GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9577**		
Country/Region:	**Grenada**		
Project Title:	**Climate Resilient Agriculture for Integrated Landscape Management**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4970 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**LD-1 Program 2; LD-3 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9; BD-2 Program 4;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$130,000**	Project Grant:	**$3,659,775**
Co-financing:	**$13,693,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$17,352,775**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Sarah Wyatt**	Agency Contact Person:	**Gabor Vereczi**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	August 11, 2016 No, while this project is generally aligned with relevant GEF strategies, please address the following - Component 2.2 - These activities are not eligible for GEF trust fund support for Land Degradation. Please revise. CSA activities should be directly focused on improving on the	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		ground land management. Invasive species related activities from component 2 (under land degradation) should be undertaken as part of biodiversity and align with that strategy. Also, in component 3 please refer to the GEF BD strategy on invasive species and ensure alignment. Specifically, support for control efforts meet the criteria established. November 16, 2016 Yes, thank you for the improvements. Please see question 5 for issues related to IAS work.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	August 11, 2016 Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	August 11, 2016 No, please address the following issues: - Sustainability - Without greater clarity on component 2.1, it is difficult to assess the sustainability of those interventions. It would also help	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		to expand on the sustainability of the activities in component 3. - Drivers - With so many scattered activities, it is hard to see how it is focused on the underlying causes and not just the symptoms of environmental degradation. - Scaling-up - It would be good to include more information about how this project will provide for and create a model for scaling up of the activities developed. November 16, 2016 Yes, thank you for the changes made. This is largely a land degradation project that is looking at the landscape approach, which requires an integration of varying activities and a look at various drivers. The resubmission appears to have addressed the key drivers of the local context. In the PPG phase we expect that these will be expanded in greater detail and infused into the Theory of Change. It does help that the implementing agency hosts the Environment and Agriculture mandates in one Ministry.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		In terms of scale and use, in the PPG phase, please consider the potential use of the database as a point of reference when prospecting for new sites for foreign investment related to tourism, mining or other sectors and should therefore be promoted widely. In the PPG phase, It would also be useful to consider how the project can link with SGP for replication in other watersheds using community level projects/interventions.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	August 11, 2016 It would be good to have more information on baseline activities in the specific areas of this project that will be built upon by this project. Particularly the activities in component 1 and 2 should be building. November 16, 2016 Yes. During the PPG, please consider synergies with additional background work done, on the FAO produced Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) Country Profile https://ccafs.cgiar.org/publications/climate-smart-agriculture-grenada#.WBikAWyQyUk	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		and The Japan Climate Change Project (regional) which may have activities related to water resources management and sustainable agriculture. http://procurement-notices.undp.org/view_file.cfm?doc_id=84256 http://www.bb.undp.org/content/barbados/en/home/operations/projects/environment_and_energy/japan-caribbean-climate-change-partnership.html	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	August 11, 2016 No, this project is taking on wide variety of activities and it is hard to see the connections between them in this project. Please address the following issues: Component 1 - How will this project address large-scale, invasive development such as large resorts that can destroy large areas of habitat for the species targeted by this - 1.1 - Please clarify who manages this database currently, how it is used, how this project will change it and	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		how it will ensure that the changes are sustainable. Also, KBAs should have already been identified for Grenada through the GEF-funded CEPF ecosystem profile. - 1.2 - The explanation of these component in the body of the PIF is confusing. Please revise for clarity. Component 2 - 2.1 - Too many options are presented as possibilities here. Based on GEF experience, decisions such as these should be made at PIF stage as these are very different options being presented and won't be realized if left until CEO endorsement. Please refer to STAP guidance documents on Payments for Ecosystem Services and Certification for how to approach these activities and ensure sustainability. - 2.3 - Please discuss the impact such testing will have and how the government will be able to respond to results and implement responses. - 2.4 - Please see previous comments on these activities. It is questionable whether these activities belong in this project as they seem out of place. There is a recently approved GEF project UNEP/OECS on IAS is undertaking some of these activities. This project needs to coordinate with	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the UNEP/OECS project to avoid duplication. Also, the activities described require sustainability plans to be effective over beyond the life of the project. Please discuss. - How will this project address irrigation? The project needs to acknowledge that in Grenada the irrigation system has to be modernized. Please address how this project will overcome this barrier or other activities (not through this project) will address it and the risk presented by the lack of adequate irrigation systems. - The project needs to assess the potential for paving the way for scaling-up climate resilient schemes, perhaps through cooperative(s), and generating jobs in that sector. Component 3 - 3.2 - The biodiversity conservation activities and the SLM activities feel quite disjointed. The scattering of activities described feels random. It doesn't seem like these activities are being integrated with CSA, but rather are something separate. Will they be taking place in protected areas/reserves/other natural habitat or are they part on farm activities? Again, please review the GEF strategy on invasive species to ensure	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		alignment and coordinate with the UNEP/OECS project. How will these activities be maintained after the end of the project? November 16, 2016 Thank you for the edits (the edits for 2.2 were particularly helpful), please address the following remaining issues. Please include SMART indicators in Table B. Components: - 1.1 - This project still says that it will be identifying KBAs. Through the course of the project. However, the GEF-funded CEPF will already be undertaking this work in early 2017. Please revise and discuss collaboration with those efforts. - 3.1 and 3.2 - Sustainability remains a particular issue for the IAS components. How will the control measures be financed beyond the life of the project? (including Bd spread prevention control measures) Please explain which threatened species will be directly benefited through this work. - 3.1 - The first sentence notes '3 broad agricultural strata' however	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		only 2 are mentioned. Please correct. - 3.3, Bullet 3 -indicates disincentives through legislative review for farmer compensation. Please specify which legislation would be reviewed. Is the legislation referenced in Component 2? - 3.2 is repeated in table B - please remove. During PPG, please take these comments into account: 1.2 - i) the length of time it may take to develop legislative instruments and ensure that the relevant stakeholders responsible for moving these instruments through the system are involved from the beginning; ii) is there a legislative instrument backing the PA System Plan, as without this it may have little power iii) Community based organizations to assist with co-management of the watershed plans to ensure active support from the community level. 2.1 - Please consider the need to possibly build the capacity of small farmers to be able access the financial and certification schemes (for e.g. training on putting together a loan application or business proposal etc) Component 3 is very heavy in terms of the number of activities in various	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		locations. In the PPG phase, please clearly identify a robust project management framework that will be able to implement all of these activities within the projected time frame. 3.1 - There are many activities outlined in this Output. For better clarity, please consider adding a table outlining which activities would be undertaken in each of the watersheds and under each of the agricultural strata. 3.2 -The explanation is noted. Please consider including a map, highlighting the specific areas where the interventions outlined in Output 3.2 will be located. 3.4- Please indicate if any of the proposed organizations received SGP support. In addition, whether or not there will be complementary support from a business support organization (e.g. a small business development agency or anything of that nature). Component 4- Please consider using community groups/NGOs to assist in capturing and share knowledge January 5, 2017 Yes, thank you for the revisions. In addition to the previous comments	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		for the PPG, please keep in mind the continued development of SMART indicators for the conservation activities undertaken that are specific and provide more detail than hectares alone can. Also, please focus on the establishment of IAS programs that are sustainable and include provisions for their long term implementation beyond the life of the project when necessary.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	August 8, 2016 Yes. This project is inherently focused on socio-economic issues and will include gender aware design of the project.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	August 8, 2016 No, Grenada only has $4,149,804 remaining in their STAR allocation. Please make appropriate revisions. November 16, 2016 Yes, thank you for the revisions.	
	• The focal area allocation?	August 8, 2016 Yes, Grenada is fully flexible.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access	August 8, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		NA	
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	August 8, 2016 NA	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	August 11, 2016 No, please address the issues above and resubmit. Also, please use the font size from the template. November 16, 2016 Thank you for the helpful revisions. A few issues remain as discussed in question 5. January 5, 2016 The program manager recommends this project for CEO clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 12, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	November 18, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 05, 2017	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.