



GEF-7 GWP Global Coordination Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10647

Countries

Global

Project Name

GEF-7 GWP Global Coordination Project

Agencies

World Bank

Date received by PM

8/11/2020

Review completed by PM

2/3/2021

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

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

August 26, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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 August 26, 2020 HF: Yes, the project description summary in the ProDoc is clear and the project structure/design appropriate to achieve expected outcomes/outputs.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

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

August 25, 2020 HF:

1. It looks like the ICCWC co-financing is for their 2016-2020 strategy period, is that correct (as stated in the CER and footnote of the co-financing letter)? Or is it for 2020-2023 (as stated in the co-financing letter)? Please clarify. If the co-financing is for the current strategy period that would mean that there would only be a couple of months of overlap between this GWP project and that

funding/strategy period which raises the question of whether this could really be co-finance for the project. Is there additional co-finance expected from ICCWC that will directly contribute to the outcomes and timeframe of the GWP global project? Please clarify/explain.

2-3-21 AM: Thanks for the explanation. Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: Although it is supporting the 2016-2020 strategic program, the funding for the efforts was significantly delayed and the majority of the funding is still to be spent (less than 20% of the total funding committed has been spent so far, so the co-financing funding is relevant at least through 2023). During implementation further cofinancing options will continue to be explored as part of partnerships and collaborative actions.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

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 August 25, 2020 HF:

Confirming that no PPG funds were requested/utilized for the GWP global child project.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted.

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

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

August 25, 2020 HF:

Given the global project aggregates and reports on GEF core indicators from the GWP-II national child projects, how is duplicative reporting/accounting by GWP avoided?

2-9-21 AM: Current targets for GEF Core Indicators are the sum of the child project targets, which means double counting. Also, all IP coordination projects are supposed to have additional impact above and beyond the sum of the child projects, please take this into consideration while revising the core indicators table. Thanks!

2-17-21 AM: Table revised and rationale provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted comment. Thank you. The CI target values reflecting the national CP aggregate were reported based on earlier GEF recommendations. In line with the comment now and that the Global Coordination Project, as a technical assistance grant, does not have direct investments on the ground to contribute to the GWP core indicators, the target values for the CI 1,3, 4, 6 have been removed from the GEF CER/Data sheet and the Core Indicator Worksheet (revised document attached). We hope this will help avoid the confusion and any potential duplication. Beneficiaries reported are expected to benefit from the training, capacity building, knowledge and monitoring technical assistance provided to CPs through the coordination mechanisms.

It is also important to clarify that the global coordination grant is more than the sum of its parts as it provides the needed glue/coordination both regionally & globally (technical assistance, knowledge and monitoring support), which the national level CPs by themselves cannot achieve under a global program. This point on contribution of the Global grant to CIs was extensively discussed at the PFD approval stage in 2019, and it was both agreed and then approved by the GEF Council that given the nature of GEF-7 GWP which unlike other GEF-7 IPs, did not receive incentive funding (to leverage additional activities on the ground), no PPG to support additional baseline work and, as a continuum to the earlier GEF-6 GWP, would not require to report additional CI values. Notably, going forward the GEF-7 coordination grant activities will support the GEF-6 national CPs in addition to the approved GEF -7 cohort of countries for M&E purposes.

As presented the project remains aligned with the approved GEF-7 PFD and its indicator targets.

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: As designed and agreed at the time of conception, the Global coordination project does not have direct investments on the ground to contribute to the core focal area indicator targets. The global project will collate, and aggregate data provided across national projects at baseline, mid-term, and end of the project. There is no duplicative reporting. Also given the evolution of the GEF-7 programming objectives from the GEF-6 objectives, the Global project will continue to monitor the core indicators for each cohort of countries respectively. Annex 5 of the project document presents the core indicators of the two phases in the manner they will be tracked.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request August 28, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.
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 August 31, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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 August 31, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 27, 2020 HF:

Component 1: Please provide a clear articulation upfront of the Project's approach to supporting national projects, and the sector(s) more broadly, in addressing the impacts of COVID-19 on WBE in paras 26 and 29 of the ProDoc and commensurate section of the CER. From the outset we need a clear picture of the (currently understood and generalized) impacts of the pandemic on possibilities for WBE (particularly NBT) and how the project is going to approach it. Of course it is not possible to know everything now, but a more nuanced and clear integration and treatment of the issue is required given the focus of this component on WBE and predominantly NBT in Africa. The text includes reference to the pandemic but somewhat still reads like this component and proposed activities are operating a bit in a pre-COVID context. Then please explicitly reflect that approach fully into Components 1 and 2 and activities therein (Analytics and PPPs). Also-please see Anna Spensley's recent work and presentation on NBT and COVID.

1.) Sub component 1.1:

a.) The first activities reads: "The effort will be to increase dissemination and knowledge of existing tools and resources, rather than initiating new studies on issues already covered previously." Isn't the dissemination and outreach of analytics/studies/reports already budgeted for in GEF-6? And if not it isn't clear why this wouldn't be considered a core knowledge management activity rather than "analytical study"-and likely has differing budget implications as well.

b.) "Conduct a new analysis (including as complements to ongoing WB efforts in PROGREEN, Global Program on Sustainability (GPS), and FOLUR) with a focus on conservation economics, legal/regulatory assessments governing NBT in countries, and financing to private sector and communities to stimulate new sector investments." Any ideas for what this new analysis would focus on? It is unclear from what is written here. Given the prominence and impacts of COVID-19 on both WBE and IWT and the possibility of a greener recovery it seems like this should be considered for a medium or longer-term area of analysis-depending on what the analytical needs are down the road (noting that lots of recent/immediate term analysis is coming out on pandemic impacts etc).

C.) What does "including as complements to ongoing WB efforts in PROGREEN, Global Program on Sustainability (GPS), and FOLUR" mean practically? And what will be the process for determining the focus of this analytical product?

2.) Sub-component 1.2:

#34:

a.) Please reword "A focused assessment of a needs-based targeted research on innovative financing and insurance mechanisms used in other sectors (i.e. infrastructure, health, etc.) to consider application for the WBE sector" for clarity.

b.) Please further elaborate final bullet point and explain what the expected outcome of this effort will be. The research and some of the feasibility work will be done, but it isn't clear what then? Is the intention to actually work to develop and launch one of these mechanisms? Or pass off the analytics and hope that it is taken up?

c.) Footnote 23 is unclear. How is this linked to #34 and what does "linked to" mean in this context?

3.) Sub-component 2.1: As mentioned above, please address the pandemic in Component 2 as well-including it as an important dynamic in the "Overview" paragraph #35.

a.) #38: AML assistance. Please clarify how GEF funds will be used to support AML activities in GWP countries, in particular parsing out the first bullet that begins: "global dialogue participation." It seems to lump a bunch of different potential ideas/activities together some of which seem clear and well justified but could be developed a bit further (integration of IWT into financial sector FATF activities) and others of which seem less of a priority (promotion of GWP and international meetings?)

b.) #39. Anti-corruption support: It is unclear why/how sponsoring participation in the IUCN WCC is a high-priority anti-corruption activity and included in this sub-component. Please explain/justify or remove/move. I would expect that participation in this type of event could be justified elsewhere in the project/budget but it isn't clear why this would be considered a key activity to support anti-corruption IWT efforts.

4.) Sub-component 2.2

a.) Donor coordination: Please ensure close coordination with GEFID 10625 and other emerging efforts in Africa to provide financing for NBT/post-COVID and the like to optimize use of resources.

b.) What type of collaboration is envisioned between GWP global project and the new IFC facility?

5.) Sub-component 2.3:

a.) Please further integrate and describe how this project intends to address the issue of zoonotics/COVID pandemic into the work on behavior change and consumption. This sub-component should further emphasize how it will address changing wildlife consumption behaviors in light of the pandemic. The GWP global coordination project is a critical, immediate entry point for doing so in areas of highest risk and priority, and globally. Please specifically refer to the recent GEF paper prepared for the GEF council

on the topic, with reference to #1 Immediate actions in particular paragraphs 12, 13, 14 that refer to GWP actions directly: https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF_C.58_Inf.07_GEF%27s%20Response%20to%20COVID-19.pdf

b.) What is the scale of the pilot project is envisioned?

6.) Sub-component 3.2

a.) #49 KM: How will the issue of COVID-19 impacts and recovery be integrated into GWPs high-priority KM activities for the next 5 year period? Please document in ProDoc and CER.

b.) Is the HWC global conference in the 2021 the one that was postponed from last April due to the pandemic? If so, wasn't this budgeted for under the GEF-6 global project? If so then it should be redacted from the GEF-7 budget presumably. Kindly revise or explain.

7.) Sub-component 3.3

a.) #51. What of this will be new and funded through GEF-7 global project versus what was done in GEF-6? Unclear from the ProDoc text. Please clarify in documentation.

8.) Please include a narrative/articulation of the Theory Of Change of this project in c.) para 17 of the ProDoc (and in the GEF CER). Simple but complete articulation of the project TOC is needed.

9. Please describe what type of "Legal, sustainable consumptive wildlife activities may be needed with non-consumptive economic activities to wildlife and humans to co-exist." and to what extent this project will work with countries to explore "consumptive wildlife activities"? Please provide examples and how sustainability will be ensured/integrated. Please note GEF resources should not be used to support trophy hunting.

2-3-21 AM: Thanks for the explanation and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: The Project document in paras 4 & 5 includes the context for COVID-19 within the projects scope designed as a technical assistance and not direct investments on the ground. In addition as per recommendation Annex #8 (COVID19 Implications for the GEF-7 Global Wildlife Program) has been developed which provides the global project's approach to addressing impacts of COVID-19. The approach details the key elements that contribute to a medium-term pandemic response and steps to be taken at the global and national levels going forward. The implications and mitigation measures are applicable to both components 1 and 2 of the global project and inherently linked to support to be provided to the national projects. The GWP team has collaborated with Anna Spensley and the EU DEVCO on NBT related efforts and impact of COVID and will continue to coordinate with them into project activities. Several National projects have both contributed to Anna Spensley's recent work and benefited from the analysis. In fact, South Africa is now conducting a deeper dive for their national level response and recovery efforts.

1. a.) This focus was added to respond to GEFSEC comments provided on 3/1/20 (7.b. Any preparatory time in search for existing information and subject experts is worth spending and will be far better than developing something that may be a duplication. It is amazing how much information is already out there or subject experts with the answer to these questions at their fingertips. Rather than spending on studies and assessments could the Global Project synthesize the results of prior research and identify lessons and guidance that GWP projects can use?). Also given the nature of this technical assistance and the component outcomes the activity is placed within the scope of synthesis of analytical work. There is a strong synergy between new analytical studies done at the sectoral level and knowledge management activities that will leverage different practices to get the content to the target audiences. In this case, a summary analysis may be considered a new analytical study rather than knowledge management sharing.
- b.) The goal is to leverage WB core analytical expertise and tap into other investment platforms to maximize the resources that are mobilized for studies (for cost efficiency) that can support national project interventions or global policy dialogue. This approach proved successful in GEF-6 where GWP contributed \$200K to a study that cost nearly \$1M (PA study) and therefore provides additional insight and tools for GWP countries to use. Topics are to be finalized with input from GWP national project teams, PSC, and as a result of global initiatives that will stem from upcoming COPs (i.e. CBD); topics may include HWC, green COVID-19 recovery and risk management investments may be considered. Based on earlier discussions and agreements, this is aligned with the projects approach to allow flexibility and tailor needs based on any evolving contexts during the implementation period.
- c.) Co-funding studies with other resources from WB MDTFs. Surveys will be conducted with input from GWP national projects, PSC, and GWP core team in

collaboration with practice managers and WB MDTF leads. GWP resources may potentially support efforts co-funded by FOLUR IP, PROGREEN, or GPS where GWP countries can benefit from the analytical output. This may include efforts that are tied to CBD COP commitments or efforts the WB will lead related to biodiversity and ecosystem services.

2. a.) Rephrased it to *A feasibility assessment of potential innovative financing and insurance mechanisms prevalent in other sectors (i.e. infrastructure, health, etc.) that could be considered for the WBE sector.*
- b.) Overall the activities, results and sustainability of the global coordination project should be seen within the larger context of the GWP partnership. The point has been elaborated further to emphasize (see page 23, para 34) that recommendations will be made as part of the research and feasibility work on actionable next steps. Given the scope and funding available, this activity is intended to be a catalyst to stimulate this market for further consideration. Based on the results of this activity, it is expected that the GWP partners will also support adoption into their own work/programs and/or create opportunities for further uptake. At this point it is not possible to assess or confirm whether launching any mechanism is feasible.
- c.) This point was added as recommended by the PSC to explore any potential opportunities to enhance private partnerships. It has been deleted as per GEF recommendation.

3. The WB project Document following the agile format limits the length of the main text in the document. Paras 4 and 5 provide the overall context and further an addendum has been developed to better articulate the global project's approach to addressing impacts of COVID-19 and referenced in the overview paragraph #35.

- a.) Clarified statement on #38 to include: *There is often a disconnect between national authorities working on AML issues and those working on wildlife issues. GEF funds will be used for GWP to work with the WB FCI practice and other partners to help mainstream wildlife crime issues into national risk assessments and global analytical/policy work to enhance opportunities to consider IWT issues. Technical resources, sponsoring participation of GWP national stakeholders in targeted regional/global meetings, and similar support will be explored. Meetings are not all known at this point so the goal will be to have flexibility to support efforts that are regional (ASEAN, ESAAMLG, etc.) or those led by FATF or EGMOND Group.*
- b.) Participation in this type of event (and other global events) is justified elsewhere in the project. This was included in response to earlier request to provide details on

potential opportunities where synergies could be drawn. As recommended by GEFSEC reference to IUCN WCC has been removed.

4. a.) GWP team is already in contact with team developing this project proposal and will continue to stay engaged to explore potential synergies.

b) Discussions are still ongoing, but if feasible goal is to make use of this private sector focused entity that will support NBT in Africa to make platform available for GWP PA authorities that are looking to engage with private sector partners to increase investments in their PAs.

5. a.) Point is noted but it is important to emphasize that following several internal peer reviews and management recommendations and approval, the scope of actions has been kept realistic. A competition/crowd-sourcing process for solutions is possible but not sure if that is where the GWP can add most value; there are other initiatives ongoing and WB may be best suited to gather and disseminate information on the ecological and economic consequences of the pandemic. The coordination grant through its knowledge/analytical activities as relevant and based on country demand will contribute to stronger communication and information on demand reduction. Activities to be conducted that will help tackle the issue of zoonotics/COVID pandemic will be finalized with input from the country teams and ICCWC partners, including UNODC that is leading a \$4M study looking at zoonotic risks in priority countries.

b). As mentioned in the project document this is a great opportunity for the GWP to tap into this as part of the OneHealth efforts being pushed by the WB and other partners. The Scale is to be determined and will depend on whether it can be a co-financed activity (part of a WB project investment ? i.e. [China](#)) or a stand-alone effort.

6. a.) An addendum (#8) has been developed and provided to articulate global project's approach to addressing impacts of COVID-19. The project document includes the annex and will be available as a public document in the portal.

b). As this conference was postponed due to COVID-19, costs were deferred until 2021 at which point the GEF-6 global project will be closed. Budget for the conference was repurposed for other GWP GEF-6 priorities and therefore the GEF-7 global project will pick up the previously agreed upon GWP costs for the conference.

7. This component was clarified to highlight that the initial compilation was done under GEF-6. Database launch, dissemination, and annual update to be done under GEF-7.

8. Paragraph 17 of project document and GEF CER (Annex A) have been updated to include a narrative of the TOC of the project. The TOC of the GWP can be summarized by a series of interdependent interventions along the value chain from source to transit to demand. This global coordination Project will scale up the existing GWP platform for collaboration and sharing of experiences between government counterparts and partners to generate knowledge, link experts, and develop partnerships. Interventions have been designed to support national project efforts and link the individual investments to help deliver global environmental benefits.

9. Statement has been clarified to align with Wildlife Economy definition and strategy under development for SADC (pg 17 paragraph 26). Additional details included: Legal, sustainable consumptive wildlife activities (e.g. conditional consumptive utilization by community conservancies where rights are devolved, non-timber forest products used commercially and for subsistence purposes, etc.) may be considered in some instances along with non-consumptive economic activities to wildlife and humans to co-exist. WBE activities can include a mix of consumptive and non-consumptive uses and vary across countries. Examples of WBE activities include nature-based tourism, hunting, wildlife ranching, payment for ecosystem services, and non-timber forest products. As relevant and based on the country demand the global coordination activities will be aligned with the national projects to the extent possible to ensure benefits at both ends. Successful WBE is expected to deliver real benefits to local communities providing concrete incentives for wildlife conservation. Integration of WBE into long-term planning and investment decisions can ensure that natural assets deliver ecological, social and financial returns sustainably.

GEF resources under the program will not be used to support trophy hunting.

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 August 28, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 28, 2020 HF:

1.) Please address how the pandemic impacts the incremental reasoning and value added of the global project and how it will support GWP countries and projects to cope and move forward with wildlife conservation efforts in this context.

2.) Please include attention to COVID-19 impacts in paras #8 and 9 in ProDoc under Project Context.

2-3-21 AM: Thanks for the information. Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you

WB Response, Jan 25 2021:

1.) Elements have been added to the incremental reasoning section. In addition an addendum has been provided to articulate global project's approach to addressing impacts of COVID-19.

2.) See Annex 8 for an assessment of COVID-19 implications within the project context.

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 August 31, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

Sustainability: Thank you for explaining the plan for sustained impact and activities of the HWC CoP via the IUCN HWC Task Force, please describe further any plans for other institutions to pick-up or incorporate other elements of GWP global project supported activities to better ensure sustainability. Or if those don't exist at the moment this may be a key approach to sustainability to consider during the life-of-project.

2-3-21 AM: Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: Recommendation is noted, but at this stage it is not possible to define and confirm other institutions that will pick up the activities. However given the strong partnerships under the overall GWP, actors involved in the PSC the GEF-6 coordination project it is expected that actions will continue to be taken up by various partners. This guidance will be considered further during the life-of-project and once implementation is rolled out.

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

August 25, 2020 HF: Please double check the maps included in the CER and the ProDoc as they seem to be missing some of the countries that were approved in June 2020 work program (including Pakistan, Nigeria and others...).

2-3-21 AM: Noted that the revised map include the official WBG cartographic guidelines for country borders and is prepared to reflect the countries participating under the GWP. Cleared

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: Noted and Correct map uploaded (Map 1, pg 10).

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 August 28, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 25, 2020 HF: Thank you for the Stakeholder Engagement Plan and list of stakeholders.

1. Please describe in Annex 3 of the ProDoc/and in CER how stakeholders will be engaged at the global level (the ProDoc has a section on "Global-level Stakeholder Engagement" without any detail on how this will be done.
2. Please provide 'detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase" of the project.

2-3-21 AM: Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you

WB Response, Jan 25 2021:

Additional details were provided in Annex 3 and Annex H of the CER as requested, including information on feedback mechanisms and a summary of stakeholder consultations held in preparation for GEF-7 project. It is important to emphasize that unlike other new projects and programs where consultations start afresh, GWP GEF-6 provides the starting point for GEF-7, and includes many of the same stakeholders that will continue to be engaged. The stakeholders engaged in GEF-6 activities and their ongoing feedback and participation has shaped the program for GEF-7.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

The gender analysis is very broad-brush for the stage in the planning and approval process, particularly as this is a phase-II project. Please further develop the gender analysis, explicitly examine the gender dimensions of each of the project Components and propose activities/results. This type of cross-walk will help to make the plans a bit more tangible and help to identify how the project plans to both support CPs but also achieve results that are gender sensitive but also proactive in the inclusion of women. Given the economic focus of Component 1 in particular it would seem to provide ample opportunity for gains on the gender front. Of course not all can be known or planned

now-but we are requesting a more concerted and integrated analysis/treatment of gender.

2-3-21 AM: Thanks for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you

WB Response, Jan 25 2021:

A gender strategy for the global coordination project has been developed for the project (Annex I to the GEF CER). As requested some elements have been better clarified under the components. Please do however note that given the nature of the project as an ASA - a technical assistance project - as designed gender equality and enhanced participation of women at the level of GEF-7 GWP Global Coordination project is within the context of targeted gender-responsive interventions in the areas of capacity, policy and knowledge (e.g in workshops technical trainings, conferences etc.) which make up the project components. These are aimed to also benefit the national child projects which are expected to implement specific gender -targeted actions. There are no direct NRM investments on the ground under the coordination grant. Please refer to the section on potential gender activities and actions.

Significantly also, each GWP national child project will carry out specific gender analyses and develop a gender action plan to include specified gender outcomes and actions, with targeted participatory activities that address project-specific gender gaps, and indicators to monitor progress towards gender outcomes. The Global Coordination grant through its M&E aggregation function will work with the national child projects to ensure that national projects report on these indicators to allow for aggregation and timely reporting of targets against the relevant Program core indicator.

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 August 26, 2020 HF: Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes, risks have been identified and addressed.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes, the institutional arrangement is described.

Given this is the Global Coordination Project the entire project focuses on coordination with donors, projects and initiatives.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

1.) The ProDoc refers to Table 1 containing a list of country requested topics on page 20, but it seems to be missing from the document.

2.) Please describe how this global project intends to support national priorities and interests throughout the life-of-project. In addressing the IEO critique of this point the ProDoc states (below), but please integrate this into the CEO Endorsement Request/ProDoc and describe the ongoing approaches of the project.

In the design of the GEF-7 GWP, targeted efforts were made to design (in collaboration with the Program Steering Committee) the program framework which was communicated to governments and implementing agencies to align their national project interventions. National project input was also used to modify the framework and integrate national priorities. As part of the child project selection process, consideration was made to the level of direct link of project components to the programmatic framework

2-3-21 AM: Thanks for the correction and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you

WB Response, Jan 25 2021:

- 1) Table of content has been updated to exclude this reference and correct the oversight.
- 2) Additional details were provided in paragraph 11 of the Project document. In summary it should be emphasized that the design of the GEF-7 GWP is based on a collaborative effort including discussions with the PSC and feedback from countries which resulted in the GWP program framework. The project approach therefore captures the national priorities and requests to the maximum extent possible. As mentioned at the outset all national projects that were selected based on the key GWP criteria through the GEF IAs, were also provided guidance on ensuring alignment of the national project activities (components) with the GWP framework so that the child projects could obtain maximum benefits from the technical assistance and knowledge activities of the global grant during their implementation.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes.

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

- 1.) To what extent will the two high-level "Outcome Indicators" for the project be able to differentiate the outcomes of the GEF-6 global project versus GEF-7 global project?

2.) Is it possible for this phase-II of the global project to consider a retrospective look at phase-I in terms of impacts of the global project, and potentially a cross-sector of national projects?

2-3-21 AM: Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you

WB Response, Jan 25 2021:

It is important to bear in mind that GEF-6 activities are coming to a close and a WB completion report (ICR) will be done in June 2021. This will capture the impacts of the GEF-6 investments with the ICR framework. Owing to the COVID -19 some of the planned meetings under GEF-6 were conducted virtually and the HWC conference has been postponed (2021 dates are yet to be confirmed). Other than that almost all activities have been completed and remaining are on track. As was envisaged at the time of GEF-7 concept development going forward the GEF-7 will build on GEF-6 and bring to the table new activities for which the outcomes and related component outputs have been defined (component description and results framework). There will be no overlap of activities per se. Given that GEF-7 will support all the countries including the GEF-6 cohort, it is expected that countries will continue to contribute to overall global program investments.

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

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

19. Annexes:

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes

2-9-21 AM: The Budget presented does not indicate any allocation of co-financing resources for PMC. According to the operationa guidelines it should be around 5% as it is the GEF contribution. Hence, for a co-financing of \$20,000,000, the expected contribution from co-financing to PMC must be around \$1,000,000 instead of nothing. Please update the budget table accordingly. Thanks!

	Sub Total (\$)	8,782,848.00	20,000,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) 0			
	GET	391,465.00	
	Sub Total(\$)	391,465.00	0.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	9,174,313.00	20,000,000.00
	Sub Total (\$)	8,782,848.00	20,000,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) 0			
	GET	391,465.00	
	Sub Total(\$)	391,465.00	0.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	9,174,313.00	20,000,000.00

2-17-21 AM: Budget table revised. Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Thank you for the recommendation. The cofinancing for the component has been adjusted to shift the funds in order to reflect a proportional US\$ 1 M in the PMC row.

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

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

August 26, 2020 HF:

Noting that para 71 of the ProDoc states:

"As a Programmatic, Bank-Executed ASA, the GEF-7 GWP Global Coordination Project is not expected to prepare and disclose separate ESF documents that would be part of Investment Project Lending operations. The GPs and Task Team responsible for the project and the ESF-Implementation Support Unit (ISU) will embrace the spirit of the OESRC Advisory Note in the following ways. The Task Team will work closely with the ESF-ISU to review the proposed activities to be financed by the GEF-7 GWP Global Coordination Project and screen for potential ESF related concerns. Where environmental or social risks are identified, the GEF-7 GWP Global Coordination Project can commission special studies or provide tailored guidance and training to ensure that ESF principles are applied and well understood by implementing and executing agencies. The project will undergo an annual review with Bank Management and the participation of all relevant oversight units, including ESF-ISU. This will be a regular opportunity to adjust approaches, plan additional training or studies, and advise partners implementing CPs on risks."

2-3-21 AM: Cleared.

Agency Response

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: Noted clearance. Thank you.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

August 28, 2020 HF:

Yes

Agency Response **WB Response, Jan 25 2021:** Noted clearance. Thank you.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request No PPG was requested/granted.

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
August 28, 2020 HF: Please see comment in previous Box 8.

2-3-21 AM: Noted that the revised map include the official WBG cartographic guidelines for country borders and is prepared to reflect the countries participating under the GWP. Cleared

Agency Response

WB Response, Feb 16 2021: Noted Clearance. Thank you.

WB Response, Jan 25 2021: Noted. Please see specific responses to the comments in the respective boxes.

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 NA.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

September 8, 2020 HF: No, not yet. Please respond to GEFSEC comments and make commensurate revisions to the CER and ProDoc.

2-3-21 AM: The project is technically cleared and recommended for endorsement.

2-16-21 AM: Please note the comments above on the Core Indicators e Budget Tables and resubmit. Thanks!

2-16-21 AM: Comments have been addressed and document is technically cleared.

Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	8/28/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations