

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

Review PIF 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

12/2/2021

Review completed by PM

1/21/2022

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 1/13/2022 - All cleared, thank you

JS 1/4/2021

1. Thank you for the revisions. However, please confirm that both the TNFD Secretariat and WWF-US, as IA of the project GEF ID 10755 "Establishing the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)", have been consulted on outcome 1.3 related to the TNFD.

2. Cleared.

JS 12/6/2021 -

1. Outcome 1.3: We note that the accompanying document reports extensive contact between IUCN and the TNFD bodies but also that the PIF has not been shared with TNFD. It is thus unclear whether what is proposed in outcome 1.3 has been explicitly discussed with the TNFD.

Please consult the TNFD, at least the TNFD secretariat and the GEF IA implementing the TNFD project, to ensure that what would be supported under 1.3 is the most relevant for the TNFD. Specific engagement with the TNFD will also be needed during project preparation to design activities under 1.3.

2. Outcome 3.2 includes implementation of the sustainability plan but outputs are limited to development of the plan and targeted outreach. Please revise output formulation so that it is clear that the project will also support implementation.

All the rest is cleared.

Agency Response

Agency Response to GEF Sec 1/4/2022 review:

As noted with added text on page 13 under Output 1.3.1. regarding WWF-US, IUCN has similarly reached out to WWF-US as the Implementing Agency for the project GEF ID 10755 ? Establishing the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)?- WWF (2021-2024), received written thanks from them (5 Jan 2022), and will address any suggestions which they may have during project preparation.?

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

1. Text under Output 1.3.1 edited to incorporate specific edits suggested by TNFD (13 Dec 2021). In addition, text added at the end of Output 1.3.1 to document that IUCN has engaged in explicit discussion on this with TNFD, modified the output description further to specific edits received from TNFD (13 Dec 2021), and will continue this dialogue in designing activities during project preparation to ensure that the output is maximally useful.?

2. Added ?implementation of? into title of Output 3.2.2.

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 1/21/2022 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 1/19/2022 -

1- As per GEF Guidelines, it is expected that PIFs provide a succinct explanation on how each of the ?investment mobilized? co-financing amounts were identified. Please provide such an explanation under table C.

2- Most "in-kind" co-financing typically falls under the recurrent expenditures category. Please confirm that the in-kind co-financing Red List Partnership is indeed investment mobilized or revise it to recurrent expenditures.

JS 12/16/2021 Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/6/2021 -

1. "Equity" (i.e. investment on a company or asset with the possibility to generate financial returns) does not seem the appropriate classification for some the co-financing reported for this project. "Grant" seems a priori more adequate. Please clarify and correct as needed:

C. Indicative sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type ⓘ

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Private Sector	Licensing of commercial use of the IUCN Red List through the Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool	Equity	Investment mobilized	630,000.00
Civil Society Organization	Grant from CSO Re:wild	Equity	Investment mobilized	450,000.00
GEF Agency	IUCN Framework funding	Equity	Investment mobilized	3,500,000.00

Agency Response

Agency Response to GEF Sec 1/19/2022 review:

Explanation added under Table C. for the grant from Re:wild that is classified as ?investment mobilized?.

After further discussion, and as recommended, the co-financing from the Red List Partnership, and IUCN Framework have been classified as ?In-kind, recurrent

expenditures?, and the funding from the private sector via IBAT as ?grant, recurrent expenditures?.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

No PPG is requested.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/16/2021- Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/6/2021 - It is acknowledged that the nature of this project precludes setting targets on all core indicators but core indicator 11, which is to measure the number of direct beneficiaries. However:

1. The methodology proposed to set a target on core indicator 11 is: "This estimate is derived by sampling typical medium-sized projects reported to the GEF by IUCN Member organisations, and multiplying this by a conservative estimate of the number of contributions which will likely be documented through the Contributions for Nature platform." It thus seems that it is assumed that beneficiaries from this project are those that would benefit from contributions documented through the Contributions for Nature platform, which in turn are estimated based on GEF MSPs. However, it is unclear how GEF MSPs are a good proxy for these contributions and, more fundamentally, why contributions to the Contributions for Nature platform are used as proxies for beneficiaries of this PIF, which supports Red List and derived data, and not the Contributions for Nature Platform.

Please explain or use another methodology to estimate the direct beneficiaries of this project. Isn't there any measurement of direct Red list data users, e.g. direct API and/or

specific web page access, that could be used to derive an estimate of the number beneficiaries of this project?

Agency Response

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

As suggested, replaced proposed indicator of beneficiaries derived from Contributions for Nature platform with indicator based on annual number of Red List users measured by specific web page access.

Replaced current methods text with "However, we use of the IUCN Red List website is closely tracked, and so we harness these data to provide Core Indicator 11. Specifically, annual unique visitors to the IUCN Red List website over 2015-2020 ranged from 3.8 million up to 5.3 million. We therefore specify an expected value of 4 million direct beneficiaries. These data are harvested from IP addresses and so no bottom-up gender disaggregation is available, but we have no reason not to assume a 50% gender balance in terms of Red List users."

Replaced indicator text with "Approx 4,000,000 including 50% each women and men"

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/16/2021 Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/6/2021 - Please consider tagging the project with "Biodiversity", "Species", "Threatened Species", and "Mainstreaming".

Agency Response

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

Added "Biodiversity" / "Mainstreaming" and "Biodiversity" / "Species" / "Threatened Species" as requested.

Also added "Capacity, Knowledge and Research" / "Knowledge Generation and Exchange".

Part II ? Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/16/2021 Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/6/2021 - As the IUCN Science and Data Centre is mentioned several times in the proposal, please provide a brief description in the baseline.

All the rest is cleared.

Agency Response

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

Added a new final sentence to the penultimate paragraph of the baseline description reading "This increasingly robust approach is supported by recent re-organization of the IUCN Secretariat's global programmes into four interacting centers: for Science & Data (which will lead execution of this project), Finance & Economy, Conservation Action, and Governance & Rights."

For simplicity, removed mention of the centre in Part I, Section F, and Part II, Section 7.3. Retained in Part II, Section 7.6, in describing Coordination.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 1/13/2022 - All cleared, thank you.

JS 1/4/2022 - Please confirm that both the TNFD Secretariat and WWF-US, as IA of the project GEF ID 10755 "Establishing the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)", have been consulted on outcome 1.3 related to the TNFD.

JS 12/6/2021 - Please see the comments on table B and address them in the description of the alternative scenario as needed.

Agency Response

Agency Response to GEF Sec 1/4/2022 review:

As noted with added text on page 13 under Output 1.3.1. regarding WWF-US, "IUCN has similarly reached out to WWF-US as the Implementing Agency for the project GEF

ID 10755 ? ?Establishing the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD)?- WWF (2021-2024), received written thanks from them (5 Jan 2022), and will address any suggestions which they may have during project preparation.?

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

Text explaining TNFD engagement added at the end of description of Output 1.3.1.
Title of Output 3.2.2 amended to add ?implementation of?.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared. Maps are not relevant for this project.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 1/13/2022 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 1/4/2022 -

1- Cleared.

2- Please reformulate the addition to confirm that the stakeholder engagement plan will be developed during project preparation and not "at the outset of the project", i.e. during implementation.

JS 12/6/2021 -

1. Please revise the table as current version implies that

(i) there would be no stakeholder input to project development (only "co-financing" or "none" reported under "Project preparation role"), when we assume the project will continue to benefit from consultations and inputs during preparation;

(ii) no academic institutions will be involved, when it seems that some will be involved in delivery and preparation.

2. Please confirm that a stakeholder engagement plan will be developed during project preparation.

Agency Response

Agency Response to GEF Sec 1/4/2022 review:

Text on page 19 has been changed from "at the outset of the project" to "during project preparation", as intended.

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

- 1.i. Added "consultations and inputs" as suggested to each row under "Project preparation" role?
- 1.ii. Added a new row for "Academic Institutions" with corresponding text.
2. Added a sentence to the text describing to confirm that "These roles will be further elaborated through development of a stakeholder engagement plan at the outset of the project."

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 1/21/2022 - The request from the implementing agency to also carry out executing functions on an exceptional basis is approved on principle at this PIF stage. Execution arrangements will be reexamined at CEO endorsement stage.

JS 12/16/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/6/2021 -

We note the intention of the Implementing Agency to also execute the project and the corresponding plans to ensure a separation between the execution and oversight functions. Please ensure that the CEO endorsement request describes in details:

- (a) A satisfactory institutional arrangement for the separation of implementation and executing functions in different departments of the GEF Agency; and
- (b) Clear lines of responsibility, reporting, monitoring and evaluation and accountability within the GEF Agency between the project implementation and execution functions.

1. To our knowledge, the Informal Technical Expert Group (TEG, referred to as "the TNFD Informal Technical Working Group" in the PIF) supporting the Informal Working Group that preceded the TNFD was discontinued with the creation of the TNFD. Please either delete or reformulate to make clear that the PIF refers here to past engagement.

Agency Response

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

As requested, details of the separation of the implementation and execution functions will be presented in the CEO endorsement request. For the PIF, text has been added in coordination section reading "through the separation of implementation and executing functions in different departments of the GEF Agency, and clear lines of responsibility,

reporting, monitoring and evaluation and accountability within the GEF Agency between the project implementation and execution functions?.

Name of previous TNFD Informal Technical Expert Group corrected, and ?previous? added to make clear that this clause relates to prior engagement.

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 -Cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/6/2021 -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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 12/16/2021 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 12/6/2021 - We note that the overall project risk classification is low. However, the corresponding Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project are not presented; and neither are management measures or supporting documentation.

1.Please clarify if a ESS risk screening has been carried out following IUCN's practice and, if so, provide the screening.

2. If risks have been identified please make them explicit in the PIF. Otherwise, if, given the nature of the project, there are no anticipated negative environmental or social impacts from the project's low-risk activities, please state it in the PIF and confirm that execution will comply with IUCN ESS policy.

Agency Response

IUCN response to 12/6/21 review:

1. ESS screening has been carried out following IUCN practice; screening form attached.

2. Text added as suggested to read "Given the nature of the project, there are no anticipated negative environmental or social impacts from the project's low-risk activities; execution will comply with IUCN ESS policy, and ESS screening has been carried out following IUCN practice."

Also removed mention of application of ILK, which is outside the scope of this project, and added reference to the ESMS Guidance Note on Stakeholder Engagement regarding development of the stakeholder engagement plan.

Part III ? Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

JS 1/21/2022- The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

JS 1/19/2022 - Please address the only remaining comment (co-financing) and resubmit.

JS 1/4/2022 - Not at this stage, please address the two remaining comments above (Coordination with WWF-US on TNFD, stakeholder engagement) and resubmit.

JS 12/6/2021 - Not at this stage, please address comments above and resubmit.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	12/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/19/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/21/2022	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval