

# Strengthening the integral and sustainable management of biodiversity and forests by indigenous peoples and local communities in fragile ecosystems of the dry forests of the Bolivia Chaco

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10393

**Countries**

Bolivia

**Project Name**

Strengthening the integral and sustainable management of biodiversity and forests by indigenous peoples and local communities in fragile ecosystems of the dry forests of the Bolivia Chaco

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

8/27/2021

**Review completed by PM**

12/6/2021

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**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

**September 8, 2021:**

Yes, 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

**September 8, 2021:**

1. Considering the component 2 is about implementation of SFM and SLM practices under the GISBB approach, the difference with the output 1.1.4 (Community action plans... implemented) is not clear as formulated in table B. Please clarify why this output is in component 1 and not in component 2.

2. The outcome 2.1 as formulated appears wide, long and not clearly focused. For instance what happens with the "the organizational systems of indigenous peoples and local communities, as well as ecosystems and their functions". Please consider a more concise and focused formulation for this outcome or eventually splitting it in two different outcomes if necessary.

3. In component 2, please clarify what "management" means under the indicator "40,000 ha under silvopastoral management systems, management, agroforestry and / or agroecological)".

4. The project management should be supported by the PMC and not a project component. Please remove the references and eventual related activities of project management in component 3 and ensure this change is applied throughout all the documentation provided (table B in outcome 3.3, budget, alternative scenario, Prodoc...). Also, considering the Component 3 includes important communication-related activities, please consider the relevance of changing the name of this component from 'Project management, M&E and COVID-19 prevention' to "Knowledge management, M&E and COVID-19 prevention".

5. It is unclear why the "participatory and management mechanisms in territorial management" mentioned in the outcome 3.1 isn't part of the component 1 on governance or component 2 on implementation. Please clarify the rationale for adding this outcome under component 3 along with the KM and M&E of the project and consider the possibility and relevance of including it under component 1 or 2.

**November 18, 2021:**

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Thank you for the clarification and amendments. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment, please note that the output 1.1.4 (And the formulation of action plans) belongs to Component 1 as part of the process of strengthening the institutional framework and national policy. Under Component 2, concrete SFM and SLM practices will be implemented with the baseline of the strengthened environment

Under Component 1. In line with this idea, we keep the output 1.1.4, for the action plan formulation, but we have now transferred the implementation to Component 2. Please refer to the new version of outputs 1.1.4 and 2.1.2 throughout the document (Table B, alternative scenario and results framework).

2. Point taken. We have formulated a new version of outcome 2.1 and corrected throughout the document. Please refer to table B, the alternative scenario section and the results framework.

3. Thank you for the comment. Please refer to the new formulation of the indicator throughout the document: *40,000 ha under silvopastoral, agroforestry, and/or agroecological management systems*?. In addition, please refer to the new paragraph 148 on which the nature of such management systems is explained.

4. Point taken. Please note that the name of component 3 is now *Knowledge management, M&E and COVID-19 prevention*?. In addition we have reformulated The Outcomes and Outputs of this component to be in line with this approach. References to project management activities have now been deleted.

5. Point taken. Please refer to the new version of Outcome 3.1 on Table B and throughout the text on the alternative scenario and results framework sections. Please note that the objective of this outcome is to strive for integration of ISMBF and LDN approaches on different government levels. For this reason, the associated outputs include the creation of knowledge sharing mechanisms, partnerships, teams and decision-making procedures. This approach is key for the sustainability of Project results.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

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

**September 8, 2021:**

1. The translation in English including the exchange rate applied is missing for the Autonomous Municipal Government of Huacareta. Please complete as needed.
2. Almost all the co-financing appears to be as in-kind. Considering the significant expected investments in Component 2 to improve practices on the ground including restoration, we would expect some co-financing as 'investments mobilized'. Please clarify why such co-financing can't be considered as grants and 'investments mobilized' and explain what investments concretely will be made on the ground with this support .

**November 18, 2021:**

1 and 2. Thank you for the consideration and the new co-financing letters. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

1. Point taken. We have now uploaded the translation of the letter from the Municipal Government of Huacareta including the applied exchange rate.
2. Point taken. Please note that we have corrected the co-financing with a new letter from the Ministry of Environment and Water recognizing the co-financing as investment mobilized. Please refer to updated table C. And the new uploaded letter.

**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

**September 8, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**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

**September 8, 2021:**

Yes, out of \$150,000, \$84,627 have been spent and the rest is committed. 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

### September 8, 2021:

1. The core indicator 1.2 target is missing in the core indicators section of the Portal (under "Expected at CEO Endorsement"). Please complete.
2. Considering the project will assess and monitor carbon soil, please consider the possibility of adding a target for the related core indicator (6.1) even in a conservative approach.

### November 18, 2021:

1. Thank you for completing the information. Cleared.
2. Thank you for considering the climate mitigation benefit of this project. Please include the indicator 6.1 in the section "6) Global Environmental Benefits (GEFTF) and/or Adaptation Benefits (LDCE/SCCF)" of the Portal entry and upload the document supporting the calculation of the expected result (we don't find the Ex-ACT Tool in the document section as indicated).

### December 6, 2021:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

## Agency Response

### November 24, 2021

Thank you for the comment. The information has been included as requested on the Global Environmental benefits Section.

Apologies for the omission of the Ex-Act Tool. This has now been uploaded.

**November 4, 2021**

1. Point Taken. The Expected Target at CEO has now been added to the portal under Core Indicator 1.2 including baseline METT Scores.
2. Point taken. We have now added Targets for Core Indicator 6.1 in line with calculations using FAO's Ex-Act Tool (Also attached to the GEF portal under documentation section). We are also considering the application of the RECSOIL approach to further monitor Soil Carbon sequestration targets.

**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

**September 13, 2021:**

1. Some parts of the project description under this section (from paragraphs 1 to 10 and 17 to 19) refer more to the baseline and not the environmental problem. Please Include this text (or a summary of it) under the baseline section.
2. The main drivers of deforestation are presented but the root causes leading to them are unclear particularly in the project area. Please elaborate further on this aspect so that we can understand the casual link between the root causes of environmental degradation and the proposed activities tackling them.
3. From the project alternative scenario, we understand that land use rights and access of the IPLCs and access to markets would also constitute important barriers to implement and scale-up sustainable practices. Please clarify why such barriers are not considered here.

**November 18, 2021:**

- 1, 2 and 3. Thank you for the amendment and additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

1. Point taken, Former paragraphs 1-10 and 17-19 are now included under the baseline section.

2. Thank you for the comment. Please consider the new information on root causes of degradation as now explained in Paragraphs 10 and 13.

3. Thank you for the comment. We have rephrased barrier 2 which now reads: "Limited knowledge and institutional capacities for the implementation of ISMBF at the central and sub-national level and limited market access opportunities". The limited market access opportunities have now been highlighted and explained under paragraph 28. As noted, the project will tackle such barriers as part of the mechanisms for ISMBF.

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**September 13, 2021:**

1. The fundamental objective of the project is to expand and integrate ISMBF into territorial planning. Nevertheless, this approach is not explained in the baseline scenario (it is under the environmental problem section, see the comment above). Please elaborate under the baseline scenario on what is the ISMBF - including the concrete practices it includes - and how it is currently promoted and applied in the country.

2. Thank you for the very extended description of the baseline. Please remove all unnecessary repetitions, such as in paragraphs 17 and 51, and in paragraphs 54 and 80 ("multi-year Programme 2014-2020... at least 225 micro-watersheds with different types of degradation (PEDES, 2016-2020)", and in paragraph 56 and 80 (PEDES aimed to reach an area of 500,000 ha)... Please consider the difficulty, lack of efficiency and lost of time such repetitions create for the review process. In the Portal entry, please provide a clear, concise and complete summary which includes all the necessary information without repetitions.

3. The baseline description is all about the institutional context, programs and objectives. But what about the human activities leading to the environment degradation or eventual private initiatives toward more sustainability? Please elaborate further on the local stakeholders involved, their current activities in the targeted landscapes, their organization their land use rights and their eventual sustainable initiatives.

4. Please use the same acronym either ISMBF (mentioned 416 times, including in the TOC) or GISBB (mentioned 82 times) throughout all the project description.

5. Please ensure the acronyms are fully written when they appear for the first time in the project description. For instance, what does "RGSPAR" stand for?

**November 18, 2021:**

1, 2, 3 and 5. Thank you for the amendments and additional information. Cleared.



4. Thank you for the consideration. Please also change the 3 remaining references to GISBB under Table C (source of co-financing).

**December 6, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

The references have been adjusted as requested.

**November 4, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment. Please refer to paragraphs 32-44, no added on the baseline scenario section
2. Thank you for the comment. The repetitive text on the indicated paragraphs has now been deleted.
3. Point taken. Please refer to the new section o the socioeconomic context added under the baseline scenario section.
4. Point taken. We now include only the acronym ISMBF throughout the text.
5. Point taken. We now correct throughout the text. Specifically, RGSPAR stands for Protected Area National Service. This, and all the other acronym appearances are now corrected throughout the text.

**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

**September 15, 2021:**

1. The description says under component 1 the project will overcome the sectoral and compartmentalized implementation. Considering the proposed activities under this component are mostly about capacity building and planning, it remains unclear what will be the sustainable coordination mechanisms (beyond the workshops) that would

need to exist or put in place to allow continuous exchanges (beyond the project) between the different institutional levels, sectors and stakeholders. Please clarify.

2. To allow the effective participatory governance and co-management, it is unclear what the project will concretely do in terms of policy or institutional developments. Please consider this aspect too or explain why it wouldn't be needed.

3. To achieve the output 1.1.2, the process will begin by mapping out key institutions, responsibilities, and roles within the project. Shouldn't this have been done during PPG? Please clarify.

4. The output 1.1.4 includes the implementation of the community action plans. Please clarify how the project will ensure and support this implementation which could require some specific and additional investments.

5. The description of the output 2.1.2 is mainly focused on the identification of the most relevant SLM and SFM practices but doesn't present how these practices will be implemented on the ground. Please explain.

6. Under the outcome 2.2, please use the acronym LDN in English (as in the rest of the project description) instead of NDT.

7. The concrete activities supported under the outcome 3.1 are not clear. The description focuses on what the situation should be at the end of the project. Please present the concrete activities which will be supported to obtain the expected output (stronger participatory and management mechanisms in land management for decision-making...).

8. The name of outputs 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 are missing under the outcomes respectively 3.1 and 3.2 and should be added. To be consistent with the rest of the project description, please complete accordingly.

9. As mentioned above, please remove any activities of project management under the component 3. Such activities can't be supported by the project components.

10. What does FNS mean in the TOC?

**November 18, 2021:**

1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10. Thank you for the clarifications, amendments and additional information. Cleared.

6. Please use the acronym LDN also in the Budget in Annex E and in the uploaded budget in excel format.

11. In addition, the "Expected Completion Date" is missing in the beginning of the project description. Please complete this information as needed.

**December 6, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

6. Acronym corrected. As requested.

11. Date completed, as requested.

**November 4, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment. We have elaborated on the description of component 1 to clarify how the project will build and strengthen the existing coordination mechanisms from the Plurinational Government of Bolivia to deliver project results and ensure their sustainability. Please refer to the Edited description of component 1.

2. Thank you for the comment. Please note that the proposal consists of having multiple outputs under Outcome 1.1 so that the activities work together to address multiple issues. While Output 1.1.1, proposes capacity-building for effective participatory governance and co-management, outputs 1.1.5 completes the strategy in terms of institutional development by providing technical assistance and developing workshops that promote the adoption and appropriation of action plans at multiple government levels.

3. Point taken. We have deleted the paragraph. Please note that we are now uploading the stakeholder engagement plan to section 2 in the GEF portal with the information on key institutions, responsibilities, and roles within the project.

4. Thank you for the comment. Please note that in line with the comments about the Project Description Summary (above) we have now corrected the result framework so that output 2.1.2 refers to the implementation of SFM and SLM practices in line with the action plans formulated under 1.1.4.

5. Thank you for the comment. We have revised the description of output 2.1.2 to explain how the SLM and SFM practices will be implemented. Please refer to paragraph 146.

6. Point taken. The LDN acronym has been corrected throughout the text.

7. Thank you for the comment. As mentioned above, we have rephrased Outcome 3.1 for better clarity. We have also clearly described the activities that will be supported under Outcome 3.1 and its Output 3.1.1. Please refer to the description of Outcome 3.1

8. Point taken Outputs 3.1.1, 3.2.1, and 3.3.2 have now been added under their respective Outcomes.

9. Point taken. The name of Component 3, Outcome 3.1, and their description have been edited throughout the document.

10. FNS stands for Food National Security. This has been corrected in the Theory of Change.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 15, 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

**September 15, 2021:**

Partially. The description focuses on capacity building of the institutions to implement and monitor MEA guidance and notably LDN, the coordination between government plans, governance, training and coordination. Please complete with what GEF support will provide in terms of integrated planning at landscape level and improved practices/land use rights/market conditions for the IPLCs leading to increased livelihood and biodiversity conservation.

**November 18, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

Thank you for the comment. Point taken. Please refer to the new version of paragraph 192 that now elaborates on the incremental reasoning with regards to integrated planning at the landscape level and improved practices and livelihoods of local communities.

**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

**September 8, 2021:**

1. The 100,000 ha of landscapes under better management for the benefit of biodiversity includes 60,000 ha under SFM and 40,000 ha under silvopastoral, managed, agroforestry and/or agroecological management systems. Please clarify why part of this area, at least the 40,000 ha is not considered as "area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems" (core indicator 4.3).

2. Also, please clarify concretely what kind of land and activities will lead to the targets reported as core indicator 4.3 (6,000 ha + 2,000 ha).

**November 18, 2021:**

1. Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

2. It is still unclear what are the 6,000 ha + 2,000 ha and what is concretely intended to be done on these areas. Please clarify in the alternative scenario, in the section "6) Global Environmental Benefits (GEFTF) and/or Adaptation Benefits (LDCAF/SCCF)" and in the results framework.

**December 6, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

The description of the 8,000 hectares has been completed under the Global Environmental Section to clarify the nature of the activities and explain the contribution of this activities to generate Global Environmental Benefits.

**November 4, 2021**

1 and 2. Point taken. Please note that we have adjusted the document and the project portal throughout to include the 40 000 ha under core indicator 4.3. We are also clarifying that the activities will be implemented in line with the description of output 2.1.2 that includes the list of possible activities that will be implemented after participatory prioritization and selection.

**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

**September 15, 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

**September 8, 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

N/A

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**

#### **September 8, 2021:**

1. We do find among the uploaded documents the Indigenous People Plan but we don't find any equivalent for all the stakeholders, is it on purpose? Please explain and clarify the stakeholders engagement plan including all stakeholders and mentioning how they will be consulted in project execution and the means and timing of their engagement.
2. There is no report on stakeholder consultations during the design phase. Please present in detail the consultations which took place during the design phase and their main results which should be aligned with the proposal.
3. In the beginning of the section, the "Private Sector Entities" are not tagged with a "Yes". Please explain why in the dedicated space. Please note that all the involved stakeholders should have been consulted during the design phase of the project and we would expect this category of stakeholders be tagged with a "yes".

#### **November 18, 2021:**

1 and 2. Thank you for the additional information. Nevertheless the presentation is confusing: this section begins with 2 tables, then a text that we are not sure to which part of the engagement plan it contributes, then finally a table without title but wrongly referenced as "Table 4. Institutional framework" at the bottom and following a paragraph focused on Universities and referring to this same Table 4. Please organize this section in a clear and logical manner.

3. It remains unclear how and when the private sector has been consulted and in particular the individual Producers and Members of Producer Associations and the potential providers of additional funding (FONABOSQUE, the Indigenous Fund, the Productive Development Bank or microfinance institutions). Please clarify.

#### **December 6, 2021:**

Thank you for the improvement and clarification. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

**November 24, 2021**

- 1 and 2. Point taken. Please refer to the Stakeholder section that has now been organized
3. Point taken. additional information on how the private sector has been consulted has been included on the stakeholder and private sector section.

**November 4, 2021**

- 1 and 2. Point taken. Please note that a stakeholder engagement plan has now been uploaded and the description is included on the portal.
3. Point taken. Please note that under "Private Sector entities" the portal is tagged with "Yes" in line with the uploaded stakeholder engagement plan.

**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  
**September 8, 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  
**September 8, 2021:**

We learn that it is recommended that the work to promote good practices related to SLM and SFM be complemented by the offsets provided by the oil companies working in the region. Please clarify what such a recommendation means in terms of private sector engagement and which concrete activities under which component will support that.



**November 18, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

Thank you for the comment. Please refer to the new information added to the private sector section to clarify the engagement of oil companies in the project (Paragraphs 236).

**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

**September 8, 2021:**

1. The climate risk analysis needs more development. Using available data, please explore the possible hazards, vulnerability and impacts of climate change during project implementation and in longer term horizons (such as in 2050) on the project outcomes and elaborate further on the the project measures and components which will contribute to mitigate that risk. We advise to refer to STAP guidance on Climate Risk Screening available here: [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN\\_GEF.STAP\\_.C.56.Inf\\_.03\\_STAP%20guidance%20on%20climate%20risk%20screening.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.STAP_.C.56.Inf_.03_STAP%20guidance%20on%20climate%20risk%20screening.pdf)
2. The analysis identified the following risk: "...little will on the part of the groups interested in adopting sustainable management practices". It is indeed a significant risk. Nevertheless the corresponding mitigation measures considered by the project are unclear. Please complete the analysis for that risk.

**November 18, 2021:**

Thank you for the complement. Also, we learn with the additional information in the private sector section that "The project activities ... will be complemented by with resources from FONABOSQUE, the Indigenous Fund, the Productive Development

Bank or microfinance institutions". Is there a risk that such financial resources don't materialize to support the project activities? If so, please consider that risk too and identify mitigation measures.

**December 6, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

Point taken. We now consider this risk on the Risk section of the Agency Project Document and GEF Portal. Please refer to section 5 where the economic/financial risk is described including mitigation measures.

**November 4, 2021**

1. Point taken. Please note that we have now extended on the Climate risk baseline on the risks section to explore hazards, vulnerability, impacts of climate change and mitigation actions. A climate Baseline has been added on the risks section, and the table "Risks to the Project" has been updated.
2. Thank you for the comment. Please note that the strategy for mitigating this risk is considered in component 3. The information on the risks table has been updated to explain how the component 3 will include measures to mitigate this risk.

**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

**September 13, 2021:**

1. At the beginning of the project description the Ministry of Environment and Water (MMAyA) is presented as the executing agency while under the Institutional Arrangement section, it is the Vice Ministry of the Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change and Forest Management and Development (VMA). Please be consistent throughout all the information and documents provided and amend accordingly.

2. The Guaran? People?s Assembly (APG) will be a co-executing partner. Nevertheless it is not mentioned at the beginning of the project along with the MMAyA. Please clarify and complete as needed.

3. In the Prodoc, FAO appears to be executing all the project budget (under the column 'FAO's Budget'). As per GEF policy the implementing Agency can't execute any activity of the project budget. Instead of FAO, the MMAyA (or VMA) and the APG should be mentioned here. Please refer to the GEF policy and amend the budget table accordingly.

4. In order to facilitate visibility and checking, please upload the budget in Excel format under the documents section of the Portal.

5. Please note that the project coordinator and the Chief Technical assistant should be charged under the PMC unless well justified in their TORs for their contribution to the components. In any case, it is difficult to understand how the Chief Technical assistant can be fully supported by the components.

6. We note 2 important and unclear items in the budget: "construction materials, repairs and others" and "productive infrastructure" representing 25% of the total project budget. Please clarify these expenses in a budget note explaining how they contribute to project activities as presented in the alternative scenario.

7. We note a petrol expense for \$82,500. Please clarify how this cost has been estimated and justify such expense considering a co-financing of +\$22 million from the involved institution.

**November 18, 2021:**

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

2. According to the new budget, it appears that only VMA is actually executing nearly all the project budget and the APG does not appear at all. Please explain and if the APG is a minor executing partner, then only put VMA at the beginning of the project description. And if APG is a significant executing partner (receiving important share of the project resources), then the Agency can indicate it in the budget in a column "Responsible Entity" where VMA and APG are mentioned where relevant. In such a case, the Agency is invited to let both names of VMA and APG under "Other Executing Partner(s)" at the beginning of the Portal entry (as it is now) and to select "others" under "Executing Partner Type" (as not both entities are from the Government).

3. Thank you for the amendment. Nevertheless we note that FAO will still be executing some activities. Please justify there is no other possible arrangement for each of these activities.

4. Thank you for uploading the budget. Cleared.

5. Thank you for the amendment and clarification. The TORs of the project coordinator refers to Annex 1 and Annex 2. But there are no such annexes in the Portal entry. Please explain and amend.

6. Thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless, the investments planned under the "Fire management practices" are still unclear as they are presented in the output 2.1.2 as "Identify and implement alternatives to using fire in slash and burn practices" and "Firefighting and management techniques", which is very vague. Please be more specific.

7. Thank you for the consideration and amendment. Cleared.

**December 10, 2021:**

5. To align with GEF policy and guidelines, there is the need to address the following comments related to the PMC:

- Coordinator costs are charged across all components and PMC ? per Guidelines, project's execution associated costs should be charged to the GEF and co-financing portions allocated to PMC ? please amend as needed.

- GOE expenses of Stationary, Telephone-internet, and Courier should be charged to PMC but not to project components:

**December 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Dec. 5 2021**

Unfortunately, as per discussions with the Government of Bolivia (GoB), it will not be feasible to use cofinancing from the Ministry of Environment and Water (MMAyA) to cover a portion of the costs of the National Project Coordinator (NPC). Cofinancing resources that are already committed will be used to ensure public investments are implemented in a timely manner in coordination with the GEF operation. In addition, it is not feasible to assign a staff from the MMAyA or a local stakeholder (eg. Asamblea del Pueblo Guaran?) the role of project coordinator as staff have limited time availability and capacity to take over a complex operation like this project.

Please note that the government of Bolivia will co-finance an Executive Director that will supervise the Project Coordination Unit and will contribute with technical (line) consultants hired in the context of the public investments that will cofinance the GEF project. Nonetheless, FAO and the GoB commit to explore opportunities to find

cofinancing for the PMC as the project advances to ensure that the exit strategy is sustainable.

Similarly, FAO cofinancing resources are tied to field activities and cannot be diverted for project management personnel because of their nature.

In line with the Guidelines on the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy, Annex 7, paragraph 4, it is proposed that a portion of the PMC costs associated to the Project Coordinator be charged to the project components, with most of the costs charged to Component 1. TORs have been updated (and uploaded into the GEF portal) to reflect the outputs that will be led by the NPC. We kindly request the GEFSEC Operational team to consider these revised TORs.

- GOE expenses have been reduced significantly (from to ensure PMC remains within the allowed 5% by GEF Policy. Funding has been transferred to field activities (i.e. budget lines 73-75; inputs for water efficiency, forest management, soil management).

#### **November 24, 2021**

2. Thank you for this comment. The APG is a minor executing partner for this project. We now include only the VMA at the beginning of the project description and we include only the column of the VMA under the Project Budget Table.

3. Thank you for the comment. Please note, however, that the current version is consistent with the standard role of FAO in the internal organization. To clarify and explain this, the Evaluation provisions text has been updated in the M&E section. Please refer to this section in the GEF portal and attached Agency Project Document.

5. Well noted. This has now been clarified referring to Annexes A and E: Result Framework and Budget respectively.

6. Well noted. The nature of these activities has now been explained in the Alternative scenario Section under the description of Output 2.1.

#### **November 4, 2021**

1. Point taken. We have now revised the document and GEF portal to be consistent. The executing agency will be the Vice Ministry of Environment (VMA).
2. Point taken. We are now including to the Guaran? People?s Assembly (APG) at the beginning of the project together with the Vice Ministry of Environment (VMA).
3. Thank you for the comment. We have now corrected the budget to indicate that the VMA will be executing the budget in line with their execution functions as written on the CEO Endorsement Request.
4. The updated version of the budget has been uploaded to the documentation section of the GEF Portal.
5. Thank you for the comment. Please refer to the updated version of the Budget. This Project will hire a Coordinator and a Biodiversity Management Specialist. The duties of this roles, including ToRs for the contribution of the Coordinator to the project components are now explained on the Institutional Arrangements Section.
6. Thanks you for the comment, well noted. Please note that we have corrected the indicated budget lines. These lines refer to the inputs and materials for the implementation of SLM and SFM practices within the ISMBF framework as described on Output 2.1.2. We have edited the budget rows to explain this.
7. Thank you for this comment. Please refer to the updated budget were we have deleted the line corresponding to petrol expenses.

**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

**September 8, 2021:**

The description rightly highlights the NBSAP submitted by Bolivia in 2019. Nevertheless, the alignments of the project "with the globally-agreed biodiversity goals" remain vague. Please be more specific on how the project contributes, including in the targeted area, to the implementation of the Plan.

**November 18, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

Thank you for the comment. We have improved the description of the alignment of the project with the implementation of the plan. Please refer to the edited description of the section.

**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  
**September 13, 2021:**

The description does mention some important outputs but the timeline of the key deliverables and the budget are missing. Please complete this section as needed.

**November 18, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

Thank you for the comment. The Knowledge Management Section has now been completed including a plan showing activities, budget and timeline for key deliverables and a description of the communication strategy of the project. Please refer to paragraphs the edited description of the section.

**Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**September 8, 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  
**September 13, 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  
**September 15, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**September 8, 2021:**

1. No, the budget in Annex E of the Portal entry is missing. Please attach the budget in this section.
2. In Annex D of the Portal entry the link provided is very useful. In addition to this link, please attach a copy of the map of the project area to enable the accessibility of the information also off-line.

**November 18, 2021:**



1. Thank you for adding the Annex E. Nevertheless, the Annex is difficult to read as most of the numbers are outside their cell and the table goes beyond the limit of Portal entry page (on the right). Please attach a budget in Annex E that includes the numbers in the right cells and fits within the portal entry page, using the GEF template.

2. Thank you for the amendment. To avoid repeated information, please only keep the maps in Annex D and remove the text and tables which are already in the project description.

**December 6, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. well noted. The table has been adjusted as requested.

2. Well noted. The repeated information has been deleted. We now keep only maps in Annex D.

**November 4, 2021**

1. The updated budget is now pasted in the corresponding portal entry (Annex E). It has also been uploaded to the GEF portal under documentation.

2. Thank you for the comment. We are now including a copy of project maps on the corresponding entry of the portal (Annex D)

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 13, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 13, 2021:**

A Comment was: "We request the project developers to further explore during the PPG phase possible articulation with actions supported by development partners such as the World Bank, IFAD, GIZ, JICA (which begins discussion on value chains in 2019) and others." This comment is not addressed in Annex B of the Portal entry. Please complete as needed.

**November 18, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

A Response to this comment is now included in Annex B in the Agency Project Document and GEF Portal. Additional information has been included in the Coordination Section

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 13, 2021:**

In Table B of the Portal entry, we don't know which Council member made the first comment. Please indicate you are addressing the US comment.

**November 18, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 4, 2021**

Table in Annex B has been updated to include the name of the Council Members (United States and Germany) that commented on the project.

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 13, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 8, 2021:**

Yes, out of \$150,000, \$84,627 have been spent and the rest is committed. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 8, 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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**September 15, 2021:**

Not yet, please address the comments made above.

**November 18, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

In addition:

1. Please note that several tables go beyond the limit right of the Portal entry" Table 3 under "1b. Project Map and Coordinates"; Annex A "Project results Framework"; and Annex E "Project Budget Table". Please adjust the tables and ensure their limits remain inside the portal entry pages.

2. Please only keep highlighted in yellow the new text and modifications resulting from this new review (except for Annex E which is easy to locate and doesn't need to be totally highlighted).

**December 10, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

**December 15, 2021:**

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The CEO endorsement is now recommended.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/15/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/18/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/10/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/15/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**