



Ecosystem Restoration Global Coordination Project

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11122

Countries

Global

Project Name

Ecosystem Restoration Global Coordination Project

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

12/17/2023

Review completed by PM

1/22/2024

Program Manager

Ulrich Apel

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Not fully.

Please clarify: if Center for Natural Climate Solutions is the executing partner on behalf of CI, does CI need to be listed as executing partner as well? The presentation in the portal is different from the Agency Prodoc, where CI is not listed.

See also the difference to para 66: "The CI-GEF Project Agency is the Implementing Agency for this project. The Center for Natural Climate Solutions is the Executing Agency".

01/22/2024: Addressed. However, the Center for Natural Climate Solutions is now listed twice - is there a reason for it?

02/13/2024: Addressed. Has been removed.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

The Center for Natural Climate Solutions at Conservation International is a division separate from the CI-GEF Agency that will execute the project with FAO, WRI and UNDP as co-executing agencies. This has been updated in the Institutional Arrangement section of the ProDoc.

2/7/2024

Double entry for the Center for Natural Climate Solutions has been revised.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Not fully.

Please revise Rio Markers: Note that "principal" has a higher priority than "significant" as per definition of Rio Markers. Therefore, the assignment of markers needs to be switched.

01/22/2024: Addressed. Now all Rio Markers have been set at the "significant" level. Is there a principal objective for this project and/or are all three convention contributions equally important?

02/13/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

Rio Markers changes to significant.

2/7/2024:

Climate change mitigation, Biodiversity, and Land Degradation markers were tagged ?Significant 1? given the objectives of the integrated program that this coordination child project is supporting. We have removed the tag on Climate change adaptation in accordance to the OECD DAC for Rio Markers for Climate.

2. Project Summary.

- a) 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 outcomes?**
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**
- c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) **Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) **[If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?**
- c) **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?**
- d) **Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- e) **Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- f) **Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Not fully.

d) Please clarify M&E budget. The M&E budget is only presented in Annex J in the prodoc. It should also be included in the portal template in the respective section by presenting the usual M&E budget table there. Further, please consider separating out M&E costs and include them into the line item in the portal Table: "Child Project Description Overview".

Note that para 54 just says: "presented in Annex J" without referring the reader to where this Annex can be located. The same applies to para 61.

e) the PMC co-financing is not exactly proportional, please amend.

01/22/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

d) M&E Budget included as a table in Annex G of the portal and Annex J of the ProDoc. Word document with all budget tables uploaded separately.

e) PMC co-financing updated to ensure proportionality.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

- a) **Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?**
- b) **Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?**

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

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

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If

a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Not fully

(1) on M&E:

- In para 53: The GCP should consider using the M&E results also for purposes to assess/document transformative change and program level impact beyond GEBs. Para 53 would be a good place to mention this.
- In the project results framework, the objective indicator for scaling out indicator 2 is projects "additional restoration projects invited". Please consider "additional restoration projects applying" as an additional indicator.
- Further in the indicator 2: "100 additional projects": please consider the size of these projects to have an idea about the scale of the scaling out effects.

(2) On Transformation levers: the mention of "transformation" throughout the document comes across as a general term without elaborating what it entails. While the ToC clarifies the different aspects of transformation in the context of this program, when the term is used in the text, it is only used in general terms. It would be helpful to elaborate at some places especially on the C1: "restoration accelerated through strengthened capacity for [...] governance, policy, finance, and enabling conditions".

(3) On Innovation: Please elaborate with examples so that the reader has an idea what the general term "innovation" could mean in the context of ERIP. Which "novel technologies, business models, and processes" the GCP will promote / consider promoting? This comment is also made in reference to the Council comment from Germany, which requested to better define "innovation". While a definition has been added to the glossary, the comment remains valid for the project description.

See e.g.: para 91: "The GCP's approach to innovation and policy coherence is holistic, emphasizing alignment with global commitments, stakeholder engagement, and capacity building." Some more elaboration is required here and in other places. A short bullet point list with a "innovation shortlist" that the GCP may promote in some of the child projects would be helpful.

(4) Private sector engagement: While mentioned adequately, it would also benefit from some concrete examples to illustrate what types of engagement opportunities the GCP will pursue in the program.

(5) Communities of practice (CoP): Please provide further information / examples of CoP that will be promoted and how they are instrumental for the program's concept to bring about

transformative change. As mentioned above a "CoP shortlist" would be helpful to better illustrate this important project element.

01/22/2024: Addressed. In addition, please address the following comment on Knowledge Management:

The project proposal includes elements dedicated to KM&L deliverables, especially in Component 2, that enable and enhance access to knowledge and information through training, workshops, communities of practice as well as dissemination of knowledge products for learning, outreach and awareness raising, including via digital platforms such as a digital Restoration portal. There is reference to a communication strategy. The project results framework includes KM&L deliverables. While the total budget for each component has been provided, there is no budget and timeline specified for key KM and communications activities.

The agency is requested to clarify the budget and implementation timeline for key KM&L activities/deliverables across all components; including training, dissemination and communications. This can be done by including a simple table in the KM&L section.

02/13/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

On M&E:

Para 53 (portal) amended: The following has been added: *?Because significant transformational change usually takes time, the GCP M&E (see Annex J) will monitor an array of indicators of progress suited to the causal pathways and impacts being pursued on various processes of scaling such as: the extent to which the organizations or other actors that need to make changes have the capacity to think about and deliver them; whether the changes in values and in policy, legal, and institutional arrangements that are needed for scaling are starting to happen, and whether measures reflecting the status quo are decreasing; whether the appropriate form of support by important stakeholders is being maintained or increased, including levels of engagement, influence, and learning, while considering vested interests and power dynamics; whether relevant novel technologies, business models, and processes are emerging, and whether appropriate levels of knowledge exchange and learning are occurring among the actors who need to deploy them; and*

whether there is evidence of appropriate financial resources increasingly flowing in the directions needed, particularly from mainstream public and private sources.?

Paragraph 65 (Portal) also explains the metrics that the project will use to monitor Transformation: *65. The project seeks expansion by intertwining child projects with global private sector entities. This facilitates national participants to spot and form private sector alliances. Additionally, the project champions science-policy dialogues in tandem with academic and research sectors, placing emphasis on nurturing the next generation of researchers. This GCP is geared towards inducing a transformative ripple effect. It accentuates the importance of holistic planning, stakeholder participation, and a futuristic vision. It also elaborates on how child projects can shape broader outcomes on both national and regional scales. These catalysts are essential for achieving the project's transformational objectives. Additionally, the project integrates both lead and lag indicators to track transformative milestones. While lead indicators measure the implementation of change, lag indicators evaluate the fulfillment of intended environmental enhancements. The monitoring framework is designed for sustainability, ensuring continued assessment even post-project completion.*

Objective Indicator 2: Amended to read, "Indicator 2, Number and hectareage of additional restoration projects applying Ecosystem Restoration IP knowledge tools, resources, platform and structure, extending beyond the original ER IP countries"

Objective Indicator 2 Target: amended to read: *?Target 2: 100 additional restoration projects representing 1 million ha applying Ecosystem Restoration IP knowledge tools, resources, platform, and structure by the end of the program.*

2) on Transformation:

-Component 1 changed to read: *?Restoration is accelerated through strengthened capacity for innovative and informed ecosystem governance, policy, finance and enabling conditions?*

-Glossary of Terms (see ProDoc): Transformation definition has been added: *?Transformation refers to a process of deep, systemic, and sustainable change leading to large-scale impacts in areas of global environmental concern. It involves significant alterations that are not only extensive and rapid but also fundamentally innovative, affecting the very values, goals, structures, and institutions of society. Transformation can occur at various scales, from individual to regional to national, and aims to improve global environmental benefits (GEBs).?*

-Para 12 (portal). Added the following example of an integrated approach: *?A pertinent example of this integrated approach in action is the planetGOLD program, which targets the transformation of practices in small-scale/artisanal gold mining across diverse geographies. The program focuses on four key pathways: awareness-raising, access to finance, formalization, and technical solutions. These pathways aim to change public perceptions of formalized artisanal gold mining, increase private finance for sustainable mining practices, reduce policy barriers to formalization, and enhance awareness of innovative technical options and best practices in both partner and non-partner countries. Such a comprehensive*

approach exemplifies how coordinated efforts across different focal areas can lead to systemic change, illustrating the kind of multi-dimensional strategy the Ecosystem Restoration IP aims to implement.?

-Para 37 (portal). Complemented the paragraph adding: *Overall, these outcomes collectively contribute to the transformational change in ecosystem restoration by enhancing multi-stakeholder collaboration, identifying, and addressing gaps in current strategies, facilitating knowledge exchange, and strengthening strategic planning capabilities?*

-Para 64 (portal) has been amended to read: *The monitoring plan in Annex J for the Ecosystem Restoration IP addresses the transformation levers by:*

Measuring Usage of Knowledge Tools: Indicators assess how country child projects use Ecosystem Restoration IP knowledge tools, providing a quantitative measure of knowledge integration and application in activities.

Scaling Out Impact: Monitoring the number and hectarage of additional restoration projects utilizing the program's knowledge tools, which helps in assessing the scaling impact beyond original program countries.

Evaluating Capacity Building: Indicators focus on measuring increased capacity in various stakeholder groups, including cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder coherence, and innovative and evidence-based ecosystem restoration techniques.

Financial Leveraging: Tracking new financing leveraged for restoration projects and the number of countries reporting increased finance due to training and technical support, offering insight into the program's financial impact and sustainability.

Governance and Adaptive Management: Monitoring includes assessing governance structures and alignment of child projects with program objectives, ensuring responsive and effective management.

Knowledge Management and Exchange: Evaluating the benefits gained by users from knowledge and learning resources, promoting continuous learning and strategic communication.?

3)On Innovation: this is covered in the portal in paragraphs 62-64 Innovation and Transformation go beyond the framings of specific components, outcomes or outputs referenced below. STAP guidance and methodologies influenced the backbone and higher-level framing of the results framework of the IP.

See also Section C of the portal (Para 92 of the ProDoc): the following text has been added: *Innovation is associated with Knowledge Management as a Lever-of-Change in the framing of the results framework of the IP titled ?Innovations & Knowledge Management?.*

Stimulating innovation is also integrated into all components with the creation of linkages to thematic Communities of Practice and targeted Working Groups. In addition, there are also plans for a Community of Practice with a focus on Innovation and Transformational models and one on Monitoring and Technology looking at innovations to support ecosystem restoration. The position of the GCP is that broad exposure to new ideas, tested experiences, traditional knowledge, can inform national-level ecosystem restoration approaches, cost effectiveness, and compatibility with local conditions, cultures, roles and norms. The linkages will support scaling of innovations in distinct ecosystems supported by the Program, equally important as informing the global audience of innovations resulting from the IP. Tactically,

the establishment of linkages supports Component 1 that seeks to improve enabling conditions in policy, restoration science, and financing. As a cross cutting theme, the Program vis-a-vis the GCP seeks innovations in all three spheres.

To the question: Innovations are considered in 5 aspects (see Para 90 of the portal)

(1.) Technological Innovation: Innovations in Restoration Methods and science can produce greater GEBs and provide cost efficiencies, such as the case of Assisted Natural Regeneration. These are often unknown and not well understood in comparison to traditional approaches. Outcome 1.2. is focused on innovation in restoration.

(2.) Innovative financing: Innovations in financing restoration are considered within Outcome 1.3 whose outputs are oriented to different angles of increasing financing through means that are innovative to national practitioners. CI considers the aspects of (a) derisking and making results of restoration bankable; (b) matchmaking with potential financiers and different ?blend? combinations; (c) working with child projects to increase local capacity and readiness for financing.

(3.) Business model innovation - See notes on the Private sector above. Outcome 1.3 supports Child Projects, the Program, and global restoration needs with strong global Private sector linkages, participation, and vision. This participation is both bilateral and is included in the RAC, the center for discussing innovations in restoration.

(4.) Policy Innovation Support GEF?s innovation and impact in policy areas- Outcome 1.1 is dedicated to innovation in policy. CI has developed partnerships with institutions, such as WRI, that brings to the table innovative policy tools. The GCP funds supporting child projects with these tools and in scaling products facilitating multi-stakeholder dialogue. The focus is supporting child projects to identify and remove barriers to ecosystem restoration.

(5) Institutional innovation - Institutional innovation is supported at the global and national levels. At the global level, the RAC is an innovative body for GEF programs. Rather than focus on Program management aspects, the RAC provides a space for thought leaders to interact in themes such as ?innovation in restoration policy, financing, science, etc.? At the global level, the GCP supports the exchange mentioned above within communities of practice and working groups. Although not novel, the space to discuss policy innovations can be a new concept for national officials. Interacting with peers in this space could create reflection points that support change at the national level. Finally, at the national level, the diagnostic tools mentioned, and the result of linkages will provide support to child projects in raising awareness on needed institutional innovations needed.

4) Private sector engagement

Paragraph 26 of the portal elaborates on how the GCP supports countries in translating restoration targets into actionable and financeable plans, emphasizing the role of blended

finance in leveraging market access and other financial opportunities. Concrete examples provided in the paragraph include:

?Using payment for ecosystem services to compensate landholders for restoration efforts.

?Catalyzing carbon markets to scale up climate-related global environmental benefits (GEBs) from restoration.

?Enhancing market readiness and access for products linked to improved management and restoration processes.

?Increasing efficiencies and returns on restoration investment to boost investor confidence and appeal.

Paragraph 40 of the portal- Additionally, the GCU will work with CI's corporate team on these three initial activities to foster private sector engagement:

?Collaborate with corporate-linked initiatives (e.g. UNEP-FI, NCS Alliance, etc.) to convene workshops with the private sector, identifying and advancing opportunities for private sector engagement in ecosystem restoration.

?Create and facilitate Ecosystem Restoration IP Private Sector Council to advise and collaborate on key partnerships, knowledge products, financing plans, etc. to leverage funds for ecosystem restoration.

?Develop business cases and portfolio presentations to promote private sector investment in ecosystem restoration, as well as capacity building materials for restoration practitioners, including women, youth, and IP&LCs to better access financing.

Also, The GCP promotes strong private sector engagement as a core component of the pathway to scale financing sustainably and capacity building for GCP stakeholders to strengthen their own proactive engagement with the private sector. It does so as part of the enabling conditions and innovations within Component 1. Although the Private sector can support many roles, The GCP sees this sector as critical in resource mobilization lever for scaling out.

The strategy is laid out in **paragraphs 26 to 29 of the portal** For many of the participating child projects, Private Sector participation is an innovation. A second aspect of the approach is to support the child projects in building out financing. An indicator is included in Outcome 1.3. on the amount of funding above the GEF investment leveraged. A second indicator seeks to raise \$30 M U.S. to support restoration world-wide, thereby scaling out the Program's impacts.

5) On Communities of Practice:

See Portal paragraphs 46: The Communities of Practice is a mechanism identified to provide support to the country child projects through strengthening their links to networks worldwide with similar thematic interests, building on existing communities of practices (CoPs) and/or supporting new ones, if needed. We have budgeted for around 13 CoP @240K each which includes support, development of knowledge products and training to support country child projects and scale. We currently have officially identified 5 CoPs; the remaining areas are flexible to meet countries' needs. Thematically these will include:

-Grasslands ? led by AFR100

- Freshwater Challenge ? part of the UN Decade led by a group of partners
- Climate Challenge - part of the UN Decade led by a group of partners
- Restoration and Gender ? REFACOF, a women-led restoration network across Africa
- Mangroves ? Global Mangroves Alliance

In addition to these 5, we also have place holders for the following: IP&LCs, youth, restoration innovation and transformational models, monitoring and technology and three others to be defined as needs arise from country child projects. Some of these CoP specifics are intentionally left open to co-creation with these communities, for example in the case of IP&LCs and youth, where in consultations from May to present, leaders emphasized the importance of self-determination on the specific use of funds and the need for representation from multiple regions on demographics, rather than one representative speaking for all or the GCP coming with a set framing for use of funds. Paragraph 46 has been amended to include the above details in the text.

2/7/2024

Par. 118 - The information requested is presented in tables 7 and 8. Table 7 shows the KM&L timeline and table 8 shows the KM&L budget. These can be found on pages 70 and 71.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Not fully.

- a) Please elaborate on the institutional arrangement regarding the roles / tasks of the executing partners listed in Part I. The respective portal section only mentions the Center for Climate solutions. While there is some mentioning in the components section, it is currently confusing as there are many other partners mentioned there, which are not necessarily executing partners. Please insert a simple table in the section: "Institutional Arrangement and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project".

See also para 66: "The CI-GEF Project Agency is the Implementing Agency for this project. The Center for Natural Climate Solutions is the Executing Agency".

(Editorial comment: there is no para 67.)

01/22/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

Institutional Arrangement section amended to explain role of co-executing agencies and table added with details.

. The Center for Natural Climate Solutions at Conservation International is the Executing Agency, co-executing in collaboration with WRI, FAO and UNDP. Details of each co-executing partner role is provided in the table below.

Co-Executing Agencies	Responsibilities
CI Center for NCS	Overall management of the GCP through the Global Coordination Unit and in coordination with the Program governance structure. Responsible for overall management, partner and country child projects coordination, delivering training, technical assistance to Child Projects, reporting to the GEF and overall project oversight.
WRI	WRI will lead outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 focused on enabling conditions to support ecosystem restoration, building on their experience working with networks for policy coherence and harmonization

<p>UNDP</p>	<p>UNDP will collaborate with GCU on outputs 1.1.4, 1.2.1 and 1.3.1 ? these will build on their work with NBSAP and Biofin and will focus on capacity building of the country projects to develop restoration action planning and finance plans. UNDP will also deliver an ecosystem restoration training/MOOC to all the country child projects.</p>
<p>FAO</p>	<p>The GCU will work with FAO on the following activities on trainings to promote adoption and dissemination of the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration standards of practice (output 1.2.1), co-develop interoperability and interaction between the FERM platform and Trends.earth to ERIP targets (Output 2.2.2), link ERIP child projects to the reporting mechanism of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework and facilitate inclusion of GEF project activities in global reporting (Output 2.2.2) and EX-ACT capacity building and technical backstopping (Output 1.2.1).</p>

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described (e.g. including these related to work in fragile locations and/or countries)? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Are the key risks that might affect implementation assessed and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request^{n/a}

Agency Response

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: No.

Reviewer could not locate the gender action plan. Please upload gender action plan and add as an Annex to the prodoc.

01/22/2024: Addressed - uploaded to documents. In addition:

Please ensure that gender experts and women are included in all references to stakeholders, dialogue, and that they are represented in councils, committees, bodies created. Please ensure that the KM and Learning Strategy to be developed is gender-responsive. In Outcome 1.3, please reflect how gender inequalities with regard to women's access to and knowledge on financial access are going to be addressed by the project.

02/13/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

Gender Action Plan Uploaded

2/7/2024

Amendments were made to paragraphs 39, 45 and 50 of the ProDoc to better reflect the measures designed as part of the GCP Gender Mainstreaming Strategy to ensure participation of women and gender experts in multistakeholder dialogues, and their representation in governance bodies.

Regarding the observation on ensuring that the KM and Learning Strategy is gender-responsive, the GCP Gender Mainstreaming Strategy describes specific actions to ensure this, for example, the development of gender dedicated knowledge products and inclusion aspects of ecosystem restoration, and the fact that there will be a working group on GESI, among other actions. To make this more visible in the description of the project components, Paragraph 47 was amended to better-reflect that the KM and Learning Strategy will be gender-responsive.

On Outcome 1.3, the GCP Gender Mainstreaming Strategy includes activities designed to address gender inequalities in financial access, such as: a) identifying specific needs and gaps of the child projects, related to financial access of women; b) addressing those needs via specific training module on how to mainstream gender to financial plans; the development of an specific knowledge product on this issue; c) promoting that proposals include specific requirements and scores to value how gender equality is promoted under financing request, etc. To make this more visible in the description of the project components, Paragraph 41 was amended.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: No.

Reviewer could not locate the stakeholder engagement plan. Please upload.

01/22/2024: Addressed - uploaded to documents.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

Stakeholder Engagement Plan Uploaded

7.4 Have required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Uploaded in documents section of the portal.

Cleared

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Editorial comment: Please fit the Logframe into the portal margins by narrowing the columns slightly.

01/22/2024: Additional comment:

Please include core indicator 11 and its target in the results framework explicitly (in Annex C).

02/13/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

01/20/2024:

Logframe margins adjusted

2/7/2024

Indicator 11 was added to Annex C as indicator 2.1b

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

01/22/2024: Additional comment:

Fields related to the geo location of project activities are empty. Please make a reference here that location of the supported project activities will be gathered by Global Coordination Project once all child projects are endorsed and under implementation.

02/13/2024: Addressed.

Cleared

Agency Response

2/7/2024

Added in Annex E - The location of the supported project activities will be gathered by Global Coordination Project once all child projects are endorsed and under implementation.

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Yes.

Cleared

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: Please note that comments on the budget will be provided in the next review.

01/22/2024: Please address the following comments on the budget:

i. Office operating costs are being charged across all components and PMC with this explanation: "Office operating costs are essential costs for the delivery of technical outcomes of the project and have been allocated across components proportional to each component's share of the overall budget." We do not agree that this explanation justifies the charge of operating costs to components, such operating costs should be charged to PMC only.

ii. Personnel and consultant costs: there seems to be overlapping positions on director/management/project lead/coordinator and on finance. These positions, except for the Sr. Coordinator and the Finance and Operations Lead (which are charged 100% to PMC), are being charged to project components and/or PMC. Please clarify / amend.

02/13/2024: Agency has responded to comments (see below response).

Agency Response

2/7/2024

i. Office operating costs are shared across PMC and utilized to primarily deliver technical outputs of the project. We believe this is consistent with best practices in resource allocation based on personnel level of effort and direct use in the various technical aspects of the project.

ii. The personnel and consultant titles have been updated to reflect the roles and responsibilities of the positions. Updates are presented in the annexes for the Project

Budget and Terms of Reference for all project positions and uploaded as a separate document for review.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Requestn/a

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

01/09/2024: No. Please address comments made in this review.

01/22/2024: No. Please address comments made in this review.

02/13/2024: Yes. Program Manager recommends CEO endorsement.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/9/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/22/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/13/2024	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)