prepare the inception report no later than one month after the inception workshop. The inception report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board.

39. GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR): The Project Manager, the UNDP Country Office, and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor will provide objective input to the annual GEF PIR covering the reporting period July (previous year) to June (current year) for each year of project implementation. The Project Manager will ensure that the indicators included in the project results framework are monitored annually in advance of the PIR submission deadline so that progress can be reported in the PIR. Any environmental and social risks and related management plans will be monitored regularly, and progress will be reported in the PIR.

40. The PIR submitted to the GEF will be shared with the Project Board. The UNDP Country Office will coordinate the input of the GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders to the PIR as appropriate. The quality rating of the previous year's PIR will be used to inform the preparation of the subsequent PIR.

41. Lessons learned and knowledge generation: Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention area through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit



to the project. The project will identify, analyse and share lessons learned that might be beneficial to the design and implementation of similar projects and disseminate these lessons widely. There will be continuous information exchange between this project and other projects of similar focus in the same country, region and globally.

42. GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools: The GEF LD Tracking Tool will be used to monitor global environmental benefit results, as agreed with the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisor. The baseline/CEO Endorsement GEF Focal Area Tracking Tool – submitted as Annex D to this project document – will be updated by the Project Manager/Team (not the evaluation consultants hired to undertake the *MTR* or the *TE*) and shared with *the mid-term review consultants* and terminal evaluation consultants before the required *review/evaluation* missions take place. The updated GEF Tracking Tool will be submitted to the GEF along with the completed *Mid-term Review report* and Terminal Evaluation report.

43. Independent Mid-term Review (MTR): An independent mid-term review process will begin after the second PIR has been submitted to the GEF, and the MTR report will be submitted to the GEF in the same year as the 3<sup>rd</sup> PIR. The MTR findings and responses outlined in the management response will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project’s duration. The terms of reference, the review process and the MTR report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center \(ERC\)](#). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final MTR report will be available in English and will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and approved by the Project Board.

44. Terminal Evaluation (TE): An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place upon completion of all major project outputs and activities. The terminal evaluation process will begin three months before operational closure of the project allowing the evaluation mission to proceed while the project team is still in place, yet ensuring the project is close enough to completion for the evaluation team to reach conclusions on key aspects such as project sustainability. The Project Manager will remain on contract until the TE report and management response have been finalized. The terms of reference, the evaluation process and the final TE report will follow the standard templates and guidance prepared by the UNDP IEO for GEF-financed projects available on the [UNDP Evaluation Resource Center](#). As noted in this guidance, the evaluation will be ‘independent, impartial and rigorous’. The consultants that will be hired to undertake the assignment will be independent from organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. The GEF Operational Focal Point and other stakeholders will be involved and consulted during the terminal evaluation process. Additional quality assurance support is available from the UNDP-GEF Directorate. The final TE report will be cleared by the UNDP Country Office and the UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Adviser, and will be approved by the Project Board. The TE report will be publically available in English on the UNDP ERC.

45. The UNDP Country Office will include the planned project terminal evaluation in the UNDP Country Office evaluation plan, and will upload the final terminal evaluation report in English and the corresponding management response to the UNDP Evaluation Resource Centre (ERC). Once uploaded to the ERC, the UNDP IEO will undertake a quality assessment and validate the findings and ratings in the TE report, and rate the quality of the TE report. The UNDP IEO assessment report will be sent to the GEF IEO along with the project terminal evaluation report.

46. Final Report: The project’s terminal PIR along with the terminal evaluation (TE) report and corresponding management response will serve as the final project report package. The final project report package shall be discussed with the Project Board during an end-of-project review meeting to discuss lesson learned and opportunities for scaling up.

#### **Mandatory GEF M&E Requirements and M&E Budget:**

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>3</sup> (US\$/CUP) <sup>4</sup>		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
Inception Workshop	UNDP Country Office	USD 11,000	CUP 2,000	Within two months of project document signature
Inception Report	Project Manager	None	None	Within two weeks of inception workshop
Standard UNDP monitoring and reporting requirements as outlined in the UNDP POPP	UNDP Country Office	None	None	Quarterly, annually
Monitoring of indicators in project results framework	Project Manager	USD 4,000	CUP 4,000	Annually
GEF Project Implementation Report (PIR)	Project Manager and UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	Annually
NIM Audit as per UNDP audit policies	UNDP Country Office	USD 15,000	CUP 3,000	Annually or other frequency as per UNDP Audit policies
Lessons learned and knowledge generation	Project Manager	USD 15,000	CUP 5,000	Annually
Monitoring of environmental and social risks, and corresponding management plans as relevant	Project Manager UNDP CO	None	CUP 5,000	On-going
Addressing environmental and social grievances	Project Manager UNDP Country Office BPPS as needed	None for time of project manager, and UNDP CO	CUP 5,000	Costs associated with missions, workshops, BPPS expertise etc. can be charged to the project budget.
Project Board meetings	Project Board UNDP Country Office Project Manager	USD 2,000	None	At minimum annually
Supervision missions	UNDP Country Office	None <sup>5</sup>	CUP 30,000	Annually
Oversight missions	UNDP-GEF team	None <sup>5</sup>	CUP 20,000	Troubleshooting as needed
Knowledge management	Project Manager	Covered by CPP Project 1	Covered by CPP Project 1	On-going
GEF Secretariat learning missions/site visits	UNDP Country Office and Project Manager and UNDP-GEF team	None	None	To be determined.
Mid-term GEF Tracking Tool	Project Manager	USD 10,000	CUP 4,000	Before mid-term review mission

<sup>3</sup> Excluding project team staff time and UNDP staff time and travel expenses.

<sup>4</sup> 1 USD = 1 CUP


<sup>5</sup> The costs of UNDP Country Office and UNDP-GEF Unit's participation and time are charged to the GEF Agency Fee.

GEF M&E requirements	Primary responsibility	Indicative costs to be charged to the Project Budget <sup>3</sup> (US\$/CUP) <sup>4</sup>		Time frame
		GEF grant	Co-financing	
				<i>takes place.</i>
Independent Mid-term Review (MTR) and management response	<i>UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team</i>	USD 20,000 (including travel)	CUP 10,000	<i>Between 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> PIR.</i>
Terminal GEF Tracking Tool	Project Manager	USD 10,000	CUP 4,000	Before terminal evaluation mission takes place
Independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) included in UNDP evaluation plan, and management response	UNDP Country Office and Project team and UNDP-GEF team	USD 33,000 (including travel)	CUP 10,000	At least three months before operational closure
Translation of MTR and TE reports into English	<i>UNDP Country Office</i>	<i>Included in costs of MTR and FE above</i>	<i>Included in costs of MTR and FE above</i>	<i>As required. GEF will only accept reports in English.</i>
TOTAL indicative COST Excluding project team staff time, and UNDP staff and travel expenses		USD 122,000	CUP 102,000	

**PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)**

**A. GEF Agency(ies) certification**

**This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies<sup>6</sup> and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.**

<b>Agency Coordinator, Agency name</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Date (MM/dd/yyyy)</b>	<b>Project Contact Person</b>	<b>Telephone</b>	<b>Email Address</b>
Adriana Dinu, Executive Coordinator, UNDP-GEF		03/27/2017	Lyes Ferroukhi, Senior Technical Adviser, EBD	+507 302-4576	lyes.ferroukhi@undp.org

<sup>6</sup> GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT  
GEF6 CEO Endorsement /Approval Template-August2016

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value		Mid-term Target		Target value		Assumptions
<b>Objective:</b> Increase availability and uptake of sustainable financing for SLM to incentivize integrated land management practices for the maintenance of essential ecosystem services.	O1. Number of producers <b>throughout Cuba</b> who have had direct benefit/support from at least one financing scheme	5,000 producers		20,000 producers		55,000 producers, of which at least 35% are women		Climate change does not exceed coping limits of the target production systems
	O2. Budget allocation to sustainable land management activities by local production entities <b>throughout Cuba</b> (cooperative farms, State Firms and Production Units) <sup>7</sup>	10,000 USD <sup>8</sup>		11,000 USD		12,500 USD		
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Mechanisms and capacities for sustainable financing consolidated at national level.	1.1 Level of budget allocated nationwide to sustainable land management activities	MINAG <sup>9</sup>	40,000,000	MINAG	44,000,000	MINAG	48,000,000	Continued policy commitment to the use of economic incentives to support sustainable land management
		AZCUBA <sup>10</sup>	8,000,000	AZCUBA	9,000,000	MINAZ	10,000,000	
		INRH	1,800,000	INRH	1,800,000	INRH	2,000,000	
		Total	49,800,000	Total	54,800,000	Total	60,000,000	
	1.2 Level of funding (USD) channeled from <u>existing</u> financing mechanisms to SLM nationwide <sup>11</sup>	FONADEF	144,000,000	FONADEF	181,000,000	FONADEF	200,000,000	
		FMA	375,600	FMA	500,000	FMA	100,000,000	
		Total	144,375,600	Total	181,500,000	Total	300,000,000	
	1.3 Level of funding channeled from <u>new</u> direct financing mechanisms to SLM nationwide			USD12,000,000		USD24,000,000		
1.4 Levels of awareness in institutions at national level of the existence, objectives and functioning of the proposed financial mechanisms in support	Capacity indices to be defined and measured at project start		Capacity indices to be defined and target defined at project start		Capacity indices to be defined and target defined at project start			

<sup>7</sup> This indicator includes funds destined to the PNMCS, operated by MINAG, part of which is allocated to AZCUBA. This indicator comes from the results framework of the CPP programme document, and its baseline value corresponds to the funds allocated by FONADEF in support of productive activities. This baseline value will be confirmed at project start,

<sup>8</sup> USD1 is equal to CUP1

<sup>9</sup> The Forestry Directorate, and its SLM funding, is included in that of MINAG

<sup>10</sup> AZCUBA was formerly (at the time the CPP was formulated) the Ministry of Sugar MINAZ

<sup>11</sup> The baseline value for FONADEF was updated in 2016 from the figure originally stated in the CPP document, 10 years ago. The baseline value for FNMA corresponds to the amount assigned to a project developed in association with the National Association of Small Farmers (ANAP); the target is based on the inclusion of payments for environmental services based on water quality.

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value		Mid-term Target		Target value		Assumptions
	of SLM, and the application of the incentives and procedural instruments							
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Sustainable funding mechanisms demonstrated and validated at local level	2.1 Number of producers in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas who have received direct benefits from at least one financing mechanism	Guamuhaya	71	Guamuhaya	650	Guamuhaya	1,404	Continued receptivity to economic incentives among producers
		Cauto	2	Cauto	700	Cauto	1,506	
		Total	83	Total	1350	Total	2,910	
	2.2 Level of budget assignation by local production entities in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas to activities in support of SLM	Guamuhaya	3,587,000	Guamuhaya	3,700,000	Guamuhaya	4,200,000	
		Cauto	2,078,000	Cauto	2,300,000	Cauto	3,000,000	
		Total	5,555,000	Total	6,000,000	Total	7,200,000	
2.3 Increased knowledge and awareness among target institutions and their members at local level, regarding the application of financial instruments	Capacity indices to be defined and measured at project start		Capacity indices to be defined and target defined at project start		Capacity indices to be defined and target defined at project start			
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Producers with technical capacities to take advantage of financial support for applying SLM practices	3.1 Percentage of producers (men and women) in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas receiving technical assistance on SLM practices	Guamuhaya	10	Guamuhaya	50	Guamuhaya	80	
		Cauto	2	Cauto	40	Cauto	75	
	3.2 Number of producers (farmers/livestock herders/forest resource users) in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas adopting practices to counter land degradation	Grazing land management	150	Grazing land management	400	Grazing land management	1,000 (at least 35% women)	
		Forest resource management	200	Forest resource management	1500	Forest resource management	5,900 (at least 35% women)	
	3.3 Area in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas benefiting from sustainable land management	Agriculture	0ha	Agriculture	40.32 ha	Agriculture	40.32ha	
		Grazing	0ha	Grazing	1,000 ha	Grazing	2,000ha	
		Forestry	0ha	Forestry	1,000 ha	Forestry	2,000ha	
	3.4 Erosion rates (t/ha/year) in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas	Guamuhaya	To be determined	Guamuhaya	2% reduction	Guamuhaya	4% reduction	
		Cauto		Cauto	2% reduction	Cauto	4% reduction	

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value		Mid-term Target		Target value		Assumptions
	3.5 Areas of forest ecosystems restored (as measured by area of forest with diverse structure) in Guamuhaya (Villa Clara) and Cauto intervention areas	Guamuhaya (Villa Clara)	2500ha	Guamuhaya (Villa Clara)	2,700ha	Guamuhaya (Villa Clara)	3,000ha	
		Cauto	10,000ha	Cauto	10,700ha	Cauto	12,000ha	
	3.6 Rainwater harvesting systems <sup>12</sup>	None		10		20		
	3.7 Yield of milk in Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas	Cauto	1,300 l/ha/yr	Cauto	1,700 l/ha/yr	Cauto:	2,200 l/ha/yr	
		Villa Clara	1,300 l/ha/yr	Villa Clara	1,700 l/ha/yr	Villa Clara:	2,200 l/ha/yr	
	3.8 Area of sustainable management of soil, water and forest resources in pilot sites <sup>13</sup>	Agricultural lands	0ha	Agricultural lands	1 farm (330ha)	Agricultural lands	1 farm (330ha)	
		Grazing lands	0ha	Grazing lands	1 farm (201ha)	Grazing lands	12 farms (393ha)	
		Forest lands	0ha	Forest lands	2 farms (337ha)	Forest lands	7 farms (644ha)	
	3.9 Increased knowledge of extension agents in technical aspects of proposed SLM practices	Capacity indices to be defined and measured at project start		Capacity indices to be defined and target defined at project start		Capacity indices to be defined and target defined at project start		

<sup>12</sup> This indicator replaces the CPP indicator of “Water use efficiency measured by the volume of irrigation water used per ton of agricultural crops produced in Cauto intervention area”.

<sup>13</sup> Proposals of criteria for compliance with this indicator (“sustainable management of soil, water and forest resources”) will be defined by MINAG, together with responsibilities and procedures for its certification, will be elaborated for each kind of land in the first year of the project and tested in pilot sites of the project. It is expected to have four sites with some level of sustainable management. For the target value, 20 of the 34 pilot sites will be at some level of sustainable soil management.

Result measurement methods

Indicator	Means of Measurement
O1. Number of producers <b>throughout Cuba</b> who have had direct benefit/support from at least one financing scheme	Records of institutions providing financing
O2. Budget allocation to sustainable land management activities by local production entities <b>throughout Cuba</b> (cooperative farms, State Firms and Production Units)	Records of producer organizations
1.1 Level of budget allocated nationwide to sustainable land management activities	Records of institutions providing financing
1.2 Level of funding (USD) channeled from <u>existing</u> financing mechanisms to SLM nationwide	Records of institutions providing financing
1.3 Level of funding channeled from <u>new</u> direct financing mechanisms to SLM nationwide	Records of institutions providing financing
1.4 Levels of awareness in institutions at national level of the existence, objectives and functioning of the proposed financial mechanisms in support of SLM, and the application of the incentives and procedural instruments	Interviews/questionnaires/focus groups with members of target institutions (indices and methodologies to be defined at project start)
2.1 Number of producers in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas who have received direct benefits from at least one financing mechanism	Records of producers and producer organizations
2.2 Level of budget assignation by local production entities in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas to activities in support of SLM	Records of local production entities
2.3 Increased knowledge and awareness among target institutions and their members at local level, regarding the application of the financial instruments proposed under Outcome 1	Interviews/questionnaires/focus groups with members of target institutions (indices and methodologies to be defined at project start)
3.1 Percentage of producers (men and women) in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas receiving technical assistance on SLM practices	Surveys of producers and records of extension agencies
3.2 Number of producers (farmers/livestock herders/forest resource users) in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas adopting practices to counter land degradation	Records/surveys of producers and their organizations, validated through field inspections
3.3 Area in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas benefiting from sustainable land management	Records/surveys of producers and their organizations, validated through field inspections
3.4 Erosion rates (t/ha/year) in the Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas	Erosion monitoring plots
3.5 Areas of forest ecosystems restored (as measured by area of forest with diverse structure) in Guamuhaya (Villa Clara) and Cauto intervention areas	Records of producers and producer organizations, and field surveys
3.6 Rainwater harvesting systems	Records of producers and their organizations, and field inspections
3.7 Yield of milk in Guamuhaya and Cauto intervention areas	Records of producers and their organizations, and field inspections
3.8 Area of sustainable management of soil, water and forest resources in pilot sites	Records/surveys of producers and their organizations, validated through field inspections
3.9 Increased knowledge of extension agents in technical aspects of proposed SLM practices	Interviews/questionnaires/focus groups with members of target institutions (indices and methodologies to be defined at project start)



**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

N/A: the concept of this project was presented in the CPP Programme Document, reviews of which were fully responded to at the time of CEO Endorsement of the CPP as a whole.



**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>14</sup>**

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 75,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
1. Process of consultation and field activities	20,000	18,690	0
2. Workshop design	30,000	5,804	24,196
3. M&E Programme	25,000	0	26,310
<b>Total</b>	<b>75,000</b>	<b>24,494</b>	<b>50,506</b>

<sup>14</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

N/A