

Inclusive Conservation Initiative

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10404

Countries

Global

Project Name

Inclusive Conservation Initiative

Agenices

CI, IUCN

Date received by PM

10/11/2019

Review completed by PM

11/7/2019

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes. This project is in line with the GEF-7 Programming Directions document. It would be good to add a few sentences on how this project relates to the general GEF BD Strategy on PAs and mainstreaming.

During PPG, it will be important to ensure that a focus remains on delivering global environmental benefits through the activities of the project.

Agency Response Noted

Indicative project/program description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/5/2019

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

10/21/2019

No, please address the following:

Component 1:

- Language – It is important to make sure that the difference between selected geography and regions is clear. In the table, they remain “candidate geographies” yet the geographies are likely going to be a much smaller area within a region. Based on prior discussions, our understanding has been that the regions serve to narrow the potential focus but the actual investments will happen in much smaller areas that will be called “geographies”. However, the language describing these is quite confusing and it, therefore, is unclear the scope of what will be selected.
- Criteria
 - o Carbon benefits should be a secondary criteria not an “or” with biodiversity benefit as this is a primarily biodiversity project.
 - o Opportunity – IPAG discussed also looking for places where there are opportunities that the scale of resources could make a big difference.
- 1.1.1 – Please consider moving this to the end of this component as it is a means the achieving the goals of the project rather than a goal itself.
- 1.1 – It could be good to add to the text description something like “strengthening collaboration with local and national government to enhance IPLC rights and governance of natural resources” as one of the potential activities to think about the actual implementation of legal rights.
- 1.2.1 – It’s important to think of this as longer term investments rather than just one-off trainings.
- 1.2.2 – The goal for this indicator should be higher. Perhaps 80% with a footnote linking the value to IEO findings of the GEF portfolio overall.

Component 2:

- It would be good to emphasize how the Learning Academy will build on and bring together existing materials in addition to creating its own.
- 2.1.4 – The Certification seems challenging to manage and ensure the quality of organizations that often have high turnover rates. How will the project address this? What will the certification accomplish? It's unclear how this will create GEBs.
- 2.2.2 - It may be good to not set limits on participation outside of priority geographies, particularly if opportunities present themselves for cofinancing in this area.

Component 4

- 4.1.1 – Clarity is needed about the difference and relationship between the Knowledge Management Platform and the IC Learning Academy on things such as their target audience, methods, plans for development, topics covered, etc.
- 4.1.3 - It would be good to clarify the relationship of the ICI CoP with other activities, such as learning exchanges.

Executing Agencies (page 47)

- As written, it is unclear whether there could be multiple EAs in a geography without a single overseeing EA. It would make sense leave language open in the text for multiple EAs in a geography to be determined by the context.

Interim Steering Committee

- It would be good to include the role of the IAs with respect to the ISC. Perhaps discussing that the IAs will convene the ISC. It sounds like it is apart from the management of the project.

During PPG, please consider the following –

Sustainability of 4.1.3 and 2.1.2 and how they will be managed and maintained after the life of the project.

Agency Response

Component 1:

Language: Language revised to ensure clarity in the difference between the scale of geographies and regions. Table column label corrected to read “indicate geographic regions.”

Criteria:

- Carbon: carbon a secondary criteria on page 21 and page 34 (under section 4).
- Opportunity: Opportunity language revised to take account of IPAG comments and add “existence of successful IPLC-led conservation initiatives that could be scaled up with project support,” on page 22.

1.1.1 -- done on page 2 and subsequent pages (previous 1.1.1 is now 1.1.8).

1.1. -- Added “ICI will work to strengthen collaboration with local and national governments to enhance IPLC rights and governance of natural resources.” on page 22 and within the description of Outcome 1.1.4.

1.2.1. -- done on page 26, added “long-term capacity.”

1.2.2. -- Increased indicator to 80% and added recommended footnote (page 3 + footnote, and thereafter as listed)

Component 2: On page 27, added “Collating existing materials and linking to related platforms to ...” Added “.. identify and create links to existing capacity building resources” under 2.1.1 text on p28.

2.1.4. -- Removed certification (page 28 and thereafter); added additional line regarding assessment on page 28 under Output 2.1.4.

2.2.2. – Text revised to remove limits on participation outside of priority geographies

Component 4

4.1.1. -- revised text to make this distinction clearer on page 32.

4.1.3. -- revised to make clearer on page 33.

Related language under Component 2 (on Learning Academy and Learning Exchanges) also revised.

Executing Agencies

Made clearer by stating there can be multiple EAs with additional text on page 47 (and also on page 22)

Interim Steering Committee

p. 10 and p.39 we state the IAs will convene the ISC at the inception, midway and final phase of the PPG; page 39 we added the ISC would be “convened by the Implementing Agencies.”

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes. At this time co-financing is sufficient. However, we expect the agencies and partners to seek out significant additional co-financing during PPG as well as during the life of the project.

Agency Response Noted

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes. The resources are available from the biodiversity set aside as approved in the GEF-7 programming directions document.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/22/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/5/2019

Please note that the GEF does not pay IA staff salaries for PPG.

10/21/2019

Yes, there is justification for an increased PPG. This project is large and will work in many different countries. Given the focus of the project, sufficient consultations are important and will require significant resources.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes. We understand that these numbers are estimates given that the project has yet to define the specific sites where it will be working. Will the project not be creating any new protected areas or supporting their definition and demarcation? (noting that they may be registered in the ICCA database or other similar system) The definitions of these different activities may be something best addressed during PPG

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Part II – Project Justification

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes. However, it would be good to note the major funders of the different initiatives where they are specific (such as the support to the ICCA consortium through SGP).

Agency Response Pages 16-19, baseline scenario was revised. SGP support for the ICCA consortium is included in the ICCA description.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/5/2019

Yes.

10/21/2019

No. For innovation, please discuss how the approaches used will be innovative in the conservation world not only for the GEF and how demonstrating this can support scaling-up. Please describe more how this project lays the ground work for scaling up these approaches. Also, it would be good to include something on how build financial sustainability beyond grants, such as private sector development.

Agency Response

The innovation section was revised on page 36 to address this request.

p.37 we added, “ICI will lay the groundwork for financial sustainability beyond grants through the developments of trust funds, private sector investment in IPLC-led businesses and explore new financing models through impact investing.”

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes. Thank you for the maps. We expect more detail at CEO Endorsemen reflecting the priority geographies and areas of intervention.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/5/2019

Yes, thank you for the additions.

10/21/2019

No, it would be helpful to include more information on how supporting culturally appropriate private sector opportunities can be a key strategy for financial sustainability.

Agency Response Added text on page 42 to include other, culturally appropriate, private sector engagement.

Risks

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/5/2019

Yes.

10/21/2019

No, while the risk table is quite well done, can you please discuss the following?

- Conflict of interest – this would be a good place for discussing how the project and the steering committees will address the issue of conflict of interest
- Grievance mechanism – this would also be a good place to discuss the role of the grievance mechanism to address risk.

Agency Response Page 44 added Conflict of Interest and Grievance Mechanism to the risk chart.

Coordination

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/6/2019

Yes. By the time of CEO Endorsement, the GEF Implementing Agencies need to present: (i) in the case that an Executing Entity will be regranteeing, they need to present a detailed explanation of the mechanism through which the Executing Entities will select the grant proposals and disburse the funds; and (ii) how GEF Implementing Agency (CI) will ensure that the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements are met by each one of the Executing Entities at all levels of the project implementation.

It is the GEF Implementing Agencies' responsibility to approve any organization that may serve as an Executing Agency (EA) (providing the required financial systems and support) for their ability to ensure that the Minimum Fiduciary Standards Requirements are met at all levels of the project implementation.

11/5/2019

Please revise the coordination language to state that the Agencies' role and structure for engagement with project execution will be discussed and approved by the GEF Secretariat during the PPG.

10/21/2019

Yes. Currently, the IA roles are listed as evenly split in terms of financial resources and agency fees. We understand that this has been done as a placeholder and will likely shift during PPG as tasks are divided based on the comparative advantages of each agency. The GEF Secretariat retains the ability to make determinations about the appropriate division of the agency fee commensurate with the activities the agencies will be supporting.

We also note that there may be some agency execution of project activities particularly in Components 2-4. However, we remind the agencies the importance of seeking out opportunities to build the capacity of IPLC organizations through this project including in the areas of project and fiduciary management. It will also be important for the IAs to maintain their oversight role by working with executing agencies.

The project will need to reach out to examine further opportunities for coordination with other initiatives during PPG.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

10/21/2019

NA at this time. As the project selects activity sites, it will need to examine this issue.

We suggest removing the commitment to conducting studies are mercury impacts though it could be part of the project.

Agency Response Page 49 removed mercury studies

Knowledge Management

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/5/2019

Yes, thank you.

10/21/2019

No. It's surprising to see knowledge products as only being developed in Year 2. This seems like something that should also happen near the end of the project as well. We think that there is an important role for ICI in synthesizing and publicizing knowledge of successful examples of inclusive conservation from a variety of partners (including on FPIC and supporting peoples in voluntary isolation).

Agency Response

Knowledge products are expected to be produced in the last two quarters of each year of the project – the timeline has been updated to clarify this (see page 64)

Text for role of ICI in synthesizing and publicizing knowledge examples can be found on page 36 (under Innovation) and page 32 under Output 4.1.1.

Part III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/4/2019

Yes. The project will need a signed letter of no objection from the OFP at CEO Endorsement for on-the-ground activities within a country.

10/21/2019

NA. As project sites have not been defined, there are no OFPs to contact. A provision will be included in the CEO Endorsement for receiving a letter of no objection before supporting on the ground activities in a country.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

11/6/2019

Yes, thank you for the revisions.

11/5/2019

Not at this time, there are a few small changes needed.

10/21/2019

Not at this time. While the project is good, there are some improvements to be made.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval