

Knowledge-4-Nature: Provisioning the biodiversity data behind global goals for nature

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10897

Countries

Global

Project Name

Knowledge-4-Nature: Provisioning the biodiversity data behind global goals for nature

Agencies

IUCN

Date received by PM

6/2/2022

Review completed by PM

9/16/2022

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 9/22/2022 - Cleared.

JS 9/22/2022 - Please add the Focal Area outcomes corresponding to BD-1-1 ("Mainstream biodiversity across sectors as well as landscapes and seascapes through biodiversity mainstreaming in priority sectors") in table A:

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1-1		GET	1,834,862.00	9,348,000.00
		Total Project Cost(\$)	1,834,862.00	9,348,000.00

JS 8/24/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/3/2022

1 Please remove the Rio marker for adaptation since the project has no clear adaptation objective:

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Alignment with the relevant GEF focal area elements is cleared, same as PIF.

Agency Response

IUCN response to GEF Sec 9/22/22 review comment:

Focal Area outcomes corresponding to BD-1-1 added to Table A

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/3/2022 review:

The Rio marker for adaption has been removed.

Project description summary

2. 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

JS 8/24/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/3/2022

Output 3.2.2 (Outreach to selected stakeholders in support of the plan, generating initial incremental revenue) of the PIF has been forgotten in table B. We understand it is a typo as it is included in the ProDoc and the rest of the portal entry. Please correct in table B.

The rest is cleared, identical to PIF.

Agency Response

IUCN response to GEF Sec 6/3/2022 review comment:

Table B has been amended in the GEF Portal to include Output 3.2.2.

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

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected 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, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 9/22/2022 - Cleared.

JS 9/22/2022 - In the co-financing table, please

A- For the row corresponding to the "Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool"

o Change "Private sector" to "Other"

o Name: change to "Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool"

o Change "Recurrent expenditures" to "Investment mobilized"

B - For the row corresponding to the Red List Committee, please change "Civil Society Organization" to "Other"

JS 8/24/2022 - Thank you. We found the updated co-financing letter from IUCN. However, we failed to locate any new co-financing letter or email that would clarify the time frame over which co-financing will be provided by the the Red List Committee and re:wild. Please correct.

JS 6/3/2022

1- The co-financing letters from the Red List Committee , IUCN and re:wild do not clarify the time frame over which co-financing will be provided. Please provide at least emails from the co-financier confirming the co-financing time frames.

Agency Response

IUCN response to GEF Sec 9/22/22 review comments:

Co-financing table modified as requested.

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 8/24/2022 review comment:

New cofinance letters for IUCN Red List and ReWild with time frames provided - sorry, these should have been uploaded with last submission.

IUCN response to GEF Sec 6/3/2022 review comment:

The co-financing letters have been amended accordingly and uploaded in the portal.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
JS 9/22/2022 - Cleared.

JS 9/22/2022 Please correct the portal entry to confirm that no PPG was requested.

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required
true

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared. No PPG was requested.

Agency Response
IUCN response to GEF Sec 9/22/22 review comments:
Portal entry corrected to indicate that no PPG was requested.
Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 6/3/2022 Cleared, same as PIF.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a 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

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 9/16/2022 - All cleared.

JS 8/24/2022

1- Thank you for the revisions. This item 1 is cleared but further comments below were triggered by the some of the activity-level descriptions added in this revised submission. Please see below.

2- Outcome 1.3 and Output 1.3.1:

2a-We note that activities under this output are limited to engagement and joint communications when the output is about proposing metrics. We would imagine that the project would plan for human and other resources to be planned for the tailoring of metrics, as necessary.

2b - Please clarify whether IUCN has joined or is planning to join the *TNFD data catalyst* (<https://tnfd.global/data-catalyst/>)? In any case, the data catalyst should be mentioned. Please also consider including an activity dedicated to contributing to the *data catalyst*.

A-output 3.1.3: We note that only three countries would be supported under output 3.1.3 to supply national red listed endemic species to the IUCN red list. Please clarify why

only three countries would be supported. Aren't there any existing global or regional red list fora, webinar, publication or other vehicle to inform and support, in a scalable way, more countries to do so? If only a targeted subset of countries can be supported, please clarify how they would be selected and confirm in the CEO endorsement request that they will be among GEF recipient countries.

B- Output 3.2.2: The only activity under this output is limited to the creation of a reporting framework. Please add activities corresponding to the actual outreach to selected stakeholders, clarifying the anticipated means and scope of outreach.

JS 6/6/2022

1- The description of the alternative scenario is exactly the same as the one in the PIF, with no refinement and no further clarity on underlying activities in any of the documents of this CEO endorsement package. At CEO endorsement request stage, please describe the project at the (tentative) activity level. Please also provide a summary table clarifying the responsibilities for output and, when feasible, activity delivery.

2- Outcome 1.3 and Output 1.3.1: Please update and refine their description to the extent possible at this stage, as there must have been further consultations with the TNFD on when and how this project's would best contribute to the TNFD's work since the submission of the PIF. The beta TNFD framework is notably not discussed, when we would expect further clarity on how the project would respond to some of the challenges identified in the TNFD discussion paper "A Landscape Assessment of Nature-related Data and Analytics Availability" which was released with the beta framework. Also, the inclusion of IUCN in the TNFD knowledge partners is not mentioned.

Agency Response

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 8/24/2022 review comment:

2a ? Correct. The following text has been added into **Activity 1.3.1.i:** ??to ensure proposal of robust, scientifically anchored and spatially explicit biodiversity metrics for inclusion into TNFD. This will also require engagement with third parties connected to both TNFD and IUCN, for example the Science-based Targets Network. A particular focus will be on STAR, further to Outputs 1.1.2 and 1.2.1 above.?

2b ? IUCN is currently planning on joining the TNFD data catalyst ? we have added this clarification and included engaging though this function under **Outcome 1.3 and Activity 1.3.1i.**

A 3.1.3. Three countries will be chosen due the IUCN Red List capacity required to support this process. These countries will be selected through prioritization (i.e. which countries have national red list data not covered on the IUCN Red List) and engagement with IUCN members. Where possible, we would want to target countries with higher number of endemic species. We will also communicate the work through the IUCN National Red List Working Group of the Red List Committee to incentivize other national engagement beyond this work. All countries supported through this project will be GEF recipient countries.

The above text has been added to the project document under **Activity 3.1.3i**.

B 3.2.2. We have **changed the wording of Output 3.2.2**, from ?Outreach to selected stakeholders in support of implementation of the plan, generating initial incremental revenue? to ?Outreach to selected stakeholders in support of operationalizing and institutionalizing of the plan, generating initial incremental revenue?. This is to reflect the activities detailed which can be achieved within the timeframes and resources of the project. Implementation of the plan, including stakeholder outreach activities, will take place over the coming years after the plan has been produced. However, we believe that that we can support the institutionalization of the plan across Red List partners (reporting frameworks activity), and support its operationalization through the production of standardized communication material which can be used by IUCN and the Red List partners in outreach activities with the key stakeholder groups that will be identified through the development of the plan. To reflect this **we have added in a new activity 3.2.2.ii. Production of standardized outreach material to support engagement with key stakeholders relevant to meeting goals set out in the sustainability plan.**

IUCN response to GEF Sec 6/3/2022 review comment:

1. Description of alternative scenario in project justification updated with additional text to further refine and clarify outputs where possible, including at the tentative activity level. New summary table included to clarify responsibilities for output and activity delivery.
2. Outcome 1.3 and Output 1.3.1 updated with additional text to reflect engagement with TNFD over the course of the last few months, and the way that this proposed work will fit into it.
4. **Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared. Maps are not relevant for this project.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

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

JS 8/24/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/6/2022

1- This section is almost identical to PIF stage and we failed to locate any full-fledged Stakeholder engagement plan (SEP). The analysis and engagement plans seem to remain at the level of very broad stakeholder categories, without identifying (beyond TNFD) a subset of key strategic stakeholders, or justifying why it is not the case. Compared to the minimum elements for a SEP outlined in the GEF Stakeholder Engagement Guidelines (SD/GN/01), the following elements also appear missing :

Roles and responsibilities for implementation of the Plan

The timing of the engagement throughout the project cycle

The budget for stakeholder engagement throughout the project cycle and, where applicable, for related capacity-building to support this engagement

Key indicators of stakeholder engagement during project implementation, and steps that will be taken to monitor and report on progress and issues that arise

The Plan should also carefully document the public engagement during project development and preparation, including summary reports of stakeholder consultations and of data on stakeholders and beneficiaries. This should include, among other things, summaries of consultations in the preparation of required safeguard documents.

Please provide an adequate SEP.

Agency Response

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/6 review comments:

Stakeholder engagement plan significantly expanded, including monitoring, and indicators. Provided as an annex.

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

JS 9/22/2022 - Cleared.

JS 9/22/2022:

Please select (Yes/No) for each of the three gender gaps the project may address (see below):

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes


Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources:

Improving women's participation and decision making

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Does the project's results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

Yes



JS 8/24/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/3/2022

1-This section is entirely identical to the PIF's, including in announcing that a gender plan will be established in the project development phase. Please update this section and provide the gender action plan.

Agency Response

IUCN response to GEF Sec 9/22/22 review comments:

Responses added for the three identified gender gaps: project will support ?Improving women?s participation and decision making?.

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/6 review comments:

A Gender analysis and action plan has been developed and added to the document.

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

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared, but see comment on the stakeholder engagement plan.

Agency Response

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/3 review comments:

Nature of private sector engagement is elaborated in the Stakeholder Engagement plan

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

JS 8/24/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/6/2022

1- Please elaborate on the project management unit and the project steering committee or equivalent, and consider adding a diagram clarifying them.

2- Please provide a diagram clarifying the separation between implementation and execution duties.

Agency Response

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/3 review comments:

1. In the institutional arrangements and coordination section we have provided a description of the project management unit (PMU), its members and their roles. We have also described the project steering committee (PSC) its role and members, along with a diagram that shows the separation between implementation and execution duties.

2. Diagram provided (Fig. 1., p. 33)

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

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

JS 8/24/2022 - Cleared.

JS 6/3/2022

1- Please clarify the responsibilities for monitoring each indicator.

Agency Response

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/3 review comments:

An additional column clarifying monitoring responsibilities has been added.

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

JS 6/3/2022 Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 9/22/2022 - Cleared.

JS 9/22/2022 -The budget pasted in the portal (annex E) is not readable (the image keeps scrolling in a loop). Please correct.

JS 8/24/2022 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 6/6/2022 -

1- Budget:

1a - Please clarify why the project coordinator is to be located in Costa Rica.

1b - More than \$1 million of GEF agency staff costs are charged on the GEF grant. Please clarify which staff positions would be new / incremental, and, in line with the GEF's mandate to cover agreed incremental costs of measures to achieve global environmental benefits, do not charge on the GEF grant any existing IUCN staff that would be funded by IUCN in the absence of this project. Such staff should be covered through IUCN co-financing.

1c- As per Guidelines on the project and program cycles (GEF/C.59/Inf.03), in the exceptional cases where the GEF Agency is carrying out executing functions and costs for Agency staff resources and/or consultants are charged to project budgets (i.e. not to Agency Fee), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs are required at CEO endorsement/approval, for review by the Secretariat. Please provide precise terms of reference for all Agency staff that remain charged on the project budget once comment 1b has been addressed.

Agency Response

IUCN response to GEF Sec 9/22/22 review comments:

Reposted the budget. May need help from GEF Portal Technical support to address this issue.

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/3 review comments:

- 1a. Text added in TOR to clarify the reason for the project coordinator position being located in Costa Rica.
- 1b. Significant restructure of the budget to reduce executing agency staff time covered by the project budget by \$559,743. IUCN staff time (excl. PMC costs) is now \$496,865. The new positions that will be created through this grant are now clearly identified, and we have provided clear justifications for incremental activities. Output-level justification provided setting out the baseline and incremental benefits. (refer to Annex provided and CEO endorsement section 2.5)

1c. Unified TOR document describing roles, responsibilities, and unique outputs for all agency staff

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 9/16/2022 - Cleared.

JS 8/24/2022 -

1- cleared.

2- This comment has not been addressed. 3.2.2 remains limited to measure whether there is reporting on income generation when this indicator should measure whether additional revenue is created. For instance, 3.2.2 could be a measure of the RL financial gap (in \$) or, at least, of the revenue generated (in \$). A baseline and a target should accordingly be included in the results framework.

JS 6/6/2022

1- Please add GEF's core indicator 11 to the Results Framework.

2- Please revise indicator 3.2.2 to measure the actual degree of financial sustainability reached thanks to the project. Currently, the indicator would only measure whether there is reporting on income generation.

Agency Response

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 8/24/2022 review comment:

2 ? We have changed the indicator to ?Income generated against the Sustainability plan has increased relative to the baseline (as identified in the plan)?.

IUCN Response to GEF Sec 6/3 review comments:

1. Core indicator 11 is added to the results framework

2. Indicator 3.2.2. now revised accordingly.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

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 NA

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Cleared.

Agency Response

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

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

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

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 9/22/2022 - Yes, the project is recommended for endorsement.

JS 9/22/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments (table A, co-financing table, PPG, Gender, budget) above and resubmit.

JS 8/24/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address the few remaining comments above and resubmit.

JS 6/6/2022 - Not at this stage. Please address comments above and resubmit.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	6/6/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/24/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations