

Regenerative livestock farming to promote sustainable landscapes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID 11221
Countries Peru
Project Name Regenerative livestock farming to promote sustainable landscapes
Agencies FAO
Date received by PM 2/7/2025
Review completed by PM 6/25/2025
Program Manager Patricia Marcos Huidobro
Focal Area Multi Focal Area
Project Type FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

2. Project Summary.

a) 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 outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2025 PM:

c) Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

a) Yes.

b) Yes.

c) No. Please elaborate further on how the proposed project fits within the broader context of the Food System Integrated Program and how this project is transformative.

Agency Response

02 May 2025

c) The Project Summary has been revised to include a more substantive link with the FSIP. Within the context of the FSIP, the project aims to transform food systems to make them sustainable, resilient, inclusive and low-emission by mainstreaming climate change mitigation and adaptation, ecosystem conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. Given the importance of food systems, including livestock, in Peru's economy and food security, this project aligns with national priorities and fits within the broader context of the FSIP. As in the global FSIP, the project will achieve this by closely engaging with policy fora and institutions (Component 1), finance frameworks and networks of private sector and civil society actors (Component 2) at the national, state and local levels; and by establishing communities of practice focused on sustainable and regenerative livestock (Component 3), which will cumulatively (with other Child Projects) support the global FSIP to generate a critical mass of evidence and policy influence capable of transforming global thinking, policies and actions on food systems.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- b) [If a child project under a program] Is there a project Theory of Change that is aligned and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?
- c) 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?
- d) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?
- e) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- f) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2025 PM:

c.1) Cleared.

c.2) Cleared.

c.3) Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

a) Yes.

b) Yes.

c) No. Please address the following comments:

c.1) Component 3 has been tagged as Investment under the "Component Type". However, only outcome 3.2 involves investment activities. Outcomes 3.1 and 3.3 involves technical assistance activities. Please update and create a new row under Component 3, one row just for technical activity outcomes and another one for investment outcomes.

c.2) Overall, the project is heavily focused on technical assistance activities and much less on the investment activities/pilots. Give the total GEF funding is relatively high, please consider redirecting part of the funds to the pilots. Also, please elaborate further on the pilots, i.e., type of good practices envisioned. Likewise, in the project description provide more information on the targeted areas: type of ecosystems covered, presence of indigenous peoples, presence of protected areas, type of restoration activities planned for each pilot, etc. This would help further understand the activities proposed under the components.

c.3) Title of Outcome 1.2. "Capacities of local actors are enhanced so they become agents of change in the transformation of food systems and mainstreaming of intergenerational and gender approaches". However, output 1.2.1 refers to strengthening the capacity at the state level. Please update the titles of the outcomes and outcomes to make it consistent.

d) Yes.

e) Yes.

f) Yes.

Agency Response

02 May 2025

c)

c.1) Noted, the table has been updated to differentiate between INV and TA.

c.2) In recognition of the importance of the pilots, Component 3 makes up half the budget. Specifically, the current budget has assigned \$6,218,439 to the pilots (of which \$4,450,964 is Investment) in coordination with baseline and co-financing valued at \$48,185,092 (from the 6 provinces). To respond to the request of further description of pilots, a Table has been added to Annex E of the Agency Project Document, including type of practices envisioned for restoration and improved practices, type of ecosystems and ecosystem services, presence of indigenous and afro-descendent populations, presence of protected areas, etc.

c.3) Apologies for the confusion, as the original intent was that state level actors are considered 'local' rather than 'national'. However, to eliminate any confusion, this has been revised to 'local and state actors'.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

a) Yes.

b) Yes.

c) N/A.

Agency Response N/A

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

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? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated

baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

f) **Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

g) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

h) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

i) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

j) **Gender:** Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

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

l) **Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/9/2025 PM:

d) Cleared.

l) Cleared.

5/16/2025 PM:

a) Cleared.

d) **Cleared with suggestions.** Thank you for providing Annex E, which is very helpful. Please consider making this annex more readable by removing the table or making the table shorter.

e) Cleared.

g) Cleared.

h) Cleared.

l) **Cleared with suggestions.** With many thanks for this explanation, we would be grateful if this justification can be included in the CEO Endorsement and, if possible, elaborate further on how policy coherence is addressed by the project.

m) Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

a) **No.** The Theory of Change is missing the drivers and assumptions. Also, since the project has been tagged as Rio Marker Climate Change Adaptation 2, adaptation impacts should also be better reflected in the Theory of Change graph.

b) Yes.

c) Yes.

d) No. Please address the following comments:

d.1) Please elaborate further on how the project will ensure the long-term sustainability of the proposed financial instruments, for instance through revolving funds, national programs, etc. Is there any good practice identify that the project plans to implement/replicate?

d.2) Consider strengthening the overall impact and ambition of the project to the extend possible by for instance replacing recommendations or drafting to adoption of regulations/policies/frameworks. For instance, we notice this could be potentially done in outcomes/outputs 1.3, 2.1.2.3, etc.

d.3) The ecosystems services to be funded by the new instruments are not identified. Please provide preliminary information on the ecosystems services to be realized and funded by the farmers.

d.4) Clarify whether the project is expected to contribute to the conservation of protected areas. These seem to have been identified under the proposed project but there not GEF Core Indicators related to protected areas. In case the project is contributed to the conservation of protected areas, kindly elaborate further on the type of areas, i.e., BD hotspot, KBA, Global 200, Endemic Bird or Plant area, etc., as well as on the ha to covered by protected areas. If possible, please differentiate the restoration activities in protected areas from those in non-protected areas.

d.5) Under Component 3 for each activity please specify the number of ha to be restored and those to be under better management practices. Please elaborate further on the characteristics of each landscape.

d.6) From the activities, it is unclear which ones will focus on restoring wetlands. For instance, activity 3.1.3.2 is related to restoration or to better management practices. In order words, is this activity linked to Core Indicator 3.4 or Core Indicator 4.1?

d.7) Activity 3.2.1.1 will provide technical assistance in BD and agro BD conservation/ecosystem restoration. Please elaborate further on the activities which will provide a real impact on species conservation.

d.8) Activity 3.2.3 plans to identify traditional and ancestral knowledge. Kindly elaborate further on how this will be linked with Component 4.

e) No. The incremental/additional cost reasoning hasn't been included in the CEO Endorsement document.

f) Yes.

g) No. Please clarify how the proposed project contributes to Global Coordination platform in budgetary terms. Often, child projects assign x% of their GEF financing to the Global Coordination platform to cover for the knowledge management and overall technical assistance provided by the Global Coordination platform.

h) No. The project needs to better identify existing drivers and how it would adapt to future changes in these drivers.

i) Yes.

j) Yes.

k) Yes.

l) No. Policy coherence has been somehow identify under barrier a). However, the project shall better articulate this existing barrier on lack of policy coherence and make a better link to the outcomes/outputs addressing this specific barrier.

m) No. As explained above, please elaborate further on the innovative aspects and transformational impact of the project. This comment has been raised by the STAP (Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel) of the GEF, but has not properly being mainstreamed in the CEO Endorsement document.

Agency Response

02 May 2025

a) Drivers and Assumptions have been added to the Theory of Change. Furthermore, in order to better reflect CC Adaptation impacts, the final column has been expanded to include an ?Agroclimatic Roundtable for the adoption of Adaptation measures in the livestock sector?.

d)

d.1) The project will work with AgroBanco to ensure the long-term sustainability of the proposed financial instruments, including, for example:

1. Agricultural Credit: AgroBanco offers specific lines of credit for the livestock sector, which can be used for livestock purchases, infrastructure improvements, input acquisition, and other operational needs.

2. Microfinance: This type of financing may be appropriate for small livestock producers who require start-up capital or funds to expand their operations without the strict requirements of traditional loans.

3. Sustainable Value Chains: Implement financing schemes that involve the entire value chain, ensuring that all actors, from producers to distributors, have access to the necessary resources to operate efficiently.

AgroBanco has extensive experience with these instruments and the project will build upon good practices identified with project partners to replicate during the project and beyond.

d.2) The project will strengthen and update existing regulations/ policies/ frameworks. While, it will not draft, recommend or elaborate new policy, it will support instruments that are already under development/ formulation and need to be strengthened or existing instruments that need to be updated, such as the National Agrarian Innovation Policy, National Food Safety Policy and National Livestock Development Plan, as described in Output 1.1.3.

d.3) The ecosystem services to be supported include the following and are detailed in Annex E of the Agency Project Document:

Provision: Collection of firewood and useful plants.

Regulation: Natural erosion control on slopes.

Support: Refuge for endemic species and pollinators, conservation of endemic and resilient flora.

Cultural: Ritual practices and traditional knowledge of the landscape, traditional agricultural practices integrated into the landscape, ancestral practices of land use and agricultural festivities.

d.4) The project will not intervene in protected areas, rather it will work with actors/ producers in the buffer zones.

d.5) Please see the updated Annex E of the Agency Project Document for a detailed breakdown of the number of ha. to be restored and those to be under better management practices.

d.6) A detailed description of the planned activities is provided in Annex E of the Agency Project Document. Activity 3.1.3.2 is related to better management practices and is linked to Core Indicator 3.4, with an emphasis on contributing to the implementation of the Wetlands Law and associated regulations.

d.7) Please refer to Annex E for a detailed description of the activities.

d.8) The actions aimed at the rescue and use of traditional knowledge, proposed in Component 3 through Outputs such as agroclimatic committees/roundtables (3.2.2), the inclusive curriculum (3.1.2), technical assistance (3.2.1) and restoration pilots (3.2.3), are complemented by the awareness-raising and dissemination campaigns for ancestral knowledge provided for in the Gender Plan, which will be implemented as part of Output 4.1.1.

e) The GEF increment (or additionality) will generate global environmental benefits that would not have accrued under the baseline scenario, such as restoring 2,915 ha of land and ecosystems, improving practices in 799,399 ha of landscape (excluding protected areas), mitigating 3,208,752.04 t CO₂e, and benefiting some 20,593 people (of which 9,855 are women). This has been added to Section B. Project Description.

g) The Project will contribute a portion of its budget to the Global Coordination Platform through Component 4 through the following manner: Total \$138,950 of which \$37,200 for global/international travel + \$42,750 for regional travel + \$20,000 for fora that facilitates the exchange of experiences, as well as \$39,000 for the creation of a regional platform that will coordinate with the Global platform. Additionally, in row 87 of the Budget (see Annex G of the Agency Project Document with the excel archive) it's considered \$90,000 for international travel for 2 people per year for relevant COP and Food Systems Integrated Program Community of Practice events. The total amount that contributes to Global Coordination platform is \$ 228,950.

h) By strengthening and enhancing existing policy and financial instruments, the project will ensure resilience in the drivers identified in the Theory of Change, especially with regards to the promotion and adoption of sustainable and regenerative livestock production for sustainable food systems.

l) With regards to Barrier a. related to the lack of policy coherence, the text has been adjusted to explain how the existing National Livestock Development Plan (valid until 2027) promotes practices that are contrary to the 2030 National Environmental Policy. For example, it promotes livestock development without any mention of efficient and sustainable management of soil or water resources, thereby resulting in exploitation and degradation of natural resources in violation of the 2030 National Environmental Policy.

This lack of coherence will be addressed in Output 1.1.3 through a diagnosis of existing public policies and instruments that can be adjusted to include aspects of soil health and stability, biodiversity, climate change resilience, among others. In particular, the project will support the updating of the National Livestock Development Plan to comply with the 2030 National Environmental Policy.

m) The project is innovative and transformative in promoting sustainable food systems through a multi-level three-pronged approach: policy and governance, financial mechanisms, and on-site interventions in pilot landscapes that transform conventional to sustainable, regenerative and inclusive livestock production for sustainable food systems. Please see the updated section on

Innovation & Transformative Change, Knowledge management, Policy coherence and Capacity development of the Agency Project Document for a detailed description.

30 may 2025:

d) Duly noted. The table in Annex E has been revised to be shorter.

l) Well noted. We have included a detail explanation of how the project will promote effective linkages with key programmes of the involved Ministries and government levels. Please consider that the project team will work with project partners to align subnational, national and regional policies so they do not conflict, and address opportunities to innovate around perverse incentives that limit access and achievement of GEBs. Through Component 1, the project will strengthen the governance mechanisms such as the Regional Agricultural Management Committees (CGRA), to address limitations and increase coherency within public policies and programs that are key for implementation of Components 2 and 3, including subsidized credit and non-reimbursable funds such as Agroideas (MIDAGRI), Agrobanco, Procompite, Agrorural, MIDIS through FONCODES (specifically the projects of the Budgetary Programme "Access of rural households with subsistence economies to local markets" - PP 0118, and the project "Temporary actions linked to productive development with adaptation to climate change in urban areas - Improving Lives"), as well as the promotion of innovation within value chains such as ProInnovate (Ministry of Production). Note that the descriptions of Outcome 1.1, Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.3 and 3.2.1 have been revised to specify this.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) **Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) **Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) **Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) **[If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/23/2025 PM:

Cleared with many thanks for the clarification.

6/9/2025 PM:

a.1) Not cleared yet. Please clarify whether MINAM will also be executing some of the funds along with PROFONANPE. If yes, please also add MINAN as co-executing agency of the project. Finally, in the budget table under column "Responsible Entity" please replace "operational entity" by either PROFONANPE or MINAN as applicable.

5/16/2025 PM:

a.1) Not cleared yet. Thank you this is clear now. Since PROFONANPE will be administering the funds, it should be considered an executing agency. Please update the "Project Information" at the beginning of the CEO Endorsement and add PROFONANPE as executing along with the Ministry of Environment.

a.2) Cleared.

b) Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

a) No. Please address the following comments:

a.1) It is unclear which entity will assume the role of executing agency of the project, the Ministry of Environment (MINAM) as indicated in the project info sheet at the beginning of the CEO Endorsement document) or PROFONANPE. Please clarify and amend accordingly. Also amend the column "Responsible Entity" in the budget template.

a.2) Kindly note that the PMU team members identified in the "implementation arrangement" section do not match the team members included in the excel budget. As per the "implementation arrangement" there are a total of 15 PMU team members, i.e., technical PC, M&E specialist, climate change specialist, transversal specialist, administrative assistant, Components 1, 2, 3 and 4 coordinators, plus 6 regional facilitators and a northern and southern coordinators. This seems a very large group. Please clarify the composition of the final PMU team and update the budget template and the "implementation arrangement" section accordingly.

b) Yes, with comments. Please respond Yes or No to the question *"Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this child project?"*.

c) Yes.

d) Yes.

Agency Response

19 June 2025

We confirm that MINAM will not execute any part of the funds. MINAM will have a role as executing entity in a technical capacity, providing technical guidance of the project, but won't manage any part of the GEF grant. PROFONANPE will have the role of executing entity only in terms of being responsible for the financial administration of the full GEF grant. The implementation arrangements section was updated to better reflect this situation.

On a side note, please consider that to avoid misunderstandings, the organigram was updated to better reflect the PMU composition, leaving only the personnel more directly related to management, while technical personnel has been separated into a different Field Technical Unit.

Also, the budget has been updated as requested including PROFONANPE as the responsible entity.

02 May 2025

a.1) The Ministry of the Environment will be the entity responsible for technically leading the project, but there will be an entity that will be the Operational Partner in charge of administering the funds. PROFONANPE has been preliminarily identified, pending the results of the capacity assessment processes that are still pending.

a.2) Considering the complexity and scope of the project, as well as the diverse areas of expertise necessary for its successful implementation, the project requires a team of 16 people, 11 of whom are directly involved in project operations and 5 in administrative management. This is deemed the most efficient and effective PMU team to ensure that objectives are met within the established time and budget, especially in intervention areas that are hard to reach. The diversity of these specialists ensures that the project is comprehensive, sustainable, and successful, addressing not only the environmental needs but also the economic and social needs of the communities involved. With a budget of \$14 million, it is essential to have a multidisciplinary team that can effectively manage the complexity and scope of the project, which will be developed in two macro-regions (north and south) across the six departments and nine provinces.

b) No, FAO, as GEF Agency, will not play an execution role in this Child Project. Kindly note that the GEF Portal only has an option for 'Yes?', no option appears for 'No?'.

30 May 2025:

a.1) Duly noted. PROFONANPE was added as executing agency along with the Ministry of Environment at the beginning of the CEO Endorsement in the section 'Project Information?'.

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

a) Yes. For Core Indicator 6 the project is using the methodology of the Ministry of Environment which more conservative than the values from the Ex-ACT tool.

b) Yes.

Agency Response N/A

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2025 PM:

Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

No. Please consider updating the fiduciary risk given the recent issues with the management of funds by the Ministry of Environment.

Agency Response

02 May 2025

Kindly note that the funds will not be transferred to the Ministry of Environment. The execution of the funds will be carried out by a third party, which will be evaluated in terms of its management capacity, a mitigation plan will be drawn up accordingly and will proceed in accordance with the protocols established by the FAO for the control and monitoring of the use of resources established in the implementation tool by operational partners (OPIM).

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

N/A.

Agency ResponseN/A

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

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCE/SCCF strategy?

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

a) Yes.

b) Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2025 PM:

Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

No. The proposal mentions its contribution to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework but does not specific to which of the 23 target contributes to. Please elaborate further on these targets.

Agency Response

02 May 2025

The project is fully aligned with the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, particularly its Goal A to maintain, enhance, and restore ecosystem integrity, connectivity, and resilience, as well as its targets 8 (by minimizing the impacts of Climate Change on biodiversity through improved practices and restoration that contribute to avoiding GHG emissions), 10 (through sustainable regenerative production practices), 16 (by encouraging sustainable consumption in food systems), and 23 (by implementing monitoring systems, capacity building, and financial resources for sustainable food systems, especially sustainable, regenerative and inclusive livestock production).

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2025 PM:

Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

No. In Section D on Policy Requirements Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment, the Agency is requested to respond (Yes or No) to the sub-question: *Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources*. Also, please consider aiming for higher than 30% of women beneficiaries in their indicators, as the GAP establishes a 50% target of women beneficiaries in most activities.

Agency Response

02 May 2025

Thank you the comment. The box on closing gender gaps has been marked as YES.

With regards to the % of women beneficiaries, Component 3 aims to benefit 50% women through the capacity development, plans, and pilot activities. However, this is not possible for the rest of the Components. For example, in topics related to governance and policy of Component 1, the target is 30% due to the lack of women leaders identified to participate in these activities. Likewise, the baseline of women with the potential to meet criteria to access financing mechanisms in Component 2, even those that are adjusted to promote access by women, is estimated to be far below 50%.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: 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 comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

N/A.

Agency ResponseN/A
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

N/A.

Agency ResponseN/A
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

N/A.

Agency ResponseN/A
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

N/A.

Agency ResponseN/A
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

N/A.

Agency ResponseN/A

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response N/A

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

5/16/2025 PM:

Cleared.

3.14.2025 PM:

No. Please clarify the type of co-financing to be provided by FONCODES. As per the co-financing table, FONCODES will provide approx. \$121,202,162 in public investments, but the co-financing letter states that "the program will participate with a contribution of US\$ 121,202,162.00 (S/ 448,448,000.00), as a non-monetary contribution". Please clarify whether this support would be monetary or not.

Agency Response

02 May 2025

Thank you for the comment. In revision of the letter with FONCODES, it was detected that there was a miscalculation in the previous letter and hence FONCODES has issued a new letter of co-financing, for USD 31,392,432.40 as investment mobilized, through its Program ?Access of Rural Households with Subsistence Economies to Local Markets? and ?Temporary Actions Linked to

Productive Development to Adaptation to Climate Change in Urban Areas.? Other partners were also identified during the review and provided letters of co-financing, and they were added to the portal.

Annex B: Endorsements

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:
Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/9/2025 PM:

Cleared.

5/16/2025 PM:

No. Please there is an inconsistency in core indicator #6. Values for this indicator are 3,208,752.04 in the various sections across the CEO Endorsement document, while in the Results Framework the value is 3,126,140.87. Please clarify and amend this inconsistency.

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

N/A

30 May 2025:

Our apologies. The correct value is 3,208,752.04. The inconsistency was corrected.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

Yes.

Agency ResponseN/A

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.9 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2025 PM:

Cleared, with many thanks.

6/30/2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. While the budget template has been revised, there are still minor mismatches in position names between the budget table and the ToRs for the Northern and Southern Zone Territorial Manager (in budget table) versus Facilitator of the Northern and Southern Landscape (in the ToRs). Please update accordingly.

6/23/2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. The current budget table is missing the "Expenditure Category" column as per the GEF Template - <https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-project-budget-template> Please update accordingly.

6/9/2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. Under the column "responsible entity" please replace "operational partner" by either "PROFONAMPE" or "MINAM" as applicable. Also, the budget table is too long and difficult to follow, please consider just adding the total for each "Component" by removing the columns of the subcomponent, i.e., 1.1, 1.2., etc.

5/16/2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. Please use the GEF Template - <https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-project-budget-template> The current template use FAO categories instead of GEF expenditure categories.

3.14.2025 PM:

No. Please address the following comments:

- Please use the GEF budget template (<https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-project-budget-template>) and cost categories.

- Please in addition to upload the budget, paste the image table in the CEO Endorsement document.

- In the column "Responsible Party" of the budget table, please replace "Operational partner" by MINAM or PROFONANFE (see previous comment on the executing agency for the project).

- Please address previous comment on the PMU team. The team shall match in the "Implementation Arrangement" section and the budget template.

- Please spell all the acronyms, i.e. ESMP, MCR, etc.

- The Technical Project Coordinator costs are being spread out to project components, M&E and PMC, while the TOR seems to focus on management work for the position. Please elaborate further in the ToRs on the technical activities to be conducted by the Project Technical Coordinator or consider charging 100% of the cost for the Technical Project Coordinator to PMC and M&E.

Hiring Objectives

The Technical Project Coordinator (TPC) will be responsible for ensuring that the project meets its obligations to the GEF, MINAM and FAO, with special attention to the management aspects of the project, including supervision of staff, liaison between actors, implementation of activities and reporting.

The TPC will work under the guidance of the National Director (ND) and in coordination with the Ministry of the Environment, and Focal Points at sub-national level, as well as other stakeholders to ensure proper project implementation.

The TPC will lead the Project Management Unit (PMU) and will be responsible for managing day-to-day activities and delivering project outputs. The TPC will support and be guided by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and coordinate the activities of all partners, officials and consultants for the implementation of the project.

- Please note miscellaneous is not an eligible activity. Likewise, what is GoE budget? This doesn't seem an eligible activity. Also, "Advise" is not a budget category, please amend accordingly.

- Please consider increasing the overall budget for the investment activities, i.e., pilots on activity 3.2.3, and decrease the resources of some technical assistance activities. The following technical activities have relatively large amounts of resources allocated for the development of studies: C3. 3.2.1., C1. 1.2.1, C2 2.2.2 or C1 1.2.1.

- In line with previous comments on the implementation arrangement, there are positions which seems to be overlapping i.e., Technical Project Coordinator, four Coordinators for components 1-4, Northern and Southern zone territory managers, etc. The TORs annexed to the ProDoc include Facilitator of the Southern and Northern Landscape and a Project Manager. Please ensure consistency between the budget table's positions (as listed in point 2.a above) and the TORs.

- Office rental should be charged 100% to PMC, not to project components. Please revise the budget

Agency Response

01 July 2025

Noted, that budget template was checked and updated to ensure coherence with the name of the positions in the ToRs.

24 June 2025

The budget was updated to include the column the Expenditure Category with more clarity.

19 June 2025

Noted, the budget was updated as requested.

02 May 2025

-The GEF Budget Template has been uploaded to the Portal.

-The image table has been pasted in the CEO Endorsement document.

-The Responsible Party is currently under assessment, as explained above. Reference as been made to PROFONANPE has the responsible party and a footnote has been included. MINAM will not execute the funds of the project.

-The Implementation Arrangements, Budget and Terms of Reference have been revised per the GEF comments.

-The TOR have been revised to reflect the technical activities to be conducted.

-Miscellaneous has been removed from the budget, as well as the GOE category (General Operating Expenses)

-The Implementation Arrangements and relevant TOR have been revised.

-The PMC has been adjusted per the comment regarding Office Rental.

30 May 2025:

Duly noted. The budget was adjusted to the new template.

Regarding the Secretariat comment we should remark that to ensure the operability of the project and based on the design of previous projects of similar scope in geographical areas, as well as a consultation process during the construction of the budget in a participatory manner with the Government, Operating Partner and GEF Operational Focal Point, it has been determined that the support of 15 professionals is required, some of them on a part-time basis, which is a country decision.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3.14.2025 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response N/A
Additional Annexes
9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation
Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

7/1/2025 PM:

Cleared.

6/30/2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. While the budget template has been revised, there are still minor mismatches in position names between the budget table and the ToRs for the Northern and Southern Zone Territorial Manager (in budget table) versus Facilitator of the Northern and Southern Landscape (in the ToRs). Please update accordingly.

6/23/2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. The current budget table is missing the "Expenditure Category" column as per the GEF Template - <https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-project-budget-template> Please update accordingly.

6//2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. Please address comments above on the budget table and the executing agency/ies of the project. Also, please remove the highlighted sections of CEO Endorsement document.

5/16/2025 PM:

Not cleared yet. Please address comments above.

3.14.2025 PM:

No. Please address comments above.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request PM Comment: As for the budget, while the project expects to hire a team of 15 professionals, some of these contracts are short and the total cost of the PMU staff is approximately 15% of the total GEF funding.

9.3 Review Dates

CEO Approval Response to Secretariat comments

First Review

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)

Additional Review (as necessary)