



Integrated management of multiple use landscapes/seascapes to promote biodiversity conservation, ecosystem restoration, improve land and marine productivity and economic benefits to local communities

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11533

Countries

Montenegro

Project Name

Integrated management of multiple use landscapes/seascapes to promote biodiversity conservation, ecosystem restoration, improve land and marine productivity and economic benefits to local communities

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/21/2024

Review completed by PM

9/20/2024

Program Manager

Celine Augereau ep Coisy

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

This project is a Biodiversity focus MFAs project, with a substantial CCM source of fund and a small LD source of fund.

The project is aligned with the GEF8 strategy and eligible for GEF funding.

The different ways the project will provide GEBs are clear. The project is aligned with the emerging NBSAP. It supports the achievement of the country's targets/commitments towards area-based conservation and climate action. These include the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework Global Biodiversity Framework's Targets 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 22. The new NBSAP that is under preparation will be the main vehicle for national engagements towards GBF Target 3 (30*30 conservation target).

From the BD point of view, it is aligned with the GEF8 programming directions. The project takes place in the Mediterranean Basin hot spot, in the Balkan peninsula and near the Adriatic Sea, a situation with biodiversity high values. It will address the question of management of PAs and KBAs at the national and local level. The 3 target landscapes and seascapes are classified in important KBA and Natura 2000 areas with representative ecosystems at the national and global level (Global 200), distinguished by their irreplaceability and distinctiveness for European forests and montane forests. The project will take place in areas host for numerous plant and animal species assessed at the national and global level.

The project proposes to improve spatial planning and develop policies to reduce harmful frameworks for the biodiversity. It will also sustain institutional capacity to manage protected areas.

The projected Global Environment Benefits provided by the projects are cleared with important areas concerned by improved management.

From the CCM point of view, and the description/justification of the CCM elements should be strengthened accordingly in the section related to "alignment with CCM FA elements". That section -as the rest of the PIF- seems to refer mostly to climate adaptation and climate risk reduction. Adaptation impacts can well be a co-benefit of MFAs but cannot be the only/main anchor of CCM FA elements eligibility.

From the LD point of view MFA project has two small LD elements, namely sustainable land management activities (LD-1) and restoration of agricultural production areas (LD-2). These are in line with the LDFA strategy and add value to this BD-focused project.

a) b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated ?

Yes

04/24/24

Thanks for your comment and for included the estimate for CI6. But the target for CI6 is still missing in the actual workflow. Could you please input the value in the system (p.45/82 PIF) ?

02/05/24

There is a significant difference between the title of the project provided in the LoE vs. the title of the project in the Portal. Please update the title in the portal to match what is provided in the LoE and signed by the OFP.

LoE : "Integrated management of multiple use landscapes/seascapes to promote biodiversity conservation, ecosystem restoration, improve land and marine productivity and economic benefits to local communities"

Portal : "Management of multiple use landscapes and seascapes to promote biodiversity conservation"

Subject: Endorsement of Project "Integrated management of multiple use landscapes/seascapes to promote biodiversity conservation, ecosystem restoration, improve land and marine productivity and economic benefits to local communities "

General Project information

Project Title:	Management of multiple use landscapes and seascapes to promote biodiversity conservation		
Region:	Montenegro	GEF Project ID:	11533

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

Thank you. The title has been adjusted in the GEF Portal to match the LoE. The CI 6 target has been added in the Portal.

Page 82 of the PIF is the Taxonomy worksheet, and RIO markers were tagged correctly

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

Thank you for the comment regarding CCM. The section in terms of alignment with CCM FA has been revised accordingly to align with CCM 1.4 *Promote nature-based solutions with high mitigation potential?* the project will support mitigation actions in terms of improved management of KBAs in terms of reduce threats, fires, illicit removal of forest products etc. improvement in grassland through improved management with medium inputs, and improvements in arable crop lands that will generate climate benefits. (Page 32) Additionally, a preliminary estimate of carbon mitigation benefits (core indicator 6) is provided in Annex I that takes into consideration benefits from terrestrial KBA conservation. (reduced degradation), protection from fires, improved pasture management, etc. These figures will be reassessed at PPG along with a calculation of benefits from improvements in arable crop lands (see Page 32 of PIF and Annex H)

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

The content is clear, but please, considering restructuring the presentation along these lines to make it easier for the reader

For example:

- (i) The Montenegro's biodiversity requires urgent conservation efforts to preserve its unique heritage, faced to major threats due to urbanization, changes in land practices, pollution, unsustainable use of resources ?
- (ii) The project aims to promote the integrated and inclusive management multiple use landscapes/seascapes to promote biodiversity conservation, ecosystem restoration, improve land and marine productivity and economic benefits to local communities.

- (iii) This will be achieved by :
- a. supporting a shift to a more transformative integrated and inclusive planning and management of biological landscapes and seascapes.
 - b. aligning the baseline investments, initiatives, projects and commitments with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan that proposes integration with the KMGBF Target 3.
 - c. improving governance, policies and capacities of institutions,
 - d. improving financial instruments for the promotion of biodiversity sensitive nature-based solutions.
 - e. facilitating and ensuring a stronger multi-sector and multi-stakeholder effort
 - f. taking into consideration the interests of local communities and private sector to address the threats to key biodiversity, species and habitats through a holistic and multi-disciplinary effort
 - g. building on the current baseline and take into consideration lessons learned from previous projects

(iv)

- improvement management of effectiveness of 70,651.40 hectares within seven terrestrial protected areas.
- improved management effectiveness of 50,000 hectares of KBAs and identified OEEMs through national policies and practices.
- improved management effectiveness of 2016.19 hectares within two marine protected areas
- restoration of 6,000 hectares of degraded forests, pastures and agricultural land
- stabilized populations of globally important species (CR, EN, VU on IUCN Red List) through improved protection, habitat restoration, monitoring and enforcement
- reduced threats and enhance protection of threatened biodiversity, including endangered species
- mitigate (to be calculated at PPG stage) mt.CO2e over a 20-year period
- directly benefit 40,000 people (50% men and 50% women) through improved natural resource management, sustainable agricultural, grazing and forest practices, livelihood improvement, small scale enterprises and climate mitigation measures.

04/24/24

Not cleared. The content is clear, but please, considering restructuring the presentation along these lines to make it easier for the reader and answer each of the questions like requested in the project summary :

- (i) what is the problem and issues to be addressed?
- (ii) what are the project objectives, and if the project is intended to be transformative, how will this be achieved?
- iii), how will this be achieved (approach to deliver on objectives), and
- (iv) what are the GEBs and/or adaptation benefits, and other key expected results.

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

The presentation of the summary is now organized under requested sub-headings in the PIF and in the Portal.

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

Thank you for this comment. It is restructured in summary section on pages 1 and 2

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

a) The project objective is clear.

b)

The component 1, its outcomes and outputs and the way the project could provide GEBs are clear.

Component 2 seems like it could inform the future creation of new protected areas or OECMs. Can you please clarify if the project considered including creation of PAs or OECMs as part of the project design and why it is not part of the current intervention strategy?

Could you also explain the role of youth and women in the mapping and monitoring, and in the implementation of Nature based solutions? Could you provide some more details about their effective participation in decision making?

From the CCM point of view the CCM 1.4 window requires that interventions supported can produce "high mitigation potential". While some level of emission reductions/carbon sequestration could be reasonably expected from activities contemplated under component 2 (output 2.4), the low level of detail provided makes it difficult to visualize the actual activities that would result in reasonably significant mitigation impacts and to make a judgement call on whether the TOC is reasonable.

Please could provide more details on how the project interventions can be reasonably expected to generate CCM GEBs ?

Connected with the point above, please could you include at least an initial and conservative expectation for Core Indicator 6 ? Without this, it is not possible to evaluate eligibility (at least an initial stage) vs. CCM funding requirements.

The core indicators are adequate for the LD investment and Rio Markers are correctly selected.

The component 3, its outcomes and outputs are clear.

The component 4, its outcomes and outputs are clear.

Could you provide details in the way women and youth are involved in the education program, in the decision making of this program, even in the cooperation plan, and in the management of lessons learnt ?

The component 5, its outcomes and outputs are clear.

Could you provide details in the way place of women and youth will be assessed ? Could you provide details in the way women and youth will be involved in this monitoring and evaluation ?

04/24/24

Component 2 : Cleared

The target for CI6 is still missing. Could you please input the value in the system (p.45/82 PIF).

Component 4 : Cleared

Component 5 : Cleared

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

Thank you; the target for CI 6 has been updated in the Portal.

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

Thank you for your comments.

In response to comments on Component 2, the project, at this stage does not intent to create any new PAs, but this will be re-assessed at PPG stage.

In terms of OECMs, the intent is following the enactment of a national framework for OECMs and guidelines, the project will look at opportunities for creation of OECMs in terrestrial and marine areas, that will be further assessed at PPG stage. This is mentioned under Component 2 on page 22 of PIF

The role of youth and women in mapping and monitoring NbS is further discussed in Output 2.1 (page 22 of PIF) and Output 2.4 on page 23 of PIF. In addition, the project will build on the findings, and collaborate with the EmpowHER Montenegro Program: Fostering Inclusive Rural Development? to creating opportunities for networking, learning, and participation, particularly for rural women entrepreneurs.

Thank you for the comment regarding CCM. The section in terms of alignment with CCM FA has been revised accordingly to align with CCM 1.4 *Promote nature-based solutions with high mitigation potential?* the project will support mitigation actions in terms of reduced degradation in KBAs, improvement in steppe grassland through improved management with medium inputs, and improvements in arable crop lands that will generate climate benefits. (Page 35) Additionally, a preliminary estimate of carbon mitigation benefits (core indicator 6) is provided in Annex I that takes into consideration benefits from protection of terrestrial KBAs from degradation including fires, unsustainable use and forest clearing, improved pasture management and crop land improvements. These figures will be reassessed at PPG along with a calculation of benefits from improvements in arable crop lands (see Page 32/33 of PIF and Annex H)

Regarding ways in which women and youth are involved with education program is provided in Output 4.1 (page 26) and Gender Equality Section on pages 27 and 28

In terms in monitoring and evaluation is provided in Output 5.1 on page 27 and Gender Equality Section on pages 27 and 28

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

The project provides insufficient details about the implication of the women and youth. Could you explain in component 2, 3, 4 and 5 the role of youth and women in the decision making, the mapping and monitoring, and in the implementation of Nature based solutions, not only in learning, awareness and communication?

04/24/24

Cleared

05/02/2024

Please ensure that the policies, plans and regulations are gender-responsive, by ensuring women's active participation (Outputs 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 1.1.4). As a good gender mainstreaming practice, please include in the Indicative Project Overview table, relevant gender equality considerations included in the component descriptions.

For monitoring and evaluation, please ensure that the Gender Action Plan to be developed is budgeted, and gender-specific results monitored and reported on.

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

Gender considerations are now reflected in the outcome indicators under Component 1 in the PIF Indicative Project Overview Table as well as in the titles of the Output 1.2, 1.5, 2.2 and 4.1

(updated in the Portal as well) and in the Component and output narratives under Section on Project Direction

A gender action plan will be developed and budgeted along with gender targets at PPG stage

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

Refer Output 2.1 (page 22 of PIF), Output 2.2 (page 23 of PIF), Output 2.4 (page 23 and 24 of PIF), Component 3 (page 24 of PIF), and Section on Gender Equity on pages 27 and 28 of PIF

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments a) The project provides insufficient details about the implication of the women and youth.

Could you explain in component 2 ,3, 4 and 5 the role of youth and women in the decision making, the mapping and monitoring, and in the implementation of Nature based solutions, not only in learning, awareness and communication?

b) The GEFTF will finance 10,3 % of the project and 10 % of the PMC. We can consider it is proportional.

c) The project management cost is 4,9%.

04/24/24

a) Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

Refer Output 2.1 (page 22 of PIF), Output 2.2 (page 23 of PIF), Output 2.4 (page 23 and 24 of PIF), Component 3 (page 24 of PIF), and Section on Gender Equity on pages 27 and 28 of PIF

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments a) The current situation is quite clear. However, a lot of threats information are at the scale country level. Could you please add information and provide details about each landscape and areas targeted, in terms of environmental knowledge and threats?

At the time of CEO endorsement please also provide more detailed maps of the issues at the local and site level on forest cover, urbanization, agriculture sector to better support the intervention strategy

The current situation about Invasion of alien species is not provided.

b) The key barriers are well identified.

During the PPG phase, please identify and address more clearly the weakness in the system for managing the designating protected natural areas and the weakness of coordination between the different institutions with the power to drive the change to more biodiversity-focused policies.

04/24/24

a) Cleared

b) Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

Thank you for your comments.

a) To clarify the original threat section of the PIF included significant information of the threats in the 3 project sites, although it was not explicitly stated. Reference has been made, in the revised PIF to also include or indicate specific threats relevant to the 3 project sites (Pages 10 -12 of PIF), while Annex C provides significant more information on threats in all PAs and other areas within each of the 3 project sites.

At CEO endorsement detailed maps regarding forest cover, degraded areas and other issues will be provided

In terms of IAS, this issue is discussed below in Section (Justification for Project) under 4.2 c) including actions in the project related to IAS

d) During PPG stage further discussion will be provide regarding management of designated natural areas and issues related to coordination.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

a) No. Please explain if the project considered other strategies and rejected them. For example, it seems like the project could have identified new protected areas as part of the project design. In this section, you can explain why this is not part of the project design.

b) Yes

c) The proposition explains in which way the GEF 8 project will have complementary interventions on the GEF 7 project 'Biodiversity Mainstreaming into Sectoral Policies and Practices in Montenegro' (2021-2026). It is written that 'GEF 8 will cover complimentary issues such as ecosystem restoration, invasive alien species, sustainable financial mechanisms and strengthening of monitoring system'. But as it is written above, this project doesn't cover the question of Invasive Alien Species. Please clarify the actions and ambition of the project with regards to IAS.

d) Most of the stakeholders and their role are described but we can notice that there is no designation for youth and women representative. Please provide the institutions that will represent these groups.

Please, could you provide the effective stakeholders that will be part in the decision making: associations, representants of professional groups ? ?

The same question is relative to the local communities. We can notice the absence of effective representative in the project. Could you please provide the name of the structures designed to be the interlocutors and decision makers in this project ?

04/24/24

a) Cleared

c) Cleared

d) Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

- a) Yes, the project considered two strategies.
The strategy focusing on the expansion of the PA system on land and the sea, including either (i) expanding existing PAs or (ii) creating new ones in areas that were either KBAs or biodiversity rich areas. Undoubtedly, this strategy was found to be unacceptable for many reasons: (i) politically not acceptable; (ii) would have placed restrictions on current community dependencies on resources and hence created antagonism to the PAs; (iii) would be narrow and sectoral in approach and hence unable to link with agricultural and other land use practices, policies and institutions that occur outside the PAs, but still have a major influence on management of PA resources and

(iv) PA remain isolated and not integrated into local level planning and budgeting systems.

The best approach was found to promote a more holistic and integrated approach to sustainable development, where the PAs and the multiple use landscapes around them would be an integral part of the planning and budgeting systems that operate at a regional level. In doing so, the intent was to ensure that (i) linkages between the land and sea, that influence each other are recognized; (ii) provides a framework for balancing competing demands and integrating policies for multiple land uses that operate in the region, and have an influence on the PA themselves; (iii) provides an opportunity for promoting a multi-sectoral governance arrangements that helps to negotiate and manage the competing demands on the boarder landscape/seascape; (iv) involves local communities living in and around these high biodiversity areas as partners in the conservation efforts, while ensuring that their livelihood and resource needs are not compromised, rather are met through a more sustainable and nature-friendly manner (Refer Project Rationale Section on Page 8 of PIF)

- b) NA
- c) To date, Montenegro has yet to conduct comprehensive research on invasive species, leaving a significant gap in understanding their impact. While individual research efforts have allowed for the compilation of a list of introduced species, particularly noticeable in aquatic ecosystems, detailed data on their invasiveness remains elusive. Montenegro's records are sporadic and often accidental. In this regard, the project intends to undertake the following activities: (i) Component 1, application of EAs to facilitate the generation of site-specific participatory and gender sensitive integrated spatial land use strategies for the landscapes/seascapes that would focus on interventions that mainstream LDN, SLM, SFM, prevent and manage invasive alien species (IAS) and promote biodiversity conservation principles, Output 1.2 in particular to align policies, guidelines and practices to support integrated and inclusive planning that as mentioned under Component 1 above seeks to take consideration the prevention and management of IAs; (ii) based on the landscape and seascapes planning frameworks, output 2.1 will ensure that mapping of biological and other attributes will be overlaid with threats (including IAS) to develop strategies to address threats (including ecological restoration and management of IAS areas); (iv) Output 2.3 will demonstrate restoration approaches with likely co-financing; and (v) support community efforts at prevention and management of IAS and supporting enhanced capacity for management of IAS and improving productivity of IAS infested agricultural lands. Information systems will also be strengthened to identify and record IAS. (Refer Outputs section mentioned above in PIF for reference to IAS prevention and management)
- d) The information of youth and women representation is now provided in table 2 on pages 29-32 of PIF. This will be further updated at PIF. In terms of women? representation, the Locally Organized Councils for Gender Equality that have been established at the municipality levels to implement the national gender mainstreaming action plan will oversee, support and guide gender mainstreaming at the local level.(refer Table 2 on pages 29-32 of PIF)
- e) In terms of local communities, these will be represented by their collective institutions as now addressed in table 2 (pages 29-32 of PIF)

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

a) There is a diagram that the logic project that is clear.

b) The key outputs are defined.

For the Output 2.4 could you please provide more information in the way the local community , the youth or women would be involved in the project ?

04/24/24

b) Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

b) Refer Output 2.4 on page 23 and 24 of PIF

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

a) yes

b) N/A. The agency doesn't ask for an exception. The Implementing partner for the project will be the Tourism, Ecology, Sustainable Development and Northern Region Development and the

project will be implemented over a period of six years with UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agency.

c) Yes

d) Learning and knowledge are described but not the communication strategy. Please provide some details about the communication strategy.

04/24/24

d) Cleared

05/02/24

The LoE mentions that the executing agency is yet to be determined so please correct this in the portal : "Executing partner : Ministry of tourism, ecology, sustainable development and northern region development

Executing partner type : Government"

I am pleased to endorse the preparation of the above project proposal with the support of the GEF Agency listed below. If approved, the preparation of the proposal will be supported by UNDP and the project executed by organization to be determined. I request the GEF Implementing Agency (UNDP) to provide a copy of the project document before it is submitted to the GEF Secretariat for CEO endorsement / Approval.

Executing Partner:	Ministry of Tourism, Ecology, Sustainable Development and Northern Region Development	Executing Partner Type:	Government
--------------------	---	-------------------------	------------

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

Thank you, the portal has been updated. However, the Executing Partner Type cannot be modified in the Portal at this stage.

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

d) This is provided now in Output 4.1 on page 25-26 of PIF

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

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency's Comments

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

NA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

a) Yes

b) Yes. There is a potential of innovation in terms of consultations and multi-stakeholders approach, in terms of new nature based solutions practices and landscape design, in terms of gender and youth implications.

c) At the current state of the project, it will follow the implementation of the national policies and the alignment with the multilateral Environment commitments.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. The project is adequately aligned with focal areas and GEF8 programming strategies.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Commentsyes

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes. The project supports the achievement of the country's targets/commitments towards area-based conservation and climate action. These include the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework's Targets 1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 14, 19, 20, 21, and 22. The new NBSAP that is under preparation will be the main vehicle for national engagements towards GBF Target 3 (through aligning the new NBSAP with the GBF targets).

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

05/02/24

As written above,

On **Gender**, please ensure that the policies, plans and regulations are gender-responsive, by ensuring women's active participation (e.g., Outputs 1.1.2, 1.1.3 and 1.1.4). As a good gender mainstreaming practice, include in the Indicative Project Overview table, relevant gender equality considerations included in the component descriptions.

Under M&E please ensure that the Gender Action Plan to be developed is budgeted, and gender-specific results monitored and reported on.

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

The response is already reflected above in response to 3.2

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

The table 10 provided does not show any consultation at this stage of the project. Please provide list of the stakeholders and the consultations held thus far. Could you clarify if Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations, and Private Sector has been consulted.

04/24/24

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

Table 10/ page 42 has been updated, but as noted in Section 'Stakeholder Engagement' on Page 42 of PIF, during the PIF phase consultation was limited, but a broad approach to stakeholder engagement will be developed during the PPG stage and continued into project implementation, including specifically enhancing consultations with the private sector, local communities, women, ethnic minorities, youth and their institutions and state and local level entities. Consultation will ensure the application of FPIC principles where relevant and in the establishment of strong partnerships across government (at all levels) to achieve their active participation for sustainable biodiversity-related natural resources and economic development.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's CommentsYes

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

Agency's Comments

UNDP comment - 15th April 2024

Please note that the LOE dated 25.04.2023 has been replaced with the LOE dated 25.03.2024. IN the new version the sources of funds and focal areas were corrected i.e. the figures corresponding to LD and CC focal areas were reversed in the old LOE version. This has been addressed/corrected in the new LOE dated 25.03.2024.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

Yes

05/02/24

As written above, there is a significant difference between the title of the project provided in the LoE vs. the title of the project in the Portal. Please update the title in the portal to match what is provided in the LoE and signed by the OFP.

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

The title has been adjusted to match the LoE.

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments
05/02/24

No. Please revise the project per comments above and resubmit ASAP.

May 21st 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

UNDP response - 17th May 2024

Thank you. The comments have been addressed in different sections of this Review Sheet.

UNDP response - 15th April 2024

All comments addressed in previous sections

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	4/1/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	