

Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10920

Countries

Global

Project Name

Policy Coherence for Global Environmental Benefits

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

1/19/2023

Review completed by PM

4/5/2023

Program Manager

Hannah Fairbank

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

April 28, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

March 30, 2023 HF:

1 & 2.) Comments cleared.

3.) The implementation start and completion dates still do not make for 24 months ? please amend.

February 3, 2023 HF:

1.) Please fix Component 1 language in Table A as the sentence is not complete. It currently ends with "in particular"

2.) The target for Outcome 2.1 includes the word "consider", which is not an adequate target for "increased policy coherence" which necessitates action beyond consideration. Please revise this target to align with Outcome 2.1, potential revised wording simply redacts the word "consider" from the target and therefore reads: "At least 2 of the 3 pilot countries using guidelines, approaches and enhance policy coherence of sustainable development."

3.) Please correct the completion date to 08/31/2025 to meet the 24 months duration.

Agency Response

- 1) *The text in Component 1 was changed to: ?Identify approaches and opportunities for policy coherence to deliver nature positive Global Environmental Benefits of significant Biodiversity?.*
- 2) *The text for Target 2 was changed to reflect the requested detail.*
- 3) *Corrected to 31 August 2025*

April 14, 2023

The completion date has been corrected to meet the 24 months duration.

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 3, 2023 HF:

1.) Component 2 seems to lack focus. Two ways to remedy this:

a.) Suggest that C2 should be focused on GEBs for globally significant biodiversity. Currently the CER mixes a broad environmental purview with biodiversity conservation/management focus. For Component 2, it makes sense to focus on policy coherence to produce/protect GEBs for biodiversity which will help to limit the scope under C2 in a way that is helpful.

b.) identify a broad policy agenda for each country, or at least a better sense of how the project will identify

2.) In Table B please include the expected output and outcome for the component related to monitoring and evaluation.

Agency Response

- 1) Component 2 text was elaborated to further demonstrate the focus of the interventions to deliver Global Environmental Benefits in significant biodiversity ecosystems in target countries.
- 2) The expected outcome and output for M&E was included in Table B. Outcome: Lessons Learnt on how to use Policy Coherence to deliver Global Environmental Benefits of globally significant Biodiversity. Outputs: The complete and detailed reporting including PIR and final review by a third party.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response
Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 28, 2023 HF:
Comments cleared.

April 4, 2023 HF:
Whereas the agency indicated the Core Indicator included in Annex 1, it is still missing from Annex A. Please amend.

February 3, 2023 HF:

1.) The target for Core Indicator 11 has been reduced by more than half from PIF to

CER. Please provide a clear explanation/justification for this reduction in the space below the Core Indicator table in the CER.

2.) Please include the core indicator 11 in the results framework. GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A.

Agency Response

1) The reasons for the reduction of the target for Indicator 11 are now presented at the beginning of Part II of the Project Document. This text was added on page 6: The only notable change was the reduction of the number of beneficiaries as indicated in the PIF: From 1200 at PIF stage to 532 in the Project Document. This reduction is the result of a reduced Conservation Caucus because the new Congress was inaugurated on July 2022 in Colombia between the submission of the PIF (March 2022) and the submission of the Project Document. A similar situation occurred in Zambia where there was a new Congress and the reconstitution and reengagement with the Conservation Caucus took place between PIF and CEO AR submission. The situation in Mongolia remained stable. The reduction in the number of beneficiaries also resulted due to changes in the structure of Governments.

2) Core Indicator included in Annex 1.

April 14, 2023

Core Indicator 11 has been included in the Results Framework in Annex A under Outcome 2.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 3, 2023 HF:

1.) Please ensure the focal GEBs are of global biodiversity significance (e.g. as opposed to transition to generally environmentally friendly or environmentally less damaging) and make revisions accordingly to clarify.

Agency Response

1) In each of the target countries, a new paragraph was included to describe the most important ecosystems and GEBs of biodiversity significance, that the project will concentrate on. Colombia paragraph 6, page 8; Mongolia Paragraph 9, page.12; Zambia paragraph 17, page 11.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

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

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

February 3, 2023 HF:

1.) The project rationale section refers to ICCF's work and experience in country, but the executing agency is listed as CCN which is confusing to the reader. Please either make consistent or explain somewhere in the CER the relationship/difference between CCN and ICCF and their respective roles in the project execution.

2.) Please specify/describe in para 102 that these are lessons learned about 'policy coherence' from OECD members (or from?)

Agency Response

1. The following was added as a footnote on page 1. The Conservation Council of Nations (CCN) was established when ICCF expanded its operations outside the US, where ICCF was originally founded to support Congress. CCN is now doing business as the ICCF Group and both terms are being used interchangeably.

2. It was clarified in the CEO AR document now para 106 in the revised version.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

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

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

February 6, 2023:

Please further articulate the contribution of this investment to the conservation of globally significant biodiversity and note that policy coherence is a critical enabling condition for the long-term conservation of biodiversity, and financing therein. Could describe/include policy coherence in the context of the GBF. Further, policy coherence is a necessary but insufficient condition for a nature positive/carbon neutral future and is critical to narrowing the financing gap for global BD conservation.

Agency Response

[Text was included to highlight the requested details. Please refer to paragraph 97.](#)

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

Yes

Agency Response

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

NA

Agency Response
Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response
Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 4, 2023 HF:
Comments cleared

February 6, 2023 HF:

1.) Looks as though Min of environment is envisioned to collaborate on this project in Mongolia, but not in the other countries. Why is that? What sort of approach is planned in terms of engagement of other branches of government e.g. will there be a whole-of-government approach to this project? Or just focused on the CCs? Or a hybrid approach? Please clarify/elaborate in the stakeholder section.

2.) In addition, please elaborate on considerations of stakeholder engagement, including civil society actors, in the approach to develop guidance and best practices for legislators to assess policy coherence as well as the role of civil society and other stakeholders in technical reviews and legislative processes.

Agency Response

- 1) Text was included in the Stakeholder section (Table 1, page 43) to reflect the role of the Ministries of Environment in the three countries, highlighting the whole-of-government approach.
- 2) Text regarding private sector engagement including their roles was added in the Stakeholder section (Table 1 page 43).

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

February 6, 2023 HF:

1.) Please include an overview in this section about how this project will take a gender-responsive approach to project design, implementation and management.

2.) Please include/reflect the substantive elements of the most recent developments in the CBD, in particular, the adoption of the post-2020 Gender Plan of Action of the CBD, and the two post-2020 Global Biodiversity Targets that directly relate to gender-responsiveness/women's empowerment: Targets 22 and 23.

Agency Response

- 1) 1) The gender-responsive approach was already included on paragraphs 103 and 153.
- 2) 2) Two paragraphs were inserted in reference to relevant Outcome of the post-2020 Gender Plan of Action and the targets post-2020 Global Biodiversity Targets. Two additional paragraphs under Paragraph 156, page 46.

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

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 6, 2023 HF:

1.) Please further develop the private sector engagement approach for the project and elaborate the private sector's role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder. Given that the objective of this project is policy coherence via legislative engagement and reform, the private sector is both significantly impacted by and has influence on those legal frameworks that are the focus of policy coherence for nature positive/carbon neutral development. The private

sector is indeed one of the core potential influencers and impacted stakeholders of policy coherence efforts. Please revise.

Agency Response

1). Text was included in the ProDoc to reflect how the private sector in general and in each of the participating countries will be involved in the execution of the project. Private sector companies are going to be central in the discussions and negotiations with the Legislators as they are the ones most likely to be impacted the most by the alignment of policies affecting the economic activities. See Table 1, page 43. Paragraph 171, page 50.

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

Yes

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

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

February 6, 2023 HF

- 1.) Please include a seat for the GEF Secretariat on the global PSC for this project.
- 2.) Please explain why this project will have four PSCs (e.g. three national PSCs in addition to a global PSC), how they will coordinate and ensure mutual learning among them.

Agency Response

1. The text now reads: The Global Project Steering Committee (GPSC) will be established comprising UN Environment, CCN and the GEF Secretariat.

2. The text now reads: Because of the legal-, cultural-, and ecosystem-differences among the participating countries, it was decided that a National Project Steering Committee (NPSC) will be established in each participating country. Additional information was added under Institutional Arrangements to the CEO Approval Request.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 6, 2023 HF

1.) Please describe a general plan for the use, dissemination, and adaption of the Legislative guide to policy coherence under Component 1. This is a key element of KM under the project.

Agency Response

1. A detailed description on the use, dissemination and adoption of the Lessons Learned contained in the 'Guidebook on Policy Coherence' was added to the KM section of the ProDoc.

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

February 6, 2023 HF

Yes

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

April 4, 2023 HF:

All comments cleared.

February 6, 2023 HF

1.) No MTR is required for this project as stated in the CER, though it is budgeted for in case it is needed. If it is not needed, please indicate how this budget (\$45,000) will be reallocated.

2.) a. Audits have been charged to the M&E budget. Per guidelines these costs should be covered by the PMC. Please request the agency to remove these from the M&E budget in section 9.

b. The total amount budgeted for M&E activities (\$283,450) represents 14% of the project budget. Per guidelines and per previous cycles we observed that projects up to 2M tend to allocate up to 5% of the overall envelope to M&E. Please request the agency to review.

Agency Response

- 1) MTR budget was removed and funding reallocated to technical components including staff and travel.
- 2) Audits are covered by the PMC.
- 3) The M&E budget was reduced to under 5%.

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

February 6, 2023 HF

Clear

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 4, 2023 HF:

Comment cleared.

February 6, 2023 HF

1.) A project technical advisor and 3 National Project Coordinators have been charged across components and PMC. 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. That said, when the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds), 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).

Agency Response

The budget was adjusted to reflect that technical tasks to deliver substantive outputs are covered by components and only the portion corresponding to administrative tasks is covered by PMC.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 6, 2023 HF

Clear

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 6, 2023 HF

Clear

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
February 6, 2023 HF

Clear

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
NA

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
February 6, 2023 HF

Clear

Agency Response
Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

NA

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request NA

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

April 28, 2023 HF:

Comments cleared.

April 4, 2023 HF:

Please make final fixes regarding core indicator and start and completion dates. These remaining comments are highlighted in yellow in the review sheet. Thank you.

February 6, 2023 HF

No, not at this time. Please revise the CER, annexes and project documentation based on GEFSEC comments in review sheet and resubmit.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	2/7/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/4/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/28/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations