

Transforming policy and investment through mainstreaming rapid approaches for natural capital assessment and accounting

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11041

Countries

Global

Project Name

Transforming policy and investment through mainstreaming rapid approaches for natural capital assessment and accounting

Agencies

IADB

Date received by PM

2/8/2023

Review completed by PM

5/18/2023

Program Manager

Jurgis Sapijanskas

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

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

JS 5/9/2023 - Thank you for the resubmission, all cleared.

JS 3/7/2023:

1- Please tag the project with a 2 on the Biodiversity Rio Marker :

Rio Markers	
Climate Change Mitigation	Climate Change Adaptation
No Contribution 0	No Contribution 0
Biodiversity	Land Degradation
No Contribution 0	No Contribution 0

2- Please add after "Global", the list of countries that have been identified for piloting:

Countries
Global

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. The project has been tagged as requested.
2. Unfortunately, the platform does not allow us to edit this section. The countries identified for piloting are Ecuador, Uruguay, Colombia, Belize, and Chile. This issue has been clarified in various sections of the document: Project Justification, Stakeholders, and Institutional Coordination.

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

JS 6/5/2023 - Cleared

JS 5/9/2023-

A- There is no co-financing of PMC. As per policy and guidelines, please ensure proportionality, i.e. that the share of GEF funding devoted to PMC is equivalent to the share of co-finance devoted to PMC:

	Sub Total (\$)	1,883,701.00	87,800,000.00
Project Management Cost (PMC) ⓘ			
	GET	96,299.00	
	Sub Total(\$)	96,299.00	0.00
	Total Project Cost(\$)	1,980,000.00	87,800,000.00

Previous comments are cleared

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- As requested in PIF review sheet for project preparation, please streamline the project objective so that it is expressed in a single sentence, e.g. "to contribute to the mainstreaming of natural capital into policy and investment decision-making processes through the

development of a standardized framework, customizable tools and scalable training material for rapid Natural Capital Assessment and Accounting".

The rest is cleared as it is consistent with that approved at PIF stage.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

The project objective has been streamlined as suggested in the project description summary section.

05/30/2023

A- Co-financing of PMC has been included as per policy and guidelines.

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 N/A

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

JS 6/5/2023 - Cleared.

JS 5/9/2023

1 and 2 Cleared. It is well understood that GEF funding will support only the 5 LAC country pilots. However, as was agreed in the PIF, the overall expected outcome of the project includes 10 pilots, thanks to co-financing for 5 pilots in Asia. We understand that reported Stanford co-financing will cover the pilots in Asia.

A - Please explain how a \$85 million guarantee can be considered as co-finance for this MSP, which is to provide only technical assistance, or remove. Per GEF policy, should be reported

as co-financing, financing that supports the implementation of a GEF-financed project and the achievement of its objective(s).

B- The grant co-financing from the IA, which was \$3,386,640 in the previous submission, has been divided by 3 in this new submission. Please explain.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- Please clarify whether all 10 pilots, including 5 in LAC and 5 in Asia, can be carried out with the GEF funding and co-funding currently reported in the CEO approval request. In other words, if the 5 pilots in Asia are funded through the co-financing from Stanford reported in table C please be explicit about it in the portal entry. If, on the contrary, pilots in Asia depend on ADB co-financing, please report, as requested in the PIF review sheet, corresponding ADB co-financing in table C with adequate supporting documentation.

2- The explanation on Investment Mobilized from IADB co-financing mentions Panama when it is not presented as a pilot country in the description of the alternative scenario of this project. Please explain and/or revise:

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

Investment mobilized reflects the technical and financial assistance provided to several potential pilot countries in the LAC Region through IDB/ IDB-administered grant resources to support the integration of natural capital analysis into national decision making. Specifically, these grants fund the application of NCAs in Colombia and Panama, as well as providing science-based inputs using NCA for country strategy processes in Latin America and the Caribbean (including, among others, a collaboration between Natural Capital Project/ Stanford University and IDB).

The rest is cleared.

Agency Response

/7/2023

1. Only the 5 LAC country pilots will be carried out with GEF funding. Stanford will fund the remaining pilots in Asia. Clarification on this point has been included in various sections of the portal: Project Justification, Project Map and Coordinates, Stakeholders, and Institutional Arrangement and Coordination.

2. The investment mobilized section has been updated and revised as suggested. Participating pilot countries-related investment mobilized has been included.

5/30/2023

Thank you for your comment. We confirm that the overall expected outcome of the project includes 10 pilots, thanks to Stanford's co-financing for 5 pilots in Asia.

A- The Ecuador debt for nature guarantee is based on a policy matrix and conservation commitments (IDB operation: EC-U0005- \$85mm). The general objective of this instrument is to strengthen environmental sustainability in Ecuador. Its specific development objectives are: (i) strengthen the institutional framework to support proper management of natural resources; and (ii) improve the organization and functioning of public financing for environmental and financial sustainability.

This instrument includes valuing the natural capital of the new "Hermandad Marine Reserve" (Galapagos Islands), determining the economic impact of conservation measures, and then informing specific marine policies and economic transition frameworks. This work will be supported by the GEF project.

We chose this guarantee, together with Ecuadorian government officials, as a result of the scoping exercise that took place during the Global Forum for Mainstreaming Nature in Decisions held at Stanford University on April 17-19, 2023.

B- At the time, where the investment mobilized co-financing was defined, the pilot countries had not yet been selected. Therefore, the Panama technical cooperation project was included as co-financing since the activities being implemented through this project were compatible and aligned with the project's objectives.

Before GEF SEC's second technical review submission, the pilot countries were finally selected. However, Panama did not end up being one of the participating pilot countries. Therefore, the investment mobilized structure had to be reconsidered to include projects in eligible countries, in line with what was agreed with government officials during the Global Forum for Mainstreaming Nature in Decisions held at Stanford University on April 17-19, 2023.

As per GEF-SEC's suggestion, the Panama technical cooperation project was removed as investment mobilized co-financing and was replaced with other options that were consistent with the working components of this project.

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 JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response Cleared

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 JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared, no PPG funds were requested.

Agency Response Cleared, no PPG funds were requested.

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 JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

As already cleared at PIF stage the project will not deliver direct GEBs measurable in the core indicator system but will indirectly contribute to the delivery of significant GEBs through the development of rapid NCAA methodologies and capacity building.

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 JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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

JS 6/5/2023 - Cleared.

JS 5/17/2023

3- Cleared, thank you.

1- Thank you for the additional elements. However, the description of the alternative scenario now includes two similar sections with a high degree of repetition, one describing outcomes to some details before the ToC diagram, and another one with description of the components after the ToC diagram. Moreover, the content of the first elaboration on outcome 1 placed before the ToC diagram is confusing as it mostly pertains to outputs under outcome 2, instead of outcome 1. Please consolidate these two sections into one single description, describing once in a consistent manner all anticipated activities under each output.

2- Thank you for the response. However, the section was not updated in the portal entry. The CEO approval request still contains the following:

Criteria for selecting pilot countries. Pilot countries will be IDB or ADB member countries and selected based on the following criteria: (i) their request/demand for application of NCAA approaches that can lead to practical, policy-relevant outcomes; (ii) a diversity in previous experience, indicated by the existence of previous analysis, institutional arrangements, workstreams or ongoing analytical work that can facilitate the rapid deployment of pilots; and (iii) geographic distribution, seeking to avoid an over concentration in any one sub-region. Countries will be selected before submitting the CEO Endorsement document through dialogue with countries and MDB country offices and letters of request will be presented. EA will ensure that countries are selected with 1) a range of ecosystems represented, 2) a range of readiness/advancement in NCAA implementation, from low existing implementation to high existing work, and 3) a range of NCAA decision contexts, relevant policies, sectors, and tools implemented. Also, care will be taken that the selected pilots add to the diversity of experiences with NCAA application, including that they complement NCAA applications already supported by GEF funds. (The CEO Approval document will provide further details on the scope, scale and policy relevance of the NCAA approach in each of the already selected pilot countries, the coordination with on-going efforts and the complementarity between pilots to achieve a representative sample of experiences that can be used to develop a widely applicable rapid NCAA framework.)

Please revise.

A- Please explain what are the "mainstreaming consultants to be hired at IDB and ADB". In particular, please confirm that they will not be funded by the GEF grant:

To provide context for general guidance, a small writing team consisting of members of the NatCap at Stanford team and the two mainstreaming consultants to be hired (one each at IDB and ADB), will produce a brief overview paper laying out the case for rapid natural capital approaches—opportunities and challenges (to fulfill output 2.1.1. 'One (1) concept paper, laying out the need for and contributions from rapid NCAAs and what worked, didn't work and lessons learned from previous applications'). The author team will incorporate feedback from pilot team members to ensure latest, relevant perspectives are reflected.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- The description of the alternative scenario has not been further detailed compared to PIF stage. Please describe the project at the output level, outlining the anticipated set of activities to be carried out under each output. In particular, please provide further details on the science-policy processes and capacity building activities to be supported in each pilot country.

2- Please update the text that refers to pilot country selection in the future, when, as discussed at PIF stage, the selection has been done during project preparation:

Criteria for selecting pilot countries. Pilot countries will be IDB or ADB member countries and selected based on the following criteria: (i) their request/demand for application of NCAA approaches that can lead to practical, policy-relevant outcomes; (ii) a diversity in previous experience, indicated by the existence of previous analysis, institutional arrangements, workstreams or ongoing analytical work that can facilitate the rapid deployment of pilots; and (iii) geographic distribution, seeking to avoid an over-concentration in any one sub-region. Countries will be selected before submitting the CEO Endorsement document through dialogue with countries and MDB country offices and letters of request will be presented. EA will ensure that countries are selected with 1) a range of ecosystems represented, 2) a range of readiness/advancement in NCAA implementation, from low existing implementation to high existing work, and 3) a range of NCAA decision contexts, relevant policies, sectors, and tools implemented. Also, care will be taken that the selected pilots add to the diversity of experiences with NCAA application, including that they complement NCAA applications already supported by GEF funds. Countries will receive and comment on the case studies before publication.

3- Pilot countries

3a- Please clarify to what extent the pilot countries in Asia have been confirmed (Cook Islands, China, Sri Lanka, Mongolia, and the Philippines) and ensure consistency throughout the document. Some sections state that these countries are confirmed (e.g., section 1b on Maps and coordinates), while this section refers to them as "strong candidate countries".

3b - In particular, as all countries in IADB's region are Upper-Middle Income or High Income countries, please confirm that some Lower-Middle Income Countries will be among the pilots and please justify why no Low Income countries are among the planned pilots.

3c - Following PIF approval, the project team confirmed that, at CEO approval stage, LoE would be provided for all pilot countries funded through GEF and that letters of support from relevant line ministries would be produced for the pilots in Asia funded through ADB co-finance.. While the LoEs have been provided, we failed to locate the letters of support. Please explain or provide.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. Further description of the outlining of the project outputs and the related activities has been included in the project justification section to expand on the Theory of change. Additionally, summaries of the scoping exercises carried out with government representatives of the five participating countries during the "Global Forum for Mainstreaming Nature in Decisions" that took place on April 17-19, 2023, have been attached as Addendums 1-5, where more detail is presented in terms of the science-policy processes, which will be supported as a result of the project.

2. This section has been updated accordingly.

3a. This has been clarified throughout the project.

3b. This a demand-driven exercise which means that only those countries that manifest interest in being part of the project are the ones that have been selected as pilots. In this case, the pilots happen to be upper-middle-income and high-income countries. These countries are those that have previously adopted NCAA frameworks and are currently mainstreaming nature in their policy and investment decisions. Hopefully, the lessons learned, and additional capacity will be transferred to other low-income countries that show interest in adopting similar frameworks.

3c. The LoEs for the 5 pilot countries have been provided. Colombia's letter has been updated, as requested. As mentioned in the project description section, GEF funding will not be used to carry out activities in Asia. Stanford University will use its own resources to fund activities in Asian countries. The participation of Asian countries will be an opportunity to share lessons learned and the outcomes of NCAA adoption with LAC counterparts.

5/30/2023

1. The suggested adjustments have been made. A single description of project outcomes and corresponding outputs has been consolidated and included after the ToC diagram in 1a. Project Description section.

2. This section has been updated in the platform. (1a. Project Description).

A- We confirm that the GEF grant will not fund the mentioned consultants as they are part of Stanford's co-financing. The mainstreaming consultants will be hired to support policy mapping activities and the identification of opportunities for biodiversity mainstreaming using NCAA approaches within countries (one for LAC region and the other one for the Asian region).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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

JS 5/17/2023 - Cleared.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- PIF-stage review requested the development, during project preparation, of the project's strategy to foster sustainability and scaling up within the pilot countries. The project indeed seems to rely heavily on the EA and external consultants and very little on in-country experts to develop the pilot NCAA analysis. While it guarantees rapidity and quality in the implementation of the pilots, it is unclear if such an approach will enable sustainability and scaling up in the countries. Please elaborate on the project's approach to foster sustainability and scaling up within the pilot countries.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. New language has been included in the project justification section (subsection g.) to clarify participating countries' sustainability and scaling-up potential. NatCap will assign an expert to each country that will work directly with policymakers to support them in the adoption of NCAA frameworks according to country priorities.

Further detail on how the implementation mechanism to foster sustainability and scaling up for project activities within country pilots has been laid out in the Institutional arrangement and coordination section.

The scoping exercises carried out during the "Global Forum on Mainstreaming Nature in Decisions" constitute key inputs to determine jointly with policymakers from the participating countries. The opportunities for institutional capacity building and scaling up the technical support provided are aligned with policy priorities defined jointly with each country. Summaries of these scoping exercises have been attached to the proposal. (See Roadmap Addendums 1-5).

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

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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 N/A

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

JS 5/17/2023 - Cleared, thank you.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- Please provide a summary of the consultations that took place during project preparation. Currently, it is limited to *"IDB has contacted the GEF Operational focal points from various regional governments through its country offices to present the project and determine the country's interest in participating in the initiative."*

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. To address this comment, a detailed summary of the 'Global Forum on Mainstreaming Nature in Decisions' (April 17-19, 2023) has been included in the stakeholder section. This convening was carried out as part of the consultations that took place during project preparation. Summaries of the scoping exercises with the 5 participating countries are attached as addendums. Additionally, a (i) list of potential stakeholders identified for each pilot country and a (ii) list of attendants to Global Forum have been attached for reference. (See Roadmap- Country-specific stakeholders and Global Forum participants list).

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

JS 6/5/2023 - Cleared.

JS 5/9/2023

1- Cleared.

A- Please tag the project on all questions. The tag is missing on gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources. Please correct.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- Please explain why the project has been tagged as generating socio-economic benefits or services for women or revise. It seems any socio-economic benefit would be quite indirect.

improving women's participation and decision-making Yes

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women Yes

2- Please notes that CBD decision XII/7, in paragraph 7 of its annex, states "Ensure that the valuation of biodiversity resources includes their use by both men and women, including gender-disaggregated data", and use this as appropriate in the project.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. Thank you for your comment. This criterion has been untagged.

2. Considerations regarding the valuation of biodiversity resources and their use by men and women and gender-disaggregated data have been added to the gender equality and the monitoring and evaluation sections. Also, GEF core indicator 11 has been included in the project results framework in Annex A. Results Matrix, as a gender disaggregated indicator.

5/30/2023

A- The project has been tagged on gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources, as requested.

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

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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

JS 5/9/2023- Cleared

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- The elaboration on the risk related to Country participation has not been updated since PIF staged when consultations with countries have taken place and LoEs have been secured. Please revise.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. This section has been revised and updated accordingly.

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

JS 6/5/2023 - Cleared

JS 5/9/2023

1 and 2- Cleared

A- Please add the composition of the steering committee in this section. While the steering committee is mentioned in several places throughout the document, we failed to find a consolidated description of its participants.

B- Please see comment on the budget in the comment box related to annexes. The budget table included in this section is not consistent with the general budget. Please revise to ensure consistency.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- Please update this part and in particular the following sentence, as pilot have already been selected:

Stanford technical leads and managers will work with the IDB and ADB to identify countries for the pilots.

2- Given the Philippines is to be among the pilot countries please add the following project in the list of GEF-relevant projects:

10386 - Philippines - UNEP -Natural Capital Accounting and Assessment: Informing development planning, sustainable tourism development and other incentives for improved conservation and sustainable landscapes

During implementation, it is recommended to look at older GEF projects that are more advanced in their implementation or closed to be able to effectively draw lessons on uptake. It includes the following but also older projects:

9073 - South Africa - DBSA -Unlocking Biodiversity Benefits through Development Finance in Critical Catchments

The GEF Secretariat would be happy to help identifying relevant projects.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. This part has been updated as suggested. We have expanded on the consultation efforts carried out as part of project preparation during the Global Forum. Also, a summary of the event has been included in this section.

2. As suggested, the listed initiatives have been included as GEF-relevant projects. We appreciate the willingness to support the identification of relevant projects during the implementation phase for drawing lessons learned.

5/30/2023

A- A consolidated description of the steering committee has been included in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section for further clarity.

B- This issue has been revised to ensure consistency. An updated version of the project budget has been included in the Roadmap (Annex E) section with its description.

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

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

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

JS 5/9/2023 - Cleared.

JS 3/7/2023 - We note the PIF-stage ESS provided. Please confirm that no further ESS assessment has been conducted since PIF stage.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

We confirm that no further ESS assessment has been conducted since PIF stage.

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

JS 6/5/2023 - Cleared.

JS 5/17/2023

1, 2- Cleared.

3- Thanks you. However, the Results Matrix Measurement Methodology is not readable in the portal. The fonts are too small. Please correct.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- M&E budget: Some of the activities reported under the M&E budget are not eligible for M&E budget (outreach events, trainings). They should be covered by other components of the project budget. Please also add the total M&E budget in the M&E budget table.

Monitoring of gender and other stakeholder identities in pilot teams, stakeholder outreach events, international convening at Stanford, and 2 regional trainings	\$50,000	At events noted throughout 15 months of project
--	----------	---

2- Please correct typos and inconsistencies in this section, including repetitions:

Progress will be monitored through regular contact with the executing agency, there will be regular formal reporting to the GEF annually. The project will prepare a monitoring and evaluation framework. This framework will inform the preparation of both the required project implementation report sent to the GEF, IDB results reporting, and the preparation of a final project evaluation, which will focus on the effectiveness of the process of partnering with countries on NCAAs in this project.

Independent consultant for Terminal Evaluation (TER) - \$78,700

Progress will be monitored through regular contact with the executing agency, Stanford University, with regular formal reporting to the GEF quarterly. The project will prepare a monitoring and evaluation framework. This framework will inform the preparation of both the required project implementation report sent to the GEF, IDB results reporting, and the preparation of a final project evaluation, which will focus on the effectiveness of the process of partnering with countries on rapid NCAAs in this project.

3- This section states the project will develop a "monitoring and evaluation framework", when the monitoring plan should be provided at this CEO approval request stage. We note the results framework provided as appendix A, but please clarify methodology of measurement and the responsible entity for each indicator in the monitoring plan. In particular, indicators 1.2 (The capacity of strategic core ministries [...] is strengthened) and 2.2 (GEF Agencies'

capacity is increased [...]) are outcomes rather than indicators and it is unclear how they will be measured in practice, and what their respective end of project targets "5" and "1" mean.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. The M&E budget table has been revised and updated accordingly. The total in the M&E budget has been added.
2. The typos and inconsistencies have been corrected as suggested.
3. A "Results Matrix Measurement Methodology" table has been added to the M&E section in the portal to clarify the methodology of measurement and the responsible entity for each indicator in the monitoring plan. This has been added as a document in the Roadmap.

Indicators 1.2 and 2.2, as mentioned in the results framework, are indeed outcome indicators. The target in the first case, "5," is related to the number of pilot countries; therefore, the number of core ministries that will be strengthened. In the second case, target "1" has to do with the improved capacity of IADB as a GEF agency.

5/30/2023

- 3- Due to the size of the Results Matrix Measurement Methodology table in the monitoring and evaluation section, it is now referenced as an annex uploaded in the Roadmap section.

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

JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/5/2023 - Cleared.

JS 5/9/2023 -

2- All Cleared.

1b. We note the added explanation in section on Institutional Arrangements and Coordination and the reduction of the budget dedicated to Stanford staff. However, the budget table inserted in that section is the same as the one in the agency project document, which is not consistent with the excel budget uploaded with this submission. 11 Stanford staff are identified in the budget table in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section and in the Agency project document for a total of \$1,044,011, when a total of 9 existing staff are shown in the excel budget for a total of \$998,957. Please revise to ensure consistency in the number and identity of staff identified in different parts of the portal entry and in the project document.

1c - As commented on for the previous submission, all staff costs associated with general project management and day-to-day administration should be charged on the PMC. The roles of project managers and co-lead seem to include such duties and should thus largely be charged on PMC when they are currently entirely charged on components. Please revise, noting that currently GEF share of PMC is at 5% of GEF project component financing and could be increased to up to 10% because this project is a MSP. Please note that in any case the co-financed share of PMC should be proportional (see second comment box in this review sheet).

1d - Cleared.

A- The budget is not readable in the portal. The font is too small. Please correct:

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Expenditure Category	Detailed Description	Amount (in US\$)					Sub-Total	BMC (Comp. 3)	PMC	Total (in US\$)	Responsible Entity
		Component 1 Outcome 1.1	Component 1 Outcome 1.2	Component 2 Outcome 2.1	Component 2 Outcome 2.2						
Operational Components						78,700	0	10,440	89,140		
	M&E Baseline & Terminal Evaluation - new Contract					78,700	0	0	78,700		
	Final Financial Audit - new Contract					0	0	10,440	10,440		
						0	0	0	0		
Program Support						263,215	0	80,650	343,865		
	Project Managers and 1 Co-lead (100 Months)	50,000	20,320	127,470	71,560	269,350	0	0	269,350		
	Project Coordinator Lead (100 Months)					0	0	80,650	80,650		
Country Support						1,257,624	0	0	1,257,624		
	Country Leads, including 1st Deputy	34,280	300,314			340,594	0	0	340,594	Board of Trustees Stanford University	
	Technical coordinators including staff Schenk	50,000	20,320	132,260	74,200	296,880	0	0	296,880		
	Facilities Coordinator	7,714	0,000	17,084	9,870	34,668	0	0	34,668		
	Staff Support (new hires)	23,220	200,500			223,720	0	0	223,720	Project Evaluation Unit (under Capital Project)	
	Local National Offices Co-ordinators	190,000				190,000	0	0	190,000		
	Local National Offices Co-ordinators	154,400				154,400	0	0	154,400		
Training, Workshops, Meetings						112,240	0	0	112,240		
	Country Leads, America	60,000				60,000	0	0	60,000		
	Country Leads, Europe			52,240		52,240	0	0	52,240		
Travel						120,000	0	0	120,000		
	Travel	120,000				120,000	0	0	120,000		
						0	0	0	0		
Grand Total		1,316,210	494,739			1,810,949	78,700	80,650	1,969,300		

JS 3/15/2023 -

1- Budget

1a - Please provide the budget also as a separate excel file uploaded in the portal and correct the following typo:

Final Financial Audit					U	15,740	15,740
Salary and benefits / Staff costs					1,108,271	0	1,188,830
Stanford Staff - Technical Managers/ Leads (3)	99,373	66,248	77,290	33,124	276,035		276,035
Stanford Staff - Technical Experts (3)	79,687	53,125	61,979	26,562	221,353		221,353
78	252,622	28,069			280,691		280,691

1b - In the proposed budget, close to \$1.2 million is dedicated to Stanford University Staff costs. Moreover, from the table provided in paragraph 4.8 of the Agency’s project document, it seems most if not all of these staff are existing staff, which does not seem in line with the GEF’s mandate to fund agreed incremental costs of activities to achieve global environmental benefits. As there is \$3.4 million of grant co-financing from the IA in the form of investment mobilized, please revise the budget to cover the non-incremental staff costs through co-financing and justify the incrementality of any remaining EA staff cost to be covered by the GEF grant.

1c - For EA staff that would remain charged on components, please provide clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs/deliverables under the respective components on which they are charged. All staff costs associated with general project management and day-to-day administration should be charged on the PMC.

1d - Please correct the M&E budget shown in table E. AS per the M&E section in this approval section, the cost of the Independent consultant for Terminal Evaluation is \$28,700, and not \$78,700:

Pilots							
Independent consultant for Terminal Evaluation (TER)					0	78,700	78,700

2- Letters of endorsement (LoE): We note the letters provided for Belize, Ecuador, Chile, Colombia and Uruguay. However,

2a - All LoEs are missing \$100 compared to the funding requested for this project as reported in table D. Please thus provide new LoEs showing the same amount as currently requested, or reduce the figure in Table D to \$2,168,000

2b- Please note that the GEF OFP for Uruguay has changed on 2023-02-14 . There is no need to produce a new LoE, as the LoE provided was signed by the acting OFP at the time of submission. Please, however, make sure that the new OFP is informed.

2c - Please note that the GEF OFP for Colombia has changed on 2023-02-07, i.e. before this CEO approval request was submitted. Please provide a LoE signed by the current OFP, Ms. Maria Teresa Becerra Ramirez.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1a. An updated version of the budget has been included in Annex E. Also, a separate Excel file of the budget has been attached as an Addendum.

1b. In order to address these comments, an updated version of the budget has been included in Annex E, along with explanations of the changes to the previous indicative budget. Additionally, new inputs have been included in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section explaining the rationale behind the single source selection of Stanford as EA.

1c. The Terms of Reference for all participating staff have been attached as Addendum 6. Notes describing unique deliverables under the respective components they are charged have been added to Annex E.

1d. The M&E budget shown in Annex E has been corrected accordingly.

2a. To address this issue, we have reduced the figure in Table D to \$2,168,000, as suggested.

2b. We have made sure to inform the new OFP about this project and its potential benefits for Uruguay.

2c. We have attached a new LoE from Colombia signed by the current OFP, Maria Teresa Ramirez, as an annex.

5/30/2023

1b. This issue has been revised to ensure consistency. An updated version of the existing Stanford staff table has been included in the Institutional Arrangements and Coordination section.

Please see that now the table lists 9 staff for a total budget of \$ **1,002,454**. This amount comes from the project budget as a sum of existing Stanford staff as follows (See below and also in Indicative Budget and IDB TC document RG4141-Annexed):

Name	Nationality	Unique skill	Cost
Mary Ruckelshaus	USA	Co-creator of NCAA methodology, continuance of work with Belize, Colombia	\$80,156
Adrian Vogl	USA	Has previously worked Integrating NCAs into MDB processes	\$91,945
Lisa Mandle	USA	Integrating NCAA approaches with policy-makers and private sector, continuance of work with Colombia	\$103,180
Rafael Schmidt	Germany, US permanent resident	Hydrological NCAA modeling	\$110,244
Alejandra Echeverri	Colombia	Integration of NCAs in national and sub-national policy, continuance of work with Colombia	\$92,348
Jessica Silver	USA	12 years of experience working with Latin American and Canada stakeholders to implement marine and coastal NCAA models, simultaneously developing local capacity through curriculum and training in all NCAA approaches.	\$95,533
Stacy Wolny	USA	World's leading expert on modeling using the proprietary InVest software and on training on NCAA	\$174,095
Jesse Goldstein	USA	Expert on InVest data visualizations	\$174,095
Mary Jane Wilder	USA	NCAA operations expert	\$80,859
TOTAL			\$1,002,454

Check the budget as follows:

Regional Support for: \$203,066 (from Components 1 and 2 subtotal; row H10) + \$164,560 (PMC; row J10) + Country Support for: \$340,904 + \$293,925 (rows H14 and H15) = **\$1,002,454**

1c. The PMC has been increased to 10%, and a proportional co-financing share of the PMC has been included. As a result of this adjustment, the values indicated in Table B have been updated accordingly, and also the budget has been updated.

A- This issue has been corrected. An improved image of the project's budget has been included for better visualization.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

IS 6/5/2023 - Cleared.

JS 5/17/2023

1-Cleared.

2-

2a- It is well understood that these are outcome indicators, but they should be indicators, i.e. their formulation should convey what is actually measured and not the outcome the indicator is trying to measure. Please consider revising (e.g. "Number of countries with increased capacity to ...")

2b- Please explain why the indicators included in the results framework are not identical to the ones included in the Results Matrix Measurement Methodology or align.

2c- Outcome 1.1 relates to piloting in 10 countries. The end of project target for outcome indicator 1.1 should include the 5 pilots funded through co-finance and total 10.

2b- Outcome 2.2 ("150 expert consultants and members of GEF agencies [...]") is supposed to reach more than a single GEF agency. Furthermore, it is not appropriate for a GEF project implemented by IADB to have as a targeted outcome the improved capacity of IADB, which is what this indicator 2.2 and its target imply. Please revise.

JS 3/7/2023 -

1- Please add GEF core indicator 11 in the Results Framework. GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly included in the Results Framework.

2- Indicators 1.2 (The capacity of strategic core ministries [...] is strengthened) and 2.2 (GEF Agencies' capacity is increased [...]) are outcomes rather than indicators so that it is unclear how they will be measured in practice. It is also unclear what their respective end of project targets ("5" and "1") mean. Please explain and/or revise.

Agency Response

3/7/2023

1. As requested, GEF Core indicator 11 has been included in the Results Framework (Annex A). A separate file of the Results Framework has been attached as an annex in PDF file.

2. The indicators mentioned are outcomes, as presented in the Results Framework in Annex A. The target in the first case, 5, is related to the number of pilot countries; therefore, the number of core ministries will be strengthened. In the second case, target 1 has to do with the improved capacity of IADB as a GEF agency.

5/30/2023

2a. Thank you for your comment. The Project's Results Matrix (Annex A) has been modified, and therefore, the corresponding adjustments have been made to Table B. In Component 1, the outcome indicator, previously defined as 1.2 has been eliminated and replaced with a

revised output indicator 1.1.2. In the case of Component 2, the outcome indicator 2.2 has been replaced with output indicator 2.1.6.

2b. The Results Matrix Measurement Methodology table has been modified to coincide and align with the Project's Results Matrix. Also, the M&E section references this table as an Annex, which has been uploaded in the Roadmap.

2c. Since IADB can't carry out any activities outside of LAC due to legal restrictions, in the Project Results Matrix, the end of project (EOP) target is defined as '5,' meaning the pilots in LAC; however, 10 pilots will be delivered as a result of project execution. Comments to clarify this issue have been included in the Project Results Matrix Annex A and in Table B.

2d. Thank you for your comment. To address this concern, the Project Results Matrix and the Results Matrix Measurement Methodology table have been updated to ensure consistency and alignment. The outcome indicator 2.2 was converted into an output indicator (now 2.1.6). This is also reflected in Table B. We reiterate that as a result of project activities, it is expected to engage various GEF agencies and their representatives during the events, workshops, and training.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared.
Comments for project preparation that have not been entirely addressed have been included in relevant sections of this review sheet.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response N/A

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request JS 3/7/2023 - Cleared

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

Agency Response

N/A

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

Agency Response N/A

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 N/A

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

JS 6/5/2023 - Yes, the project is recommended for clearance.

JS 5/17/2023 - Not at this stage. Please address comments listed in this review sheet and resubmit.

JS 3/7/2023 - Not at this stage. Please address comments listed in this review sheet and resubmit. Please contact jsapijanskas@thegef.fr for any clarification.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/5/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations