

Environmental routes to incorporate communities in good conservation practices and nature-based businesses that promote human development in ecosystems of high environmental and social vulnerability in the Regional Corridor El Palmar - Tariquia, in the departments of Potosí, Tarija and Chuquisaca

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11034

Countries

Bolivia

Project Name

Environmental routes to incorporate communities in good conservation practices and nature-based businesses that promote human development in ecosystems of high environmental and social vulnerability in the Regional Corridor El Palmar - Tariquia, in the departments of Potosí, Tarija and Chuquisaca

Agencies

CAF

Date received by PM

4/7/2023

Review completed by PM

9/8/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

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

May 5, 2023:

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

May 6, 2023:

1. Please rate the Rio Marker for Biodiversity as "2" as this project is totally funded by the BD FA.
2. In the column "Expected Outcomes" of table B, please clarify with "Indicator" and "Target" where relevant.
3. The outcome 2.1 includes deforestation avoided of at least 72 ha. Please clarify why this result is not reported under the core indicator 4.4 "Area of High Conservation Value or other forest loss avoided".
4. Please add in table B where appropriate the 697,643 ha of Terrestrial Protected Areas under improved management.
5. Surprisingly, the table B is almost the same as the one provided in the PIF. Didn't the PPG process and consultations provide any new elements to take into account for the outputs, oputcomes and targets? Please explain.

June 16, 2023:

- 1, 2, 4 and 5. Thank you for the amendments and clarification, cleared.
3. No, the core indicator 4.4 is still missing in the core indicator section. Please complete.

July 27, 2023:

3. Thank you for the addition. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Corrected again, the CI 4.4 has been included. Sorry

September 7, 2023

All the requests have been attended and texts completed. Please see Table B. indicator and Target 2.2.2. .

Due to technical issues The GEF Portal does not allow to load highlight text

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

May 5, 2023:

1. The co-financing letter from SERNAP (for \$11,421,386) doesn't inform about the type of co-financing and if the cofinancing is recurrent expenditure or investment mobilized. Please provide a letter with this information, including the full name of SERNAP, and ensure it is consistent with the table C in the Portal.
2. There are 2 uploaded co-financing letters in word format which are the same (for \$11,421,386) but with different file names (referring to SISCO and SERNAP) ant not signed. Please remove these documents from the Portal as they are useless.
3. The co-financing letter from CAF is not signed and doesn't indicate the type of co-financing and the if the cofinancing is recurrent expenditure or investment mobilized. Please provide a signed letter with the required information on the type of co-financing and precising if the cofinancing is recurrent expenditure or investment mobilized.
4. The co-financing letter from SISCO is missing. Please provide a signed letter from SISCO with the required information on the type of co-financing, precising if the cofinancing is recurrent expenditure or investment mobilized and including the full name of SISCO.

June 16, 2023:

1 and 4. No. The letters should specify the kind of co-financing and if the cofinancing is recurrent expenditure or investment mobilized. Please provide letters from SERNAP and SISCO with this information as already requested in the previous review.

2 and 3. Thank you for the clarification and new co-financing letter from CAF. Cleared.

July 27, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification and the new co-financing letters. Cleared.

Agency Response

1 and 4. The letters have been re-issued and uploaded.

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

May 5, 2023:

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

May 5, 2023:

The table provided in the annex C includes only one line. Also, it's difficult to understand no amount has been spent during the 10 months since PIF approval. As requested in the Portal template, please provide more details identifying the main activities carried out and the outcomes achieved with the PPG and their status in terms of amount spent and committed.

June 16, 2023:

Partially:

1. The total of the amount spent and committed shouldn't be higher than the total budget available for the PPG. If the amount spent is \$45,000, then the amount committed shouldn't be higher than \$5,000. Please correct.

2. As requested in the previous review, please provide in the Annex C more details identifying the main activities carried out and the main outcomes achieved with the PPG.

July 27, 2023:

1. Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

2. Thank you for the additional information provided. Please complete the PPG budget table with the main budget items (reports, consultants, meetings, travels...). It doesn't need to be much detailed but we need to see what were the main expenses.

August 18, 2023:

2.1 The PPG table still needs to present more detailed information. Please present the itemized information as it is requested in the GEF template using the categories included in the Table 1 of annex 1 in Guidelines GEF/C.59/Inf.03 (under Annex 2: Project Preparation Grant).

2.2 Also, as presented the sum of columns 'Budgeted Amount' and 'Amount Spent To date' is incorrect (the first line is the total and should be removed as the last line is also the total). Please amend accordingly.

| PPG Grant Approved at PIF: USD 50,000 | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------|------------------|
| Project Preparation Activities / Implemented | GETF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$) | | |
| | Budgeted Amount | Amount Spent To date | Amount Committed |
| Activities related to project design, including participation and consultation, technical design, implementation arrangements and others | 50,000 | 45,000 | 5,000 |
| Consultant team | 32,000 | 27,000 | 5,000 |
| Participation activities (on site) | 18,000 | 18,000 | - |
| Total | 50,000 | 45,000 | 5,000 |

September 6, 2023:

2.1 Thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless, only the title of the 2 lines/categories have changed and there is no more detailed information. Please clarify why there was no other kind of expenses such as local consultations, travel costs, local consultations and Gender and Environmental and Social Safeguards analysis. Btw, surprisingly the response from the Agency (amount corrected) is not relevant to what was expected (more detailed information).

2.2. Thank you for the amendment. Nevertheless it was requested to remove the first line (which was a repetition of the last one " Total") and not the first column. Please put back the first column "Budgeted amount".

September 7, 2023:

The comments are not addressed. Please address the comments.

September 7, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The amount committed, but not yet spent, has been corrected as requested.
2. Done, the first column has been removed. Please see Annex C.

September 7, 2023

Please see Annex C, Request attended. Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG).

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

May 6, 2023:

Under the core indicator table, please provide an explanation on targets, methodologies used, and other focal area specifics including justification where core indicator targets are not provided (such as the 72 ha of avoided deforestation).

June 16, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

CI table has been corrected as mentioned above. The explanation has been included under the table.

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

May 6, 2023:

No, the project justification is missing. Informing only there is no change from the PIF is not enough. The PPG phase should have provided the opportunity to further improve the proposal. In any case this section needs to be completed. Please complete as needed.

June 16, 2023:

1. No, please provide the information as requested in the Portal. The reference to the Prodoc is not enough as the Portal is the main project document for a GEF project. As already mentioned at the end of the previous review, the Portal entry should include all the requested information. Please complete as necessary under the different topics below:

Briefly Describe

- a. The global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed;
- b. The baseline scenario and any associated baseline Programs;
- c. The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project;
- d. Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies;
- e. Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing; ①
- f. Global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF);
- g. Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up. ①

2. Please clarify what "PAPS" means.

3. In addition, please note the Agency response in the review sheet for this comment is not appropriate as it is exactly the same as the one provided above for the core indicators.

July 27, 2023:

1. The targeted landscapes, their environmental problems and their root causes are not described. Please elaborate clearly and with details on these important aspects to justify the proposed approach.

2 and 3. Thank you for the amendments and clarification. Cleared.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

1. The section is filled. The assumptions, theory of change, and strategic rationality of the project have been tested, deepened, and enriched.
2. SPAP stands for Plurinational System of Protected Areas (acronym in Spanish)
3. This must be a Portal entry bug/error. Corrected.

Julio 27, 2023

1. Done. The section is filled with even more details from the Project Document. The assumptions, theory of change, and strategic rationality of the project have been tested, and intervention strategies have been proposed, and field-tested.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 6, 2023:

No, the baseline scenario is missing. Informing only there is no change from the PIF is not enough. As mentioned above, please complete as needed.

June 16, 2023:

No, please see the comment above.

July 27, 2023:

The baseline scenario should not be only a long list of relevant law and decrees. How this regulatory framework is actually implemented and successful on the ground? While these are useful to mention and must stay in the description, there is the need to present the current elements of the targeted landscape the project will build on and articulate with (including the different stakeholders and their respective role and activities, the land uses, status and rights - SPAP, individual protected areas, agriculture production..., the contribution from co-financing, and the existing initiatives and projects from local, national and eventually international partners). For instance it is very surprising to see the word "tourist" first appearing under the private sector section whereas this sector is not mentioned all in the baseline and in the alternative scenario. Please complete a full description accordingly.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

The section is filled. The present situation in the Corridor, including the complete identification of subnational Protected Areas (not covered by SPAP) and other area-based conservation measures, the understanding of SERNAP and its role in this problematics, and territorial dynamics around the identified barriers have been thoroughly documented.

July 27, 2023

Done. The section is filled with even more details from the Project Document. Please see section b) The baseline scenario and any associated baseline projects

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

May 6, 2023:

No, the description of the alternative scenario is missing. Informing only there is no change from the PIF is not enough. The PPG phase should have provided the opportunity to further improve the proposal, especially for the alternative scenario taking into account the results of the consultations. In particular, should we understand that none of the 77 proposed interventions during the consultation workshop had an influence on the project design? This section needs to be completed and improved from the PIF. Please complete as needed.

June 16, 2023:

No, please see the comment above.

July 27, 2023:

The description of the TOC with its logical pathways linking problems, causes, barriers, solutions and outcomes is missing. The presentation of the alternative scenario is very succinct relying on a simple copy of the project outcomes in table B. Please present fully the TOC and describe with details the activities planned under each project output (including the presentation of what each stakeholder will do exactly).

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

The section is filled. As previously mentioned, the formulation process has been focused on confirming/rejecting the theory of change and alternative scenario, and fine-tuning intervention strategies for the achievement of the expected results and outcomes.

July 27, 2023

Done. The section is filled with even more details from the Project Document. Please see section c) The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project - 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

May 6, 2023:

No, the alignment of the project with the GEF focal area strategies is missing. As for the other sections above, please complete as needed.

June 16, 2023:

No, please see the comment above.

July 27, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

The section is filled. The objective and proposed activities of the project are well aligned with the programming priorities and the ToC.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 6, 2023:

No, the incremental reasoning (including the contribution from the baseline and co-financing) is missing. Informing only there is no change from the PIF is not enough. As mentioned above, please complete as needed.

June 16, 2023:

No, please see the comment above.

July 27, 2023:

The description is unclear and the presentation of the co-financing contribution shouldn't be placed in this section but under the baseline scenario. In this section we expect to know how the GEF support is additional to what is currently happening and planned by other stakeholders. This can be presented describing what would be the situation without GEF project and what it will be thanks the different project outputs. Please clarify this section accordingly.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

The section is filled. The ToC is solid, acts at various levels where problems have been detected (economic, cultural, ecological) and aims coherently at changing them.

July 27, 2023

Done. The section is filled with even more details from the Project Document. Please see section e) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing

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

May 6, 2023:

No, the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits is missing. Informing only there is no change from the PIF is not enough. As mentioned above, please complete as needed.

June 16, 2023:

No, please see the comment above.

July 27, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response The section is filled. The project uses fully compliant, verifiable methodologies and benchmarks.

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

May 6, 2023:

No, the better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up is missing. Informing only there is no change from the PIF is not enough. As mentioned above, please complete as needed.

June 16, 2023:

No, please see the comment above.

July 27, 2023:

1. The innovation is unclear. Please clarify what exactly the project is promoting that doesn't exist yet in the targeted landscapes and/or in the country.
2. The sustainability of the project is said to be "ensured... by its focus on a non-contentious environmental issue such as landscape sustainability". This is very general. Please be more specific and complete the text presenting which specific elements of the project approach will make its outcomes sustainable over time.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

The section is filled. The project aims coherently in the directions outlined in the ToC, enhancing what similar landscape level initiatives have tried.

July 27, 2023:

1. The section is further filled. The project aims coherently in the directions outlined in the ToC, enhancing what similar landscape level initiatives have tried for the last 15 years but

profiting from opportunities unique to the country, intervention area, and conjunctural moment.

2. The section is further filled. The sustainability of the project approach is sustained by SERNAP's technical support to policy making regarding protected areas and the protected area system, and landscape-wide by behavioral features (unobservable payoffs, enhanced efficiency) sustained by the platforms supported by the project.

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

May 5, 2023:

The geo-referenced information is missing. Please complete.

June 16, 2023:

No, the geo-referenced information is still missing. Please complete.

July 27, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information (please note the map is in Annex D not E). Cleared.

Agency Response The section is filled. Extended information is available in Annex E.

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

May 6, 2023:

1. Reference is made to the Prodoc but there isn't any description in the Stakeholders section in the Portal. Please include in this section 1- a summary of the consultations including who participated and their main findings and 2- a summary of the stakeholders engagement plan (the "Table 3. Project Stakeholders" of the Prodoc can be used).

2. In particular, it was requested at PIF stage that during PPG phase, IPLCs and CSOs were formally and directly consulted and involved in the project design. Please describe clearly in this section of the Portal how this has been done.

3. The paragraph "Project design included a participatory phase... with Special Attention to Indigenous Peoples." is repeated. Please remove the repetition.

June 16, 2023:

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

Agency Response

1. 1. a The summary has been included; b. The stakeholder table has been included.
2. 2. the specific reference to IPLCs and CSOs has been included. A good representation of these organisations participated in the consultations.
3. 3. Done.

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

May 6, 2023:

A summary of gender analysis needs to be included in the section "3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment" in the Portal. Please complete.

June 16, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response The section has been filled. The project includes gender disaggregated indicators and targets and establishes mandatory thresholds for women and indigenous participation.

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

May 6, 2023:

As mentioned above, it is not enough to say there is no changes from PIF. Please include in this section an updated description of the private sector engagement.

June 16, 2023:

The description is very limited. Please elaborate further on who are the private sector stakeholders involved and what will be their role in the project.

July 27, 2023:

The description is too generic. Please be more specific on the involved economic sectors and kind of stakeholders and present the exact role of private stakeholders in these sectors.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

The section has been expanded. The participation of the private sector is small to date, but significant at the local level. Its local partnership model provides opportunities for further development of nature-based, sustainable products and services.

July 27, 2023

Done. The section has been further expanded in the Portal. The participation of the private sector is small to date, but significant at the local level. Its local partnership model provides opportunities for further development of nature-based, sustainable products and services, supported by the project through Component 2.

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

May 6, 2023:

We take note of the COVID-19 risks consideration in the uploaded Appendix 10. Nevertheless, the analysis should also include the opportunity the project can provide to mitigate the impact of future pandemic. Please complete the analysis accordingly.

June 16, 2023:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

The analysis has been completed and included in PRODOC 3.6. Risks and mitigation measures and Appendix 10. Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures.

September 7, 2023

Environmental and social impact assessment is presented in ProDoc 4. Summary of the ex ante evaluation. It concludes that the project is cost-efficient, technically sound, environmentally positive, and will strengthen local capacities among project stakeholders to work towards sustainability. Stakeholders participate in the identification of project priorities and in the definition of planned outputs and outcomes, and all stakeholders are provided the opportunity to provide specific inputs to the project process.

The implementation of project activities will be in accordance with the Environmental and Social Safeguards for CAF/GEF Projects Manual, Version 1 of May 2015. The Project is classified as Category C, according to the Guidelines and Procedures on Environmental and Social Safeguards for CAF/GEF Projects Manual (Section V.I.2 Annex I). Project interventions, especially on-the-ground interventions under Component 2, are not expected to cause major

adverse environmental impacts, and instead, will improve the environmental and social conditions prevailing in the areas of intervention, as evaluated in PRODOC's .

Special attention is devoted to the compliance of safeguards concerning indigenous peoples and gender equity, as well as to those related with climate change.

The nexus in mitigation and adaptation approach that Bolivia promotes at the international level is applied, with its five methodological steps, including strengthening forest governance, participatory planning, joint target setting, implementation of integrated forest management through provision of finance and technology and monitoring of indicators. This approach provides a national normative framework to which the project contributes. More generally, the country has the legal framework which mandates and enhance effective indigenous people participation and CAF and the project also fully comply with this mandate.

Social impacts and related measures as well a detailed Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), including indigenous people, have been designed in a extensively participatory manner. Local workshops and project information dissemination through small focal groups with experts have taken place during 2022 and January-February 2023. The ESMF in Annex 11 includes both expected impact identification, a safeguard triggering evaluation, and measures to be developed and performed, as well as monitoring and reporting guidelines. In case that further analysis or monitoring and reporting tool would be needed, these will be promptly developed in the earliest implementation stage of the project.

Indigenous peoples participation is considered key to this project and the design phase has included crosscutting indigenous participation, from decision makers all the way down to field level. This participation is going to be maintained and enhanced during execution phase, through the provisions set out for minimum participation of indigenous peoples in project activity and governance. Appendix 11 includes detailed information & recommendations, as well as Appendix 6. Public Consultation Process & Stakeholder Engagement Plan, with Special Attention to Indigenous Peoples, which includes separate, ?Specific guidance for engagement with indigenous peoples? which mandates:

- The incorporation of traditional governance mechanisms and local knowledge into every project activity, including non-field activities such as proposing regulatory changes, data analysis and others.
- The reinforced participation of indigenous peoples, women, and women organisations in the governance mechanisms of the project.
- The development of specific indicators for equity and inclusion of indigenous peoples and women, both for processes and results.
- The promotion of mechanisms for indigenous peoples and women participating in the access to and management of biodiversity and natural resources.

At the highest level, of the five persons conforming the Project Steering Committee, at least one must be of indigenous origin and one woman, with no less than two persons (40% of the committee) from these groups.

Enhanced participatory and transparency content measures have been designed to ensure that all stakeholders and the project in its integrity comply with the highest ethical, technical and managerial standards as the GEF and CAF requires. The overall and detailed Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) for the project is included in the ProDoc as Appendix 11.

Further, a specific Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) is required and budgeted for each local intervention, that conforms to all safeguards triggered by the project and applicable national regulations, and to the Guidelines and Procedures on Environmental and Social Safeguards for CAF/GEF Projects Manual.

September 11, 2023

The Project will conduct further environmental and social risk assessment, particularly related to the potential restriction of natural resources and impacts of indigenous communities, and develop a detailed environmental and social risk management plan with a clear budget and timeline in the early stage of the project.

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

May 6, 2023:

1. The description in the Portal is too succinct. Please elaborate further using the information included in the Prodoc under "3. Implementation".
2. Please ensure the acronyms are fully written the first time they appear in the text (SERNAP, VMA...).

June 16, 2023:

1. Thank you for the additional information. In addition, please consider the following:
 - 1.1 Please add the role of the GEF Agency (CAF) and how it will work with the other relevant stakeholders of the project.

1.2 There are only 4 people in the Steering Committee. Please consider having more representatives covering each kind of stakeholders involved in the project and having at least one woman **and** (not or) one indigenous representative.

1.3 There is no information on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives. Please elaborate on this aspect too.

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

SERNAP will execute the project on behalf of MMAyA for national protected areas. In the case of subnational areas and other sites, SERNAP will propose and the MMAyA will delegate mandates as appropriate. The general design and institutionalisation of shared-

2. Please write fully the acronym of "SERNAP" the first time it appears in the project description (now under the co-financing table).

July 27, 2023:

Thank you for the consideration. The executing agency is said to be "MMAyA (Ministry of Environment and Water)" at the very beginning of the project description and "SERNAP" in the coordination section and in the budget table. For consistency purpose, please use exactly the same entity as the executing agency throughout all the project description. It should be: "National Protected Areas Service (SERNAP), Ministry of Environment and Water" at the very beginning of the project description under "Other Executing Partner(s)".

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

1.1. Done. The section has been expanded to include CAF's role.

1.2. Point taken, thank you. The Steering Committee has been expanded to include five members, of whom at least one woman AND one person of indigenous origin, for a total of at least two (40%) of the Committee from these disadvantaged groups.

1.3. Relevant external coordination mechanisms foreseen in the ProDoc (with Project GEFID 10627 Programme to sustainably manage and restore land and biodiversity in the Guadalquivir Basin, and the Mi Agua and Mi Riego Programs) are now included in the Portal entry.

2. Institution's names have been simplified, and first use reviewed. Sorry about that

July 27,2023

Done. Please see section 6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

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

May 6, 2023:

Thank you for the information provided. Please complete with the information that was provided in the PIF and which was more complete.

June 16, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Please complete the information presenting clearly and in the Portal how the project is aligned and contribute to the implementation of the CBD convention (NBSAP, Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework...). This is important because this project is a BD project.

July 27, 2023:

We don't see the improvements in this section. In addition, the information on the alignment of the project to the GEF BD FA is already presented in another specific section of the project description. Please elaborate in this section on the alignment of the project with national strategies/plans/reports/assessments under the relevant conventions and especially under the UNCBD (including Bolivia NBSAP and the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework) as this project is a BD project. In doing so, please clearly present how the project contributes to the different goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

Done.

July 27, 2023

Done. The information on FA alignment has been removed. This should make it easier to spot the already included, and further enhanced, information on national alignment.

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

May 6, 2023:

1. The description of the knowledge management approach is not complete and refers (again) to the Prodoc. Please elaborate further in the Portal addressing the following key GEF knowledge management and learning expectations:

- i. an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept
- ii. plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations
- iii. processes to capture, assess and document information, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
- iv. tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites
- v. knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate)
- vi. a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability
- vii. plans for strategic communications and outreach

2. Please provide a budget of the knowledge management approach, including the key deliverables and a timeline (it can be presented in a table).

June 16, 2023:

1. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

2.1. In table "B. Project description summary", the GEF support to knowledge management is \$146,853 while the total budget under the knowledge management section is above \$550,000. Please explain the difference between the 2 numbers.

2.2 The total for the key deliverable below is not correct. Please correct.

| | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| At least 5,000 local stakeholders trained to promote and strengthen their good governance mechanisms | 462.500 | 157.500 | 210.000 | 157.500 |
|--|---------|---------|---------|---------|

July 28, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification and correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

2.1 while Component 4 includes the concept knowledge management in its title, it is not the only project Component that contains KM activities, which are key for the achievement of other project outcomes too. Specifically, the total for KM is composed of budget for the Outputs 1.2.1, 2.1.1, 3.2.1, and 4.1.2

2.2. Corrected, sorry for the typo.

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

May 6, 2023:

We note the ESS screening document uploaded in the document tab of the Portal. Please remove the copy of this long document in the project description of the Portal (the links provided under "Supporting Documents" are enough).

June 16, 2023:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response Done

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

May 6, 2023:

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
May 6, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
May 6, 2023:

1. No, the Annex A "Project Results Framework" is missing in the Portal entry. Please provide this Annex.
2. In the Annex E, please use the GEF template (Appendix A of the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy - GEF/C.59/Inf.03) which shows the responsible entity (executing entity) for each budget item.

June 16, 2023:

1. Thank you for providing the Annex. Please complete the Annex with the relevant GEF core indicators adding their exact names and targets where relevant. All the core indicators providing results in this project must be included in the Project Results Framework.
2. No, there is no change from the previous version. As requested in the previous review, please please use the GEF template which shows the responsible entity (executing entity) for

each budget item and includes M&E and PMC. Please also name the components and outcomes.

Appendix A: Indicative Project Budget Template

| Expenditure Category | Detailed Description | Component (USDeq.) | | | | | | | | Total (USD eq.) | Responsible Entity (Executing Entity receiving funds from the GEF Agency) ¹⁰ | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|-------|-----------------|---|-------|
| | | Component 1 | | Component 2 | | Component 3 | | Sub-Total | M & E | | | P M C |
| | | Outcome 1.1 | Outcome 1.2 | Outcome 2.1 | Outcome 2.2 | Outcome 3.1 | Outcome 3.2 | | | | | |
| Works | ... | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ... | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Goods | Equipment 1 | | | | | | | | | | e.g. Ministry of Environment | |
| | Equipment 2 | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | ... | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Vehicles | | | | | | xxx | | | xxx | x | | |
| Grants/ Sub-grants | ... | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Revolving funds/ Seed funds/ Equity | ... | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Sub-contract to executing partner/ ... | | | | | | | | | | | | |

3. Please note that in the Portal, the Project Results Framework is the Annex A (not Appendix 2) and the Budget is in Annex E (not Appendix 3).

July 27, 2023:

1. In the Project Results Framework, the GEF core indicators are missing. Please include all the relevant GEF core indicator expected results for this project mentioning the exact name of the core indicator (for instance "GEF Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity": 5,000 ha).

2. On the budget: Thank you for providing a new budget table.

2.1. In this table, please add budget items corresponding to the staff responsible for project management (project coordinator, financial specialist, eventual project assistant, etc.). We need to ensure these budget items are charged to the PMC.

2.2. The PMU is not an executing partner. Please indicate in the budget table the executing agency as identified in the project description at the very beginning under "Other Executing Partner(s)" and in the coordination section.

2.3. Please clarify what "Other Operating Costs" includes.

3. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the amendments and clarification. Nevertheless, even when zooming out, the budget table is not readable (see screenshot below). Please include a readable version ? once we can see it, last policy checking will be carried out to assess and provide comments if

appropriate (hint: the budget can be presented per component, so the table will be slimmer and will fit within the margins. Please see the proposed template already sent in a previous review on June 16).

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

September 6, 2023:

Partially. The budget table can be read now (thank you for the adjustment) but its definition remains low. As there are other comments in this review sheet, please try to copy a budget table with a better definition (for technical issues in the Portal, the Agency may want to request assistance from the GEF IT team).

September 7, 2023:

The new table is bigger than the Portal page and goes beyond the margin on the right (format issue). Please provide a table which fits within the margins of the Portal entry.

September 7, 2023:

Thank you for providing a readable budget table. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

1. The Project Results Framework is uploaded as ProDoc Appendix 2 AND CEO ER Annex A

2. The budget is included as ProDoc Appendix 3 AND CEO ER Annex E, and compliant with GEF/C.59/Inf.03

3. Attended to.

1. Done. Core indicators are explicitly included in parenthesis and bold in the corresponding target.

2.1. The items have been added.

2.2. Done.

2.3. All ?other operating costs? have been specified.

August 14, 2023

Annex E has been amended as requested. Also, the detailed table has also been provided in Excel format for ease of review. You should be able to find the file Annex E Budget.xlsx in the Portal entry.

September 7, 2023

Request has been attended. Table between frame margins

September 11, 2023

Request has been attended in Annex E at the GEF Portal .

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 6, 2023:

As mentioned above, this Annex is missing. Please complete.

June 16, 2023:

Please complete this Annex as mentioned above.

July 28, 2023:

Please complete the Project Results Framework in Annex A with the GEF core indicators as requested above.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

Done as above.

July 27, 2023

Done as above.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 5, 2023:

At PIF stage, the following comments were requested to be addressed at PPG stage and still need consideration:

1. On the Component 3 alignment, please provide the response in the relevant section of the Portal entry (the reference to the Prodoc is not enough).
2. On the risks, please refer to the Risks section of the Portal (where the comment should be addressed) and not only to the Prodoc.

June 16, 2023:

1. We don't find the clarification in the Portal. Please indicate exactly where the section has been filled and copy-paste the first sentence of the additional text in the the Agency response in the review sheet (to help the reviewer find the text).

2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

July 28, 2023:

1. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. the clarification is included in Annex B: Response to Project Reviews, along with the review of how each and all comments to PIF have been addressed.

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

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

May 6, 2023:

All the PPG amount is committed but as mentioned above, the information provided on the use of the PPG needs to be more detailed.

June 16, 2023:

Please address the remaining comments above on PPG.

July 28, 2023:

Please address the remaining comments above on PPG.

August 14, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

June 16, 2023

Done, in Annex C.

July, 27 2023

Done as above.

September 11, 2023

Request has been attended in Annex C at the GEF Portal.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 6, 2023:

As mentioned above, the geo-referenced information is missing and needs to be completed.

June 16, 2023:

Please address the remaining comments above on the geo-referenced information which is still missing.

July 28, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Done, in Annex E.

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

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

August 14, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments above. In addition, checking alignments with GEF policy and guidelines revealed the need to clarify the following elements. In doing so, please clearly indicate where the changes has been made in the text and highlight the completed/edited text in yellow to facilitate the review process.

1. On Environmental and social Safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and CAF attached the Project Concept and safeguard Triggering Preliminary Questionnaires. However, we failed to find the Environmental and Social Management Framework to manage the project's environmental and social risks and plan for further development of Environmental and Social Management Plan. Please provide an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to manage the project's environmental and social risks, particularly including indigenous peoples plan for their full engagement of the project in culturally appropriate manner and plan for further development of Environmental and Social Management Plan to address environmental and social risks at the CEO Approval stage. Indigenous Peoples Plan needs to include identification of indigenous peoples groups in the project areas, their cultural background, and relevance of indigenous peoples engagement of the project based on continuous consultation with indigenous peoples groups.

2. Geographic Location Data: In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated "GEO Location" data entry field in the portal.

3. On Gender:

? In Target 1.1.1, please reflect representation of women in the working groups;

? Indicator 1.1.2 has to be gender-responsive/incorporate gender dimensions;

? Indicator 2.2.2 - What are these "measures" referred to? Please ensure that these measures take into account gender considerations.

? Target 4.2.1 - Please ensure gender-responsive M&E.

Agency Response:

1. Done. Information from the PRODOC, in general in 4. Summary of the Ex Ante Evaluation, and in particular in epigraphs 4.3. Social analysis and stakeholder participation, and 4.4. Environmental impact, detailing the project's ESIA, ESMF (Appendix 11.pdf), and Safeguard monitoring, has been included in the Endorsement Request's epigraph 5. Risks

2. Done.

3. Done.

- Done as requested for Target 1.1.1

- Done as requested for Indicator 1.1.2

- Indicator 2.2.2 refers to biodiversity-friendly measures that promote Nature-based livelihoods, to be participatorily proposed, selected and implemented in each of four sectors (Ecosystem restoration and management, Sustainable agriculture & food production, Sustainable tourism and health & wellbeing, and Research and innovation sectors)

- Done as requested for Target 4.2.1

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 6, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the comments above considering the Portal entry is the main project document for the GEF and as such, it should include all the requested information. An improvement from the PIF document is also expected considering there was a PPG phase which lasted about 10 months.

June 16, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments. Please ensure all the comments are really addressed before resubmitting the project.

July 28, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments. For some reason, the agency responses from the previous reviews have disappeared in this review sheet. Please consider copying all the previous Agency responses so that we can see all the chain of GEF comments and Agency responses in the review sheet.

August 14, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments above. In addition, checking alignments with GEF policy and guidelines revealed the need to clarify the following elements. In doing so, please clearly indicate where the changes have been made in the text and highlight the completed/edited text in yellow to facilitate the review process.

1. On Environmental and social Safeguards: We note that the project overall ESS risk is classified as low, and CAF attached the Project Concept and safeguard Triggering Preliminary Questionnaires. However, we failed to find the Environmental and Social Management Framework to manage the project's environmental and social risks and plan for further development of Environmental and Social Management Plan. Please provide an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to manage the project's environmental and social risks, particularly including indigenous peoples plan for their full engagement of the project in culturally appropriate manner and plan for further development of Environmental and Social Management Plan to address environmental and social risks at the CEO Approval stage. Indigenous Peoples Plan needs to include identification of indigenous peoples groups in the project areas, their cultural background, and relevance of indigenous peoples engagement of the project based on continuous consultation with indigenous peoples groups.

2. Geographic Location Data: In Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates, please consider inserting the geographic location of the site directly under the dedicated 'GEO Location' data entry field in the portal.

3. On Gender:

? In Target 1.1.1, please reflect representation of women in the working groups;

- ? Indicator 1.1.2 has to be gender-responsive/incorporate gender dimensions;
- ? Indicator 2.2.2 - What are these "measures" referred to? Please ensure that these measures take into account gender considerations.
- ? Target 4.2.1 - Please ensure gender-responsive M&E.

September 6, 2023

Not yet. the comments are partially addressed. Please address the remaining comments below:

1. Thank you for the information included in the Annex 11. Nevertheless we don't find the specific information requested on indigenous peoples: plan for their full engagement in the project in culturally appropriate manner; and for the identified indigenous peoples groups in the project areas, their cultural background, and the relevance of indigenous peoples engagement in the project based on continuous consultation with indigenous peoples groups. Please complete on this aspect.
2. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.
3. The comment on Indicator 2.2.2 has not been considered in the agency response. Please clarify what these "measures" are referred to and ensure that these measures take into account gender considerations.

September 7, 2023:

1. Not addressed (the text has not changed). Please address the comment.
3. Not addressed (we don't see the new text highlighted in yellow). Please address the comment.

September 7, 2023:

1. Thank you for the additional information including on the specific arrangements for indigenous people. Cleared.
3. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

September 11, 2023:

Further checking on policy alignment revealed he need to provide clarification on the following issues:

1. in Appendix 11, we can find the CAF-GEF Project ? Project Concept and Safeguard Triggering Preliminary Questionnaire. However, we failed to find the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), which needs to explain identified environmental

and social management risks in detail and risk management measures including indigenous peoples' engagement in the project with clear action plans, timeline, and budget. Please also revise or explain: a. why it is considered that the project, which will consolidate connectivity and integration of managing the area, does not pose any risk related to economic displacement or restrictions on land/water use; and b. why it is considered that the project does not pose any risk related to the Indigenous People Safeguard Standard, when IPs have been identified in the area. Please ensure the above elements will be clarified.

2. Status of utilization of PPG: while the level of detail improved this time around, still there is one budget line (?Outsourcing to elaborate ??) that requires further detail in terms of the eligible activities that are in Guidelines ? is this an external consultant? If so, please include it.

3. Budget table: now that is readable, we have the following comments:

3.1. Budget line ?Goods? require details. Please clarify what it entails.

3.2. Budget line ?Subcontract Executing Entity? is not eligible as it is ? only activities or specific expenditures associated with the project?s execution can be covered by GEF funds (actually they can be charged to PMC, not to the components). Please clarify ensuring only eligible activities are considered here.

September 11, 2023:

Thank your providing clarification to the remaining policy issues. The CEO approval is recommended.

Review Dates

| | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|---|---|---|
| First Review | 5/6/2023 | 6/5/2023 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 6/16/2023 | 6/16/2023 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 7/28/2023 | 7/28/2023 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 8/14/2023 | 8/14/2023 |
| Additional Review (as necessary) | 9/6/2023 | 9/7/2023 |

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations