

# National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10916

**Countries**

Global

**Project Name**

National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3

**Agencies**

WWF-US

**Date received by PM**

1/6/2022

**Review completed by PM**

2/8/2022

**Program Manager**

Hannah Fairbank

**Focal Area**

Biodiversity

**Project Type**

MSP

## CEO Approval Request

### Part I ? Project Information

**1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

March 1, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 23, 2022 HF:

1.) Please revise the expected implementation start date, end date and expected implementation duration (up to 18 mos).

#### **Agency Response**

03/01/2022

The CER has been adjusted to reflect a new start date of 3/31/2022 and end date of 30 September 2023 for an overall project duration of 18 months.

**2. Project description summary. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

#### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

March 1, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 7, 2022 HF:

1.) through 5 cleared.

6.) Cleared though 60 pages w/out annexes is on the very outer limits of what would be a useful guide, a more succinct "how-to" is desirable.

7.) through 11 cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

- 1.) The selection criteria in the MSP text focuses on institutional and organizational elements only. These are necessary but insufficient given the nature of the planning. Please also include inclusion/balance of LDCs, SIDs, megadiverse, geographic/ecological balance etc.
- 2.) Since the five countries have been selected-but not yet finalized-it seems to make sense to describe the 5 countries the MSP will support, how they were chosen and why, and then how their experience will be the most replicable going forward-with the caveat that these are not yet confirmed/finalized. This material/justification might also be helpful in communications with governments regarding project engagement.
- 3.) Suggest simplifying/changing title to: National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3.
- 4.) Selection criteria: suggest replacing "in the short" before project timeframe with "within the"
- 5.) Please be specific on how relevant line ministries will be engaged in planning and dissemination/uptake of plan (including: identified financing gaps specific to plans, subsidy identification/reform etc with min of planning, finance, agriculture etc) with a view towards narrowing the financing gap by reducing drivers of nature loss and filling the gap by securing an increase in public funding.
- 6.) Output 1.1.1: Please ensure the themes of "clear language and practical guidance/recommendations" are prominent.
- 7.) Table under Activity 2: Suggest including "Data access and availability" for/within each country under "Factors affecting Target 3".
- 8.) Activity 4: Producing 5 national plans: Overview text: Third to last bullet should clearly include government from each country. Also all of these bullets seem to focus on the results of the analyses and baseline assessment but critically also needs to include the actual **synthesis-The Plan** for how the country, given what we have learned from the baseline work, intends to meet/exceed GBF Target 3-and specifically HOW. Please make sure this is very clear endpoint for each of the plans. Just want to ensure that we don't miss the forest for the trees in this. The analysis is important, but not at the cost of action-oriented planning which is really the desired outcome here.
- 9.) Outcome 2.1: Is there a way to incorporate a bit of uptake of the ?knowledge? produced as opposed to just having the outcome as the production of the knowledge?
- 10.) Output 2.1.2: In the output description, and in the KM section, please be specific on concrete platforms and fora?s through which dissemination may happen effectively.
- 11.) Output 2.1.1 after 'representatives' please add 'to communicate results' [at the...] in Table B. Also, please note that June 2022 is TBC for the GEF Assembly so please include that caveat as it may be delayed.

- 

## **Agency Response**

03/01/2022

6) This is understood. Language has been incorporated in the Table B description of Output 1.1.1 to emphasize that the guide will be a 'concise, user-friendly "how-to" guide. Language has also been added in the description of Output 1.1.1, so that it now reads: "The concise, user-friendly "how-to" guide will be produced in an easily accessible format in clear language; contain practical guidance and recommendations; be under 60 pages long (this is an upper limit; including annexes); be produced in English, and translated into at least French and Spanish."

02/07/2022

1) Inclusion/balance of LDCs, SIDS, megadiverse, geographic/ecological balance have been added to the list of selection criteria at the start of the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section.

2) Shortlisted countries the project will support include Ecuador, Guyana, Mexico, Namibia, and Nepal. The countries were chosen to represent GEF client countries, including and balancing across LDCs, SIDS, diverse geographies, biomes, and also for their potential for IPLC and/or OECM integration into Target 3 plans. Additionally, the selected countries represent a spectrum of places from those that are already international leaders to places that have further to go towards planning for/delivering Target 3 Other factors considered in country selection have included: government willingness to champion this work and present the work (e.g. at GEF Assembly, tbd), local capacity, political stability, membership in the High Ambition Coalition, existing relationships between civil society and government to get this work done, and countries that have the capacity to influence others and/or lead on IPLC issues. The inclusion of these five countries in the project has been discussed with the five country governments, but is pending confirmation with the technical ministries and OFPs, and as such, are not listed in the CER. Final confirmation of the five countries will come in early project implementation. The process and criteria are described at the start of the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section.

3) The CER title has been revised to use the suggested title: National Planning for an Inclusive and Effective Conservation Approach to Reaching Global Biodiversity Framework Target 3.

4) Edit made as suggested in the selection criteria at the start of the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section. The sentence now reads: Government willingness to generate plans for Target 3 within the project timeframe.

5) The following paragraph has been added in the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section, for Output 1.1.2 after the bullet points in Activity 2 "During the baseline

data and gaps assessment, to complement the review process described above, interviews with key stakeholders (e.g., line ministries, national and international NGOs, and Indigenous People) will be conducted by national consultants in each country to identify non publicly available or missing data on the four gaps." And a few additional sentences in the table under Activity 2 to address this comment "Identify financial gaps specific to strategic plans" and "Identify additional reforms and policies that are barriers to the implementation of Target 3".

6) Suggested changes made in the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section, for Output 1.1.1. The sentence now reads: "The guide will be produced in an easily accessible format, in clear language, contain practical guidance and recommendations, be under 60 pages long (not including annexes), be produced in English, and translated into at least French and Spanish."

7) Edit made as suggested in the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section, for Output 1.1.2, Activity 2. "Data access and availability" has been included under "Factors affecting Target 3" in the middle column (concerning barriers) of the table under Activity 2.

8) Government has been included in the third to last bullet under Activity 4 in the in the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section, for Output 1.1.2. The following has been included in the second to last paragraph of Activity 4 to speak specifically to the plans for how each country intends to meet/exceed GBF Target 3, given what has been learned from the baseline work. "CSF will conduct literature reviews, online research, and interviews with key stakeholders to identify the gaps. Additional interviews will be conducted to assess the appropriateness of the collected data and to guarantee that the gaps analysis process is inclusive. As a result of these activities, CSF will write and share a document with WWF country offices and WWF US. This document (one for each country) will contain a description of the baseline, a summary of the missing data, and a set of recommendations regarding the data and analysis that would need to be done to close the identified gaps and support the implementation of Target 3. The information in this report will be used by WWF country offices as input when writing the national plans. Based on CSF's reports and the stakeholder engagement process in the five countries, WWF will be in charge of writing national plans, including recommendations about how to meet / and exceed Target 3 and a roadmap to achieve that goal. The stakeholder engagement in this process will also be key to identifying the national level's planning actions to meet/exceed Target 3."

9) Text has been added in the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section for Outcome 2.1 and Output 2.1.2 to better link the products from Component 1 (the guide and the national plans) with uptake through the project, and uptake of the guide and national plans has also been reflected in the section on scaling up (section 1.a.7). Beyond this, it is beyond the scope of the project to ensure the uptake of the knowledge produced.

10) Changes have been made in the description of Output 2.1.2 to give specifics on how dissemination will happen, which may include through the in-country stakeholder

engagement meetings/workshops, emails to key rights-holders and stakeholders (including the people who attended the consultative processes), national level in person or virtual information sharing sessions, and/or the development of multimedia products to share the plans. The guide will be shared in country and also globally disseminated through an online event on Zoom at the end of the project, as well as made available on the GEF ([www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org)) and WWF ([www.worldwildlife.org](http://www.worldwildlife.org)) websites respectively. In addition, the GBF Target 3 GEF Project will coordinate and build off some existing best-practice and wide-reaching knowledge sharing platforms to disseminate results. This includes exploring the potential to develop synergies with other GEF-supported, World Bank managed programs ? Global Wildlife Program, Food Systems, Land Use and Restoration (FOLUR) Impact Program, and Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program, as well as IW Learn ? which all host frequent, well attended webinars.

The same revisions have been made in the KM section.

11) The suggested change has been made to the output language in Table B and the narrative such that it now reads: Output 2.1.1: Capacity support and presentation materials for use by country representatives to communicate results at the GEF Assembly in June 2022. Additionally, a sentence was added in the description of 2.1.1 to note that Assembly may be delayed, and throughout the GEF Assembly is noted as TBD.

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

#### **Agency Response NA**

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

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

All cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please include a placeholder for counterpart government co-financing (presumed it would be at least in-kind recurrent expenditures) or at least please plan to track in project reporting.
- 2.) Given CSF is the executing agency for this project it is surprising there is no co-finance contribution included. Can some in-kind/recurrent expenditures at least be expected?
- 3.) Please describe generally what the over \$3 million in 'recurrent expenditures' in co-finance from WWF is/contains as it is a bit surprising to have that much staff time (over

\$600,000 in staff time for each country plan?) and if that isn't what it is, but it is all recurrent (vs. investment mobilized) please explain or revise.

### **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

1) Given the country selection has not been finalized, the team will aim to track and report on counterpart government co-financing at the end of the project period.

2) Now added to the co-finance table C, CSF has provided a co-finance letter for \$20,000.00 for staff time not covered under the budget.

3) Agreed that the co-finance was too high to be replicable, and it included grants funds supporting 30x30 initiatives rather than only supporting this specific project. As such, the co-finance from WWF-US (including the country offices in the 5 countries) has been redrawn as direct co-finance support to deliver this project. The WWF US Co-finance will cover the staff time from WWF's Earth for Life team not under the Project Management Unit, who will spend small percentages of time providing guidance, advice, and support during implementation of this project. Included in the co-finance is WWF Country Directors that will work with their technical staff on stakeholder and government agency engagement, and guiding through different project components, as needed.

**5. GEF resource availability. 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 CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response** NA

STAR allocation?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** NA

**Agency Response** NA

Focal Area allocation?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes.

**Agency Response** NA

LDCE under the principle of equitable access?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

NA

**Agency Response** NA  
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** NA

**Agency Response** NA  
Focal Area Set Aside?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** Yes. BD set-aside.

**Agency Response** NA  
Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** NA

**Agency Response** NA  
6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**  
January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes. PPG grant amount included.

**Agency Response** NA  
7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** NA

**Agency Response** NA  
8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** January 14, 2022 HF:  
Yes

**Agency Response** NA  
9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?

## **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request** January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

### **Agency Response** NA

#### **Part II ? Project Justification**

**1. Project Description. Is there sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

## **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Barriers: suggest including a brief statement regarding the implication of each of these barriers.
- 2.) The issue of policy incoherence needs to be clearly addressed as a barrier (e.g. the 'left hand is working against the right' in all sorts of ways-contradictory planning/policy/concessions/subsidies-resulting in nature loss and ever increasing the financing and actions it will take to achieve GBF T3 regardless of how innovative we are at 'conservation finance').

### **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

- 1) A new body of text has been added at the end of the Barriers section (section 1.a.1 part iv) to describe the implications of not addressing each barrier effectively.
- 2) The following text, in bold has been added to Barrier 5 in the barrier section: "Yet in-country legal and policy frameworks and related institutional arrangements are not necessarily sufficient or adequate to facilitate what is required, and this can result in ?policy incoherence?; i.e., when the government?s diverse stated aims are not fully aligned, including where policies support both subsidies to biodiversity damaging and plans to achieve biodiversity targets." Also, the sub-heading for Barrier 5 has been adjusted to read: "Policy incoherence hinders progressive approaches to Target 3".

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

## **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:  
Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

1.) In the baseline section be specific and mention existing regional plans and frameworks relevant to the selected countries. This is to insure that, wherever relevant, plans and frameworks help inform national level planning with a view of securing e.g., critical links between marine fish stocks, their migratory patterns, key national or transboundary habitats etc. As an example, both Mexico and Guyana have endorsed the CLME+ SAP (2015-2025) containing agreed upon priority strategies and actions required to improve the transboundary governance and management of shared living marine resources. Likewise, both Ecuador and Guyana have endorsed the Amazon Strategic Action Programme focusing on Integrated and Sustainable Management of transboundary Water Resources in the Amazon River Basin. Special care should be taken to reflect experiences from including regional priority strategies and actions into the guide developed under output 1.1.1.

2.) In the baseline for knowledge management (and in KM section) please include IW Learn and FOLUR as potential GEF funded platforms for dissemination.

### **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

1) Given that the five countries have not yet been finalized, information on existing regional plans and frameworks relevant to the selected countries has not been added. However, some examples of regional plans and frameworks have been added to the baseline section (1.a.2) and the project team will identify such plans and frameworks in implementation and ensure they inform the national plans.

2) IW Learn and FOLUR have been added as potential GEF funded platforms for dissemination in the text in Baseline for knowledge management and in the KM section (and noted in the description of Output 2.1.2).

**3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF  
All clear.

January 14, 2022 HF:

1.) The anticipated five plans needs to be endorsed at the relevant government level for them to become implementable. Realizing this is a small/short-term project with resources spread across five countries, please include in as an element of the plan the details for

future government endorsement of the anticipated plans. This point of course also relates to the country led presentations of plans at the assembly.

2.) Please be more specific on the point of cross sector coordination as a key element when shifting subsidy schemes etc. toward nature positive outcomes. Indirectly, the key deliverables of this MSP could contribute towards devising roadmaps for achieving net zero emissions by 2050. This point could feature more prominently in the Proposed Alternative Scenario section and in the ToC section.

3.) Throughout the project design and documentation please ensure that the issue of financing clearly includes at least these three elements: a.) Identifying the financing gap; 2.) Narrowing the financing gap (e.g. decreasing subsidies that support nature loss and increasing policy coherence for conservation) and; 3.) Filling the gap (e.g. domestic resource mobilization, innovative finance etc). The table under Activity 2 that contains "Gaps" "Activities" "Specific Activities/Goals" should also reflect these.

4.) Theory of Change: Good articulation but please 'take it home' in terms of articulating the expected results and impact that will ultimately be achieved if the plans are developed, and followed. Understanding that the "end state" of this limited MSP is an important step in that direction.

•

## **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

1) The following text has been added in the description of Output 1.1.2, Activity 4, in the section on Components, Outcomes and Outputs, to speak to this point: "The respective national government agencies will be core partners of each of the national processes and the project team will draw on government progress and priorities. The work aims to advance the existing status of national progress on area-based conservation and result in inclusively developed and scientifically-based plans. The executing agency and partners (WWF-US, WWF country offices, CSF) will work at the beginning of the project to understand in each country the respective processes for national level 'sign off' on those plans so that those related processes can be planned for from the start, and included as an element of the individual plans. It is aimed to deliver by the end of the project five GBF Target 3 plans that have been agreed by the relevant national-level bodies, such that they may be endorsed after the project period, and so they can be acted upon expeditiously."

2) A sentence has been added to address this comment at the end of Point 5 at the start of the section on Proposed Alternative Scenarios (section 1.a.3): "Key to repurposing harmful subsidies is also the coordination among different sectors in the economy and potentially a paradigm change in some traditional sectors (e.g., agriculture and mining)."

Section Theory of Change - An additional sentence was included at the end of Point 5 in this section: "Coordination among different sectors is also crucial to increase the

probability that the necessary institutional reforms to achieve or exceed Target 3 are implemented."

In the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs section, language has been added to Output 1.1.2 Activity 1 describing the consultative planning processes. [Inclusive consultation activities] "will include a stakeholder analysis at an early stage, with direct linkages to the project Stakeholder Engagement Plan that recognizes, among other things, the importance of cross sector coordination as a consideration in the development of comprehensive plans, particularly in the context of shifting subsidy schemes toward nature positive outcomes."

3) The following paragraph has been added to the description of Output 1.1.2, Activity 2 to address this comment and be more explicit/clear about the goals in Phase I and Phase II. "The activities and goals described in the table above will be conducted in Phase I. The main goal of this first phase is to identify the financial gap and current and future potential sources that would help close the financial gap. Recommendations based on this data assessment and the other gaps (e.g., enabling conditions) will be made, but no quantitative analysis will be conducted in this phase. In the second phase, because of the short timeframe, countries - through an inclusive and collaborative process - will decide which one of the four gaps should be prioritized for an in-depth quantitative analysis. If countries prioritize the financial gap, the analysis in the second phase should focus on the elements mentioned, especially (2) narrowing the financial gap and (3) filling the gap." "Identify financial gaps specific to strategic plans" has been added to the table under Activity 2 in Specific activities/goals.

4) The Theory of Change (section 1.a.3) has been edited and language added to the final paragraph so it now reads: "Overall, if GBF Target 3 plans are developed with a keen focus on inclusive conservation and conservation effectiveness, and based on comprehensive data, then countries will be in an optimum position to work towards either achieving or exceeding GBF Target 3 in ways that are rights-based, equitable and achieve the in-situ conservation of important biodiversity, ecological connectivity and climate resilience in systems of PAs and OECMs across landscapes, seascapes and river-basins. Taken together, the GBF Target 3 plans will establish an inclusive and scientifically sound basis for working towards Target 3, in ways that will deliver equitable and effective conservation outcomes."

**4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

**Agency Response** NA

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

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

**Agency Response** NA

**6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

**Agency Response** NA

**7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

**Agency Response** NA

**8. Project Map and Coordinates. Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Clear

January 14, 2022 HF:

Please also note that this is not a 'site-based' project.

**Agency Response**

02/07/2022

Language has been added to specify that this is not a site-based project.

**9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

#### **Agency Response NA**

**10. Stakeholders. Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Please be sure to include OFPs of 5 countries in "government" category of stakeholder (as well as CBD focal points and other line ministries across-sectors).
- 2.) List of NGOs includes the "World Conservation Society"-is this a typo? If so, please correct to "Wildlife Conservation Society"

#### **Agency Response**

02/06/2022

1) OFPs for the governments of the five countries participating in the project have been added to the project stakeholders table in Section 3 of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan supporting document.

2) This was a typo. The error in the project stakeholders table in Section 3 of the Stakeholder Engagement Plan supporting document has been corrected.

**11. Gender equality and women's empowerment. Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

1.) Please also include a discussion of **the barriers** to women's empowerment and engagement (e.g. overburdened with labor both within and outside the home, lack of child care etc. e.g. even if she is invited to participate she can't and won't), the removal of which can be transformational in some cases for gender equality and women's empowerment.

## **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

1) The language below summarizing findings from the Gender Analysis has been added to Section 3 on Gender Equality to address this comment. Section 4 of the Gender Mainstreaming Action Plan supporting document, contains more information on project-specific gender information and considerations.

"The gender analysis provided several observations:

**Roles & Responsibilities:** Men, on average, play a larger role than women in the commercial exploitation of natural resources, because women also devote time to domestic activities (i.e., cooking, water and fuelwood collection, childcare, etc.). Women frequently have responsibilities for natural resource management but no rights to them.

**Access & Control Over Resources:** Men and women have different rights to access and control over natural resources such as land and forests. Women have generally faced more restrictions, particularly in terms of independent ownership and access to land. Due to a lack of land and other constraints, women have fewer opportunities to obtain credit and support services, unless these are specifically designed to address women's disadvantages.

**Decision Making:** Women have historically had fewer opportunities to participate in environmental decision-making. As a result, when policies are designed, their perceptions and interests are sometimes ignored or excluded. The lack of opportunities is frequently due to cultural constraints, women's lack of education, and logistical reasons in other cases.

Additionally, women are over-represented in interpretive, communicative, and administrative roles. In contrast, men are over-represented in positions that require more leadership, risk-taking, or involve fieldwork. Women also perform more unrelated office housekeeping tasks, such as taking notes and organizing and coordinating events, that are unrelated to their core responsibilities. This frequently results in women performing lower-status tasks rather than taking on roles such as scientific experts and decision-makers, which are more highly valued and visible in these organizations. All this impacts how conservation and natural resource management work and research are carried out, such as which research questions are asked, which work is prioritized, and who is taken into account.

**Knowledge Base:** Women's and men's knowledge of how to use natural resources may differ as a result of differences in activities and access. Differences in knowledge between

men and women are also influenced by their social class, age, and ethnic group. Women frequently have intimate knowledge of their resources, but a lack of formal education prevents them from participating in projects. Women are excluded from conservation projects due to a lack of literacy, financial literacy, experience, and confidence in tools and technologies that specific efforts and resources must be targeted.

**12. Private sector engagement. If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

1.) Given the nature of GBF T3 and what it will take for countries to reach it, the private sector should be fully included as not only a stakeholder but a player that will have considerable influence-either/both as an 'opportunity' and 'risk' to achieving T3. Further the role of the private sector in sustainable conservation finance should also be included. Please revise section to be more proactive and inclusive of PS at all levels (including international supply chains that have prominent impact and influence on the ground).

### **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

The following language has been added to Section 4, Private Sector Engagement to address the comment raised. "In addition, the national-level plans will highlight the importance of direct private sector actions in achieving Target 3, including their role as potential contributors (e.g. directly through improved business practices to promote sustainability in their supply chains; the development of new financial mechanisms) and barriers to the achievement of Target 3. Similarly, by highlighting the economic and financial benefits and co-benefits of conservation and the risks and costs associated with declining biodiversity, both in the short and long runs, plans will facilitate governments to address perverse subsidies and thereby incentivize the private sector to adopt more sustainable practices."

**13. Risk. Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

## **Agency Response NA**

**14. Coordination. Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

March 1, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 23, 2022 HF:

1.) The project Information section, indicates that the Executing Entity is Conservation Strategy Fund, whereas under Section 6 (Institutional arrangements), the project is self-executed by WWF-US with sub-grant to Conservation Strategy Fund and other WWF country offices. Please correct the inconsistency between the narrative in Section 6 (which states WWF as the executing entity) and the executing entity in Project information.

January 14, 2022 HF:

- 1.) GEF Project Manager and GPU Manager approve the 'self-execution' of this project as it is clearly necessary and justified.
- 2.) Please revise steering committee language to clarify that GEF Secretariat will sit on the Steering Committee rather than "likely to".
- 3.) Please include 5 target country governments in Figure 1 to clarify their placement and role in project institutional arrangement (Figure 1 and the project budget seem to depict that no financing will flow to Government line agencies, is this the case? Regardless they should be clearly included in institutional arrangement). Please see related comment on co-finance.

## **Agency Response**

03/01/2022

1) The project information table has been adjusted so that WWF-US is listed as both Lead GEF Agency and "Other Executing Partner," resolving the noted discrepancy between that table and Section 6 on Institutional Arrangements & Coordination.

A new subheading and text has been added in the Institutional Arrangements & Coordination section: "Related GEF Projects" which specifies the following: The PMU will engage other related GEF-funded projects, including a) UNEP-GEF ?Enhancing Political Will for Sustainable Protected Area Financing, and b) UNEP-GEF ?Policy Coherence and Political Consistency to Achieve Tangible and Durable Results in Conservation Areas for People and Livelihoods.?

02/07/2022

2) The description of the Project Steering Committee under Section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination has been amended so it reads: "Partners will include WWF US, CSF leadership, WWF Country Office leadership, a GEF Secretariat representative, and a representative of the the Indigenous Peoples Advisory Group."

3) Figure 1 in Section 6. Institutional Arrangement has been updated to reflect government agency role.

**15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

May also consider the contributions of meeting GBF T3 to NDCs and meeting commitments under other relevant MEAs.

### **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

Policies such as Nationally Determined Contributions and Multilateral Environmental Agreements will be considered when analyzing the factors affecting Target 3 in the gaps analysis.

The following sentences have been added in the table under Output 1.1.2 Activity 2: "Conduct interviews and desk research to identify the main barriers (e.g., laws, policies, subsidies, and institutional arrangements) that prevent Target 3 from being achieved, as well as policies that contribute to achieving Target 3 (e.g., Nationally Determined Contributions and Multilateral Environmental Agreements)." And, in the same table, under Specific activities/goals, is now included "Identify reforms and policies that contribute to achieving or exceeding Target 3".

**16. Knowledge management. Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

Suggest including a reference to using the materials and capacity built for the event at the GEF Assembly as a basis for a potential (TBD) event at COP-15 in Kunming.

## **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

The following sentence has been added in Section 8 on KM: "In addition, the resources developed through this project, including the materials and capacity built for the event at GEF Assembly (TBD) could be drawn upon for a potential event at CBD COP 15, although direct support at an event there falls outside the scope of this project."

**17. Monitoring and Evaluation. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

## **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

February 7, 2022 HF:

Cleared.

January 14, 2022 HF:

Please include a budget for the M&E plan.

## **Agency Response**

02/07/2022

We have included a table for the M&E budget for the M&E added.

**18. Benefits. Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBS or adaptation benefits?**

## **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

## **Agency Response NA**

**19. Annexes:**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

## **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

## **Agency Response NA**

**20. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS):**

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

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

**Agency Response NA**

**Project Results Framework**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

**Agency Response NA**

**GEF Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

**Council comments**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

**STAP comments**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

**Convention Secretariat comments**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

**Other Agencies comments**

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

CSOs comments

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

Status of PPG utilization

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

**Agency Response NA**

Project maps and coordinates

**Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

January 14, 2022 HF:

Yes

**Agency Response NA**

Part III ? Country and Agency Endorsements

**1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request**

March 1, 2022 HF:

Comment cleared. Please see email correspondence between GEFSEC PM and WWF-US dated 02/23/22 confirming that LOEs are required prior to in-country activities.

February 23, 2022 HF:

- 1.) Prior to undertaking in-country activities please provide Letters of Endorsement from the OFPs.
- 2.) Please include the following language in the second paragraph of the LOEs for OFP signature that clearly indicates the implementation/execution arrangement for the project:  
"I am pleased to endorse the implementation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Agency listed below. As approved, the proposal will be prepared, implemented,

and executed by WWF-US. I request the GEF Agency to provide a copy of the project document as approved by the GEF Secretariat."

### **Agency Response**

03/01/2022

This is noted and has been acted upon.

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

NA

### **Agency Response**

NA

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

### **Agency Response NA**

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)**

### **Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA**

### **Agency Response NA**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

#### **1. RECOMMENDATION.**

**Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?**

### **Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request**

March 1, 2022 HF:

Yes, CEO approval of this MSP is recommended.

February 23, 2022 HF:

Please address remaining comments regarding Table A, country endorsement and institutional arrangement.

February 7, 2022 HF:

Yes CEO endorsement of this one-step MSP is recommended.

#### Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	1/14/2022	2/7/2022
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	2/8/2022	3/1/2022
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	2/23/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	3/1/2022	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The draft UNCBD post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) builds on the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and sets out an ambitious plan to implement broad-based action to bring about a transformation in society's relationship with biodiversity, ensuring that by 2050 the shared vision of "living in harmony with nature" is fulfilled. The framework's theory of change assumes that transformative actions are taken to deploy solutions to reduce threats to biodiversity. Actions should ensure that biodiversity is used sustainably to meet people's needs. The Framework comprises 21 targets and 10 "milestones" proposed for 2030, en route to "living in harmony with nature" by 2050.

Action Target 3 of the GBF outlines an ambitious objective for protection of land and sea by 2030: *Ensure that at least 30 per cent globally of land areas and of sea areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and its contributions to people, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.*

The objective of this project is to *support country planning to inclusively and effectively meet or exceed GBF Target 3*. Under component 1 project partners will develop an easily accessible guide to developing inclusive and effective national level plans to achieve Target 3. The project will support a series of in-country consultations and workshops with a wide range of stakeholders relating to GBF Target 3 to discuss local-to-national level priorities, review data, gaps analysis and develop national plans with five countries (countries will be identified based on criteria during project implementation). As part of this, project partners will support assessment and documentation of baseline data and gaps assessment relating to enabling conditions for Target 3, setting out what exists and what additional data are required to support work towards Target 3. This will support an inclusive analysis of those findings to address selected, prioritized data or knowledge gaps. These activities and output will feed into broader multi-stakeholder consultations about local-to-national priorities for Target 3, designed to be inclusive, with a focus on right-based approaches to conservation, and to plan for effective, connected and climate resilient systems of PAs and OECMs. This will result in 5 national plans for achieving or exceeding GBF Target 3. Component 2 will provide capacity support, and KM products and dissemination for scaling-up national planning for GBF Target 3, including support to country representatives for presentation of country plans at the 7<sup>th</sup> GEF Assembly.

The project provides a strong opportunity for scaling up. The guide to national planning will be widely disseminated for use by all countries for potential uptake to build their own Target 3 plans, as well as the 5 country plans as examples for other countries to replicate through their own national process. Policy coherence and domestic resource mobilization, both addressed in this project, will add to sustainability and scaling up.

The COVID risks identified include: Availability of technical expertise and capacity, and changes in timelines; Stakeholder Engagement Process; Potential for reduced government focus on the environment during the COVID-19 crisis; and Reduced co-financing availability. The project design has taken each of these into account and incorporates mitigation measures for each.

WWF-US is the GEF implementing agency with Conservation Strategy Fund (CSF) as the executing agency. The GEF-7 trust fund amount is \$2,180,000 of BD set-aside and \$343,246 in co-finance with further country co-finance expected. Core indicators result targets 5000 direct beneficiaries.