



Improving wetlands management for biodiversity and improved human-wildlife coexistence.

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11435

Countries

Timor Leste

Project Name

Improving wetlands management for biodiversity and improved human-wildlife coexistence.

Agencies

CI

Date received by PM

10/18/2023

Review completed by PM

11/6/2023

Program Manager

Sarah Wyatt

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/29/2023

No.

a. Yes.

b. No, in Annex A the source of funds is the only table where all three focal areas should be listed. Otherwise, it should only be biodiversity. If there are problems entering it as such, please work with ITS to address the issue.

11/4/2023

No.

a. Yes.

b. No, this project is biodiversity not MFA.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

The Project is exercising STAR flexibility. Since the BD funds were already utilized and we could not validate the submission in the portal, we therefore used the LD and CC allocation to ensure submission.?

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

11/29/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, see comments below.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

Paragraphs 1-7 have been rewritten to more directly address the biodiversity and climate change resilience aspects of the project, and further outlining the Global Environmental Benefits.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

11/29/2023

Yes, thank you for the significant revisions to the project.

During PPG, please address the following -

While the simplicity of the objective is welcome, a bit more specificity would be good. The goal of all biodiversity projects is to protect biodiversity - what type? where? It also seems to miss the alternative livelihoods activities.

1.1.2 - What type of assessment? GIS is just a tool to do the assessment. Or is this more of a mapping? Extensive detail isn't needed, but just a bit more specificity.

1.1.3 - Is this only a plan for the PA or are there multiple plans?

1.2 - What will be measured to assess whether or not there is improved management?

1.1.4 - Please make sure all people data is sex disaggregated. Perhaps you can put a footnote or something to keep the language clear.

1.1.5 - Describing first aid training as an incentive for conservation activities seems a bit problematic. Perhaps it can be described as part of the same training and engagement, noting a holistic approach to wetland management.

2.1 - Each of the livelihood pathways or interventions needs to have its own theory of change and logic for how replace encroachment activities rather than simply be additional as has been known to happen in other projects. This would articulate assumptions about how the project activities will lead to desired results. It will also be important to be realistic in the potential for tourism and associated revenue and making it clear that the tourism depends on the crocodiles. This approach will also need a carefully considered ToC noting that tourism development often comes at the expense of wetlands and mangroves.

11/6/2023

No.

a. No, the project objective doesn't seem to match the project. Typically indicators are not included here.

b. No, please address the following:

Overall, this project needs a major shift in focus in order to deliver global environmental benefits. While we understand that HCC is a significant and likely under reported issue, saltwater crocodile conservation is not something the GEF would focus on. Based on the discussions between the IA and GEF Sec, there are many changes to make to the project to make it eligible for funding under the BD focal area. Some of the suggested target wetlands have been identified as KBAs and other important sites for biodiversity and so the project needs to focus on the site management efforts. In addition, habitat loss and competition for resources (e.g. fish) have been identified as potential sources of HCC and these threats can be addressed through a holistic approach to management of the wetlands including reducing agricultural expansion. Therefore, we will provide a detailed review of some of the below items when resubmitted.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

a?With the adjustment of the project to be more biodiversity focused and less HCC-focused, the objective (p.3 in Indicative Project Overview chart) is more aligned with the project and indicators were removed.

B?The section was revised to include the KBAs and to adjust focus to the BD focal area.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

a. Yes.

b. Yes.

c. Yes.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

11/29/2023

Yes.

a. Yes.

b. Yes, during PPG please ensure there is a strong link in the activities for BD protection. This is a place where the link between HCC and conservation and, thus, the need to involve it in the project could be elaborated.

11/6/2023

Yes. However, this section may need to be revised with the revised project design.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

Adjustments have been made to all of these sections.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

11/30/2023

Yes.

a. Yes.

b. Yes.

c. Yes. Engagement with Australian institutions would be strategic given their experience with the same species. Other projects have worked with university students to try generate solutions and assess data related to impact of different interventions. The work and activities of this project seem particularly well-suited to such an approach which can also provide training opportunities for Timorese students and co-financing.

d. Yes.

11/6/2023

No, subject to revisions.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

a. Paragraphs 3,4, 8, 10-15, 21 and 35

b. Paragraphs 8, 21,28,37,39,44,47-58

c. ?Section 4: Baseline Understanding and Projects? includes GEF and non-GEF projects that predate or overlap this work and paragraphs 25-27 explain how the lessons and experiences will be utilized by the project.

d. Section D: Policy Requirements there is a stakeholder engagement chart that lists the previous engagement (related to the development of the PIF) and the future involvement in the project.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

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

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

11/30/2023

Yes.

a and b. Both of these items will need significant fleshing out at CEO Endorsement when community consultations and assessment of potential options can be done fully and brought into project design.

11/5/2023

No, subject to revisions.

a. ToC - Given the complicated nature of the situation, it will be important to have a well-considered ToC focusing on the specific behavior changes needed and how this project will support them.

b. No.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

The ToC chart and explanation (Section B: Project Description; paragraphs 46-58) have been updated.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments

11/30/2023

Yes.

During PPG, it could be helpful to have a short specific paragraph noting that the government will be working on the issue of HCC and there is an opportunity to do this in ways that are or are not biodiversity-friendly, so the project is covering the incremental cost of the biodiversity friendly approach and building on those interventions such that there is an increased value for money.

11/6/2023

No, please provide this information.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

Paragraph 36 and also sentences included in paragraphs 47, 50, 52, and 57.

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

a. Yes.

b. Yes, noting that this is not a clearance for CEO Endorsement.

It will be important to have discussions prior to submission for CEO Endorsement to get these activities cleared. From the brief text, it appears that CI will take on contracting and, in the case of local executing NGOs, supervision. Clarity on the amount of resources being paid to CI and for what activities will be important for clearance.

11/6/2023

No

a. No, subject to revisions. The Letter of Endorsement includes the following institutions as Executing Partners: (i) Vice Prime Minister and Coordinating Minister of Economic Affairs; (ii) Minister of Tourism and Environment; (iii) Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Forestry; (iv) Ministry of Health; (v) Ministry of Interior; (vi) Ministry of Youth and Culture; and (vii) CI Timor Leste. However, in Portal the only executing partners listed are CI Timor Leste and Ministry of Tourism and Environment. Please ask the Agency: (i) to include in Portal all the institutions included in LoE; (ii) The executing type for CI in Portal is CSO, it has to be modified for ?GEF Agency?.

b. No, the IA is asking for a substantial execution role. This requires some type of justification. It is noted that the Agency expects to play an execution role, and that during PPG, upstream discussion will be held with the GEF Program Manager on the execution

service presenting all the options including third party arrangement". As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze at the time of CEO endorsement request submission any requests for dual role playing by an agency and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an exceptional basis. If execution support is required, we strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward.

c. No, please provide this information not just related to CI's execution.

d. Yes.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

a. Executing Entities have been updated in the General Project Information to include all Ministries listed in the LOE. Executing partners and co-implementors are listed in the stakeholder engagement chart in Section D: Policy Requirements (pages 28-31).

They are also listed in the specific components they will support in Section B.

b. Explanation and justification for CI as co-Executing Agency is included in paragraphs 48-50.

c. ?Section 4: Baseline Understanding and Projects? includes GEF and non-GEF projects that predate or overlap this work and paragraphs 25-27 explain how the lessons and experiences will be utilized by the project.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, subject to revision.

a. Yes.

b. No. How will the non-management plan wetlands management be improved?
Restoration, PAs, and/or OECMs may be relevant indicators that should be included.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

Paragraph 56 ? the justification for the 13,463 ha of improved management has been updated to explain 519 ha fall within community managed lands and the other 12,944 is in Protected Areas. Because most of the land is in Protected Areas, the communities cannot legally manage the area, but the project will provide guidance and recommendations to the government to carry out the management plans on the lands they are responsible for.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?

b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No.

a. No, it would be good to note how expected climate change impacts will be included in project design.

b. No, subject to revision.

c. Yes.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

a) Risks to project design and implementation are included in the chart on pages 24-26. The climate change risk has been expanded and additional information was added to the project narrative (paragraphs 25-26, 39-41)

b) See Risk chart on pages 24-26.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, subject to revision.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

a. See paragraph 7, and additional text in Section B.

b. See paragraph 7

c. Timor-Leste currently has policy coherence, what is lacks is the financing to implement and enforce these policies and regulations and also lacks the funding needed to create awareness about these policies and their value to society.

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, please see above to explanation on how the project does not align with the GEF-8 BD strategy.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

See paragraph 69.

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

11/29/2023

Yes, thank you.

11/6/2023

No, please include the specific targets this project focuses on.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

Added in paragraph 51

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

Yes. However, please revise these tables based on the fact that this is a biodiversity project not MFA.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

The Project is exercising STAR flexibility. Since the BD funds were already utilized and we could not validate the submission in the portal, we therefore used the LD allocation to ensure submission.?

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, in the LoE, the OFP only endorsed BD resources from that source (BD STAR). However, in Portal the Table Sources of Funds allocated the funds among the three STAR Focal Areas. Please ask the Agency to either (i) change the figures in Portal to match the Sources of Funds allocated through the LoE reflecting the whole allocated amount to BD STAR, assuming that Timor Leste has enough resources in BD; or (ii) to obtain a new LoE that match the amounts in Portal, which would reflect the available funds for Timor Leste in the STAR Focal Areas (note: changes in a new LoE must be reflected in all Financing tables ? we will review all of them pre the resubmission).

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

The LoE has been updated.

All Financing Tables have been updated in the PIF.

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

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

11/6/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, at this point it is difficult to justify the CCA 1 of this project. Please provide more information or revise.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

Additional text has been added to the PIF to detail the justification for CCA 1. Specifically, Paragraphs 4, 38, 41 and 42 introduces the adaptation benefits that can be provided by healthy wetlands. Paragraph 48 explains that the management plans will address the adaptation needs of the wetlands as well as highlight the adaptation benefits for the community. Paragraph 53 details that the livelihood activities will consider adaptation needs of the community and promote resilient livelihoods. Additional data will be collected during the PPG that will provide a more thorough explanation of the link between the identified risks, vulnerabilities and impacts and the project activities.

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, there are a number of missing relevant terms under biodiversity in particular.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

Additional relevant levels have been added to the taxonomy worksheet.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

12/1/2023

Yes.

11/6/2023

No, this project requires a substantial revision to be eligible.

Agency's Comments

11/20/2023

We will make the necessary changes and resubmit.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments 2.1 - During PPG each of the livelihood pathways or interventions needs to have its own theory of change and logic for how replace encroachment activities rather than simply add to them.

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)