



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF TRUST FUNDS

| | | | |
|--|---|------------------------------|--------------|
| GEF ID: | 5880 | | |
| Country/Region: | Global (Bolivia, Brazil, Botswana, Belize, Cote d'Ivoire, Cameroon, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Jamaica, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritania, Malawi, Mexico, Mozambique, Panama, Peru, Paraguay, Suriname, El Salvador, Tanzania, Uganda, South Africa) | | |
| Project Title: | Knowledge for Action: Promoting Innovation Among Environmental Funds | | |
| GEF Agency: | UNEP | GEF Agency Project ID: | |
| Type of Trust Fund: | GEF Trust Fund | GEF Focal Area (s): | Biodiversity |
| GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | BD-1; | | |
| Anticipated Financing PPG: | \$0 | Project Grant: | \$913,240 |
| Co-financing: | \$3,854,050 | Total Project Cost: | \$4,767,290 |
| PIF Approval: | June 13, 2014 | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Yoko Watanabe | Agency Contact Person: | Robert Erath |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------|---|---|--|
| Eligibility | 1. Is the participating country eligible ? | This is a global project. The identified participating countries are all eligible for GEF BD finance. | Yes as noted at the time of PIF approval. |
| | 2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project? | n/a as this is a global project. | n/a |
| Resource Availability | 3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply): | | |
| | • the STAR allocation? | n/a | n/a |
| | • the focal area allocation? | Yes, the project amount is within the remaining GEF-5 BD focal area | Yes. |

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|---------------------|---|--|---|
| | | allocation. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access | n/a | n/a |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? | n/a | n/a |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund | n/a | n/a |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? | This project is expected to be financed through the BD FA set-aside finance. As noted above, the project amount is within the GEF-5 BD FA allocation. | Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval. |
| Strategic Alignment | <p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p> | Yes, it is well aligned with BD1 on sustainable financing of PA system. | Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval. |
| | <p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p> | Yes, the proposal is well aligned with the CBD biodiversity strategy and targets, as well as country level NBSAP and other strategies. | Yes, as noted at the time of PIF approval. |
| | <p>6. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p> | Baseline projects and initiatives, particularly led by the Redlac and Cafe are sufficiently described. Further details on their linkage and coordination are expected by the time of MSP approval. | While substantive reference have been made on the earlier RedLAC Capacity Building Project, there is lack or limited information on the current baseline situation, i.e. what are the ongoing related activities? It would be important to further clarify and provide necessary information on: 1) the current |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| Project Design | | | <p>baseline situation; 2) gaps; and 3) GEF alternative. Please provide necessary information.</p> <p>Information on the related GEF projects are also very limited. The GEF has financed most of the RedLAC and CAFE member organizations. There are ongoing support towards related activities (including promoting innovative financial mechanism and diversification of resources) through these projects. Further, the GEF has provided financial and technical support to the two key documents prepared through the CFA, namely the Rapid Assessment of CTF; and the Practice Standards of CTFs. Please provide tangible information on the related activities through the ongoing GEF projects as well as related GEF activities with the CFA, RedLAC, and CAFE Networks.</p> |
| | 7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed? | Yes, the project framework is sufficiently clear at this stage. Concrete baseline data/information as well as targets should be clarified by the time of MSP approval. | <p>While the project framework and targets are sufficiently clear, the project outputs and outcomes should be further reviewed and focus on results (i.e. XX% increase in finance through innovative financial mechanism, X% increase in private sector finance - diversification, etc).</p> <p>It is not clear what the GEF finance will be focused on, particularly under component 3 and 4 with very limited GEF financing. Indeed it would be important to concentrate GEF finance on component 1 and lesser degree to</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|---|---|---|
| | | | component 2. The GEF finance should be focused on tangible and selected activities. It could possibly focus support on activity 3 (database development) under component 3, and activity 1 for component 4. Please review and clarify. |
| | 8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate? | Yes, sufficiently described at this stage. Tangible and measurable Global Biodiversity Benefits should be further determined by the time of MSP approval, particularly on the benefits towards protected areas systems as this project is specifically linked to BD1. | The Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) are still vague and unclear. Please identify few measurable and tangible GEBs with targets, including increased and diversified financial resources, enhanced institutions and conservation results on the ground. In addition, information provided in the Response to Comment section should be incorporated in the adequate sections of the project document. |
| | 9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits , including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits? | | A few appropriate approaches have been noted on gender mainstreaming. Please reflect these approaches and incorporate gender responsive indicators, including gender disaggregated indicators, in the project results framework. |
| | 10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained? | Stakeholder involvement is adequately informed. However, concrete coordination mechanisms with the CSOs should be further clarified by the time of MSP approval. | Yes, adequate information provided. |
| | 11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience) | Yes, adequately explained. Further details and analysis are required by the time of MSP approval. | Yes, adequate information provided. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|--|--|--|
| | 12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region? | Yes, coordination with ongoing GEF trust fund related projects and other initiatives are noted, particularly by the CFA. Coordination mechanism and roles should be further clarified by MSP approval, particularly with CFA and other related key initiatives. | No, as noted above on the baseline section, please further clarify the baseline activities and concrete coordination mechanism with them. |
| | 13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. | Yes, the project is innovative as it promotes design and implementation of innovative conservation finance tools through existing networks of Environmental Funds to complement the traditional sources of funding for biodiversity conservation. Active involvement of private sectors through various innovative funding mechanisms is also an innovative element of this project. On sustainability, the project will reinforce Environmental Funds in their effort to improve conservation finance in a long term by mobilizing significant financial resources from diverse sources. | No, please further clarify how this project will contribute in furthering innovation, sustainability, and scaling up of the EFs. Please provide further information and clarification in the relevant sections of the project document, in line with the information provided at the time of PIF approval. |
| | 14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes? | | Budget allocation between components as well as outcomes and outputs have been slightly changed. Please note these changes and provide explanation in the CEO approval request document. |
| | 15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits? | | Section B3 does not provide sufficient information. What were the other options and how is this approach most cost effective? Please provide further information. |
| | 16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B | Yes, the cofinancing ratio is 1 to 2.5 and considered adequate. | Yes, cofinancing ratio is 1 to 4 and considered adequate. |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Project Financing | appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs? | | |
| | 17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed? | Cofinancing is identified from FFEM, Redlac, and Cafe. There is no cofinance identified from UNEP. | Adequate cofinancing letters are provided. The information provided on RedLAC and CAFE's cofinancing is not consistent between the cofinancing letter and the CEO approval request (i.e. in-kind and cash amounts differ). Please correct. |
| | 18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate? | Yes, PMC is about 5% of the project grant and proportionate to the cofinance. | PMC is about 3% and considered adequate. |
| | 19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund? | No PPG finance is requested as they have secured resources from other sources for project preparation. In particular, it is important that Global Environmental benefits (GEB), baseline and targets, and coordination mechanism with other relevant initiatives, are further clarified during the preparation of the MSP proposal. | n/a |
| | 20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included? | n/a | n/a |
| Project Monitoring and Evaluation | 21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable? | | Some information are missing in the tracking tool, including date of submission, name of reviewers, and lead project executing agency. Please complete all required sections. |
| | 22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets? | | Yes, adequate. |
| Agency Responses | 23. Has the Agency adequately | | |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|--|---|--|--|
| | responded to comments from: | | |
| | • STAP? | | n/a |
| | • Convention Secretariat? | | n/a |
| | • The Council? | | n/a |
| | • Other GEF Agencies? | | n/a |
| Secretariat Recommendation | | | |
| Recommendation at PIF Stage | 24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended? | Yes, the PM recommends the PIF for CEO approval. | |
| | 25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval. | | |
| Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval | 26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended? | | <p>No, please review and provide appropriate responses to the comments made above. Please revise and provide additional information.</p> <p>15 Sept 2015 No, many comments have been adequately addressed but the following comments required further information. The PM had an upstream discussion to clarify the issues, and expect a revised version to be resubmitted soon.</p> <p>a. Additional results indicators that were identified need to be incorporated appropriately in table B (Project Framework) and Results Framework b. Baseline and gaps (section 2.6) requires further revision to further clarify the logic and need for this project investment. c. Gender consideration (section 3,11) require further information and clarify specific approaches.</p> <p>9 Oct 2015 Yes. The GEF Secretariat received a revised CEO approval package that</p> |

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹ | Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP) |
|-----------------|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | | adequately responds to earlier comments. The PM recommends this MSP for CEO approval. |
| | First review* | June 12, 2014 | July 20, 2015 |
| Review Date (s) | Additional review (as necessary) | | September 14, 2015 |
| | Additional review (as necessary) | | October 09, 2015 |
| | | | |

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**