



# REQUEST FOR CEO APPROVAL

PROJECT TYPE: Medium-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Knowledge for Action: Promoting Innovation among Environmental Funds			
Country(ies):	Global [Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Panamá, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname and Botswana, Cameroon, Ivory Coast, Guine Bissau, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, and Uganda].	GEF Project ID	5880
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	01312
Other Executing Partner(s):	Funbio, RedLAC and CAFÉ networks	Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity	Project Duration(Months)	36
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):	N/A	Project Agency Fee (\$):	86,758
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For PPP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
BD-1			GEF TF	913,240	3,854,050
<b>Total project costs</b>				913,240	3,854,050

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

The GEF finance will focus on component 1 (innovative financial mechanisms for coservation) and lesser on component 2 (EF to EF mentorship program to enhance institutions to achieve Practice Standards). In component 3 only 8% of GEF finance will be allocated in activity 3 (database development) and in component 4 the GEF finance allocated is for the final evaluation.

**Project Objective: To strengthen EFs' capacities on financial innovations through knowledge management and exchange.**

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
COMPONENT 1 : Innovation Seed Fund	TA	Outcome 1.1: EFs' portfolio of innovative initiatives is strengthened with the funding of feasibility studies and projects on	- EFs' finance has an increase of at least 5% through innovative finance mechanisms (around 15 million USD), being 50% of this increase coming	GEF TF	630,000	1,751,000

		innovative financial mechanisms.	<p>from private sector funding.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- EFs increase 10% of the total number of hectares they already help to protect (8.5 million hectares).</li> <li>1.1.1 - 1 mechanism set up to select, finance and monitor innovative financial mechanisms;</li> <li>1.1.2 - 10 feasibility studies financed to analyze innovative financial mechanisms;</li> <li>1.1.3 - 5 innovative financial mechanisms supported;</li> <li>1.1.4 - 30% of RedLAC and CAFE EFs have at least 1 project of an innovative nature;</li> <li>1.1.5 - 15% of the EFs in RedLAC and CAFÉ diversified their funding sources;</li> <li>1.1.6 - 10 case studies on innovative financial mechanisms are produced.</li> </ul>			
COMPONENT 2: Capacity Building and peer-to-peer mentoring program	TA	<p>Outcome 2.1: Knowledge and best practices are exchanged through peer-to-peer mentoring, workshops and online tools.</p> <p>Outcome 2.2: EFs staff improved their knowledge and capacity to run EF day to day operations.</p>	<p>2.1.1 - At least 16 EFs involved in the mentoring activities: 8 individual mentoring activities (pairs) and one web discussion forum exists; 2 groups connected in collective mentoring;</p> <p>2.2.1 - At least 6 to 8 EFs use and improve the methods established during the first project on one site or MPA;</p> <p>2.2.2 - At least 2 to 3 EFs improve their integrated monitoring system;</p> <p>2.2.3 - 4 capacity-building and exchange workshops have been delivered, including publishing of guides or</p>	GEF TF	158,750	909,000

			case studies. 2.2.4 - Gender balance is achieved in the participation of men and women in the component 2 activities as a whole (50% men and 50% women).			
COMPONENT 3: A-Z Environmental Funds Solutions Database	TA	Outcome 3.1: Information on EFs performance and experience is documented, shared and capitalized at network level.	3.1.1 - 1 Strategy and action plan for the database and e-learning training mechanisms is elaborated; 3.1.2 - EFs database is operational, building on the contents developed and incorporating e-learning tools; 3.1.3 - Annual presentations of the database in international events (CBD COPs, IUCN congresses, RedLAC and CAFÉ Assemblies) to promote replication worldwide.	GEF TF	76,250	405,300
COMPONENT 4: Institutional strengthening for the RedLAC and CAFE networks	TA	Outcome 4.1: RedLAC and CAFE networks are consolidated in terms of functioning and financial sustainability.	4.1.1 - 2 studies produced on networks situation with an indicators system (Year 1 and Year 3); 4.1.2 - 1 strategic and business plan for RedLAC produced; 4.1.3 - 1 strategic and business plan for CAFÉ produced; 4.1.4 - 1 working group of RedLAC and CAFÉ created to discuss financial sustainability of the networks (gender participation balanced in 50% men and 50% women); 4.1.5 - 1 mechanism tested in each region for generating	GEF TF	23,240	758,750

			resources for the networks; 4.1.6 - 1 MoU between CFA and the two networks clarifying complementarity and rules for communication signed; 4.1.7 - At least 10 CAFÉ/RedLAC members per year supported to attend the networks' General Assemblies (gender participation balanced in 50% men and 50% women); 4.1.8 - At least 1 member of the Asia-Pacific region supported to attend the CAFE General Assemblies.			
Subtotal					888,240	3,824,050
Project management Cost (PMC)				(select)	25,000	30,000
<b>Total project costs</b>					<b>913,240</b>	<b>3,854,050</b>

**C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)**

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
Bilateral Aid Agency (ies)	FFEM	Cash	1,421,750
Foundation	Mava Foundation	Cash	575,000
CSO	Environmental Funds – RedLAC members (22 EFs in Latin America and the Caribbean) and CAFE members (18 EFs in Africa)	In-kind	857,300

CSO	Environmental Funds – RedLAC members (22 EFs in Latin America and the Caribbean) and CAFE members (18 EFs in Africa)	Cash	1,000,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			3,854,050

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	(in \$)		
				Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNEP	GEF TF	Biodiversity	Global	913,240	86,758	999,998
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				913,240	86,758	999,998

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants			0
National/Local Consultants			0

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? (Select)**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

Not applicable

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

**A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF<sup>1</sup>**

- A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc. NA
- A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities. NA
- A.3 The GEF Agency’s comparative advantage: NA
- A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address: same as PIF, further details added. Please refer to prodoc Section 2.
- A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental

<sup>1</sup> For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIF stage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project: the preparation phase of this project showed that institutional strengthening was not only highly advisable but also essential to adequately underpinning the achievement of the first three original components, so a fourth component was added to the project with this objective. In this context, an additional crosscutting component on institutional strengthening of both networks was developed to improve the project's impacts. The aim of this component is to consolidate the functioning and the sustainability of the RedLAC and CAFE networks in terms of communication, institutional integration, monitoring and characteristic features, and in terms of sustainable financing to cover the leadership of each of the networks. The strategy is based on the excellent cooperation that exists so far and the importance of maintaining synergies and strengthening bonds between the EFs on each continent. It is also based on using the experience of the RedLAC network (governance, economic model, leadership) and taking into account the differences of the two networks and their needs to plan ahead over the long term. Please refer to section 3.3 of pro doc for details on this component. Further details on incremental cost analysis were added in Section 3.7 of pro doc and Incremental Cost Analysis was carried out - refer to appendix 3 of pro doc.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks: same as PIF, further details added in Section 3.5 of prodoc.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives same as PIF

## **B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation. As a project developed by two regional networks, there are several groups of stakeholders directly or indirectly involved. Besides the 40 Environmental Funds (EFs) congregated in RedLAC and CAFÉ, other EFs, especially from Asia-Pacific region, may participate in some of the project's activities. Several conservation institutions, especially the ones congregated in the Conservation Finance Alliance (CFA), may benefit from the project's results and materials. For further details refer to section 2.5 of the project document for the detailed stakeholder mapping and analysis.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF): The project document details the gender considerations made in the project development (Section 3.11), highlighting that gender balance will be specially observed in terms of participation of African women in the project activities, as this was the only aspect in the previous project that showed a slight unbalance. The Section 2.2 of the project document details the global significance of the conservation targets of the EFs involved in the project, highlighting the global benefits to be achieved with the strengthening of these EFs.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design: Among the options to promote innovation and to support EFs to achieve best practices and standards, the project took the most cost-effective one. Grants to innovation will reach at least 10 EFs through a competitive process and the lessons learned from these innovative mechanisms will be shared with the whole community. In terms of training and enhancing practices, the mentorship option together with capacity building and exchange workshops achieve a great portion of Funds, providing specialized support with a relatively low cost. The other options to achieve the same outcomes and outputs would be to keep doing only information and experiences exchange in the Assemblies (which has not proven to be effective in terms of replication or innovation) or to follow the same model of the previous RedLAC Capacity Building project, which did not support feasibility studies for innovation and had capacity building only delivered through in person meetings. We concluded by the evaluation of the previous project, that more ideas could be studied if we provided a smaller amount for feasibility assessment. Beside this lesson learned, we increased the amount for implementation to achieve higher effectiveness in the innovative mechanisms implementation. In terms of capacity building activities, more online tools were added to reduce travel costs and more mentorships were added as they prove to be an effective method for enhancing EFs' capacities.

**C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:** Please refer to Appendix 7 in the project document.

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):**  
 (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.
---

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please refer to Appendix 4 of the project document.

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Please refer to Appendix 17 of the project document.

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>2</sup>**

A. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

NA. No GEF funding was dedicated to preparation.

PPG Grant Approved at PIF:			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
<b>Total</b>	0	0	0

<sup>2</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

Not applicable