



Conservation of Biodiversity, its Sustainable Use, Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits in India (CONSERVE)

Review PPG Request and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11784

Countries

India

Project Name

Conservation of Biodiversity, its Sustainable Use, Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits in India (CONSERVE)

Agencies

UNDP, World Bank

Date received by PM

11/1/2024

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Naoko Nakagawa

Focal Area

Biodiversity
Project Type
GBFF

GEF-8 Project Preparation Grant request Review Sheet

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

- a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GBFF funding?
- b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments
Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

II. Indicative Project Overview

- a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?
- b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective?

Secretariat's Comments
Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

- c) Are the components adequately funded?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional (only for Multi-trust Funds PPGs with BD from the GEF Trust Fund)?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for projects of more than \$2 million or 10% for projects of less than \$2 million? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments
Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

III. Project Rationale

a. Does the project adequately describe the: (i) current situation/baseline conditions within the project geographic area or project thematic area; (ii) problem(s) that the project will address; (iii) goal and objectives of the project; and (iv) justification for the project intervention; and (v) expected results including the Global Environmental Benefits and an estimate of the project's contributions to the relevant biodiversity core indicators.

Secretariat's Comments

Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

IV. Project Description

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the project components and activities identified in the theory of change adequately described.

c) Is a list of stakeholders that will be involved in the project and their roles in the design and implementation of the project provided?

d) Are the Specific Action Area(s) that the project is aligned with identified and an explanation provided on and how the project will support the achievement of the specific Action Area objective(s).

Secretariat's Comments

Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

V. Does the proposal adequately describe how the project meets the following criteria:

- a) Potential to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) (include a description of the GEBs the project will generate per the GEF-8 Core Indicators for biodiversity);
- b) Alignment with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and/or National Biodiversity Finance Plans or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities;
- c) The level of policy coherence and coordination across multiple ministries, agencies, the private sector, and civil society that the project aims to support;
- d) Whether the project will mobilize the resources of the private sector and philanthropies'; and
- e) Whether and how the project will engage with and provide support to IPLCs.

Secretariat's Comments

Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

VI. Project results indicators

Is the table correctly populated and consistent with the Project Description?

Secretariat's Comments

Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

VII. Project Financing Tables

a) Are all the tables correctly populated?

b) Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines (only for projects with GEF TF components)?

Secretariat's Comments

Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

VIII. Project Endorsement

a) Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) OFP and has the OFP at the time of PPG request submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

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

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

Secretariat's Comments

Dec 6, 2024

Cleared

Agency's Comments

IX. GEFSEC Decision

a. Is the PPG recommended for technical clearance?

b. Additional comments to be considered by the Agency during project preparation

Secretariat's Comments

NN Dec 6, 2024

The PPG request is recommended for clearance.

During project preparation, please ensure the following:

1) We note the project is proposed to be co-implemented by UNDP and the World Bank. If such implementation arrangements are maintained, please justify and detail their modalities, including the roles and responsibilities of each Implementing Agency, in the CEO endorsement request. Please ensure clear and efficient implementation arrangements as early as possible during the PPG phase. In line with the GBFF portfolio target related to the share of International Financial Institutions that are GEF agencies, please consider increasing the share implemented by the World Bank. No reduction should be envisaged during PPG. Please ensure there is a clear logic that the proposed GBFF project is implemented in the three provinces by the two IAs: the current

proposal does not yet show a strong enough logic that it goes beyond each of two IAs operating in the two distant geographical areas.

(2) Outcome 2 ?Strengthened capacities for monitoring NBSAP implementation through the development of an integrated biodiversity information system? is not eligible as proposed. The GBFF programming directions do not include support to generic monitoring of NBSAP implementation. If some support to monitoring is maintained in the project design, please ensure it is part of a well justified theory of change linking interventions on monitoring to the direct generation of global environmental benefits (GEBs) through other project activities. As described, outcome 2 does not underpin any project intervention that will generate direct benefits for biodiversity of global significance. Please also justify the budget allocated to monitoring activities, ensuring high cost-efficiency in the delivery of GEBs.

(3) Baseline and incremental cost reasoning: Please carry out a thorough baseline analysis and clarify the increment provided by this GBFF project in relation to:

- BIOFIN-India; the GEF-7 Global Biodiversity Framework Early Action Support; and the GEF-8 Umbrella programme to support NBSAPs and 7th national reports (relevant to outcomes 2 and 4); and

- the recently approved and ongoing UNDP/GEF projects in India: GEF ID 11423 (Enhancing the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity to meet India's commitment to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework targets by 2030) which has similar approaches and potentially overlapping project pilot sites (e.g., Uttarakhand and Nagaland); and GEF ID 10776 (Strengthening Institutional Capacities for Securing Biodiversity Conservation Commitment) with similar activities in different geographic areas; and

- the World Bank ELEMENT project to be implemented in Nagaland and Tripura.

(4) IPLCs: We note the project is to allocate USD 2,475,780 to support actions by IPLCs for the conservation, restoration, sustainable use and management of biodiversity. Please ensure that the entire amount reported as ?amount to support action by IPLCs [for] biodiversity? in the CEO endorsement requests corresponds to project activities supporting action by IPLCs, and that the project documentation describes the IPLCs who will benefit from the project and details their role in the project. Activities where IPLCs are mere beneficiaries should not be counted in this amount. Support to stakeholders that are not IPLCs (i.e., indigenous peoples or local communities that embody traditional lifestyles relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity) should not be counted either. Whether the project as a whole or certain project activities support action by IPLCs could entail a number of circumstances, including but not limited to: IPLCs directly receive resources through the GEF agency for execution of project components/activities; IPLCs lead the design and management of some project activities but do not manage financial resources; the project provides in-kind support to actions led by IPLCs for biodiversity, etc.

(5) Core indicators / GEBs:

- The project is to have a direct impact over 200,000 hectares, which is not commensurate with a GBFF funding request of USD 13.8 million and USD 100 million of co-financing. Through project development, please ensure a high cost-efficiency in the generation of Global Environmental Benefits, which is to be reflected by significantly larger targets on GEF core indicators in the CEO endorsement request.
- This project is to work on OECMs, including the establishment of new OECMs. Please include corresponding targets related to OECMs on core indicator 4.5 (or 5.4 for marine OECMs) following the GEF Results Framework guidance:
https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results_Framework_Guidelines_2022_06_30.pdf.
- Please measure anticipated climate mitigation co-benefits and add a corresponding target under core indicator 6. We note the project may develop carbon credits. Please note that any mitigation benefit that is to be sold as a carbon credit that may ultimately be used as offset should not be reported on core indicator 6. GEF core indicators are meant to capture GEBs, when offsets do not generate net GEBs.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PPG Request Review	Agency Response
First Review	12/6/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		