

The deployment of EarthRanger, a data visualization and analysis software to strengthen Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Africa's National Parks.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10551

Countries

Regional (Botswana, Congo, Mozambique)

Project Name

The deployment of EarthRanger, a data visualization and analysis software to strengthen Protected Area Management Effectiveness in Africa's National Parks.

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

12/1/2021

Review completed by PM

3/4/2022

Program Manager

Adriana Moreira

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

12-16-21: Project remains aligned with BD Focal Area element BD-2-7. ?Address direct drivers to protect habitats and species and Improve financial sustainability, effective management, and ecosystem coverage of the global protected area estate.?

02-25-22: Kindly note that, as per our calculations, with the current expected implementation start and expected completion dated, the duration should be 44 months and not 45. Please correct.

Submission Date 1/27/2022	Expected Implementation Start 7/1/2022	Expected Completion Date 3/1/2026
Duration ⓘ 45 in Months		Agency Fee(\$) 216,609.00

Agency Response CI-GEF 03/03/2023: Expected completion date revised. Project duration now at 45 months
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 12-16-21: Project structure and design is appropriate, with clearly stated outputs and outcomes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

12-16-21: Project co-financing is adequate and has increased since PIF stage with substantial investment mobilized. Please add Vulcan LLC to the ?name of co-financier? rows currently identified as The Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2), for consistency with the co-financing letters and PIF proposal.

Agency Response

CI -GEF 1/27/2022

To clarify, The Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2) and Vulcan were founded by the late Paul Allen, but they are separate organizations. Vulcan is not part of the project anymore and the co-financing letter was signed by AI2 to affirm that AI2 will uphold all the commitments made by Vulcan Inc. to the GEF. Therefore, adding Vulcan as a co-financier might create confusion. Nevertheless, in-order to address this comment, we have added the foot note below on all co-financing tables where AI2 appears.

Change in Executing Agency (EA) from Vulcan Inc. to The Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2). The EarthRanger Technology was developed by Vulcan Inc. in partnership with several conservation and technology partners. AI2 is not within Vulcan, but a separate organisation. AI2 is one of Paul Allen's stable organisations, but is separate from Vulcan, and is a different entity type. As of September 2021, EarthRanger Unit was moved to AI2 from Vulcan. AI2 has signed the co-financing letter and will uphold the commitments made by Vulcan Inc. to the GEF at PIF stage and CEO Endorsement.

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

12-16-21: The proposed financing presented in Table D is adequate.

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 12-16-21: Status of PPG utilization is satisfactorily reported in Annex C.

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

12-16-21: The core indicators have been adjusted as recommended at PIF stage. The number of hectares of Protected Areas (PAs) under improved management increased from 2,115,200 to 4,901,650, including baseline data of METT for 6 PAs.

Agency Response

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

12-16-21: The proposal presents adequate elaboration on threats, root causes and impacts of environmental degradation to be addressed by the project.

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

12-16-21: Baseline scenario and associated projects are well described.

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

12-16-21: Components are adequately described and proposed outcomes are clearly articulated.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-16-21: The alignment with the strategies of the BD focal area is satisfactory.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-16-21: Incremental reasoning is satisfactory.

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

12-16-21: This is a transformational project with a significant area (> 4.9 million ha) of PAs under improved management effectiveness in three countries, with strong scaling up potential and important global environmental benefits.

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

12-16-21: Project is highly innovative with strong potential for scaling up. With regards to sustainability, please provide further detail on how the costs for maintenance of control room, staff training and salaries will be covered after the initial GEF investment, given financial constraints facing many PAs and PA agencies.

Agency Response

?CE-GEF 1/27/2022

See Section G on Sustainability of the CEO Endorsement/portal (Part II 1a Project Description)

After the initial set-up costs that this project will undertake, the ongoing running cost of the software is minimal. The primary ongoing costs are staffing and personnel costs. We have intentionally designed the project so that all personnel costs are covered by field partners. In this way, we prepare partners to budget for the ongoing annual personnel costs even after the project ends. Notably, 5 out of the 6 selected Protected Areas have well-established public-private partnerships in place with the Government which we view favorably in terms of long-term sustainability. In addition, these project activities are embedded on existing structures jointly run and managed by the Government and selected partners hence it is anticipated that operationalization and management of the technology will be continued by government authorities with support from the partners and AI2 advisory support.

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

12-16-21: Please provide coordinates information for the Project's maps, and geo-referenced information for the PAs where the project interventions will take place.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 1/27/2022

Each Protected Area's coordinates are now included in the Project Map and Coordinates Section

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

N/A

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

12-16-21: Project includes adequate stakeholders engagement plan and communications strategy.

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

12-16-21: The project conducted gender analysis and includes gender-sensitive activities and indicators linked with project objectives.

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

12-16-21: Engagement with private sector has been one of the pillars of the project since concept stage, including substantial co-financing.

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

12-16-21: Project includes comprehensive risk analysis and mitigation measures, with considerations in regards to the COVID-19 situation.

Agency Response

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

12-16-21: Please provide additional information/justification on role of Conservation International (Africa Field Division) to provide project executing services on an exceptional basis. Part 6.A of the CEO Endorsement document states that "The Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2) is the project's Executing Agency supported by Conservation International Africa Field Division (CI AfFD)." The project budget (Annex

E) indicates CI-Africa Field Division as the recipient and executor of the US\$2,407,360 GEF Grant. Please explain.

02-17-22: Managerial approval was granted for Conservation International (Africa Field Division) to provide targeted execution support on an exceptional basis. Please include Conservation International (Africa Field Division) as executing partner in Part I of the template and adjust the project documents accordingly.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 03/03/2022: In Part 1 of the template, Conservation International (Africa Field Division) has been added as an Executing partner.

CI-GEF 1/27/2022

Justification on role of Conservation International (Africa Field Division) to provide project executing services on an exceptional basis.

Overall, The Allen Institute for Artificial Intelligence (AI2) prefers to play a technical backstopping role to the PMU and executing partners during the implementation phase. In this arrangement, AI2 would wire the 2M cash co-financing funds through CI (Africa Field Division) who will play an execution support role. The agreed specific roles of AI2 and CI Africa Field Division are outlined in the exception letter. It was, therefore, acknowledged that it would be economical and strategic for CI (Africa Field Division) to also manage the GEF funds instead of scouting for a different institution to play the execution role.

CI has in-house Earth Ranger technical capacity. There are existing staff who have the technical know-how and experience deploying and utilizing the Earth technology. The CI staff also have hands-on experience in deploying the EarthRanger (ER) technology and building the capacity of beneficiaries in Africa to utilize the ER technology.

CI has a robust and transparent financial and grants management system that can handle large financial transactions and numerous grants running at the same time. CI will support finance and operational tasks such as procurement, grants management, financial audits, build the capacity of the Government, project staff, and co-executing partners on financial management and reporting in order to ensure compliance with the GEF's fiduciary standards. On this basis:

AI2 will transfer their USD 2M cash co-financing to CI Africa Field Division

The USD 2.4M GEF funds will be wired by CIGEF to the CI Africa Field Division

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

12-16-21: Description of alignment with national priorities, strategies and plans is satisfactory.

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

12-16-21: Project includes a Knowledge Management strategy integrated with the monitoring/evaluation and communication activities, including specific deliverables and timeline.

Agency Response

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

12-16-21: Environmental and social safeguards are adequately described and documented.

Agency Response

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

12-16-21: Project includes a satisfactory M&E plan with indicators, targets and budget.

Agency Response

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

12-16-21: The socioeconomic benefits are adequately described.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-16-21: Please provide additional information on the staffing and equipment included in the Earth-Rangers Installation and training "packages" listed under Expenditure Category Grants and Agreements in the project's Budget Table to be financed by the GEF (Annex E).

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)					Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity <small>10 Adminstrative Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency/IFs</small>
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1					
Grants and Agreements	Earth Rangers Installation and Training-Zinave Mozambique - Peace Parks Foundation	186,805	16,378	203,183	4,377		207,560	Third party grantees via Ci-Africa Field Division
	Earth Rangers Installation and Training Republic of Congo -Odzala-Kokoua - African Parks	204,143	26,019	230,162	5,745		235,907	
	Earth Rangers Installation and Training Republic of Congo -Nouabalé-Ndoki - Wildlife Conservation Society	195,868	26,019	221,887	5,745		227,632	
	Earth Rangers Installation and Training Republic of Congo -Konkouati-Douli - Noe	174,648	24,380	199,028	4,104		203,132	
	Earth Rangers Installation and Training Botswana-Chobe National Park	485,243	52,983	538,226	11,067		549,293	
	Earth Rangers Installation and Training Mozambique-Limpopo - Peace Parks Foundation	463,058	27,035	490,092	6,759		496,851	
				-			-	

Please also indicate if motorized vehicles will be purchased with GEF resources.

02-25-22: The program manager and finance staff charged to the PMC and across the components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Please amend.

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Component (US\$eq.)					Total (US\$eq.)	Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency/IFs)
		Component 1	Component 2	Sub-Total	M&E	PMC		
		Outcome 1.1	Outcome 2.1					
	Staff-Deputy Regional Program Manager	39,721	27,579	67,300	4,630	37,479	109,409	
	Staff- Technical Lead/Wildlife Conservation Technology Expert	15,517	16,683	32,200	2,525	19,611	54,336	
	Staff- Safeguards Lead	17,813	17,707	35,519			35,519	
	Staff-Finance and Grants Lead1	15,724	14,364	30,088	14,793	26,704	71,586	

03-07-22: Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project's execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. That said, *when the situation merits* (i.e. not enough co-financing funds ? which for this projects is not the case), the project's staff could be charged to the project's components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 237K million and out of 4.8 million of co-financing, 2.23 million (46%) are represented in grants.

Regarding the TORs in Annex X, one can read that the responsibilities of the Technical Lead/Wildlife Conservation Technology Expert (TL/WCTE) as well as those for the Deputy Regional Program Manager (DRPM) are not only Managerial in nature, but also duplicative (see below). For instance:

- the TL/WCTE ?*Guide the day-to-day technical and operational functioning of the project?* while the DRPM ?*Facilitate the day-to-day technical and operational functioning of the project according to ProDoc* ??
- The TL/WCTE ?*Identify potential risks and work with PMU to put in place mitigation measures?* while the DRPM ?*Identify potential risks and work with PMU to put in place mitigation measures?*

Overall, most of the responsibilities identified in the TORs of these two positions are managerial and duplicative (see the details below), and no justification was found on the need of having two people doing the same ? also, given the nature of the responsibilities, we reiterate that these have to be covered by PMC (both portions: GEF and co-financing)

The responsibilities of the Finance and Grants Officer are ?conversely? mainly (though not exclusively) technical in nature ? hence, charging this position to PMC and projects? components seems to be reasonable

Please revise and resubmit.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 03/16/2021:

Thank you for these observations. Please note that the ToR has been updated for the Deputy Regional Program Manager to reflect that the two roles (Technical Lead) are not duplicative. The TL/WCTE is providing overarching technical inputs as well as coordination with partners, while the Program Manager will be providing the day-to-day management, in addition to executing activities under the components. However, your comments are well taken, and the budget has been revised to remove the costs under the

components and pay for those with the co-financing. See Budget image and changes to the TORs in Annex 10 of the ProDoc. Noted on the Finance and Grants Officer

CI-GEF 03/03/2022: CI has already allocated co-financing to cover the costs of the staff in the budget. However, the three staff charging to components and PMC will still provide technical inputs to the components and capacity building to grantees, these are not PMC costs and are additional to what was provided as co-financing. The GEF Guidelines, also state that if staff will provide inputs to the components, as well as supporting project management functions, then TORs should be provided. From our interpretation and previous experience, staff are allowed to charge to both PMC and component lines. The TORs were provided in Annex X of the ProDoc.

CI-GEF 1/27/2022

This project will have **no** direct staffing costs under the Expenditure category Grants and Agreements. Equipment installation under Grants and Agreements includes the installation of solar panels and generator power, two-way radio networks and associated hardware, internet access and associated hardware, wildlife and vehicle tracking devices, office equipment including desks, computers, and TV monitors. All EarthRanger Training will be paid for and managed by AI2.?? There are instances where the partners may hire consultants to undertake specific tasks, for example radio installation and solar installation. There may also be instances where they pay their staff to undertake specific work. The budgets we have are high-level activity-based budgets which will be refined further at the next phase. No motorized vehicles will be purchased with GEF resources.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-16-21: Results framework is satisfactory.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

12-2-21: Package is being returned upon request for adding missing documentation.

12-20-21: Please address comments above and resubmit. Thanks!

2-25-22: Please address the additional comments above and resubmit. Thanks!

3-7-22: Please address the comments on PMC and resubmit. Thanks!

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-17-21: Council comments have been responded.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-17-21: STAP comments have been responded.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-16-21: Status of PPG utilization is satisfactorily reported in Annex C.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 12-16-21: Please provide coordinates information for the Project's maps.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 1/27/2022

Each Protected Area's coordinates added in the text under Section 1B.

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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

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

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations