

# Strengthening management of protected and productive landscapes in the Surinamese Amazon

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10252

**Countries**

Suriname

**Project Name**

Strengthening management of protected and productive landscapes in the Surinamese Amazon

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

12/10/2020

**Review completed by PM**

4/1/2021

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

**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

1/21/2021

Some adjustments but still aligned. Cleared.

Agency Response

**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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/21/2021

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

4/7/2021

The letters from CSO partners (WWF, Tropenbos Suriname, ACT) and private sector (SFM group) do not specify the type of co-financing (grant). Please revise.

Agency Response

July 2021

Revised letters have been received, which specify the type of co-financing. This information has been included in Table C of the CEO Endorsement Request. A few of the partners adjusted their contributions, which resulted in a higher overall budget.

**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

1/21/2021

It appears that GEF is paying the full costs of the PMC. Please remember that the PMC should be shared between GEF and cofinanciers consistent with the overall [GEF: cofinance](#) ratio. Please revise and adjust accordingly.

4/1/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

**UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 1/21/2021**

Table B of the CEO Endorsement Request was adjusted to reflect proportional co-financing for PMC. All this will be provided by the project implementing partner (Ministry of RGB).

**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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

1/21/2021

Yes. 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

1/21/2021

Yes. 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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/21/2021

Yes. 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

1/21/2021

Yes. 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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

1/21/2021

Yes. 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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **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

1/21/2021

Yes. 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

1/21/2021

Yes for the most part.

Please more fully elaborate the risk and the mitigation strategy from impacts of COVID-19 and include in the risks section.

4/1/2021

Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

### **UNDP Agency Response to GEF Sec Comments from 1/21/2021**

Risks and the mitigation strategy to address the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have been further detailed in the ProDoc and included in the risk section of CEO ER. Please see paragraph 77 (subsection e), paragraphs 92 (subsections a and h) and Annex 5 (risk 16) of the ProDoc, and section 5 of the CEO Endorsement.

## **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

1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

4/1/2021

In the audit table a link is provided to a letter of agreement between Government of Suriname and UNDP for modest project support services which are reasonable and are cleared.



Agency Response  
**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  
1/21/2021

Yes. 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  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

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  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**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  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
1/21/2021

NA.

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/21/2021

**137,615 was budgeted for PPG, 92,501.67 used and 45,113.93 committed.**

Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/21/2021

Yes. 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

1/21/2021

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

1/21/2021

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

1/21/2021

NA

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

January 21, 2021

No. Please address issues above.

Please also be sure when you resubmit to include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project that responds to the recent audit findings.

4/7/2021

Audit checklist was included.

Please resolve these remaining issues and resubmit:

1. On project information: the duration is wrong and should be corrected to 72 months.
2. Budget: the personnel of the Project Management Unit (Project Manager, Project Operations Manager, Technical Assistant) should be charged to the Project Management Costs instead of being spread out throughout the different components. The project has an adequate level of co-financing allocated to PMC to cover these salaries. Also eliminate the budget line ?Miscellaneous?, as this cannot be covered by the GEF portion of the PMC.

3. Co-financing: The letters from CSO partners (WWF, Tropenbos Suriname, ACT) and private sector (SFM group) do not specify the type of co-financing (grant).

7/14/2021

All issues have been satisfactorily addressed. Project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

#### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	<b>1/21/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/7/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/14/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

Despite its vast forest cover, Suriname is facing environmental challenges leading to deforestation and degradation, driven by the mining sector, increasing forestry activities, and, to a lesser extent, infrastructure and urban development, agriculture, and others. There is an urgent need to manage the valuable biodiversity, carbon stocks and natural resources of the country by adopting integrated approaches that address ecosystem services across landscape scales. These approaches should entail land use planning to balance conservation and economic development objectives, strengthened management of protected areas (PA) and reduced threats within these areas, and the promotion of alternative sustainable livelihoods, among others. In response to this challenge, the project ?Strengthening management of protected and productive landscapes in the

Surinamese Amazon? focuses on promoting improved sustainable forestry practices, while strengthening PA management, promoting sustainable livelihoods through agroforestry systems, nature tourism and non-timber forest products (NTFP), improving land use planning and monitoring. The project will focus on four strategic project components: (1) Improved management of protected landscapes (2) Strengthened, gender-inclusive, participatory management of productive landscapes; (3) Policies/incentives for protected and productive landscapes; (4) Knowledge management, learning, and monitoring and evaluation. It will be executed in two major landscapes of the Surinamese Amazon biome: the Saamaka-Matawai and the Coeroeni-Paroe landscapes.

In the likely case that travel and meeting restrictions continue after the expected start-up of the project, COVID contingency planning will be carried out and appropriate measures will be put in place. This will be done by the PMU in line with national COVID-related protocols and those of the UNDP County Office and will be shared with key stakeholders. Measures will imply that several activities have to be adjusted by using teleconferencing means for meetings and training, for which adequate equipment and connections need to be ensured as needed. The timeline may need to be adjusted, postponing field-based activities and advancing as much as possible on desk-based activities. Once face to face meetings and field visits are possible and needed, personal protection items (masks, gloves, gel) will be provided to participants of workshops and meetings and social distancing measures will be put in place.

In the audit table a link is provided to a letter of agreement between Government of Suriname and UNDP for modest project support services which are reasonable and are cleared.