

Implementing Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) Site Conservation and Preventing Global Extinctions

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10581

Countries

Global (Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Madagascar)

Project Name

Implementing Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) Site Conservation and Preventing Global Extinctions

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

3/30/2020

Review completed by PM

7/8/2020

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

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

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

4/7/2020

There are several inconsistencies in Table B that require clarification.

Please rewrite the objective into one objective, not three. You could probably put a period after sites and that is your objective. What follows after that are outcomes that you identify in Table B.

Component One:

The PIF notes that some countries have made their decision on what sites they will work in already, thus, these should be listed in Table B.

Please also provide in the text of the PIF document a short list for each country from which the final list of 20 sites will be identified. Include in this list the set of criteria that are more robust and that are better aligned with the theory of change underpinning the project than is currently presented in the PIF. For example, we would expect that other criteria would include: the likelihood of success, the presence of a strong baseline where a modest GEF investment would be meaningful etc.,. Please present the criteria in an evaluation matrix so we can understand why the countries have already selected certain sites and what these sites are and how the remaining countries will select their sites. These sites should then be entered into the Core Indicators by the time of CEO approval of the MSP.

It is not clear why output 1.1.1 and output 1.1.2 of the project are required as we would expect that these activities would be undertaken during the PPG and ONLY for the 5 sites per country that the project will support. Remove these outputs as they are part of PPG activities and revise Table B.

Under Outcome 1.1 the first indicator should state that the 20 sites will be identified during PPG as that is the only way you can develop baseline METT scores as indicated under the second indicator.

Please provide evidence in the text regarding output 1.1.6 that this is a viable economic option in each country and what research and evidence the project is basing its strategy on in each country given the historical challenges of having success with this kind of intervention.

Regarding output 1.1.7 if the project is identifying financing options, please also implement them in the project. If the project will not implement them, then who will and what is sustainable about this output? If there are no plans for implementation of financing strategies, then repurpose this money elsewhere in the project and/or revise the strategy to ensure that this output serves as an input to other financing strategies in the country that are under implementation.

Component Two:

Please remove output 2.1.2 as this component must be solely focused on the mainstreaming actions within the participating countries and GEF funds cannot be used to lobby Parties to advance AZE/KBAs in the new Global Biodiversity Framework.

Please allocate resources and actions to support participating countries to include AZE/KBA in their national policies and regulations.

Regarding the indicator on number of companies using IBAT, please clarify that these are companies operating within each of the four participating countries.

Regarding the indicator focused on lending institutions, please clarify that these are lending institutions operating within each of the four participating countries.

Component Three:

Under outcome 3.1 who are the global partners referenced? Please list them and explain in the text why these global partners are so critical. Please clarify if these global partners are also providing cash cofinancing.

Outcome 3.1 is not an outcome but an activity. Please provide the measurable outcome that results from the use of knowledge and how that supports the project objective.

6/25/2020

The current draft of the PIF submitted in the portal does not have the revised objective. Please revise.

All other changes cleared.

7/7/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

Response:19/06/2020

1. We revised the objective as suggested. Now it reads as:
"To improve the conservation of Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites."
2. We inserted the provisionally identified sites in Table B.
3. We provided the list of criteria that was used to identify the priority AZE sites. We also provided the evaluation matrices for each site in Annex E of the PIF.
4. We removed output 1.1.1 and output 1.1.2.
5. We already identified the 20 sites. However, we will confirm these 20 sites at the PPG and we clarified this under the first indicator of Outcome 1.1
6. We provided the evidence regarding financial sustainability based on output 1.1.6 in the Sustainability section under 1a.7.
7. We included Output 1.1.5 regarding identifying and implementing nature-based financing options at project sites, where applicable. The sites where such options will be implemented will be determined during the PPG phase.
8. We removed output 2.1.2 originally planning to provide technical support for inclusion of AZE sites into GBF. We revised it for to allocate resources for participating countries to include AZE/KBA in their national policies and regulations.
The revised output: "Output 2.1.2. Financial and technical support to project countries to include AZE in their national policies and regulations"
9. Regarding the indicator on number of companies and lending institutions using AZE sites into their approach we highlighted that these are the companies in 4 pilot countries:
Number of lending institutions (local, regional and global banks and lending agencies) **in the four project countries** that integrate AZE site conservation into their policy approaches and ongoing screening of potential project sites for siting at and impacts to AZE sites.
Number of companies operating **in the four project countries** and more broadly using IBAT to better scope and plan their actions within the vicinity of AZE sites (baseline and targets tbd during PPG).
10. We modified Outcome 3.1 to provide a measurable outcome and have removed the referenced global partners.

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

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2020

Please explain why the budget allocation from each country is so different, how this relates to the level of effort that the project will undertake in each country, and the cofinance provided by each country.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response:19/06/2020

The budget allocations reflect the countries' allocations of their STAR to this Project. The differing budget allocations from each country will be reflected in the level of effort that the project will undertake in each country. However, even countries with lower budget allocations will be able to advance AZE site conservation, mainstreaming and knowledge management in their countries. We clarified this under Incremental/additional cost reasoning.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2020

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2020

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

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

4/2/202

The PIF notes that some countries have made their decision on what sites they will work in already, thus, these should be listed in the core indicators.

If for some justified reason the proponents are unable at this time to provide the names of all of the actual sites, please provide in the text of the PIF document a short list for each country from which the final list of 20 sites will be identified. Include in this list the set of criteria that are more robust and that are better aligned with the theory of change underpinning the project than is currently presented in the PIF. For example, we would expect that other criteria would include: the likelihood of success, the presence of a strong baseline where a modest GEF investment would be meaningful etc,. Please present the criteria in an evaluation matrix so we can understand why the countries have already selected certain sites and what these sites are and how the remaining countries will select their sites. These sites should then be entered into the Core Indicators by the time of CEO approval of the MSP.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response: 19/06/2020

We inserted the identified sites in Table B. We also provided the evaluation matrices used to identify the priority AZE sites. The 20 sites provisionally identified will be confirmed at the PPG and we will reflect the list in the Core Indicators at the CEO Endorsement request phase.

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

4/2/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

4/2/2020

Please provide a more precise analysis of the threat to biodiversity at the 20 AZE sites in the participating countries. Since some countries have identified sites, please provide the root causes of BD loss in these sites. For the sites not identified, please provide an assessment of the root causes/barriers for the candidate sites for these countries. What is currently presented is too generic of an analysis of the threats to biodiversity writ large in the country.

Please provide the strategic rationale for these four countries to be working collaboratively on a global project.

Please provide an underpinning theory of change for the investment strategy that is reflected in the investment strategy in each country.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response: 19/06/2020

1. We included more comprehensive analysis of threats at the 20 AZE sites under Subsection 1.a.1

2. We provided the following text explaining the rationale for these four countries to be working collaboratively under Section 6. Coordination:

The four project countries will work collaboratively on this global project. Chile and Madagascar were both project countries in the GEF5 AZE project and will provide continuity with the previous project and will help guide the amplification of AZE conservation in other countries. Including countries at different stages of AZE conservation implementation is a goal of this project. Colombia has worked on AZE site conservation in past years and seeks to reinvigorate its focus on AZE site conservation. Dominican Republic is newer to AZE site conservation and can take advantage of lessons learned from other project countries.

The four countries will also work with non-project countries to increase awareness of AZE site conservation regionally. Each country will focus outreach regionally, in the Southern Cone (Chile), Tropical Andes (Colombia), Caribbean (Dominican Republic), and southern Africa (Madagascar).

As megadiverse countries, Colombia and Madagascar will demonstrate the importance of conserving AZE sites to other members of the Like-Minded Megadiverse Countries group. Similarly, Dominican Republic will be able to demonstrate the application of AZE site conservation in the Caribbean, a region that to date has not had a strong focus on AZE.

3. The Investment strategy is based on four revenue streams (public funds, partnerships with local businesses for their corporate environmental responsibilities, income generating activities, market based mechanisms). This is briefly explained and which source(s) will be used in each country is detailed under the sustainability section.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/2/2020

No.

Please try to focus this on AZE site support and not such a generic overview of the baseline in each country. The baseline should only cover the investments that are supporting the management of the AZE site and/or surrounding landscapes of the 20 sites.

Please move the description of the GEF-5 AZE project to the description of the baseline not in the section of the problem description.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response: 19/06/2020

1. We included more precise baseline investments at the 20 AZE sites starting on page 15.
2. We moved the description of GEF5 AZE Project into the beginning of the baseline section.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/7/2020

No. The alternative scenario is too generic and needs to ground the alternative scenario into the reality of the participating countries and how the project outcomes will find expression within each country for the site work, and globally for the work under component three. Currently, as with much of the PIF the document, this section is too generic in its descriptions and presentations.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response: 19/06/2020

We provided details of how alternative the scenario will be shaped in each participating country and further explanation of how Component 3 will benefit from the country experiences and from the results of the GEF5 Project, and how this information will be disseminated globally.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/7/2020

Yes, for the most part, but please see comments on Table B above which request that certain activities currently identified in the project design be eliminated from the GEF project support for mainstreaming (global lobbying for KBAs/AZEs in the new GBF) and this money be re-directed towards mainstreaming support at national level.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response:19/06/2020

We reflected suggested changes on the log-frame.

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

4/7/2020

Please provide an incremental cost reasoning explanation that is specific to the very different conditions of the 4 participating countries as well as to the component focused on global outreach and knowledge exchange and training.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response:19/06/2020

We have provided an incremental cost reasoning explanation in Section 1a.5. that is specific to the very different conditions of the 4 participating countries and to the knowledge management component.

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

4/7/2020

Yes, for the most part but please improve the indicators for assessing the condition of the 400,000 hectares of the productive landscapes that will be improved for the benefit of biodiversity.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response:19/06/2020

We have identified the 20 sites and we know whether the sites are protected and/or have a management plan. The targeted productive landscapes will be around these identified sites. However, we don't have accurate data and information for assessing these landscapes. The data and the condition will be assessed at the PPG phase.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/7/2020

No.

Please provide some discussion on how the approach has evolved since the GEF-5 project on AZE as the PIF does not present any evidence of the approach evolving to be more innovative in nature. Please clarify.

Table B only states that the project will identify potential financing mechanisms for the sites, but does not commit to implementation nor does the PIF suggest any potential novel financing strategies to be implemented, thus, site management may in fact cease after the GEF investment is over. Please clarify.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

With regards to scaling, please discuss what kind of scaling up occurred in the countries that benefited from the GEF-5 investment on AZEs and how the current investment will replicate that approach and/or propose a different one if there was no scaling.

7/7/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

Response:19/06/2020

1. How the approach has evolved since the GEF-5 project is provided as a table in the baseline section.

2. We explained the financial sustainability under the 1.a.7 Sustainability section.

3. The scaling up in the GEF5 countries is highlighted in the 'Potential for Scaling Up' section.

Response:30/06/2020

We provided additional information on scaling up initiatives that were used during the GEF5 project. We further articulated what additional scaling up actions is planned this project.

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

6/25/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

4/7/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

4/7/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

4/7/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

4/7/2020

On Environmental and Social Safeguards, the PIF show that some risks screening has taken place. Please provide the completed Environmental and Social Risk Identification – Screening Checklist. Please indicate more clearly the preliminary overall risk classification of the project as well as the types and risk classification of any identified risks and impacts including any preliminary measures to address identified risks and potential impacts.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response:19/06/2020

The completed Environmental and Social Risk Identification – Screening Checklist is provided.

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

4/7/2020

Please clarify this section as under the section on stakeholders it lists the Government as lead executing agency in each country but in this section it indicates that NGOs will be the lead executing agencies.

Please explain how if only some project sites have been selected you are sure that these projects are the most related to the project interventions in the 20 sites.

What is the mechanism to ensure coordination between existing projects and programs with the activities undergoing at the 20 sites.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response: 19/06/2020

1. Governments will be the lead executing agencies.

2. All 20 sites have been provisionally selected.

3. We clarified coordination between project and activities under the stakeholders section (second paragraph).

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

4/7/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

4/7/2020

Delete the paragraph about GEFSEC as it does not make any sense and is not relevant.

Please revise this entire section and eliminate all the references to the GEF-5 AZE project and simply describe that the KM approach will actually be based on evidence of success and failure with the GEF-5 project. Provide a detailed description of the KM approach.

6/25/2020

Adequate clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

[Response:19/06/2020](#)

1. We removed the paragraph about the GEF.

2. We rewrote the KM section, highlighting that the KM approach will be based on the evidence from the past project experience. We also highlighted that the project has a standalone KM component and summarized the KM approach in this section.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/25/2020

Yes, this issue was discussed, addressed and cleared in the section on risks above. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

4/7/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

6/25/2020

NA.

Agency Response

UNEP's response to Recommendations/Comments made on the section below - GEFSEC Decision

Responses 30/6/2020

We revised the project objective on the portal.

The countries are entered once in the system (see the screenshot) this looks like an issue of the portal. We alerted the portal admin about this issue.

 Add Other Agency

* ☒ Global ☐ Regional ☐ Country

Chile ×

Colombia ×

Dominican Republic ×

Madagascar ×

We have entered the executing partners as "Others", since the Executing Partner Type are Government and CSOs. However the system does not allow us at the Agency level to enter each Partner per row. This is a system issue. Does not allow the Agency to add multiple selections/ items per row. we have sent an email request to WB IT team to assist: Find below.

Other Executing Partner	Executing Partner Type
Ministry of Environment (Chile),	Government
Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development (Colombia),	Government
Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (Dominican Republic),	Government
Ministry of Environment, Ecology and Forests (Madagascar),	Government
AZE Partnership and Secretariat (American Bird Conservancy - ABC),	CSO
Birdlife International	CSO

RESPONSES to comments dated 7/14/2020

Many thanks for the additional comments.

1. We aligned the financing figures with the OFP letters of endorsement.

2. We provided additional information about, which local communities, civil society were consulted during the PIF stage in Section 2 Stakeholders.

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

4/7/2020

No. Please review the comments above and revise the PIF accordingly and resubmit a revised version addressing all issues identified to date.

6/25/2020

No.

Please revise the objective in the portal.

Also, two clerical issues. First on the PIF, please just enter the names of the countries once.

Second, the Executing Partners are Governments and CSOs. Please revise as currently it says "other" in the portal.

7/14/2020

All technical issues previously identified have been addressed. However, please address these two issues below:

1) GEF project financing figures entered in the Portal for all 4 countries (Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Madagascar) do not match the GEF project financing reflected in all the OFP endorsement letters. Please use the correct amounts as asked for in the OFP letters of endorsement.

2) On Stakeholder's Engagement:

The Agency ticked all the boxes regarding stakeholders that were consulted during the project development, indicating that Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, civil society and private sector participated in those consultations, but a description about those consultations is missing. Please note that the Policy on Stakeholder Engagement requires that at PIF stage 'Agencies provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development...'

7/29/2020

All remaining issues have been addressed. The PIF is now recommended for technical clearance.

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

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The GEF-7 AZE proposal builds on and expands the GEF-5 AZE project, *Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE): Conserving Earth's Most Irreplaceable Sites for Endangered Biodiversity*. The GEF-7 AZE project has three components:

Component 1. Improvement of the conservation status of 20 AZE sites and associated AZE trigger species in the four countries of Chile, Colombia, Dominican Republic, and Madagascar.

Component 2. Mainstreaming AZE site conservation at global and national levels.

Component 3. Knowledge management to enhance understanding of and interest in AZE site conservation across sectors.

The Project's financial sustainability will be based on four revenue streams, including public funds, private sector partnerships, nature-based livelihoods in local communities, and market-based mechanisms, such as Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) approaches.

