

# Enhancing Political Will for Sustainable Protected Areas Financing

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10921

**Countries**

Global (Colombia, Indonesia, Kenya, Mexico)

**Project Name**

Enhancing Political Will for Sustainable Protected Areas Financing

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

2/7/2022

**Review completed by PM**

3/15/2022

**Program Manager**

Hannah Fairbank

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

## PIF

### Part I ? Project Information

#### Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

February 11, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Indicative project/program description summary**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

All comments cleared.

February 11, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please write-out all abbreviations the first time they are used with abbreviation in parenthesis.
- 2.) It seems that NCA and NCAA are being used synonymously in the proposal. If so please select one to use throughout, otherwise make sure to define and clarify usage.
- 3.) Please use simple language, without jargon, to describe project Components, Outcomes and Inputs. This is not a substantive change, but will greatly ease understanding of what is proposed. For instance: Instead of saying: "sustainably

leveraging central government allocation" could consider: "increasing the central government's allocation" and instead of: "revenues of PAs increased by enhanced legal frameworks as enabling condition for innovating funding schemes...." say: "PA revenues increased through improved legal frameworks that support innovative public and private finance." Please simplify for general comprehension.

Component 1:

3.) 1.1.2: Please include "systems" in output language as this is focused at system-level financing.

Component 2:

4.) Please revise output language to be more substantive (for instance a 'communication channel'-2.1.2-or a briefing-2.2.2-should not be a project-level output).

## Agency Response

### **Response10/03/2022**

We wrote-out the abbreviations in their first appearance in the text.

Natural Capital Accounting and Assessment (NCAA) comprises Natural Capital Accounting (NCA). Therefore, we used NCAA in the document.

We revised and simplified the language of Components, and Outcomes.

We changed output 1.1.2 to

1.1.2 Draft recommendations and roadmaps to integrate NCAs into protected areas **systems**

Outputs of Component 2 have been revised as:

2.1.2 Training programs developed and implemented for better coordination and communication on the status of conservation budgets and financial tools to help meet needs of the protected areas system through Caucus model.

2.2.2 Government awareness enhanced on the global commitments and trends in conservation finance and how these could be tailored to national context

### **Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 28, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

In the list of co-financing letters, please spell out CCN.

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 15, 2022 HF:

1.) Given this project is country-based, co-finance would generally be expected from each of the participating countries. If, at this stage, those amounts cannot be estimated for each country, please at least include a discussion in the note section (section titled 'investment mobilized') regarding expected country co-finance at CEO endorsement stage and during implementation.

Agency Response

23/March/2022

We wrote out CCN in the cofinance section

**Response10/03/2022**

The co-finance from participating countries will be identified and secured at the PPG phase. We included the following text under Section C.

The participating countries will be co-financing the project with in-kind and ?investment mobilized?. The in-kind contributions will be the recurrent expenditures of the salaries of the staff of the Ministers of Environment, Protected Area Agencies and the Legislators working on the implementation of the project. The ?investment mobilized? will come from fresh resources committed by NGOs, the Private Sector and philanthropic organizations. Investment mobilized is likely to be obtained from projects funded by USAID (Colombia, Kenya) and The Walton Family Foundation (Indonesia). CCN is expected to raise funds from the members of the Conservation Council, a group of more than 50+ ICCF partner organizations, of which more than half are private sector companies, <https://www.internationalconservation.org/partners>.

**GEF Resource Availability**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
February 15, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

Agency Response

**The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
February 15, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Impact Program Incentive?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
February 15, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Core indicators**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
March 14, 2022 HF:  
Comment cleared.

February 11, 2022 HF:

1.) Given the METT targets for PA system-level financial sustainability, please ensure the proper tracking tool is populated at submission of CEO endorsement request stage. Please also note this in the notes section for the Core-indicator targets.

Agency Response  
**Response10/03/2022**

The GEF7 tracking tool only measures PA level METT scores. We will develop a financial sustainability scorecard. Then, we will measure the baseline with the financial

sustainability scorecard and report at midterm and project end. In order to clarify this, we added the following statement in the explanation section of Table F Project's contribution to GEF core indicators:

" The Project will develop a Scorecard to measure the 'Financial Sustainability of PA Systems'. A baseline assessment will be conducted with this Scorecard for the whole pilot countries at the PPG phase. Enhancement in the financial sustainability of PA system will be measured and reported with this scorecard at midterm and project end."

**Project/Program taxonomy**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
February 16, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Part II ? Project Justification**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
March 28, 2022 HF:

All comments cleared.

March 14, 2022 HF:

1.) Comment cleared, though I don't see a reference to NCAA under section 6.) GEBs in the PIF. Please further develop during PPG.

2.)-4.) Comments cleared.

February 11, 2022 HF:

1.) Please describe relationship between NCA (NCAA) and protected areas system sustainability on which this project design is built. It seems to be assumed but right now

there is not a clearly articulated relationship between NCAA and the project goal, and how the project will approach this.

2.) Please include a sentence about why the massive decrease in budget for KWS between 2015-2016. Right now it leaves the reader guessing and the reason may inform the approach that this project takes to finance.

3.) Section on Donor Reliance (#2) states: "The project will examine how such funding streams could become more sustainable." We assume though that this project would look beyond the sources mentioned to a broader financing picture focused on the mobilization of domestic resources (DRM)-if that is indeed the case, please include in this section.

4.) Revenue Streams from User Fees (#3): Please spell out PNN.

#### Agency Response

**Response 23/03/2022**

Point 1 above is well noted with thanks. The NCCA under section 6.) GEBs in the PIF will be developed further during the PPG phase.

#### Response10/03/2022

We provided a paragraph under the Global environmental benefits section to explain the relationship between NCAA and Protected Areas System sustainability.

We added the following text on Page 7.

This reduction in the allocation of funds to KWS took place as part of overall budget cuts across the government agencies.

1. We amended that statement with the following one:
2. The project will look into these and other sources of financial resources, including mobilization of federal domestic resources (DRM), reallocation of financial resources from municipalities and regional developing agencies, and the reallocation of financial resources that get freed-up when addressing subsidies and perverse incentives that ICCF may be able to secure when working on Policy Coherence with the participating countries.

We wrote out it: Parques Nacionales Naturales (PNN).



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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

All comments cleared.

February 15, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please revise and further develop the generalized baseline scenario statement/paragraph for this project including characterization of the current situation regarding PA finance (gaps/opportunities), target country commitment, caucus interest, legislative opportunity (this is broad baseline scenario/language that is beyond the baseline section for each caucus). Current the baseline scenario goes directly into detail, we need an easy to understand chapeau on the baseline scenario to set the scene.
- 2.) Please revise the first sentence of this section that starts with "the proposed project seeks to promote..." as it is unclear.
- 3.) Section references Targeted Technical Assistance (TTA) in the Kenya section-is this TTA from WAVES? Or something else? Please include a clarifier.
- 4.) Baseline GEF Projects: Please include/engage with WWF-US on a.) GEFID 10916 National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3; and WWF's work on Project Finance for Permanence/Enduring Earth.

### Agency Response

#### **Response10/03/2022**

1. We added the following paragraph in the beginning of the baseline section:

The agencies in charge of the management of the conservation areas require resources for annual operating budgets, capital investment, staff training, community development, and public awareness among other activities. The control of unsustainable practices, including encroachment of agriculture and illegal mining, are an additional burden for the management agencies. Unfortunately, there is a significant funding gap in agencies in charge of the management of these conservation areas and is of significant concern for the long-term conservation of biodiversity and the ecosystem services that these areas provide. There are several sources of funding for the protected area systems including federal and regional government budgets, multilateral and bilateral donor agencies, revenues from payment from ecosystem services, and private sources, including business and philanthropic foundations, non-governmental organizations and even local communities. While domestic government budgets are the single largest source of PA financing in most countries the sums are relatively small. For example, in

Latin America and the Caribbean, the investments in the environment averages less than 1% of the GDP, and a fraction of that for protected areas. The low levels of investment on the part of governments originate in the Legislature, where overall budgets for the environmental sectors are set. Low levels of investment emerge, at least in part, from the lack of understanding on the part of policymakers on the financial and social benefits that can be derived from the protected areas. This challenge offers a unique opportunity for ICCF to engage parliamentarians in pursue of larger allocations of financial resources in the federal governments. ICCF's Conservation Caucus model will be used in the participating countries, to enhance political will among policymakers to increase the allocation of financial resources in support of protected areas. The target countries have been chosen because the members of the Conservation Caucus have expressed interest in the project and are in a position to assist in working toward a more robust allocation of resources for the protected area systems.

2. We removed this sentence as the overall objective of this project is explained in the alternative section.

3. Yes, this is WAVES Kenya, we clarified in the text.

4. We included this project:

This project will coordinate with GEF 10916 "National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3" that will be addressing direct drivers to protect habitats and species and improve financial sustainability of the global protected area estate.

The ICCF project will also coordinate with the Enduring Earth initiative, the partnership between The Nature Conservancy, The Pew Charitable Trusts, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and ZOMALAB, the family office of Ben and Lucy Ana Walton. The work with WWF and the members of the partnership will be facilitated because the first three institutions are also members of ICCF Conservation Council. The coordination with the two projects will include the discussion on the role of Policy Coherence and Political Consistency in advancing the financial sustainability of the protected areas systems by means of engaging the Legislatures of the Target Countries.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 11, 2022 HF:

1.) Please include/address policy coherence as an essential element of the alternative scenario for this project. Sustainable financing and the future of PAs and PA systems

will not be possible if the 'right hand' works against 'the left hand' through contradictory legislation, perverse subsidies etc. A key approach to addressing the financing gap for PA systems is to first reduce the gap by reforming/eliminating those legal/legislative conditions that are contributing to PADD. This is when political will for protected areas financing is going to be most important. Please revise.

#### Agency Response

##### **Response10/03/2022**

We added the following paragraph:

Closing the financial gap for nature and the protected area systems in particular will require a two-pronged approach: increasing financial flows from multiple sources, and reducing financial needs (GEF 2022. Policy coherence and the impact of the GEF. Technical Note. 8th Replenishment). The Legislature of the target countries can play a dual role in assisting closing the gaps. By increasing the funding for the Executive to execute (the main objective of this project) and by eliminating subsidies responsible for harmful practices on the environment. A key for achieving this dual objective in the Legislature will be to use the principles of Policy Coherence, *the systematic promotion of mutually reinforcing policy actions across government departments and agencies creating synergies towards achieving the agreed objectives?*. Policies that work across purposes will only serve to lessen the impact of the very funds to the environment that are being increasingly required from the same Legislative bodies. Since ICCF will be working with these legislators, efforts will be made not only to show them the benefits of increasing the funding of the protected area systems as engines of economic growth but to touch on the in-coherent laws and regulations that may well derail their efforts to enhance the financial sustainability of the PA systems.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

February 16, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

#### Agency Response

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

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comments cleared.

February 11, 2022 HF:

1.) Please re-articulate the proposed incremental reasoning for this project to specifically and clearly state the "value added of involving GEF" in this project. Please revise to include the baseline and alternative scenarios in the baseline and alternative scenarios sections.

### *Step 3 : Incremental Reasoning and GEFs' Role*

**18. Incremental reasoning defines the role for the GEF in the context of the expected agreed global environmental benefits from a proposed project. It is based on an assessment of the value added by involving the GEF.** The identification of GEF's role is of great importance for the design and implementation of a project, and therefore requires a recorded process of transparent dialogue and negotiation between key stakeholder groups such as the project proponent, the involved GEF Agency, the GEF Secretariat and the GEF Council.

2.) Please include a clear description of how the project is approaching NCAA in relation to the sustainable PA financing objective.

#### Agency Response

#### Response10/03/2022

1. We revised the Scenario with the GEF Investment as:

Under the scenario with GEF investment, a dedicated component will increase greater awareness of the value of biodiversity in protected areas through engagement with experts on NCA assessments and innovative financing tools, as well as with Protected Areas stakeholders on the potential financial and economic benefits of a sustainably funded system of protected areas. The project will capacitate legislators for sustainably leveraging central government allocation and external financial mechanisms for the conservation of biodiversity in national parks and other protected areas. This project would allow legislators to better understand the GEF as the financial mechanism of environmental conventions and identify ways by which they could contribute to its mission of delivering Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). Legislators could greatly contribute to delivering environmental results that are more ambitious and durable than ever before if they could examine the legal frameworks governing the management- and finances of the protected area systems. along with the laws and regulations that may work across purposes with biodiversity conservation. The GEF eligible countries could deliver tangible and measurable GEBs that can be sustained for longer periods because Legislation is more stable and durable than actions taken by the Executive. The views on how Policy Makers could contribute to not only increase the financial viability for the protected areas but to examine the most obvious laws and regulations hindering the conservation efforts, were discussed at the recent GEF-ICCF *Conference on Policy Coherence and Political Consistency?*, held in Costa Rica, February 17-21, 2022.

2. The following explanation has been added:

The Project will assist in using NCAAs developed or being developed in the pilot countries for the identification of multiple benefits of Protected area systems provide to the economy. This assessment will be critical in identifying the monetary benefits and demonstrating the return on investment and expenditures on protected areas. These returns on investment to PA systems will be key information for assessing the budget performance.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 11, 2022 HF:

1.) Please include a discussion of the relationship between the assessed gap in protected area system financial sustainability and the percentage target proposed (or to be determined in PPG) for the METT financial scorecard for the PA systems. And factors to be considered in target setting for each country. Currently 10% increase is given but it is unclear on what this is based/why this number would be generally applicable.

Agency Response

**Response10/03/2022**

We discussed the linkage between legal and policy improvements and PA finance sustainability and added that these targets will be reviewed and updated at the PPG phase:

Such legal, policy and regulatory improvements enhance revenue generation, help to identify economic valuation of protected areas, which will contribute financial sustainability of protected areas. These enhancements are measured with METT-Financial Sustainability Scorecard. Therefore, an 10% increase in the METT-financial scorecard and on average 10 % increase in federal/national funding for protected areas systems in pilot countries are targeted These targets are yet indicative, and they will be determined for each pilot country at the PPG phase.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 16, 2022 HF:

1.) Innovation: Please revise beginning of this section to clarify what and how "institutional capacity" will be improved by this project and how this is related to innovation under the project.

2.) Sustainability: Beyond addressing sustainable finance (which is the objective of the project), please include/address issue of sustainability of conservation caucus model in-country as this is the basis for the project approach.

## Agency Response

### **Response10/03/2022**

1. We revised the innovation section as:

The capacity of policymakers to engage on environmental issues through the legislative process will be augmented through the activities organized by the Conservation Caucus. These activities include briefings, workshops, seminars, exchanges with peers from developing and developed countries, and field visits. The experience of ICCF in the US and in the countries where Conservation Caucuses operate has shown that a combination of indoor and outdoor activities greatly improves the understanding of Legislators of the conservation issues and potential solutions to the environmental problems. Conservation Caucuses are instrumental for informed dialogue, discussion, and change within the legislative and a powerful mechanism to engage the Executive, including heads of state, and ministers of environment and finances.

2. We added the following paragraph:

The Conservation Caucuses in the participating countries will improve their political- and financial sustainability. This project will raise their political and public profiles becoming magnets for new legislators interested in participating in initiatives of interest to various political parties. Taking decisive action in support of conservation is likely to result in receiving financial support from various institutions that could be organized and formalized around structures like the Conservation Council of ICCF-US. This is a group of more than 50+ partner organizations, composed of private sector companies, philanthropic institutions, conservation organizations, NGOs, and the civil society that provide financial contributions to ICCF to cover some of its recurrent operational costs.

### **Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not Applicable given these are no site-based activities at this time.

Agency Response

## Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 27, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

Please provide information on stakeholder consultations that have taken place in the project design, including the process and with whom.

February 11, 2022 HF:

Cleared

## Agency Response

23/March/2022

We added a paragraph summarizing the consultations that took place with the stakeholders.

## Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 27, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 18, 2022 HF:

Please provide information on plans to carry out gender assessments/analysis during PPG to inform project development and design.

February 11, 2022 HF:

Cleared

## Agency Response

23/March/2022

We added a paragraph stating a gender analysis will be conducted and the gender-related activities and gender-specific budget will be decided at PPG together with the stakeholders.

## Private Sector Engagement

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

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 16, 2022 HF:

1.) Please include/address private sector engagement in the context of payment for ecosystem service arrangements as a key approach to sustainable financing for PA systems in-country.

## Agency Response

**Response10/03/2022**

We added the following paragraph:

Private sector companies will be important stakeholders in discussion on Payment for Ecosystem Services. This engagement will be instrumental as many private sector companies and industries depend on key ecosystem services like the provision of water to the utilities and the agricultural and cattle ranching sectors. The provision of water to cities in the target countries is secured through schemes like the Water Towers in Kenya that use an integrated approach which aims at involving state organizations, local communities and private sector in the management of the supply of water resources. In Colombia there is a Payment for Ecosystem Services scheme in an effort to ensure the provision of water to the sugar cane industry in the Cauca Valley. In Indonesia, there are a number of PES schemes involving water and carbon, that include communities in several districts and involve a range of community and private sector sellers of ecosystem services, non-governmental and private sector intermediary organizations, and both private and public purchasers of ecosystem services. Mexico's Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) program is the combination of two previously separate programs: the Payments for Hydrological Environmental Services Program (PSAH) and the Program of Payments for Carbon, Biodiversity and Agroforestry Services (PSA-CABSA) where the private sector is a stakeholder as providers of the services.

## Risks to Achieving Project Objectives



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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

February 16, 2022 HF:  
Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Coordination**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:  
Comments cleared.

February 16, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please coordinate with WWF-US on a.) GEFID 10916 National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3 (30x30); and b.) WWF's work on Project Finance for Permanence/Enduring Earth that both contain important elements of PA system sustainable financing and policy coherence elements.
- 2.) The country office in Bangkok is still included in this section. As Thailand is no longer included in this project, please redact.
- 3.) Please correct/update the "on-going GEF-financed projects" section as some included projects are long-since closed out.

Agency Response

## **Response10/03/2022**

1. This project will coordinate with GEF 10916 "National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3" that will be addressing direct drivers to protect habitats and species and improve financial sustainability of the global protected area estate. The ICCF project will also coordinate with the Enduring Earth initiative, the partnership between The Nature Conservancy, The Pew Charitable Trusts, World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and ZOMALAB, the family office of Ben and Lucy Ana Walton. The work with WWF and the members of the partnership will be facilitated because the first three institutions are also members of ICCF Conservation Council. The coordination with the two projects will include the discussion on the role of Policy Coherence and Political Consistency in advancing the financial sustainability of the protected areas systems by means of engaging the Legislatures of the Target Countries.

2. We removed Bangkok.

3. We removed those projects mentioned as 'implemented' on the gEF portal.

### **Consistency with National Priorities**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

February 16, 2022 HF:

Cleared

Agency Response

**Knowledge Management**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

February 16, 2022 HF:

Cleared. During PPG please further develop approach to KM with/within Conservation Caucuses nationally/network-wide.

Agency Response

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comments cleared.

February 16, 2022 HF:

Please redact Thailand from ESS analysis.

Agency Response

**Response10/03/2022**

We removed Thailand from SRIF.

**Part III ? Country Endorsements**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 14, 2022 HF:

Comments cleared.

February 17, 2022 HF:

1.) The Mexican OFP has changed as of January 18, 2022, prior to the official submission of this PIF on February 8, 2022, so the current LOE is no longer valid per GEF policy (page 5: [Guidelines on the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy](#) GEF/C.59/Inf.03). Please obtain a new LOE signed by the current GEF OFP for Mexico:

**Mrs. Noemi Hernández Rodríguez Borjas**

Operational Focal Point since 2022-01-18

Director

Ministry of Finance and Public Credit

Insurgentes Sur No. 1971, Torre III, Piso 3, Col. Guadalupe Inn, Alcaldía Álvaro Obregón

Mexico City 01020

Mexico

Tel: +52 5536882616

Email: noemi\_hernandez(AT) hacienda.gob.mx

2.) Please include the country names in the title of the LOEs listed in the Portal so it is clear which one is which.

Agency Response

**Response10/03/2022**

1. A new LoE from Mexico is included with the resubmission.
2. We added the country names.

**Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

**Response10/03/2022**

Response to the comments below:

We will address these at the PPG phase. No action needed at the PIF submission.

## **GEFSEC DECISION**

## **RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

March 28, 2022 HF:

Yes, all comments cleared. MSP is technically recommended by PM.

March 18, 2022 HF:

Please see remaining comments on co-finance, gender and stakeholders.

March 14, 2022 HF:

Yes, this 2-step MSP is recommended for technical clearance.

February 16, 2022 HF:

No, not at this time, please address enclosed comments and resubmit.

## **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

February 15, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please further address core indicator and results framework targets/M&E plan for this project during PPG.
- 2.) Further develop approach to engagement with legislature vs/and executive branch for intended sustainable financing for PA systems in each target country.
- 3.) Given the METT targets for PA system-level financial sustainability, please ensure the proper tracking tool is populated at submission of CEO endorsement request stage.

4.) The Alternative Scenario mentions 'drafting NCA integration roadmaps for the caucuses to agree upon' it is unclear what these are and where they fall in the project's results framework. Please clarify during PPG.

5.) Appendix E contains sections titled: "Opportunities for policy changes to facilitate sustainable financing for PAs" for each of the target countries. Please revise to ensure it is clear how each of the identified opportunities relates back to the project objective of sustainable PA financing.

6.) At CER stage please submit a graphic that shows the institutional arrangement for this project, including the positioning of conservation caucuses/CCN/government ministries etc.

7.) Ensure broad stakeholder engagement is focus of PPG and incorporated into final design.

**Review Dates**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>2/16/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/14/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/18/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/27/2022</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

This is a \$2 million global MSP supported through the GEF-7 BD set aside with UNEP as the GEF implementing Agency and the Conservation Council of Nations (CCN) as the EA. The objective of the project is to *leverage the conservation caucus model to increase the sustainability of funding for protected areas systems*. The project's theory of change is based on the premise that legislators play an important role in the sustainable financing of protected areas systems and that by engaging and building political will for protected areas and natural capital accounting amongst policy-makers, protected areas systems will receive greater central government allocations and enabling legislation for innovative funding models involving public and private sectors,

increasing the overall sustainability of financing for protected areas at the system level, with input from key stakeholders, including the executive branches.

The project will take a system-wide approach to protected areas financing, recognizing that each protected area system functions differently and will therefore pursue a country-by-country approach to defining and designing the specific activities and interventions for each target country, including Colombia, Mexico, Kenya, and Indonesia. The project will leverage the conservation caucus model to bridge silos in government by raising awareness amongst legislators and the executive on natural capital accounting assessments and innovative conservation finance tools along with specific legislative opportunities to enhance the sustainability of funding for protected areas through action at the federal level and/or by creating enabling conditions through policy to more effectively leverage external financing from the public and private sectors. These countries have been specifically selected due to the strength of their conservation caucuses and Secretariats on the ground to support project outcomes, as well as their potential to be models for other countries in their respective regions on sustainable protected areas finance.

The project will have three components: 1.) Build and enhance legislative awareness and political will for protected area systems in pilot countries; 2.) Increase central government allocations and external financial contributions to support biodiversity conservation in protected areas systems; and 3.) Knowledge Management, Sharing, and Communications including capturing best practices for NCAA integration into financing for protected areas systems.

The project is targeting at least 8,400 beneficiaries and will be validating and refining a 10% increase in a "Financial Sustainability of PA Systems" scorecard. Further metrics, M&E planning and target setting will be undertaken in PPG.

The spread of COVID-19 globally presents a risk to project activities and outcomes. The prevention of in-person activities due to travel restrictions and event mandates could force activities to be held virtually, reducing the effectiveness in building relationships between legislatures and stakeholders in public and private sectors. Additionally, the economic and health impacts from COVID-19 will create competing priorities for federal budget, constituting a potential risk to project outputs. However, COVID-19 has had global impacts that could create opportunities for the project, as well, by revealing the importance of ecosystem services provided by protected areas. The pandemic's zoonotic origins revealed the critical linkage between human health and biodiversity conservation and the rise in demand for nature-based tourism during the pandemic has revealed the potential of protected areas to support economic development. The global shift to virtual interactions over the course of the last year will both strengthen the impact of in-person caucus activities, while also allowing stakeholders that are unable to engage in-person to participate virtually, maximizing the benefits of project activities.