

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in India

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10125

Countries

India

Project Name

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in India

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

11/25/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 9, 2020 HF:

1.) Is Outcome 1 of the project is intended to achieve BD and LD results? Whereas Outcome 2 is CCM, correct? If so, please include globally significant biodiversity conservation as a key element of this Outcome (or make it a separate outcome) as currently the language for **Outcome 1**: "Ecosystem services enhanced through improved community-led management practices and systems" does not adequately capture global biodiversity conservation outcomes (as ecosystem services are locally/nationally important/relevant but not synonymous with globally important biodiversity conservation outcomes).

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

The description of Outcome 1 has been changed to: Globally significant biodiversity protected, and ecosystem services enhanced through improved community-led management practices and systems.

Revisions made to Part II (Project Justification) Section 1a-3 (The proposed alternative scenario with a description of outcomes and components of the project) of the CEO ER, and Section IV (Results and Partnerships: Expected Results) of the Project Document.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

- 1.) Please make clear the linkages between Component 1 and 2 and how they work together (or why are they separated as C-1 is the "what" and C-2 seems like the how?)? Please clarify in the CER and ProDoc.
- 2.) What exactly happens under C-2 if it isn't resulting in the outcomes under C-1? Or maybe it is in supporting of the granting that occurs under C-1? Please clarify in CER and ProDoc.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

- 1) The landscape strategies and multi-stakeholder platforms developed and established under Component 2 will provide guidance to the selection and prioritization of actions to be addressed by the community-level projects in Component 1.
 - 2) The description of the project strategy in Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a-3 (The proposed alternative scenario with a description of outcomes and components of the project) of the CEO ER and Section III (Strategy) of the Project Document.
- 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

April 12, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

December 9, 2020 HF:

1.) Please ensure each and every co-financing letter contains the following required elements: a.) Co-financing amount (in US dollars); b.) The time period for which the co-financing is offered; 3.) The kind of co-financing (in-kind, cash) and 4.) Whether it is investment mobilized or recurrent expenditures. Please acquire revised co-financing letters to ensure each comply with GEF requirements as such. Please refer to GEF guidelines on co-financing for details.

7. Supporting evidence should:

- (a) confirm the information provided by the Agency, including the name of the entity that provides the Co-Financing, the type of Co-Financing provided, the amount of Co-Financing, and the time frame over which the Co-Financing will be provided;
- (b) confirm that the Co-Financing identified supports the implementation of the GEF-financed project or program for which GEF financing is sought, and the achievement of its objective(s); and
- (c) be presented in English, where feasible, or be accompanied by an English translation of the original.

2.) UNDP letter needs: to specify timeframe and type of co-finance. Please revise.

3.) MOEFCC letter needs: breakdown of cash vs in-kind (which should also be reflected in Portal table) and timeframe for co-finance.

4.) The co-finance letter signed by the National Steering Committee Chair of SGP-OP7 needs to specify the time period of the co-finance.

5.) Additionally, the entries into the portal of the cash and in-kind need to be classified correctly in the first two columns since right now it is classified as CSO contribution whereas the letter comes from the government of India. Please correct the classification of these two entries.

6.) RBS co-finance letter needs to specify type of co-financing as well as time period please.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

- 1.) The co-financing letters have been revised as described below.
- 2.) The UNDP letter has been revised with the time period and type of co-finance.
- 3.) The MoEFCC letter has been revised with the type of co-finance (in-kind).
- 4.) The co-finance letter signed by the Co-Chairperson of the NSC has been revised with the time period of the co-finance.

5.) The letter signed by the Co-Chairperson of the NSC represents co-finance from the CSO grantees.

6.) The RBS (new name: NatWest India Foundation) has been revised with the type and time period of the co-financing.

Table C (Confirmed Sources of Co-financing for the Project by Name and Type) of the CEO ER and Annex 18 (Co-financing letters) have been revised and updated accordingly.

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 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 Yes.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

1.)-6.) Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) Please note that the marine litter sub-indicator is meant to capture results of IW and CW investments, and is not eligible for BD (or other STAR) funds. Please redact and re-direct funds/effort into achieving results under indicator 4.1 or 5 for BD.

2.) Please note that indicator 4.1 and indicator 5 are the only BD indicator selected for the project targeting 31,200 hectares of significant biodiversity will be under improved

management (marine and terrestrial total) for \$2.147 million BD STAR. Please provide an explanation/justification for this high cost/hectare .

3.) Indicator 3 is an LD indicator so please ensure that the restoration targets are commensurate with the resources allocated. In rare exceptions BD resources can be used for highly targeted restoration or rehabilitation activities in key biological corridors resulting in globally significant biodiversity results. Please further describe and provide justification if BD resources are intended to support activities contributing to indicator 3.

4.) The ProDoc includes reference to protected areas management, and the sites contain key protected areas, whereas the core indicator targets are not set for PA management improvement. Please clarify or revise.

5.) Thank you for providing details for the estimation of the avoided/reduced GHG emissions for the project, including through interventions in the agriculture, forestry, and land use sector (AFOLU), which were not included in the Core Indicator 6 estimation. Please add to Sub-Indicator 6.1 to complete the reporting of the expected climate change mitigation benefits from the project.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) The marine litter core indicator has been redacted. The community grants in the India Coast project landscape that were envisaged to include interventions aimed at reducing marine litter would likely be associated with broader initiatives focused on improving management of coastal ecosystems, including mangroves and wetlands. These interventions would contribute towards achievement of results under Sub-Indicator 5.1. If marine litter is included in the interventions, those efforts would be funded through co-financing.

2.) Building upon achievements under OP6, the OP7 project design includes a concerted focus on conservation and sustainable utilization of agrobiodiversity resources and promotion of agroecological practices. The envisaged interventions associated with improved management of agrobiodiversity were included under Sub-Indicator 4.3; those estimations have been shifted into Sub-Indicator 4.1.

3.) The 10,000-ha end target for Core Indicator 3 is considered commensurate with resources allocated. The restoration target is broken down among agricultural lands, forest and forest land, and coastal wetlands and mangroves. The envisaged restoration interventions in production landscapes, e.g., enhancing soil and water conservation, improved vegetative cover, erosion control, etc., would facilitate multiple co-benefits, including for biodiversity, as well as for sustainable livelihoods for the rural communities in the project landscapes and seascapes.

4.) The socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes targeted by the project are mosaics of multiple land uses, including protected areas. Community interventions are envisaged, for example, within buffer zones of protected areas, but the project is not focused directly on strengthening protected area management, i.e., the SGP OP7 project is not targeting GEF 7 Core Indicator 1.

5.) The estimated avoided GHG emissions in the AFOLU sector have been added to the Core Indicator 6 estimation (Sub-Indicator 6.1).

The revisions described above have been made to the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet in Annex F to the CEO ER and Annex 15 to the Project Document, as well as to the Project Results Framework in Annex A to the CEO ER and Section V of the Project Document.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) Please revise to ensure the project's theory of change clearly addresses the drivers of biodiversity loss in target landscapes. It is currently unclear whether Component 1 (and others) are doing that: *?through sustainable harvest of NTFPs and marine resources, rehabilitation or restoration of degraded ecosystems, management of human-wildlife conflict, managed natural regeneration of key habitats or others?*

2.) Please provide a clear narrative statement of the TOC. The text provided does a nice job of outlining some of the assumptions but refers to the Figure 3 for the TOC which unfortunately is missing key elements of a theory of change (impact pathways, key leverage points) and looks like an enhanced results framework (see STAP TOC primer for further guidance). Figure 3 is fine as is to depict the project objective, components, outputs, intermediate state and outcomes (e.g. no need to revise), but please include a clear narrative of the project's Theory Of Change (only a few sentences are needed for this) in the ProDoc and CER text.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) The project's Theory of Change has been revised, highlighting the drivers of biodiversity loss in the target landscapes.

2.) The narrative of the project's Theory of Change has been expanded and the diagram in Figure 3 revised, showing three causal pathways.

These revisions were made to Part II (Project Justification), Section 3 (The proposed alternative scenario with a description of outcomes and components of the project) of the CEO ER and Section III (Strategy) of the Project Document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

The baseline projects are a long list-with little sense of how they relate or contribute to the current project. Are there geographic synergies? Institutionally related? Building on results? Recommend revising to be more descriptive and targeted about what investments provide a meaningful baseline for this project.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

A summary of the baseline scenario has been provided in the front-end part of the baseline section, and further information on potential geographic and thematic synergies have been added to the discussion on baseline activities.

Relevant revisions have been made to Part II (Project Justification), Section 2 (The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects) in the CEO ER and Section II (Development Challenge) of the Project Document.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

1.) Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) Please revise the long-term vision section of the CER/ProDoc to eliminate jargon and clearly communicate, with specific examples, what is the intended end state/or vision for this investment-make sure this is included in the TOC as well.

2.) Typo in ProDoc para 96: Indicative activities under Output 3.1 include: should read ?Output 2.1?

3.) Please consider re-numbering so project outputs and outcomes are depicted with decimals that correspond with the Component number, rather than having the Outcomes be sequential from beginning to end?(e.g. Component 1, Outcome 1.1 with output 1.1.1 etc; Component 2, Outcome 2.1; Output 2.1.1 etc) This tracks the format customarily used by IAs (including UNDP) and it is much more clear in understanding the results framework for the project.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) The long-term vision was revised to include the following (and included in the theory of change):

The long-term vision of the project is to generate multiple benefits for biodiversity, climate change, land degradation, and the well-being of local communities through participatory, integrated land and resource management approaches implemented across socio-ecological production landscapes and seascapes.

The revision to the long-term vision was made to Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a (Project Description) of the CEO and Section II (Development Challenge) of the Project Document. The theory of change revision was made to Part II (Project Justification), Section 3 (The proposed alternative scenario with a description of outcomes and components of the project) of the CEO ER and Section III (Strategy) of the Project Document.

2.) The typographical error mentioned in the comment was corrected, along with the renumbering of the outputs and outcomes in response to the third comment in this section (see below).

3.) The outputs and outcomes have been renumbered. The revision to the numbering of project outcomes and outputs was made through the CEO ER and Project Document package.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) BD funds may not be used to support waste management activities. Please redact these activities or ensure that they are covered by project co-financing.

2.) Agrobiodiversity activities (output 1.3 presumably) should fit under entry point 1-4 Sustainable Use of Plant and Animal Genetic resources. Activities should be designed accordingly to either: 1. Establish protection for crop wild relatives (CWR) in-situ through CWR reserves; second via sustainable use through farmer management of plant genetic resources in Vavilov centers; and/r third: conservation and sustainable use of

animal genetic resources and actions to conserve the wild relatives of domesticated livestock, not only focusing on breeds. Please consider this in the alignment with GEF BD entry points and revise CER/ProDoc accordingly.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) Confirming that BD funds are not allocated for waste management activities. The proposed activities associated with avoiding marine litter have been redacted from the GEF 7 Core Indicator Worksheet and the Project Results Framework. Waste management might be included among interventions implemented under the climate change mitigation focal area, e.g., promoting low emission agricultural waste management, such as recycling of agricultural biomass and reducing indirect emissions through use of co-products as energy and soil amendments.

2.) Conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources (BD-1-4) has been added to the focal area outcomes listed in Table A of the CEO ER. The Indian Center is one of the Vavilov Centers of Diversity, and Output 1.1.3 of the OP7 project strategy is focused on conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity resources.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) The project's incremental cost reasoning/GEF scenario currently does not include any biodiversity GEBs. Ecosystem services are relevant at the local and sub-national levels but are not equivalent to globally significant biodiversity GEBs. Please revise.

2.) Please redact waste management from the project activities-or support with co-finance. Please redact from the ?GEF scenario? as this is not an eligible use of GEF funds (see previous comment on this regarding co-financing etc).

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) Incremental reasoning on GEBs has been revised (Table 3 of the Project Document, which is also included in Part II (Project Justification), Section 5 (Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF and co-financing).

2.) Waste management has been redacted from the project activities under the biodiversity focal area, including avoiding marine litter.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) Please see previous comment on incremental reasoning and GEBs and revise accordingly.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) The incremental reasoning has been revised accordingly, as indicated in the response to the previous comment.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) Institutional sustainability: Please revise sustainability section to include sustainability from the perspective of institutional capacity and sustainability to perpetuate project impacts beyond the project period.

2.) Environmental sustainability should include reference to any activities that could potentially have adverse (unintended) impacts on local ecosystems etc (small-scale infrastructure or works development etc) and cross-reference this to those risks being addressed and mitigated via the SES package and plans for the project.

3.) Scaling up: Please provide a more descriptive (with specifics about approach and examples) and ambitious project approach to scaling up given the long history of SGP, as well as the relatively limited amount of resources given the challenges at hand. Please revise CER/ProDoc to enhance or clarify.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) The institutional sustainability section has been revised, including discussion on strengthening institutional capacities and sustainability.

2.) The environmental sustainability section has been revised, discussing activities that could potentially have adverse impacts on local ecosystems, and also cross-referencing these considerations to the risks addressed in the SES package.

3.) More details have been added to the scaling up section.

The revisions described above have been made to Part II (Project Justification), Section 1a-7 (Innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling up) of the CEO ER, and Section IV (Results and Partnerships: Innovativeness, Sustainability, and Potential for Scaling Up) of the Project Document.

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

December 19, 2020 HF:

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

- 1.) Please describe how the pandemic has impacted stakeholder engagement since March, how the project team will adapt to this and cope during early implementation if conditions persist.
- 2.) We'd expect that this would also impact budgeting scenarios-please address.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) The PPG process started in September 2019 and many of the stakeholder consultations were completed before the outbreak of COVID-19 in March 2020. Virtual PPG consultations were carried out after March 2020. Domestic travel is currently (January 2021) permitted in India, with requisite quarantine and testing protocols according to national and state level directives. As outlined in the Project Document, certain adaptive management measures are envisaged during project implementation in case of a prolonged or recurrent pandemic.

2.) Through implementation of possible adaptive management measures, project implementation is expected to be carried out without major impacts to the budget over the 5-year duration. For example, local NGO partners have important roles in facilitating integrated landscape approaches, such as the participatory baseline assessments, development of landscape strategies, and convening multi-stakeholder landscape platforms. The Implementing Partner will provide strategic guidance to the local partners through a variety of in-person and virtual techniques accordingly.

This information has been added to Part II (Project Justification), Section 2 (Stakeholders) of the CEO ER, Section IV (Results and Partnerships: Stakeholder engagement and south-south cooperation) of the Project Document, and Annex 8 to the Project Document (Stakeholder Engagement Plan).

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) Thank you for the inclusion of the mainstreamed gender analysis with demonstration of activities thought out each project component. Please include relevant information available on the gender dimensions of the project themes for each of the project geographies please include in the gender analysis. Currently the landscape information on gender is generic stats etc.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

The Gender Analysis (Annex 10 to the Project Document) has been updated with information on the gender dimensions of the project themes in the project geographies.

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

December 19, 2020 HF:

Yes

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comments cleared.

December 19 2020 HF:

- 1.) Thank you for the submission of the climate risk screening document.
- 2.) Thank you for the analysis on COVID-19 risks and opportunities. Please provide a few sentence synopses of how the project is approaching COVID-19 risks/opportunities as a chapeau to this document and included in the CER.

3.) Please provide analysis and risk mitigation measures for Risk 3 in relationship to non-BD grants too (rather than only the BD grants)

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

2.) A short synopsis on how the project is approaching COVID-19 risks and opportunities has been added to Section 5 (Risks) of the CEO ER and Section IV (Results and Partnerships: Risks) of the Project Document.

3.) The risk analysis and risk mitigation measures associated with Risk 3 were expanded to also include non-BD grants. The revision was made to Part II (Project Justification), Section 5 (Risks) of the CEO ER, Annex 5 (SESP) to the Project Document, and Annex 6 (UNDP Risk Register) to the Project Document.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

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

April 12, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared

December 19, 2020 HF:

1.) Why is the SGP Learning Forum (including an e-platform) being developed with a small grant for India only? Wouldn't doing this at the regional if not global level provide efficiencies and scale to allow all SGP projects/participants to use and benefit from it? Please explain/revise.

2.) What are the plans for ensuring that this forum is sustained beyond the project period?

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) Knowledge management is a key pillar to the landscape approach that is incorporated into the project strategy for OP7 in India. During the PPG phase, consulted CSOs, several of which participated in earlier phases of SGP in India, stressed the need to connect SGP grantees and other CSOs, sharing best practices as well as identifying opportunities and partnerships. Knowledge products emanating from the project will also be uploaded to the SGP global Communities Connect platform which disseminates case studies and other information and facilitates regional and global partnerships. The details of the proposed SGP Learning Forum in India will be worked out during the development of the Knowledge Management Strategy and Communications Strategy during project implementation.

2.) Maintaining the SGP Learning Forum will be advocated as part of the sustainability plans for ensuring the durable functioning of the multi-stakeholder landscape platforms. Utilizing the SGP Learning Forum as a marketing platform, e.g., for showcasing agricultural products, handicrafts, ecotourism experiences, etc., could also help ensure sustained maintenance of the learning forum. In developing the Knowledge Management Strategy, opportunities for linking the SGP Learning Forum to existing schemes and platforms will be explored, e.g., rural banks and microcredit institutions.

The information outlined above has been reflected in Section 8 (Knowledge Management) of the CEO ER and Section IV (Results and Partnerships: Knowledge management) of the Project Document.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:
Comments cleared.

December 29, 2020 HF:

1.) Under the safeguards section 11, the CER in the Portal contains duplicative copy/pastes of Table(s) 2, 3 & 4. Please correct.

2.) Please format the text in Section 11 under the heading: "**Measures to address identified risks and impacts**" as unfortunately it is currently an unreadable mass of text without spacing, paragraphs, sections or bullets. Once this is completed it will be reviewed and comments provided.

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) The duplicative copy/pastes of Tables 2, 3, and 4 in the Portal have been corrected.

2.) The text in Section 11 of the Portal has been formatted accordingly.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 19, 2020 HF:

Yes.

1.) Budget-what type of flexibility or adaptation arrangements exist depending on whether monitoring activities (and other project activities) are virtual versus in-person?

Agency Response

8 April 2021:

1.) Domestic travel is currently (January 2021) permitted in India, with requisite quarantine and testing protocols according to national and state level directives. As outlined in the Project Document, certain adaptive management measures are envisaged during project implementation in case of a prolonged or recurrent pandemic. Through implementation of possible adaptive management measures, project implementation is expected to be carried out without major impacts to the budget over the 5-year duration. For example, local NGO partners have important roles in facilitating integrated landscape approaches, such as the participatory baseline assessments, development of landscape strategies, convening multi-stakeholder landscape platforms, and carrying out site-level monitoring and evaluation tasks. The Implementing Partner will provide

strategic guidance to the local partners through a variety of in-person and virtual techniques accordingly.

This information has been added to Section 9 (Monitoring and Evaluation) of the CEO ER.

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

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 29, 2020 HF:

1.) No, please describe in the CER how socioeconomic benefits will support "the achievement of GEBs"?

Agency Response 8 April 2021:

1.) By adopting the integrated, socio-ecological resilience landscape approach, the project will help ensure the socioeconomic benefits are coupled with achievement of global environmental benefits. In order to garner genuine local participation and to ensure sustainability, the community-driven GEB-generating interventions in the project landscapes-seascapes will be aimed at producing socioeconomic co-benefits. Facilitated through multi-stakeholder, participatory processes, collective action initiated at the community level will lead to conservation of biodiversity resources at scale. And protection and restoration of critical terrestrial, coastal, and marine ecosystems at landscape-seascape dimensions will provide increased resilience to the impacts of climate change, providing a buffer against extreme weather events, floods, and droughts.

This information has been added to Section 10 (Benefits) of the CEO ER.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Contained in review sheet.

Agency Response

Council comments




Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 12, 2021 HF:

Comment cleared.

December 29, 2020 HF:

1.) Please directly address the US Council comment, found in the "stakeholders' comments" tab of the portal and pasted below.

- *Comment by Elizabeth Nichols, PhD, U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Oceans, International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, Office of Environmental Quality and Transboundary Issues, Council, United States made on 6/4/2019*   

Comment:

ü United States Comments

The below comments from the United States were provided prior to the Council meeting. An initial agency response was provided and can be found in the list of documents specific to the project in the GEF Portal.

· Recognizing that the intent of these projects is to mitigate or reverse deforestation, the United States needs to officially confirm for internal purposes that the following projects will not involve any logging of primary forests. Can the GEF please affirm that no logging of primary forests will occur during the implementation of projects: 10125, 10184, 10188, 10192, 10198, 10206, 10208, 10220.

2.) Germany's comments were sufficiently addressed.

Agency Response 8 April 2021:

1.) The response to the U.S. Council comment was added to Annex B (Response to Project Reviews) to the CEO ER.

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

December 29, 2020 HF:

No STAP comments found for this PIF.

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 Cleared.

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 12, 2021 HF:

Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended as all comments have been addressed.

The UNDP Audit Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template has been satisfactorily completed for this project.

December 30, 2020 HF:

No, not at this time. Please address comments in review sheet. Also please resubmit and include the UNDP Audit Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/19/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/12/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations