

Inclusive Conservation Initiative

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10404

Countries

Global

Project Name

Inclusive Conservation Initiative

Agencies

CI, IUCN

Date received by PM

5/24/2021

Review completed by PM

11/9/2021

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF □ **CEO Endorsement** □

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes.

7/15/2021

No, we think some these activities may need to be revisited when addressing issues below.

Agency Response CI-GEF 07/29/2021: The EOIs for the resulting set of pre-selected subprojects will be further developed as full Impact Strategies during the first year of the ICI.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes. We note that the challenges presented by COVID have meant that activities proposed for the PPG have been moved to Year 1 in order to move execution forward where possible.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/13/2021

Yes, we note that line between MPA and marine mainstreaming can be even more tricky than in terrestrial contexts. The recently published guidelines on MPAs from IUCN could be helpful in separating these.

8/6/2021

No, thank you for the edits but it is surprising that there are no MPAs or marine mainstreaming (Core Indicator 5) as part of this project. Can you please confirm this?

7/15/2021

No, we are surprised to see how low the PA values are especially for core indicator 1 and 2. While we recognize the long and complicated history with PAs as such, we expected to see more areas under protection as part of this project with whatever name they may have (ICCA, OECM, etc). This project includes developing guidance for or potentially modifying the METT for use with indigenous and community areas so it would make sense that there would be larger areas being protected as part of the project. Please note that we do not expect areas for core indicator 1 or 2 to be no-use areas, but areas that have limited modification.

In addition, there are places where the numbers don't match between what has been entered in the Portal, the ToC (number of ha of PAs), and the narrative (number of beneficiaries).

Agency Response

?CI-GEF 08/16/2021:

•Based on the subprojects selected by the ISC, we updated marine targets during PPG phase. 165,200 is included under Indicator 5: Area of marine habitat under improved practices to benefit biodiversity (excluding protected areas). This target includes two subprojects: Ru K'ux Abya Yala and Lau Seascape/Cook Islands.

Note that Lau/Cooks in the original EOI included the same marine areas in both Indicators 2 and 5. We removed them from Indicator 2 to not be double-counted.

•

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

Core Indicators revised.

To further clarify, description of indicators were edited as follows: 1. In the ToC: Changed ?1.45 million hectares of PAs under improved management? to ?1.45 million hectares of PAs created or under improved management? 2. In the Results Framework: Changed ?b. Area (hectares) of IPLC To further clarify, description of indicators were edited as follows: 1. In the ToC: Changed ?1.45 million hectares of PAs under improved management? to ?1.45 million hectares of PAs created or under improved management? 2. In the Results Framework: Changed ?b. Area (hectares) of IPLC terrestrial and marine protected areas under improved management for conservation and sustainable use. (Target: 1,446,051 ha)? to ?b. Area (hectares) of IPLC terrestrial and marine protected areas created or under improved management??

Regarding the number of beneficiaries in the narrative, Paragraph 148 (ProDoc)/GEB section of portal refers to ?The ICI will directly benefit at least an estimated 151,309 people (50% women) through on-the-ground project activities including employment in conservation jobs, strengthening of existing livelihoods, and investment in sustainable livelihoods (e.g. ecotourism).? and ?The ICI will also reach at least 1,340 beneficiaries through capacity building and global component project activities.? This totals the number of beneficiaries in the Core Indicators (and elsewhere in the ProDoc), which is 152,649. To avoid confusion, the text in the ProDoc now clarifies that direct beneficiaries are the sum of beneficiaries from Component 1 activities and from Components 2-4. Paragraph 148 now reads: ?The ICI will directly benefit at least an estimated 152,649 people (50% women). This total includes 151,309 people through on-the-ground project activities (Component 1) including employment in conservation jobs, strengthening of existing livelihoods, and investment in sustainable livelihoods (e.g. ecotourism). The ICI will also reach at least 1,340 beneficiaries through capacity building and global component project activities (Components 2-4); capacity built through the ICI will equip IPLC partners to access larger conservation finance opportunities, influence decision-making related to international environmental policy, and advance the IPLC agenda of the GEF.?

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/6/2021

Yes, thank you for the edits. Maintaining the link between IPAG and the SC is important, and it is important to clarify that the SC will not approve workplans, so processes can move forward. We expect the agencies will keep the GEF Secretariat apprised of the updated workplans.

7/15/2021

No, please address the following:

- Fellows programs - it looks like there are multiple fellows programs. Can you please provide clarity on these different activities, what they will entail and how they relate to each other?

- Governance - More details on the make up, structure and roles of the Steering Committee are needed. Is there a role for IPAG and GEF on the Steering Committee? Friends of ICI are referenced but no details provided.

Output 1.1.2 - We believe that the GEF Secretariat needs to have a role in reviewing the subprojects as well especially as we are not able to review them at this point in time. It also seems like it may be challenging to hold up Work Plan approval until the annual process of the Steering Committee. While we understand the desire to support indigenous governance, it will be important to make sure that it is not an impediment to progress for the many different moving parts of the project.

Target 2.3B - We think it's important that any sustainable financing strategy is about more than seeking grants or donor funds, rather that it looks to ways for the organizations and communities to fund themselves and not be dependent on donations. While they could be part of such a plan, it would be important to have a diversity of funding approaches to make the plans more resilient such as in Output 2.3.1.

Outcome 3.1 - While this may be a challenging outcome to measure, it's worth reexamining these two targets. A) 400 seems like a high number compared to the number of IPs who regularly participate in international processes. It also feels a bit odd to just use self-reporting though admittedly this is trying to get at quality not just quantity of participation. B) Seems like to something that is very much outside the control of the project and could be challenging to achieve even if the project is well-implemented.

Output 3.1.4 - The list of organizations is a bit confusing as some are things to be influenced while others are things to work with (ICCA, DGM). It would be good to separate those.

Output 4.1.1 - How will this be managed and maintained at project end?

Agency Response

CI-GEF 11/08/2021:

Information on the types of IPLC activities to be funded by the project is now included for each component.

CI-GEF 11/03/2021:

Responding to question received on 11/02 in GEFSEC recommendation section of review sheet.

CI has included language on the funds going to IPLCS at the beginning of each component description as well as below the Theory of Change diagram.

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

There is only one fellows program, which is the ICI International Environmental Policy Fellows (Target 3.1.3.: 15 fellows (5 per year in years 2-4 of project, at least 50% women)). In the ProDoc text, this program was also referred to as ICI International Policy Fellows. This inconsistency has been corrected in the ProDoc.

The following text was inserted as paragraph 223 of ProDoc/ Institutional Arrangements section of the portal ?Thus, the steering committee includes representatives of the sub-projects, and two additional members outside of ICI subprojects to be considered once the Steering Committee is established (see TORs in Appendix XVI). Additional members may include a representative from the IPAG, and potentially a representative from outside the project scope to allow for cross-learning. The GEF Secretariat will have a non-voting seat on the GSC and provide relevant guidance related to GEF strategy, policy and procedures. Representatives of the GEF Implementing Agencies (CI/IUCN) will provide technical and secretarial support to the ICI Steering Committee. In keeping with ICI being IP-led, necessary decisions will be taken by the SC members, with advice coming from GEF and the IAs. The ?Friends of ICI? (see below) will be composed of funders, other initiatives and will be established to facilitate cross-learning, coordination with other similar initiatives and to allow broadening of the reach of the initiative. This will also allow potential co-funders to learn directly from the partners. The Friends can be convened on a needs basis and costs will be borne by the members. Some members may opt to observe some of the global activities of ICI.?

TORs for both the Steering Committee and Friends of ICI are included in added Appendix XVI. Regarding the comment on Output 1.1.2: we note that the Steering Committee is not in charge of Work Plan approval of subprojects; Work Plans will be approved by the Implementing Agencies. The GEF Secretariat will have opportunities to review and comment on subprojects through participation in Steering Committee meetings as described in para 222. Target 2.3B - This comment appears to refer to Indicator 2.3B. The comment is accepted and indicator adjusted to read: Percentage of ICI subproject lead organizations that report greater capacity in proposal development, fundraising and implementation of sustainable financing strategies. Target 3.1.A. This is not expected to be an issue, given the number of years and the number and variety of virtual and in-person opportunities including events, training, interventions, etc.

Target 3.1.B. Based on relationships and networks that CI and IUCN can draw upon to facilitate this type of engagement, combined with the investment in capacity as well as dedicated network events at major convenings, we are confident that this is feasible. Output 3.1.4. To avoid confusion, the relevant sentence in para 122 was edited to read ?(for example, these may include meetings under the Minamata Convention, Rio Conventions, CITES, Equator Initiative, and New York Declaration on Forests, and other meetings convened under DGM, IUCN, and the ICCA Consortium).? Output 4.1.1: As noted in the ProDoc, IUCN and CI will engage with the ?Friends of ICI? group to establish the Knowledge Platform as a go-to site for knowledge sharing on

IPLC led conservation. The "Friends of ICI" group will also be engaged to sustain the Platform beyond the project term, noting that basic maintenance costs are anticipated to be modest and that continued support aligns with the interest and priorities of these partners. The following text was added to para 165: "Moreover, the project will engage the "Friends of ICI" group for continued support of the Knowledge Platform established as Output 4.1.1 beyond the project term."

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/6/2021

Yes, thank you.

7/15/2021

No, while this is generally good, it would be good to include more emphasis on how this project can model and advocate for inclusive conservation approaches and financing opportunities to encourage governments to use funds (donor and otherwise) and the private sector to take this kind of work on.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

The following text was added as para 168 of ProDoc/Innovativeness section of the portal: ?To disseminate innovations generated through the project, the ICI will work through multiple platforms and channels to model and advocate for increased government and private support for inclusive conservation approaches. Overall, a key focus of the ICI Communications Strategy will be to reach and influence these audiences to increase their support and promote adoption of learnings and best practices. Other specific anticipated platforms for engagement include: subproject country-level stakeholder meetings

and supervision missions (engaging governments, conservation organization and relevant private sector partners to encourage related investments), events in global policy forums, and presentations in GEF meetings.?

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes. We note that each subproject will require its own stakeholder engagement process.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes, we note that each subproject will need to complete its own gender analysis.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes. There is limited private sector engagement described at this time and we hope that as the subprojects are elaborated and sustainable finance plans developed, there is attention given to opportunities to create long term financing through engagement with the private sector.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/6/2021

Yes, thank you.

7/15/2021

No, please include discussion on how to adjust if there is change in leadership in the EAs as well as the possibility of the revocation of consent by an organization. We note that there are certain restrictions that are non-negotiable for the GEF and, therefore, it is possible though probably highly unlikely that there could be issues that could cause problems.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

Lack of leadership continuity is noted as a risk for Outcome 1.2 in the Risk Assessment and Mitigation Table. The following risk mitigation measures are identified:

Communications strategy; application of FPIC; transparency requirements stipulated in sub-grant agreements; grievance mechanism; targeted training on skills and organizational capacity; design training programs to reach a critical mass of current and potential future leaders Also see Risk Assessment and Mitigation Table 6: Outcome 1.1. and

2.1. See barriers listed to addressing the Environmental Problems and Root Causes (ProDoc p.61)/Barriers section of portal: - Limited capacity to access and manage financing for IPLC-led conservation. - Limited capacity of IPLCs in administrative management skills and communications technology. See (p.87) Output 1.1.1 on organizational capacity assessments (p.88) Output 1.2.1 on subproject Impact Strategies (p.100) Output 1.2.1 on customized capacity building plan for subprojects (p.101) Output 1.2.2 on customized capacity building activities (p.107) Output 2.1.3 on organizational development and capacity building

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/6/2021

Yes. It will be important to collaborate with the SGP fellows program in implementation.

7/15/2021

No, it would be helpful to have a conversation on how CI and IUCN will work together and with the different EAs. At this point, there is little information in this regard. It would be good to have a meeting to discuss this in depth.

Page 65 - It would be good to think about how this initiative might be able to influence implementation of GEF projects and design of new ones - not only to collaborate and avoid duplication.

How will this project work with the SGP IP Fellows?

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

Clarified through TORs and budget. On page 66, the last row (GEF Projects and Relevant Initiatives in subproject countries) of Table 8 is revised as follows: ?The ICI will facilitate communication and engagement between ICI subproject lead organizations and related projects in the involved countries, with particular attention to GEF projects and projects implemented by CI and IUCN. The intent is to influence

implementation of GEF projects and design of new ones, building from innovation and lessons learned from the ICI. This will be done through regular interactions with government and other GEF project partners, including through full subproject design processes, other in-country stakeholder meetings, engagements with government and partners around supervision missions, and ongoing engagement with the IPAG and GEF Secretariat, including through the project Steering Committee. Purposes of these interactions will include: exchange of lessons learned, best practices, and networking resources; exploration of scope for co-investment or strategically and programmatically aligned investment; avoiding duplication of efforts; alignment of messaging in interactions with key stakeholders and constituencies; joint exploration of potential for follow-on programming, financing solutions, replication, and scale-up. See Appendix X for a listing of GEF projects and relevant initiatives by subproject. Regarding collaboration with SGP fellows, the following text was added to the first row (Small Grants Program) of Table 8: "Finally, the ICI will benefit from lessons learned from the SGP

fellowship program to design a relevant and impactful fellowship program; SGP IP fellows will be considered for roles as mentors/advisers for the ICI fellows."

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
8/6/2021

Yes.

7/15/2021

No, it would be good to discuss how these efforts can be promote to change project implementation and government policy more broadly.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

This will be covered in more detail in the ICI Communications Strategy, to be developed in year 1 of the project. In addition, text was added to the end of para 185 so that it now reads: "How the Knowledge Platform and other resources will be used to disseminate knowledge products and support other ICI efforts will be detailed in an ICI Communications Strategy (Output 4.2.1), to be completed by the end of the first year (though some knowledge management and communications activities will commence before then). This strategy will include analysis of key target audiences, strategic communications channels, and strategic communications and outreach opportunities (e.g. global conferences and events). The strategy will also serve to ensure a consistent articulation of the ICI design and purpose among all the subprojects. Additional objectives of the Communications Strategy will be to support policy engagement by IPLC representatives, coordination among IPLC organizations and delegations, and efforts related to sustainable financing (e.g. working with IPLC-led conservation implementers on communications to reach potential investors). Thus, the Communications Strategy will also serve as an important complement to the ICI capacity-building investments. The Communications Strategy will also consider how to leverage knowledge products to inform project design and implementation by the GEF and partners, for example by using project Supervision Missions to engage stakeholders including government policy makers; direct engagement with the GEF IPAG; engagement of national GEF OFPs; and participation in other multi-stakeholder project development processes.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/6/2021

Yes, thank you for including the safeguards review.

7/15/2021

Yes. We note that subprojects will need to do their own assessments as activities are full outlined.

For gender on component 4, who qualifies as ICI staff?

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

For gender on component 4, staff refers to lead staff of subproject EAs as well as the PMU. This is now clarified on page 78 of the ProDoc: ?-Percentage of ICI staff (PMU and subproject EAs) who believe that gender has been adequately mainstreamed into the ICI?

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

8/6/2021

Yes. Thank you for the edits and additions. We look forward to seeing more outcome and impact indicators from the subproject plans. It would be good if there could at least be a percentage increase in capacity across all subprojects. Having indicators that can roll up is obviously challenging but will be helpful in the long run.

7/15/2021

No, while there is a budgeted M&E plan, most all of the indicators are simply about the existence of a plan or output and not its quality. It would be good to think about how the quality/use/effective implementation could be measured through the indicators.

In addition, there is reference to developing individualized organizational capacity scorecards. We would suggest that it would be better to have a standardized scorecard that potentially could be used in the future (and may come from partners) so that there are indicators that can be aggregated across the different subprojects.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 07/29/2021:

Para 89 of ProDoc/ Description of Output 1.1.2 in the portal reads: "Subproject M&E plans elaborated for Impact Strategies will include locally appropriate quality indicators to enrich interpretation of quantitative indicators, defined with IPLCs to ensure that they reflect local norms and are meaningful to local stakeholders." We may add that Output indicators typically serve to track project implementation progress ? this means they typically are less likely to capture quality considerations. Quality, within the project M&E framework, typically is better captured at the Outcome and Objective level. This clearly is the case with the Objective level indicators for ICI (particularly the first 3); likewise, quality is captured in multiple indicators at the Outcome level. We have reviewed the Project Results Monitoring Plan to identify places where quality considerations can be further highlighted, and made adjustments in the Methodology column such that they read as follows: Indicator 1.1.2.: Document review (verify IS completed and reviewed for quality) Indicator 1.2.1.: Review of documentation (verify assessments conducted and plans completed In addition, para 100 of the ProDoc notes ?Pre- and post-assessments of capacity will be conducted to evaluate the impact of training.? Indicator 2.2.2.: Review of learning exchange reports, including participant assessment of learning events Indicator 2.3.A.: Document review (verify that financing strategies are completed; each will be reviewed by a panel of experts for quality) Indicator 2.3.2.: Review of training event reports (including pre- and post- capacity assessment) In addition, para 116 of the ProDoc notes ?Pre- and post-training capacity assessments will be conducted to evaluate the impact of the training.? In addition, as stated in Output 1.1.2. ?Impact Strategy development will also include refinement and selection of cultural benefit indicators (see Appendix XV).? Regarding organizational capacity scorecards, para 101 of the ProDoc has been edited to include the following: ?Changes in technical, project management and governance

capacities will be measured through a capacity scorecard. The scoring framework will include standard sections applicable to all projects, and sections tailored to each subproject lead organization based on their capacity-building plan. This will permit aggregation to track ICI-wide progress and application to other geographies, while also capturing elements specific to each project.?

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes. It will be important to consider how this relates to various SDGs and other international goals and agreements.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/23/2021

1. On Project Information: Please change the expected start date to a future date and kindly make sure to meet the 60 months duration. The expected completion date should be a day before the starting the next year (though currently incorrect in Portal, it would be: 08/31/2026).
2. The funds allocation in Table D at PIF stage is different from CEO Endorsement ? please amend by modifying Table D in the CEO Endorsement (leaving the same amounts as in the PIF approved by Council).
3. On Core Indicators : Core Indicator 2 (Marine Protected Areas) and Indicator 11 (Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment) have to be reflected in Annex A. Project Results Framework.
4. On co-financing:
 - UNDP: change ?GEF Agency? to ?Donor Agency?.
 - Global Wildlife Conservation: change ?In-kind? ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Grant? ?Investment mobilized?.
 - National Geographic: change ?In-kind? ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Grant? ?Investment mobilized?.
 - Nia Tero: change ?In-kind? ?Recurrent expenditures? to ?Grant? ?Investment mobilized?.
 - Under ?Investment mobilized? description, provide the financing plans for each source.
5. Please include Letters of no objection from Nepal and Bolivia are required in the re-submission.
6. On budget:
 - Project staff (Lead/Manager + Financial and Administrative & Logistics Specialist) are

charged to both ?PMC and project?s components, while the Technical Advisor/Assistance is fully charged to the project?s components. Also the Lead Manager is listed twice. Per Guidelines, PMC funds (the GEF portion and the co-financing portion) are meant fully cover the costs associated with the project execution, including project?s staff. For this project, the co-financing funds allocated to PMC is \$ 6,542,480 and 55.5% of the co-financing (50.1 million) are represented in grants. There is enough room for the co-financing to cover the project?s staff costs (note that in the M&E section of the COE Endorsement they only refer to the GEF portion allocated to PMC). Please charge the above mentioned project?s staff to both portions of the PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion).

- There is an item namely ?Logistics? (in the budget appended to the document?s tab) which cost is \$313,820, of which \$149,892 is charged to PMC ? please provide details about what this item entails. Also note that the budget in Annex E of the CEO Endorsement in Portal this is labeled as Grant Manager / Finance / Admin and Logistics. Per Guidelines, both budgets need to be identical - please assure that both budgets are the same.

9/13/2021

Yes, thank you for the clarifying information in the annexed budget that helps make it clear the resources that are being given to or spent directly on IPs.

8/14/2021

No, the budget as attached is confusing (for example, the use of the term executing). It is also important to make it clear how much money is going to indigenous people and IPOs as part of the project.

7/15/2021

No, the budget as attached in the Portal is unreadable. Please include a document attachment in the documents and consider how the Portal version could be legible.

We will likely have comments on the budget once we can view it. It will be important to understand how the PMC will be used, agency fee divided, etc. It would also be good to have information on the total amount to be provided to IPLC organizations across the various components.

There is also no need to include responses to GEF comments that were provided informally in an annex.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 10/26/2021:

As noted, in the RFP for GEF ICI and in the ProDoc, approximately 80% of the resources would be directed toward Indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCS).

CI and IUCN have worked collaboratively with the Interim Steering Committee (ISC), composed principally of Indigenous peoples and a representative of the GEF, to layout an open and transparent process during the PPG and under COVID conditions. Each element and step of the PPG phase engaged the ISC, including budget conversations and review of approaches. We also must acknowledge that ICI is a unique initiative for the GEF. It directly supports Indigenous leadership, delivers significant global environmental benefits, and supports capacity development for IPLCs and their organizations in the management and access to financial resources, including meeting GEF standards.

As noted in previous communications, the CI/IUCN agencies have put considerable thought into the design of this project, its budget approach, and the process necessary to achieve its project development objective. To respond to the questions raised on the 80% allocation in the budget, we would like to untangle the approach a bit from the expense categories. In general CI/IUCN agencies defined the 80% going to IPLCS in the following manner:

ICI Funding to IPLCs in Grants and Agreements represent 69% of the total budget.

? ICI Grants and Agreements to IPLC organizations represent 69% of the total budget. All this funding goes to IPLC organizations.

- o Grants to 9 subprojects in 12 countries under (C1).
- o Grants for regional and global exchanges (C2).
- o Grants for Environmental Policy Fellows (C3).

ICI Funding to IPLCs in Professional Services represent 6% of the total budget.

? **Contractual services:** It is envisioned that contractual services for learning exchanges, assessments, capacity building modules, online training, communications:

- o Many of the contractual services are local services to each subproject, such as local support to address identified capacity-building needs of subproject organizations. Some of these contractual services may be disbursed as grants once the subprojects are fully developed and specific needs per subproject for these activities confirmed in year one of the implementation.
- o Where broader contractual services are needed, the project aims to target IPLC organizations, individual IP experts, or entities specializing in the services needed through contracts.

? **Service Providers:**

- o Translation Services and interpretation costs across the project are essential for IPLC participation and governance. The project will work with a minimum of 3 languages. These costs should not be underestimated as they are a core element to ensure inclusion, access to information, and full and effective participation of IPLC in ICI at multiple levels.
- o Facilitation services will target Indigenous facilitators for exchanges.
- o Product design: the project communications deliverables will support and promote the work of Indigenous designers and artists.

ICI Funding to IPLCs in meetings and workshops represents 3% of the total budget.

? **Travel meetings and workshops** funding to IPLCS and IPLC organizations represent 3% of the overall budget, which will directly benefit IPLCs through the payment for their travel and participation in workshops and conferences.

CI and IUCN recognize the unique elements of ICI's project design such as its governance, engagement in international policy, and the executing role of IPLC organizations. CI/IUCN also highlight the fact that the portfolio approved by the project Interim Steering Committee consists of 9 subprojects in 12 countries. The project development objectives go beyond delivering global environmental benefits and represent a learning by doing process where IPLC organizations, GEF, and Implementing Agencies will demonstrate that there is a pathway to provide adequate financial resources for IPLC organizations to secure both their cultures and their territories. The process will unfold over the 5 years of project implementation.

In conclusion, CI/IUCN agencies approach addresses 79%* or approximately 80% of ICI funds (as laid out in the RFP) to IPLCs through direct investment in subprojects, combined with grants to IPLC organizations and opportunities for IPLC organizations and companies to engage in contractual and/or service provider agreements in support of ICI products or activities. This along with adequate translations services, provides a more inclusive approach to engaging IPLCs across the entire project.

***rounding up**

Below is the revised breakdown:

Component	Outcome	Amount	Revised Amount without GI	%
Component 1	Outcome 1.1	\$ 15,526,273	\$ 15,414,172	
	Outcome 1.2	\$ 385,372	\$ 385,372	
Component 2	Outcome 2.1	\$ 304,000	\$ 304,000	
	Outcome 2.2	\$ 581,000	\$ 581,000	
	Outcome 2.3	\$ 167,076	\$ 167,076	
Component 3	Outcome 3.1	\$ 495,939	\$ 451,706	
	Outcome 4.1	\$ 313,584	\$ 313,584	
Component 4	Outcome 4.2	\$ 80,000	\$ 80,000	
Grand Total dedicated to IPOs		\$ 17,833,643	\$ 17,697,309	79%
Project total without GEF Fees		\$ 22,535,780	\$ 22,535,780	

Expense Category	Amount	Revised without GM	%
Professional Services	\$ 1,749,252	\$ 1,428,990	6%
Travel, Meetings and Workshop	\$ 649,149	\$ 649,149	3%
Grants and Agreements	\$ 15,619,170	\$ 15,619,170	69%
Equipment	\$ -	\$ -	0
Other Direct Cost	\$ -	\$ -	0
Grand Total dedicated to IPOs	\$ 18,017,571	\$ 17,697,309.07	79%

?CI-GEF 10/14/2021:

1. Dates have been adjusted, new start is 12/21, end is 11/26
2. PIF screenshot is below. The reason why the numbers per Agency differ is because the numbers in the ProDoc are based on the revised budget.

B. Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
CI	GET	Global	Biodiversity	BD Global/Regional Set-Aside	11,267,890	1,014,110	12,282,000
IUCN	GET	Global	Biodiversity	BD Global/Regional Set-Aside	11,267,890	1,014,110	12,282,000
Total GEF Resources(\$)					22,535,780	2,028,220	24,564,000

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total(\$)
CI	GET	Global	Biodiversity	BD Global/Regional Set-Aside	11,290,453.00	1,016,141.00	12,306,594.00
IUCN	GET	Global	Biodiversity	BD Global/Regional Set-Aside	11,245,327.00	1,012,079.00	12,257,406.00
Total Grant Resources(\$)					22,535,780.00	2,028,220.00	24,564,000.00

Below is table D in the CEO endorsement in the portal. There is a difference because the project went through a detailed budgeting process, during the PPG phase, where the agencies created their detailed budgets to deliver on the project objectives. The budget submitted in the PIF phase, was an estimated budget per agency, and amounts differ because a budget was developed during the PPG phase.

3. RF Objective level indicator a. is now disaggregated into terrestrial and marine, capturing the relevant Core Indicators. Core Indicator 11 is captured by the combined indicators for Outcomes 1.1, 2.1 and 3.1.

4. Changes to co-financing table made as requested. Appears that explanation of Investment Mobilized below the table may not have been uploaded in the portal. (Describe how any ?Investment Mobilized? was identified. ?Investment Mobilized? refers to additional funding that will be deployed over GEF?s investment period to support Inclusive Conservation, catalyzed by GEF?s investment. This includes both public and private co-financing and grant funding to support the delivery of the investment strategy. It is expected that, by the end of the GEF investment period in 2026, circa US\$59 million will have been mobilized.)

5. NEPAL received and uploaded. Bolivia did not provide non-objection and has been removed from project. With the removal of Bolivia, the Southwest Amazon subproject now only involves Peru. FENAMAD has adjusted its EOI and targets, with the subproject geography now encompassing fewer total hectares but more in Protected Areas, and fewer beneficiaries (previously 15,640 ha, now 5,505 ha). These changes are reflected in the ICI Core Indicators as follows.

Core Indicator 1: was 1,446,051 ha, is now 4,551,701 ha

Core Indicator 4: was 7,240,544 ha, is now 2,883,851 ha

[Total for 1-5: was 8,866,109 ha, is now 7,615,066 ha]

Core Indicator 6: was 21,400,210 metric tons, is now 20,862,368 metric tons

Core Indicator 11: was 152,649 (76,200 women; 76,449 men), is now 142,514 (71,133 women; 71,381 men)

These changes also are reflected in the Results Framework and GEBs, and throughout the ProDoc, Endorsement Request, and Safeguard Plans.

6. Budgeting Approach for CI/ IUCN Agencies for the Inclusive Conservation Initiative (ICI)

Conservation International (CI) and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) are the joint Implementing Agencies for this project, bringing

decades of collective experience working with IPLCs and regional and global expertise to the GEF Inclusive Conservation Initiative. Both organizations have a segregation of duties so that no staff that works in an Implementing Agency oversight role performs project execution work charged to project budgets.

CI will co-execute the project through its Center for Communities and Conservation and IUCN through its Global Program on Governance and Rights. The activities that these two divisions will undertake include building the execution capacity of the EAs who will execute the sub-projects under Component 1 and providing targeted capacity, coordination, and technical support to the cross-cutting global Components 2-4. During the PPG phase, the Agencies conducted an exercise to properly staff the project, reviewing the project at the output level to identify the activities that each staff function would assume to ensure that this initiative supports IPLC-leadership in the delivery of GEBs and associated capacity development of IPLC institutions to execute larger-scale initiatives, manage GEF financial resources and increase their access to other public and private funding sources. The budgeting exercise included assessing the required level of effort for staff to dedicate to capacity building and technical assistance that goes beyond project management, and ToRs were developed. The ToRs provide detailed information on the activities that staff are taking that support project management, and additional activities that support technical/capacity-building under the components. As detailed in the ToRs, these functions contribute to the execution of Component 1-4:

- ? The Project Lead will oversee the development of guidance materials for the subprojects and provide targeted capacity and technical support to each component,
- ? The Technical Advisor/Assistance function will manage and provide capacity building and technical assistance to each of the four components of the project, including Component 1 (9 subprojects in 12 countries) and the three cross-cutting Components 2-4
- ? The Finance, Grants, and Administrative Specialist will provide full-cycle support and capacity building to the Subprojects and targeted finance and administrative support for cross-cutting capacity, knowledge, and policy activities.
- ? In-house consultants will provide expert specialist capacity and technical support in areas such as gender and sustainable finance.

Additional details in response to the questions posed by reviewer:

a) Per the GEF Guidelines, Terms of reference are provided for the positions charging to both components and PMC. The Lead/Manager and the Finance and Administrative staff are providing both management services and financial capacity building to the EAs. This project is fully focused in building the capacity of IPOs, which require support to them beyond project management, including training to ICI staff and EAs to ensure compliance with local and CI/IUCN global standards, policies and practices and GEF Minimum Fiduciary requirements.

b) The Technical Advisor/Assistant(s) will play an integral role in providing technical and capacity building assistance to each of the four components, including component 1 with the 9 subprojects and the three cross-cutting components 2-4. This function will lead in managing the relationship with IPLC partners in all subprojects and serve as lead expert on indigenous peoples and conservation issues for cross-cutting capacity, policy and knowledge activities.

c) The Lead/Manager is listed twice because these are mirror positions that are working on the project from both IUCN and CI. You will see that the budget is separated by Entity and therefore each organization has similar staff working on the different aspects of the projects based on their expertise.

d) On the question regarding PMC co-financing to fund all the costs for the staff that are charging to components, this is not possible, given that the staff are providing the technical inputs required to deliver on the project. CI and IUCN recognize that while there is a substantial amount of PMC co-financing, that co-financing is provided by the partners/co-financiers to cover their costs of additional participation in steering committees, and the management costs of their support to this project. The funding requested under the components is to assure that the staff have sufficient resources to deliver on the technical and capacity building aspects of the project and the ToRs were provided to fulfill this requirement.

e) The comment is noted and there was an issue with the upload. It was cutting the whole description, which is below in yellow. This function is charged across the components and PMC because it is providing a series of support that includes project management and capacity building of grantees (sub-projects) as well.

Staff- Grant Management, finance, Admin and Logistics

CI-GEF 08/16/2021:

Budget showing division of funding is uploaded as an annex. This is separate from the budget image in Annex E: Project Budget Table.

07/29/2021:

Budget image re-uploaded, along with excel file.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 11/18/2021

1. Start Date: Adjustments have been made

2. Core Indicators

? GEF Indicator 2: Target (0 has) verified, and confirmed it matched updates submitted in October.

? GEF Indicator 11: added?(50% m, 50% w).? See paragraph 152 and table 5b for more details about Indicator 11.

3. Bolivia was removed from documents in October submission and ensured that Bolivia was fully removed

4. TORs have been submitted and information was provided in May 2021. Appendix IX was uploaded again. In some cases, CI and IUCN also have different internal

institutional arrangements for different components; allocations of time for specific outcome/outputs may vary accordingly across each institution.

5. Note for Implementation: CI/IUCN will note the minor adjustment in split between CI and IUCN. This amendment will be made in the PIR as an amendment.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/15/2021

Yes. We note that detailed maps are attached as an annex and greater detail will likely be provided as the subprojects are developed.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/19/2021

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

11/15/2021

No, please address the following issues:

- Change the start date and ensure that the time between start and close is 60 months as described

- Core Indicators: Alignment of indicators (between Core Indicator Table and Annex A ?Project Results Framework?) is Not resolved -

- GEF Indicator 2 (marine protected areas) has target in Annex A, but missing CEO-endorsement-stage target in Core Indicators Table

- GEF Indicator 11 (number of beneficiaries) in Annex A reads ??disaggregated by gender? but the target is presented as total (not disaggregated)

- Remove mention of Bolivia and Bolivia from the map.

- Provide the TORs for the Lead Manager ? Finance and Administrative and Logistic Specialists ? Grant Manager that provide justification for charging to project components rather than PMC. We note that it appears that certain items have been charged twice (likely because of two agencies) and it would be good to make a note to provide clarity.

In addition, please note for implementation

- Because the split between IUCN and CI has changed from PIF, Table D at CEO Endorsement (\$11,290,453 / \$1,016,141 for CI - \$11,245,327 / \$1,012,079 for IUCN) compared with the Council approved figures at PIF stage (\$11,267,890 / \$1,014,110 for both Agencies): we read the Agency?s explanation in the review sheet. Due to the marginal change, this is considered a minor amendment. This minor amendment has to be reported at the first PIR.

11/2/2021

No, as discussed please provide clear language on funds going to IPLCs at the beginning of each component description as well as after the Theory of Change.

10/20/2021

No. As further information is being provided about the budgeting of various aspects of the project, the GEF Secretariat is concerned about the low percentage of resources going to IPOs and IPs in comparison to what is going to the agencies. While we understand and have approved some agency execution of particular aspects of the project, the balance as it stands does not approach the 80% of project funds supporting IPLC organizations that was committed to. We note that the text of the ProDoc states "Approximately 80% of ICI project component funds will support IPLC organizations under Component 1" which would mean that 80% of all ICI project funds support IPLC organizations. We have provided detailed responses via email and look forward to working together to ensure that we can meet the commitment that has been made.

9/13/2021

No, please address the issues raised under annexes.

The PM notes that this project because of its unusual nature and in an effort to reduce layers between the GEF and the indigenous peoples organizations being supported (that will execute parts of this project), there will be significant agency execution.

8/14/2021

No, please provide the edits/clarifications requested.

7/15/2021

Not at this time. We look forward to discussing this project with the team to address the issues raised.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	7/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	8/14/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/23/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/20/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/15/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations