

Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program Phase 3

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11198

Countries

Regional (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Suriname, Venezuela)

Project Name

Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program Phase 3

Agencies

World Bank, UNDP, WWF-US, CI, FAO

Date received by PM

4/12/2023

Review completed by PM

5/12/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

PFD

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Program Information

a) Is the Program Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

1. The Program Commitment Deadline is missing. Please complete (it should be the expected deadline for the actual CEO endorsement of all the child projects, which is 18 months after the expected Program approval by the Council - 29 December 2024).

2. In the General Child Project Information of Brazil, the duration of the project indicated is 96 months. This is longer than the Program duration (72 months). Please correct.

May 11, 2023:

1 and 2. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

1. The Program Commitment Deadline has been added.

2. Thanks for bringing this to our attention. The information for Brazil has now been updated in order to propose a project of 48 Months.

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

2. Program Summary

a) Does the program summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the program objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Is the program's geographical coverage explicit, as well as the covered sectors? Does the summary explain how the program is transformative or innovative?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

a)

a.1. Please add the unit (million) in the sentence: "With a total Program amount of \$88.6".

a.2. The notion of "loss of socio-diversity" is unclear in the summary especially considering it is not mentioned anywhere else in the PFD. The loss of biodiversity is important to highlight considering the Program is supported by 81% from the the BD Focal Area. Please mention it explicitly and clarify the term of "socio-diversity" in the context of the ASL3.

b) In general the summary describes well the problem to be addressed and the program objectives, but misses to highlight the key outcomes/environmental benefits and the transformative and innovative nature of proposed activities. Please, include these aspects for a complete summary.

May 11, 2023:

a) and b). Thank you for the clarification and the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23

a.1. Done

a.2. Summary has been adjusted to reflect the actual meaning of social/cultural diversity with more accurate wording. The loss of biological diversity has been highlighted in the paragraph.

b. The Summary has been adjusted to better highlight the key outcomes and transformative and innovative nature of activities.

3 Indicative Program Overview

a) Is the program objective statement concise, clear and measurable?

b) Are the components and outcomes sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the program objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the program

components and appropriately funded?

d) Are the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5%? If above 5%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 20, 2023:

a) Program objective: The first sentence is the one presenting the overarching objective of the project which includes the two main pillars of improving integrated landscape conservation and sustainable management. Please complete this sentence considering also the objective of fostering regional cooperation (this is an important element to scale up and increase the impact). Also, considering the conservation of primary forest is the ultimate goal of the Program, we suggest to explicitly mention "primary forest" in the program objective.

b) In general, the components and outcomes are very clear and appropriate to achieve the program objective and the core indicators. In particular, the integrated land-use/landscape planning is an important element identified in the barriers and the TOC. Nevertheless, the project components and notably the component 3 (enabling environment) don't clearly identify this element. Please be more explicit on this aspect in one of the outcomes.

c)

c.1. There isn't any gender consideration in the indicative Program Overview. Please include explicit language in the table to reflect this dimension is appropriately taken into account and budgeted.

c.2 As commented below, the knowledge management approach needs to be more clearly specified and budgeted (as presented the outcomes focus only on enhancing the implementation capacity and strengthening cross-scale and cross-sectoral dialogue). Please amend accordingly.

d) Yes, cleared.

e) Yes, the PMC is equal to 4.3%. Cleared.

May 11, 2023:

a) and b) Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

c)

c.1. Gender dimension has not been added explicitly in the output 4.1 but we understand from the Agency response it is included and will be further develop during PPG. Cleared.

c.2. Clarification is well taken at this aggregate level. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

a. Adjustments have been made to the program objective (that was agreed with the country members) throughout the PFD. New PDO: Improved regional collaboration and national investments towards integrated landscape conservation and sustainable management in targeted areas, including primary forests in the Amazon region. (Not all interventions will happen in primary forests, for instance restoration will happen in degraded areas in buffer zones of primary forests as a key strategy for ecological connectivity.)

b. The outcome 3.1 Environmental criteria mainstreamed into policies, regulations, norms, and land use plans of other sectors to foster cross-sectoral and institutional coherence, aims to go beyond support of land use plans but to do so in a way that mainstreams environmental considerations. The menu of interventions also includes: Integrated natural resource management plans at different jurisdictions (zoning, planning, land regularization, watershed plans, tenure/access rights, climate mitigation/adaptation plans). That said, emphasis has been added in the document. Component 3 will support integrated land use planning.

c.1. Adjustments have been made to explicitly incorporate gender in the following outcomes: 2.2 Increased stakeholder capacity for and participation in sustainable value chains based on standing forests and free flowing rivers, disaggregated by gender. 3.3. Increased participation of civil society, including IPLC and women, in decision-making fora, land-use planning, project implementation and monitoring fostered at multiple administrative levels; 4.1 Enhanced knowledge and institutional implementation capacity among national and regional project stakeholders disaggregated by gender

c.2. The core of knowledge management activities will be implemented by the regional project. The full child project document will be prepared with a budget and specific detailed outcomes and ways to measure them. At aggregate level an essential outcome for KM is that the learning and exchanges enhance implementation capacity and strengthen cross-scale and cross-sectoral dialogue. Each child project will also specify details of KM activities and budgets, which at the initial aggregate level has allocated over \$16M. Preliminary outcome based indicators for KM (including in the M&E section of the PFD) are: number/type of adaptation and problem-solving cases at project level collected annually; extent of learning with and from one another among actors (and satisfaction on relevance and clarity); number of illustrative examples of action taken as a result of learning and knowledge sharing events.

4 Program Outline

A. Program Rationale

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

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

c) Is the baseline situation and baseline projects and initiatives well laid out and how the program will build on these?

d) Have lessons learned from previous efforts been considered in the program design?

e) For NGL, is there a brief description of the financial barriers and how the program ? and the proposed financial structure- responds to these financial barriers.

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2023:

a)

a.1. In paragraph 4, please indicate when the data collection began.

a.2. In paragraph 6, are the direct drivers equally important in terms of deforestation and degradation? If not please indicate which ones are the most important. This will help understand the choice of the Program main focuses and proposed interventions.

a.3. The proposal presents a well-referenced description of the problem, including a synthetic analysis of current status, threats and drivers of forest degradation in the Amazon Basin, and recognizes barriers that the program will address through the various investments. A comprehensive explanation of the thematic and spatial baseline at national and regional level is also presented. In order to support this well written section it will be important to include a map of the basin with the current forest cover, deforestation hotspots, and land use categories (PAs, Indigenous Lands, etc). Please consider adding such a map.

a.4. In the program description, much emphasis is made on the sustainable management of waters, including restoration of water habitats and aquaculture. Nevertheless it is unclear how bad management and degradation of waters affects the conservation of primary forests. Please clarify and justify the inclusion of such activities related to fresh waters in the context of this Program aiming at conserving primary forests.

b) The section on stakeholder engagement in the portal references efforts empower women and promote reduction of gender gaps. However it does not provide information

on the stakeholder consulted during PDF development (including civil society) or details on how relevant stakeholders will be engaged as part of the development and implementation of the Coordination Child projects. Please provide additional details mentioning at least the past consultation the in-person workshop in Quito in September 2022 and the virtual workshop in January 2023.

c)

c.1. The baseline is exclusively focussed on the institutional and policy relevant framework. There are also many other initiatives from bilateral and multilateral support, private sector and others the ASL can build on and/or articulate with. Please elaborate further on this baseline too, either in this section or under the Program Description where the incremental role of the ASL is presented (paragraph 33-34).

c.2. In the baseline scenario, ASL1 and ASL2 with their community of practice also constitutes an important regional initiative ASL3 will build on. Even if it is obvious, please briefly mention these previous phases in the regional baseline scenario.

d) We take note of the uploaded document on lessons learned. Nevertheless the description in the Portal should be complete and include all the required information. Please summarize in the section the lessons learned from previous efforts.

e) N/A

May 11, 2023:

a) Thank you for the clarification and additional information. Cleared.

b) Thank you for the additional information provided in the review sheet. Unfortunately, we don't find this information in the project description under the Stakeholder Engagement section (as indicated in the Agency response). We take note of the clarification in the review sheet and in the interest of efficiency of the process given the time constraint, this comment is cleared.

c)

c.1 and c.2. Thank you for the clarification and additional information. Cleared.

d) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

a.1. Data collection on deforestation in the Amazon began in 1970. This information has been added as a footnote in the PFD.

a.2. It is not possible to make such assessment to isolate one driver and measure its contribution to deforestation and degradation. Some drivers enhance others. Also conditions for each country and even at subnational level vary. Thus, the need to remain with a more general argument of the main drivers. The proposed interventions will address the main drivers also bearing in mind that some forces behind deforestation are beyond the Program's scope of action (like internal civil conflicts).

a.3. Thanks for the recommendation. Maps have been added in the PFD (figures 1 and 2).

a.4. The program will not restore water habitats. Further information on the role of water/freshwater ecosystems in support of healthy primary forests and a wide range of ecosystems in the Amazon has been added to the PFD. Freshwater ecosystems play a critical role in supporting the health and vitality of primary forests by providing essential hydration for trees and flora, as well as promoting the growth and sustainability of the diverse ecosystems in the Amazon region.

b. The short timeline to prepare the PFD and child projects did not allow for a full stakeholder consultation, much less FPIC when needed. However, as mentioned in the PFD (section Stakeholder Engagement), consultations for the third phase of the Program initiated with the ASL1/ASL2 annual conference held in Puenbo, Ecuador, in September 2022, where key stakeholders from the current Program, but also NGOs and an indigenous leader started building a common vision for ASL3. The process was later refined in a workshop with key stakeholders from Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, and Suriname as well as representatives from GEF agencies, experts in conservation and natural resources sustainable management, and representatives from the donor community (Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation, Bezos Earth Fund and Green Climate Fund). In January 25, 2023 a virtual workshop also enhanced preparation. After GEF Council approval of the PFD, the coordination child project will be prepared and workshops/consultations will be held with government representatives, GEF agencies, executing agencies and potential partners. As per the regional project, as indicated in the concept note and PFD the project will be prepared with active involvement of a working group comprising key country representatives and other partners such as scientists from the Science Panel for the Amazon and in alignment with complementary projects that other agencies finance. It will also continue its demand-driven approach, allowing stakeholders from child projects during implementation to prioritize their needs, for impactful activities and for ensuring buy-in, a key strength of the ASL Program.

c.1. The ASL3 Program includes the work developed by regional entities such as the Amazon Cooperation Treaty Organization (ACTO), the Coordinator of Indigenous Organizations of the Amazon River Basin (COICA), and the Governor's Climate and Forest Task Force. Numerous technical initiatives and projects exist as well, including the Inter-American Development Bank's Amazon Initiative (including the GCF funded Bioeconomy fund), the International Climate Initiative (IKI), the European Union's Amazonia 2.0, the Science Panel for the Amazon (SPA), the Amazonian Georeferenced Socio-Environmental Information Network (RAISG), WWF Amazon Regional Initiative,

WCS Amazon Waters Initiative, the Brazilian Amazon Fund, Amazon Investor Coalition, USAID's Amazon Regional Environment Program, the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation's Andes-Amazon Initiative, and the Bezos Earth Fund, among others. The World Bank is also designing a broader Amazon Initiative to scale up ASL and integrate other larger Amazon related interventions from multiple sectors. The proposed program further builds on its previous phases, which have laid the foundation for the upcoming ASL phase 3, by establishing partnerships, building capacity, and implementing a range of activities focused on biodiversity and forest conservation, sustainable land use, and community development in the Amazon region.

c.2. This has been added. The proposed program further builds on its previous ASL1 and ASL2 phases, including their communities of practice, which have laid the foundation for the upcoming ASL phase 3, by establishing partnerships, building capacity, and implementing a range of activities focused on biodiversity and forest conservation, sustainable land use, and community development in the Amazon region.

d. This has been summarized.

WB 5/17/23:

We apologize that the wrong content was included in the Stakeholder Engagement section of the portal. This has been corrected.

5 B. Program Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the program logic, including how the program design elements are contributing to the objective, a set of identified key causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences?

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

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Have the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline programs been described? Is the program incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)?

e) Are the relevant levers of transformation identified and described?

f) Is there an adequate description on how relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) will contribute to the design and implementation of the program and its components?

g) Gender: Does the description on gender issues identify any differences, gaps or opportunities linked to program objectives and have these been taken up in component description/s?

h) Are the proposed elements to capture, exchange and disseminate knowledge and lessons learned adequate in order to benefit future programs? Are efforts for strategic communication adequately described?

i) Policy Coherence: How will the program support participating countries to improve, develop and align policies, regulations or subsidies to not counteract the intended program outcomes?

Secretariat's Comments

April 22, 2023:

a)

a.1 The first paragraph presents results of ASL1 in terms of some limited GEBs (deforestation avoided and GHG emission mitigation). It would be useful to clarify the outcomes which allowed such GEBs: number of new PAs, area of improved management, success in enhancing the financial sustainability of PAs, improved governance and institutional frameworks, development of sustainable value chains, conservation or restoration of corridors... This would clarify what concretely can be done successfully and strengthened to achieve the results and help justify the proposed components and outcomes in the TOC.

a.2. The description of the TOC is mainly focussed on the evolution of the ASL3 as compared to previous phases. While this is indeed critical, there is no clear explanation of the logic and causal pathways from the problems and barriers to the solutions enabling the achievement of the objectives. Please briefly elaborate on the key causal pathways underlying the TOC.

a.3. The PFD provides an encompassing theory of change that frames the overall program investment strategy, including key assumptions, and a clear description of project components, expected outcomes and supporting activities. However, given the third phase of the program it would be important to further highlight in the description what has changed, what is happening to the Amazon, and what the program will do to counteract the fast-approaching tipping point and keep the Amazon ecosystems integrity intact.

a.4. Only Component 3 mentions primary forests. Considering the overarching objective of the program is the conservation of primary forests, please be more explicit on this

aspect in the program description and notably in the component 1 and 3 which include conservation objectives.

a.5. As presented in table 1, Suriname is the only country seeking to increase the protected area of globally significant forest. This is not aligned with all the other countries which adopted the new GBF (especially for Colombia, Ecuador which are like Suriname well below the 30% of protected areas). Please clarify stronger how this program will contribute to the implementation of the GBF for all the participating countries including in terms of increasing the area of protected areas.

a.6. Under component 2 description. please revise the following sentence which is not clear: "building capacity of farmers, local authorities and others for and...".

a.7. Please write the full name of the acronyms when they are not obvious (such as "PIPs" in Peru).

b) Yes, considering the comment above on lessons learned is addressed. Cleared.

c) Yes, the proposed solutions and critical assumptions are well presented, including a "menu of interventions" to be adjusted to country specificities. The program approach is well justified, building on, complementing and scaling the previous ASL phases. Cleared.

d) The incremental reasoning is briefly mentioned particularly as compared to ASL1 and ASL2. Please elaborate further in the incremental role of the ASL3 from a business as usual perspective which includes the broader baseline situation. For CEO endorsement, it will also be important that each child project expand the incremental reasoning with more detailed information on the national context and articulate the links to this regional vision.

e) Yes, the transformation levers are well identified and presented throughout the program description. Cleared.

f) The description of the program focuses on the strategy and supported activities. It remains unclear how relevant stakeholders will contribute to the implementation of the program and its components (except for women to some extent). Please elaborate on this aspect in one new paragraph under each component.

g) Yes, cleared.

h) Yes, considering the comment below on knowledge management is addressed. Cleared.

i) The description highlights well the intersectoral coordination, the mainstreaming of environmental concerns, and regional cooperation/coordination as drivers for policy coherence. Cleared.

May 11, 2023:

a) Thank you for the clarification and additional information. Cleared.

d) Thank you for the considering the comment. Cleared.

f) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

a.1. Many thanks for bringing this to our attention, the team has now added further information to the PFD (Program Description section) to clarify, in concrete terms, what the program is able to achieve and in support of the proposed components and ToC.

a.2. Current efforts in the Amazon, while necessary, have not been sufficient to contain the environmental threats and ensure the Amazon biome continues delivering global environmental benefits. Growing deforestation from anthropogenic sources demonstrate the urgency for more transformative change to safeguard and sustainably use the wealth of natural resources provided by the complex and unique Amazonian ecosystems. Insufficient multi-stakeholder dialogue and coordination across different scales and sectors to harmonize governance and policies across the region, including at local, decentralized levels, have not been able to bring existent changes to scale. The Program aims to address these issues and safeguard the integrity of the Amazon biome through four pillars of work: conservation under different protection regimes; sustainable production and restoration; reinforcement of enabling environment; and promotion of capacity building, communications, and regional cooperation. These four pillars will address key barriers to tackle the issues that risk the Amazon integrity, some of which are beyond the scope of individual child projects? capacity. These include shortcomings in the institutional framework, management, and financing for areas under various forms of protection, including protected areas, indigenous territories, Ramsar sites, among others. Similarly, there are shortcomings in the governance structures, policies and legal frameworks that promote integrated conservation and sustainable development, as well as in the enforcement capacity to address illegal activities. Knowledge gaps and insufficient integration of scientific, traditional, and local knowledge in decision making, also are barriers, as are difficulties with market access for sustainable value chains, among others. These barriers impede the transformational change necessary to achieve the ASL Program objectives and longer-term vision.

a.3. The PFD includes a description of what has changed (threats, drivers and uncertain future as well the evolution from previous phases), what the program will do counteract is explained with the components that have been designed to target the existent barriers. The PFD also acknowledges that the ASL will contribute to address drivers that

are causing the negative progress towards tipping point; however there are matters beyond program control and were coordination with other efforts will be essential.

a.4. Stronger reference to primary forest has been made.

a.5. This recommendation will be sent to countries to consider during project preparation. The countries will contribute with GBF targets beyond the one of creating new PAs which require a strong political commitment. The lead agency has promoted this but it is the governments' sovereign decision. Some countries like Colombia have already reached 30% of its territory under protection and the Amazon biome already has close to 50% of its area under protected areas and indigenous territories combined. Each country had the opportunity to internally discuss and decide on their own priorities and needs. There is information that Brazil and Ecuador might consider creation of new protected areas but not with GEF but complementary funding and to be confirmed during project preparation. Child projects will contribute to GBF beyond creation of PAs.

a.6. The sentence has been improved: "... building capacity of farmers, local authorities and other stakeholders in order to promote sustainable, forest- and freshwater-friendly businesses ?."

a.7. This has been amended. For the case of PIP: Public Investment Programming (Green PIPs)

d. The information has been improved and the recommendation will be shared for each child project during project preparation. The GEF funds will provide incremental value across a range of project interventions to increase the terrestrial and freshwater area under effective protection, reduce deforestation, restore degraded areas, and promote sustainable and ecologically connected landscapes at the national and regional level. The co-financing leveraged from multilateral, bilateral, development agencies, grants from private donors, contributions from the UN Agencies country programs, and, potentially, partnerships with the private sector, will complement this. Addressing current threats and drivers require a coordinated, multi-country approach that considers the interdependent parts of the entire system, the root causes of challenges facing the Amazon, and the sub-regional contexts, which is what ASL3 hopes to facilitate and one of the key elements of its incremental justification. The regional platform will enable that regional coordination that stand alone initiatives lack and is a key incremental value to this new program.

f. We have added new paragraphs under each component making reference to relevant stakeholders that will contribute to the implementation of the program and its components. We trust this will provide further clarity regarding the involvement of different stakeholders in the implementation of the ASL 3 Program. each national and regional child projects will prepare SEP.

5.2 Program coherence and consistency

a) How will the program design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and allow for adaptive management needs and options?

b) Is the potential for achieving transformative change through the integrated approach adequately described? How is the program going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

c) Are the countries or themes selected as child projects under the program appropriate for achieving the overall program objective?

d) Are the descriptions of child projects adequately reflective of the program objective and priorities as described in the ToC?

e) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate to meet the program objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2023:

a) This third phase of the ASL program is innovative in is expanding investments across eight Amazonian countries to respond to key drivers of deforestation and environmental degradation in the region and harmonize sectoral government policies that impact the region. Interventions will not simply focus on specific sites only but rather on mechanisms and enabling conditions, to be enhanced by collaboration of the countries to improve the policy, regulatory and legal frameworks guiding development in the region. Please, indicate the elements of the project design that will ensure resilience and allow for adaptive management in face of changes in the national and regional context.

b) Yes, the use of the four levers of transformation are presented throughout the Program description and indicators to monitor the transformation potential are identified (table 5).
cleared.

c) Yes, selected countries and themes are aligned with the overall program objective.
Cleared.

d)

d.1. The Concept note of Bolivia refers to an annex 3 which doesn't exist (this annex only exist for Venezuela). Please provide the annexes of the Bolivia Concept note.

d.2. In the Concept notes of Suriname and Venezuela, the order of the components is different than the one of the PFD (there is a switch between component 1 and 2). Is there any reason for that? Also for some countries like Bolivia, the alignment with the Program and its component is not clearly presented. To facilitate the understanding of how the national child projects contribute to the Program, please ensure all the concept note clearly and explicitly refers to all the Program components and if possible in the same order.

e) Yes, cleared.

May 11, 2023:

a) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

d)

d.1. We don't find the Annex 3 of Bolivia Concept Note. Nevertheless, considering this Annex is not required at this stage, the comment is cleared.

d.2. Thank you for the consideration of the alignment of the components including at PPG phase. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

a. To ensure the success of the Program and its child projects, it will be crucial to adapt to changes in national and regional contexts. To achieve this, ASL 3 will implement a multi-faceted approach that includes: (i) Involving and empowering technical teams that are typically stable through periods of political change. Such teams can provide continuity to the project while also helping it adapt to new situations; (ii) facilitating dialogue and participation of indigenous communities, local communities, and stakeholders. This helps foster ownership and participation in national projects and enables feedback to be incorporated into program planning and implementation (ensuring that the program continues to be responsive to their needs and priorities); (iii) Partnering with NGOs that have deep roots in the communities they serve and are traditionally resilient to political changes at the national level. These partnerships will help ensure continuity and stability during periods of political transition while also providing valuable expertise and support to the benefit of project and program implementation; (iv) Regular monitoring and evaluation of the program to assess its progress, identify areas for improvement, and make necessary adjustments; (v) Establishing strong partnerships with government agencies including multicountry like ACTO and COICA, and ensuring that the program remains aligned with national and regional policies and strategies to promote sustainability and long-term impact.

d.1. Bolivia Annex 3 is the Theory of Change, this has been uploaded.

d.2. Bolivia and Suriname adjusted their components. Venezuela will do so during project preparation. As indicated by the GEF Agency, a readjustment will require additional discussion and work with national counterparts, so commitment has been made to address this during project preparation.

WB 5/17/23:

Annex 3 of the Bolivia Concept Note is included in the compilation of child project concept notes (p.23).

5.3 Program Governance, Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Programs

a) Are the program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has a program level organogram / diagram been included, with description of roles and responsibilities, and decision-making processes?

b) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs (such as government, private sector and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the program area, e.g.).

Secretariat's Comments

April 22, 2023:

a) For the regional coordination project, the arrangement in Venezuela with FAO needs to be briefly indicated. Please complete.

b) The coordination and cooperation with non-GEF financed initiatives, projects/programs are not mentioned. Please elaborate further on this aspect. It is particularly important to build synergies with other donors.

May 11, 2023:

a) Thank you for clarifying this important aspect during the PPG phase.

b) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

a. This specific arrangement is yet to be refined and discussed with FAO. It will be included in the preparation of the regional project with political sensitivity.

b. Besides coordination with other initiatives at national level, regional partnerships will be established both during regional project design but also during implementation, as themes and activities are prioritized by key program stakeholders. Some of the preliminary identified non-GEF funded projects/programs to coordinate with include: Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation's Amazon Andes Initiative, Inter-American Development Bank Amazon Initiative, projects from WWF Amazon regional unit, TNC projects in the Amazon, the Amazon Georeferenced Socio-Environmental Information

Network (RAISG), Andes Amazon Monitoring Project, USAID's Amazon Regional Environment Program, WCS Amazon Waters Initiative, Nia Tero Amazonia program, projects from Amazon Regional Alliance for the control of illegal gold mining, and projects within the scope of the North Amazon Alliance. This has been added in the section on Framework for overall Program governance and coordination.

5.4 Program-level Results, Monitoring and Reporting

a) Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified? Does the PFD describe how it will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits which would not have accrued without the GEF program?

b) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01/GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

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

d) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the program at the global, national and local levels sufficiently described?

e) Is the described approach to program level M&E aiming to achieve coherence across child projects and to allow for adaptative management?

Secretariat's Comments

April 22, 2023:

a) Yes, the description of how the Program will support the generation of multiple environmental benefits is provided throughout the Program description and notably under the components 1 and 2. Cleared.

b) and c)

c.1. The development of OECMs is an important element of the Program strategy. It is in particular presented as one important evolution of ASL3 as compared to ASL1 and 2. Nevertheless only Bolivia and Peru include targets for OECMs (Indicator 4.5). Please explain why the other countries doesn't consider this option despite its importance in the Program strategy. Please note the Program description says: "Under the Program, countries will more fully embrace additional effective conservation measures (OECMs)". This is not reflected in the reported indicators. Please consider the relevance of adding a target for this indicator in the countries which didn't considered it so far.

c.2. The creation of new PAs is also an important element of the Program strategy, especially for its scale-up ambition and in the context of the new GBF as indicated above

(Indicator 1.1). Nevertheless only Suriname include a target for this core indicator. Please explain why the other countries doesn't consider this option despite its importance in the Program strategy and for the implementation of the GBF.

c.3. In Bolivia, nearly all the WDPA ID are missing (for core indicators 1.2/PAs and 4.5/OECMs). Please complete.

c.4. In Bolivia, the calculation of the GHG emission mitigation is unclear. Please clarify the methodology used and the calculation. Please explain why a recognized and widely used methodology (such as Ex-ACT tool for instance) is not used.

c.5. In Brazil, there is no restoration target and notably for the Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration. Please consider a relevant restoration target or explain why it is not relevant for this child project.

c.6. In Brazil, there is a target under the Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes under third-party certification incorporating biodiversity considerations but there is no Type/Name of Third Party Certification reported. Please complete.

c.7. In Brazil, the estimated GHG emission mitigation is by far too low. Also, the estimate has to be made over a 20 years period (and not 6 years as reported in the Portal). Please revise the calculation as needed and consider a more ambitious target.

c.8. In Colombia, some WDPA ID are missing (core indicator 1.2). Please complete.

c.9. In Colombia, the estimated GHG emission mitigation is relatively low (especially considering the high level of co-financing as investments mobilized). Please check the assumptions and consider more ambitious targets for these child projects. Also, the estimate has to be made over a 20 years period (and not 6 years as reported in the Portal). Please revise the calculation as needed.

c.10. In Ecuador, some WDPA ID are missing (core indicator 1.2). Please complete.

c.11. In Ecuador there isn't any estimate for the GHG emission mitigation. Please provide an estimate at PFD stage (please note this estimate is not definitive and will be revised at CEO endorsement stage).

c.12. In Peru, all the WDPA ID are missing (core indicator 1.2). Please complete.

c.13. In Peru, the restoration is only considered for agricultural lands. There is no target for the Indicator 3.2 Area of forest and forest land under restoration. Please consider all relevant restoration targets or explain why forest restoration is not relevant for this child project.

c.14. In Peru, the calculation of the GHG emission mitigation is unclear. Please clarify the methodology used and the calculation. Please explain why a recognized and widely used methodology (such as Ex-ACT tool for instance) is not used.

c.15 In Suriname, WDPA ID is missing (core indicator 1.1). Please complete.

c.16. In Suriname, the estimated GHG emission mitigation is relatively low. Please check the assumptions and consider more ambitious targets for this child project. Also, the estimate has to be made over a 20 years period (and not 5 years as reported in the Portal). Please revise the calculation as needed.

c.17. Venezuela doesn't have any core indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices). This doesn't appear aligned with the Program strategy as areas outside the PAs are also expected to be considered. Please clarify and complete.

d) Yes, this is one of the main focus of Component 2. Cleared.

e) Yes through component 4. Cleared.

May 11, 2023:

c.1, c.2, c.3, Thank you for the completing information as available and for planned further improvements during PPG phase, Cleared.

c.4. The expected result for CI 6 is very high and will need to be reconsidered during the PPG phase. Cleared.

c.5. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

c.6. Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

c.7. Thank you for the clarification. The calculation of CI.6 will be requested at PPG stage to justify the result. Cleared.

c.8. Thank you for the completing information as available and for planned further improvements during PPG phase. Cleared.

c.9. Thank you for the consideration and amendments. Cleared.

c.10. Thank you for the completing information as available and for planned further improvements during PPG phase. Cleared.

c.11. Thank you for the consideration and amendments. Cleared.

c.12. Thank you for the completing information as available. Cleared.

c.13. Thank you for the clarification and for considering potential forest restoration during PPG phase. Cleared.

c.14. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

c.15. Thank you for the completing information as available. Cleared.

c.16. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

c.17. Thank you for the clarificaton and considering further analysis during PPG.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

c.1. Thanks for bringing this to our attention. This recommendation will be sent to countries for a detail review and improvement during project preparation. Several projects are working in configurations that are OECM like, but that are not necessarily formally defined as such. For the particular case of Colombia, the indicator had not been properly registered and now has been added with 1,811,915 Ha of OECMs supported (despite some not officially registered yet). For Suriname Indicator 4.5 was revised. The child project will contribute to the creation of two terrestrial OECMs in west Suriname: a) Kabalebo and b) Bakhuiys. The area and type of each OECM will be determined during the PPG phase in consultation with local stakeholders.

c.2. This recommendation will be sent to countries to consider during project preparation. The countries will contribute with GBF targets beyond the one of creating new PAs which require a strong political commitment. The lead agency has promoted this but its government's sovereign decision. Some countries like Colombia have already reached 30% of its territory under protection and the Amazon biome already has close to 50% of its area under protected areas and indigenous territories combined. Each country had the opportunity to internally discuss and decide on their own priorities and needs. There is information that Brazil and Ecuador might consider creation of new protected areas but not with GEF but complementary funding and to be confirmed during project preparation.

c.3. For Bolivia, WDPA-IDs have now been completed, as available. Registration of some OECMs are yet to be conducted or determined following proper consultations during project preparation and implementation.

c.4. The new version of the Bolivian CN now makes explicit reference to the use of the Carbon Balance Tool (EX-ACT) in estimating the mitigation benefits over a period of 20 years (the EX-ACT spreadsheets are attached separately in Annex 7, Annex 8 lists the assumptions considered for these estimations).

c.5. The Brazilian Ministry of Environment informed the ASL Team that the restoration target is contemplated in the restoration initiatives under the GEF-PROVEG proposal for

Brazil, which has been submitted to the GEF in its GEF 8 cycle. A footnote has been added to the CN for Brazil in order to clarify this.

c.6. A target was incorrectly entered for CI 4.2 when this should have been under CI 4.3. This has been corrected.

c.7. The Brazilian Government has indicated that the estimation of this target was performed considering the amount of project resources, territorial scope, the need to avoid double counting with PAs supported in other phases, and the information available at this time to render these estimates. Further clarification was provided on the time horizon on which the GHG Emissions reduction estimates were based, clarifying that these have been done for a 20 years timeframe.

c.8. For Colombia, WDPA-IDs have now been completed, as available. Registration of some OECMs are yet to be conducted or determined following proper consultations during project preparation and implementation.

c.9. The estimated GHG emission reduction calculations for Colombia have now been adjusted in order to reflect the country's ambition. The estimates have been adjusted to a time horizon of over a 20 years.

c.10. WDPA IDs have been added for Ecuador, as available.

c.11. The estimated GHG emission mitigation calculations for Ecuador have now been performed. The estimates have been made to fit in a time horizon of over a 20 years.

c.12. WDPA IDs have been added for Peru, as available.

c.13. The Government of Peru clarified that the actors involved identified agricultural land restoration as an opportunity under the ASL Program. The feasibility of adding forest and forest land restoration activities will be assessed in the PPG stage, after field assessments and consultation with local actors.

c.14. After consultation with the Government of Peru, further clarification was provided and pointed to the fact that the project for Peru estimates avoided GHG emissions based on MINAM's Forest Emissions Reference Level for reducing deforestation in the Amazon Biome and this figure will be validated in the PPG phase. The project uses the same methods, sources, and emission factors as the country's Forest Reference Emissions Level (NREF) and GHG inventory (INGEI) reports, following IPCC guidelines to align with national GHG emissions reports. The national emission factors for deforestation calculations are precise, based on the National Forest Inventory and scientific research in the Peruvian Amazon.

c.15. The WDPA ID for Core Indicator 1.1 and 1.2 have been added. WDPA ID for OECM are to be determined.

c.16. The estimated GHG emission mitigation benefit only considers emissions reduction associated with forest degradation, as the project target geography is highly forested and presents minimal deforestation; thus, the original assumptions are the same. The estimate has been made for a 20-year period for a total of 9,623,508 metric tons of CO₂e mitigated. The Excel file for core indicators was updated accordingly. The estimated GHG emission mitigation will be revised once more during the PPG phase.

c.17. For CI4 in Venezuela, the area preliminarily identified for direct intervention in areas adjacent to the protected areas (ABRAEs) is 50 hectares. As reported by the MINEC and considering that it is difficult to access these areas, the project foresees direct intervention in areas with communities living in areas with important biodiversity, with river or land access, and with indigenous people willing to participate in the project. During project formulation, further analysis will be done to evaluate increasing the area outside ABRAEs that can be directly intervened and reported accordingly.

5.5 Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes

- a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the program identified and adequately described? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) Are the key risks and mitigation measures that might affect implementation and the achievement of outcomes adequately rated?**

- c) Are environmental and social risks and impacts adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

April 22, 2023:

a) The climate risk is too briefly described. The proposal says "projected climate change patterns in the Amazon may have strong impacts on the water cycle in the region as well as on the forest ecosystems". At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at biome or country level (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available), list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios and identify mitigation measures. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) Yes, cleared.

May 11, 2023:

a) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

a. More information has been added in the risk section. This includes: Increased climate variability and change affects biodiversity, including forest dynamics, carbon cycling, freshwater, and coastal ecosystems in the Amazon region. In this context, multiple interactions and reinforcing loops manifest in complex ways through changes in climate, forcing, biophysical, and biogeochemical feedbacks across different spatial and temporal scales. This renders the Amazon as one of the world's most at-risk regions, where possibly more than 90 percent of species could be exposed to unprecedented temperatures by 2100. Furthermore, existing gaps in knowledge related to carbon balance are significant, including the role of forest degradation and natural photosynthesis enhancements.

Climate change, as an overarching and existential threat may also reduce the impact of positive actions under the program, as these may not lead to intended outcomes due to climate related hysteresis effects (i.e., delayed climate change effects, and evolving changes that can push the entire system into functioning under entirely different operating conditions). Combined with deforestation, increased climate variability and change can cause 58 percent decline of tree species richness by 2050. Climate change is expected to significantly affect forest dynamics in the region, with the potential to -reshape much of the structure, carbon content, and species composition of standing and primary Amazonian forests. Anthropogenic climate change is also expected to severely alter forest dynamics across the entire region. Over the long-term, projected climate change patterns in the Amazon may have strong impacts on the water cycle in the region as well as on the forest ecosystems which will ultimately impact regional and global climate.

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

6.1 a) Is the program adequately aligned with Focal Area and IP Elements, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

***For IPs: is the program adequately aligned with the Integrated Program goals and objectives as outlined in the GEF 8 programming directions?**

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2023:

Yes, but as requested above, the focus on water management needs to be clarified and justified. cleared.

Agency's Comments

b) Child project selection criteria: Are the criteria for child project selection sound and transparently laid out?

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2023:

Yes, all the country child projects and identified landscapes are part of the Amazon basin.
Cleared.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the program alignment/coherent with country / regional / global priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2023:

In the Portal under section C, the "Figure 4 ? Linking Contributions of Program Components to GBF Action-oriented Global Targets" can't be seen. Please ensure this figure is properly copied.

May 11, 2023:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

This has been corrected.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat's Comments

April 21, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Environmental and Social Safeguards

Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal? (annex D)

Secretariat's Comments

April 22, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8 Other Requirements

Knowledge Management

8.1 Has the agency confirmed that a project level approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been included in the PFD?

Secretariat's Comments

April 22, 2023:

1. While an overall approach to Knowledge Management and Learning has been provided in the Program description and some communications activities are mentioned in Component 4, there is no reference to an overall Communications Strategy/Plan for the Program. Please include a brief description of a Communications Strategy/Plan for awareness raising and dissemination of program outputs/results, including outreach & dissemination to/from child projects, and also explain how this strategy/plan builds on/learns from previous phases. This should also be properly budgeted into the Program.

2. The ASL Program has established a strong model for regional collaboration, capacity building and knowledge management. The results of this collaboration, be it in national policies, monitoring, assessments, research, and other areas, needs to be captured and evaluated for its impacts. There is an important link to the program's monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management strategies that needs to be elaborated. Please, include text on how program will continue to guide innovation and transformative impacts in the national and regional context.

May 11, 2023:

1 and 2. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

1. Information has been provided in Component 4 description about the communication strategy.
2. This has been made explicit with further information added to the PFD.

9 Annexes

Financing Tables (Annex A and Annex H)

9.1 GEF Financing Table:

a) Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Country STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

IP Set Aside

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

IP Contribution

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

For Child Project Financing information (Annex H)

- b) Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? Are the IP contributions aligned with the Program? The allocated amounts (including Agency Fee) match those in LoE?**
- c) Project Preparation Grant Table: Are the IP Matching Incentives amounts correctly calculated according to the country STAR focal areas? allocated amounts? The allocated amounts (including PPG Fee) match those in LoE? Is the requested PPG within the authorized limits set in Guidelines? (pop up information?) If above the limits, has an exception been sufficiently substantiated?**
- d) Sources of Funds Table: Are the allocated sources of funds for each and every one of the three STAR Focal Areas within the Country's STAR envelope by the time of the last review?**
- e) Indicative Focal Area Elements Table: (For IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area element corresponds to the respective IP?**
- f) (For non-IPs) The selected Indicative Focal Area Elements are aligned with the respective Program?**
- g) Co-financing Table: Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing provided and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

b) No more than 1/3 of the STAR allocations are used in the child projects. The IP contributions are aligned with the Program. Cleared.

c) Yes, cleared.

d) Yes, cleared.

e) Yes, cleared.

f) N/A

g)

•g.1. Grant is normally classified as ?investment mobilized? . Please revise the below which is classified as ?recurrent expenditures?, and change it to ?investment mobilized?.

Others

Fundación Gordon y Betty Moore (Proyectos en cartera de la
Iniciativa Andes – Amazonía)

Grant

Recurrent
expenditures

g.2. Please complete the name of co-financier and the investment mobilized filed in below or remove it

Civil Society Organization	TBD	Other
----------------------------	-----	-------

- g.3. Below, please include only "Green Climate Fund" and revise "GEF Agency" to "Donor Agency" on first column (if there is only 1 fund) or decouple the co-financing from WWF and GCF and enter them separately (if there are 2 funds).

GEF Agency	Green Climate Fund - WWF	Grant	Investment mobilized
------------	--------------------------	-------	----------------------

May 11, 2023:

g.1, g.2 and g.3. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

g.1. We have revised the relevant section accordingly to ensure that the grant is accurately reflected as investment mobilized. Thank you for bringing this to our attention. This specific case related to Peru and for funds under a Moore Foundation Grant.

g.2. Done. This cofinancing for Suriname refers to Suriname Conservation Foundation which has been added in the portal.

g.3. This is a project from GCF that will go to finance Heritage Colombia (Protected area management financial mechanism). Adjustment has been made,

9.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG): if PPG for child projects has been requested: has the PPG table been included and properly filled out adding up to the correct PPG and PPG fee totals as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

9.3 Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation

Does the table represent the sum of STAR allocations sources utilized for this program?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

9.4 Indicative Focal Area Elements

For non-IP Programs

Does the table contain the sum of focal area elements and amounts as per the sum of the child projects?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

9.5 Indicative Co-financing

Are the indicative amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequate and reflect the ambition of the program? Has the subset of co-finance which are expected to be investment mobilized been identified and defined (FI/GN/01)?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, but we encourage the GEF Agencies to further explore more cofinancing during the PPG phase as its ratio compared to GEF investment is currently 1:6.2 while the co-financing target at corporate level which is 1:7. The co-financing ratio is particularly low for Bolivia and Suriname. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

9.6 Has the program and its respective child project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

1. In the table "Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):" the link to the endorsement letters from Bolivia, Brazil and Colombia is missing. Please complete.
2. Please provide an explicit and clear name to the uploaded LoE from Brazil, Colombia and Ecuador so that they can be identified easier in the document section of the Portal.
3. In the LoE from Colombia, there is no PPG requested amount corresponding to the IP incentive while it is the case in the financing table. Please ensure consistency between the LoE and the Portal.
4. In the LoE from Brazil, the signatory is Mr. Andr? Luiz Campos De Andrade while in GEF database the OFP is Ms. Livia Farias Ferreira de Oliveira. Please ensure the signatory of the LoE is the OFP.
5. In the case of Bolivia, there is the need to revise the LoE to reflect the current sources of funds numbers in Portal.

UNDP	GET	Bolivia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	13,430,045.00
UNDP	GET	Bolivia	Climate Change	CC STAR Allocation	2,169,955.00

Please provide a new LOE for Bolivia reflecting the current sources of funds numbers in the Portal.

6. On the Peru child project: please change the GEF financing table and PPG table so that country STAR allocation by BD, CC, and LD match with Sources of funds table:

IP child list							Sources of funds					GEF financing table and PPG table					Differences				
Child ID	Country	Parent IP ID	Parent IP Name	BD STAR Allocation	CC STAR Allocation	LD STAR Allocation	Grand Total	Child ID	BD STAR Allocation: IPs	CC STAR Allocation: IPs	LD STAR Allocation: IPs	Grand Total	Child ID	BD STAR Allocation: IPs	CC STAR Allocation: IPs	LD STAR Allocation: IPs	Grand Total				
11203	Peru	11198	Amazon Sustaini	6,976,000	2,024,000	1,000,000	10,000,000	11203	6,976,000	1,000,000	2,024,000	10,000,000	11203	-	1,024,000	(1,024,000)	-				

May 11, 2023:

1. Thank you for adding the missing links. Cleared.
2. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.
3. Thank you for the amendment and new LoE. Cleared.
4. Thank you for providing a new LoE signed by the OFP from Brazil. Cleared.
5. Thank you for providing a new LoE signed by the OFP from Bolivia. Cleared.

6. The financing numbers are not yet aligned for the Peru child project. Please change the financing table and the PPG table so that total CC STAR Allocation reaches \$2,024,000 while total LD STAR Allocation reaches \$1,000,000 to match with the Sources of funds table. We also need a revised Letter of Endorsement to match with these numbers in the Sources of funds table:

GEF Financing Table										
Indicative Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds										
GEF Agen-Trust Func	Country/ Focal Area	Programming of Funds	GEF Program Financing(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total GEF Financing(\$)	Financing + PPG	Fee + PPG Fee	Total costs		
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Biodiversi BD STAR Allocation: IPs	6,243,040	561,874	6,804,914.00	6,400,000	576,000	6,976,000	
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Biodiversi BD IP Matching Incentives	2,081,013	187,291	2,268,304.00	2,133,333	191,999	2,325,332	
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Climate C CC STAR Allocation: IPs	894,931	80,544	975,475.00	917,431	82,569	1,000,000	financing table and PPG table to be changed to \$2,024,000
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Climate C IP Matching Incentives	298,310	26,848	325,158.00	305,810	27,523	333,333	
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Land Degr LD STAR Allocation: IPs	1,811,341	163,020	1,974,361.00	1,856,881	167,119	2,024,000	financing table and PPG table to be changed to \$1,000,000
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Land Degr LD IP Matching Incentives	603,780	54,340	658,120.00	618,560	55,706	674,666	
Total GEF Resources(\$)			11,932,415.00	1,073,917.00	13,006,332.00		12,232,415	1,100,916	13,333,331	
Project Preparation Grant (PPG)										
GEF Agen-Trust Func	Country/ Focal Area	Programming of Funds	PPG(\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total PPG Funding(\$)					
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Biodiversi BD STAR Allocation: IPs	156,960	14,126	171,086.00				
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Biodiversi BD IP Matching Incentives	52,320	4,708	57,028.00				
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Climate C CC STAR Allocation: IPs	22,500	2,025	24,525.00				
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Climate C IP Matching Incentives	7,500	675	8,175.00				
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Land Degr LD STAR Allocation: IPs	45,540	4,099	49,639.00				
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Land Degr LD IP Matching Incentives	15,180	1,366	16,546.00				
Total PPG Amount			300,000.00	26,999.00	326,999.00					
Please provide justification										
Sources of Funds for Country STAR Allocation										
GEF Agen-Trust Func	Country/ Focal Area	Source of Funds	Total(\$)	LOE						
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Biodiversi BD STAR Allocation	6,976,000.00	6,976,000.00					
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Climate C CC STAR Allocation	2,024,000.00	1,000,000.00	LOE to be changed to \$2,024,000				
WWF-US	GET	Peru	Land Degr LD STAR Allocation	1,000,000.00	2,024,000.00	LOE to be changed to \$1,000,000				
Total GEF Resources(\$)			10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00						

Current LOE:

The total financing (from GEFTF) being requested for this project is US\$ 13,333,333, inclusive of project preparation grant (PPG), if any, and Agency fees for project cycle management services associated with the total GEF Project Financing. The financing requested for Peru is detailed in the table below.

Source of Funds	GEF Agency	Focal Area Source	Amount (in US\$)				Total
			GEF Project Financing	GEF Project Financing Agency Fee	Project Preparation Grant (PPG)	Project Preparation Grant (PPG) Agency Fee	
GEFTF	WWF – US	BD STAR Allocation	6,243,040	561,874	156,960	14,126	6,976,000
GEFTF	WWF – US	LD STAR Allocation	1,811,341	163,020	45,540	4,099	2,024,000
GEFTF	WWF – US	CC STAR Allocation	894,931	80,544	22,500	2,025	1,000,000
GEFTF	WWF – US	STAR IP Matching Incentives	2,983,104	268,479	75,000	6,750	3,333,333
Total GEF Resources			11,932,416	1,073,917	300,000	27,000	13,333,333

May 15, 2023:

6. Thank you for adjusting the financial numbers and providing a revised LoE. Financial table, PPG table and LoE now align and match with the Source of funds table. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

1. New LoEs for these countries have been uploaded. All LoEs have been uploaded in the LoE section, but we have noticed repeatedly that some of the links are disappearing in the portal after they were uploaded. They are all accessible in the documents section.
2. This has been done.
3. New LoE from Colombia has been uploaded.
4. New LoE from Brazil has been uploaded.
5. New LoE from Bolivia has been uploaded.
6. Updated version of the documents (including concept note and LoE) have been uploaded in the portal.

WB 5/17/23:

New LoE for Peru has been uploaded and the necessary changes made to the financing tables.

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

Yes, considering a revised Letter of Endorsement from Bolivia is uploaded. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

There are some discrepancies between the Letters of Endorsement and the information in Portal. Please see below **in red color** the fields that are inconsistent. The figures in Portal can be lower than those in LoEs, so there is no need to do anything on these LoEs when

the change can be made in the Portal. Some fields are easier to be changed in Portal (i.e. Title or Executing Entity) so we encourage to make the changes as much as possible in the Portal. Please ensure consistency between the Letters of Endorsement and the information in Portal.

Country	Title of Child Project in LoE	Title of Child Project in Portal	OFF name in LoE	OFF name in database	Ex Ent in LoE	Ex Ent in Portal	BD STAR Allocation Requested \$ in	BD STAR Allocation Requested \$ in Portal's Source of fund table	CC STAR Allocation Requested \$ in	CC STAR Allocation Requested \$ in Portal's Source of fund table	LD STAR Allocation Requested \$	LD STAR Allocation Requested \$	Total GEF Project Financing	Total GEF Project Financing requested \$ in Portal's Financing table	Total Agency fee requested \$ in LDE	Total Agency fee requested \$ in Portal's Financing table	Total PPG request \$ in LDE	Total PPG request \$ in Portal's PPG table	Total PPG fee requested \$ in LDE	Total PPG fee requested \$ in Portal's PPG table
Venezuela	Integrated management of sustainable landscapes for the conservation of the forest biome and the maintenance of the state of Amazonas, Venezuela	Integrated management of sustainable landscapes for the conservation of the forest biome and the maintenance of functional and ecosystem services in the state of Amazonas, Venezuela	Miguel Alberto Serrano	Miguel Serrano	Ministry of Popular Power for Ecopolitism/MNEC	Ministry of Popular Power for Ecopolitism (MNEC)		5,000,000.00					*****	5,366,208.00	*****	536,958.00	*****	150,000.00	*****	13,500.00
Brazil	Brazil Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Phase 3	Brazil Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Phase 3 Project	André Andrade	Luisa Farias Ferreira de Oliveira	Ministry of Environment and Climate Change		*****	7,000,000.00					*****	8,562,691.00	*****	770,642.00				
Colombia	CFB Amazon Integrated Program for Colombia	CFB Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Phase 3 Project	Maria Teresa Ramirez	Maria Teresa Becerra Ramirez	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	*****	15,000,000.00	*****	3,000,000.00	*****	*****	24,261,344.00	*****	2,185,320.00	*****	163,487.00	*****	16,511.00	
Ecuador	Integrated management and ecological connectivity of a priority landscape in the Ecuadorian Amazon headwaters	Integrated management and ecological connectivity of a priority landscape in the Ecuadorian Amazon headwaters	Jose Luis Naula	Jose Luis Naula	Ministerio del Ambiente, Agua y Transición Ecológica (MAATE) and World Wildlife Fund Ecuador	Ministerio del Ambiente, Agua y Transición Ecológica, WWF Ecuador	*****	4,000,000.00					*****	4,742,566.00	*****	426,867.00	*****	150,000.00	*****	13,500.00
Peru	Sustainable Management of the	Promoting Integrated Sustainable Management of the Peruvian Amazonian landscape Madre de Dios	Inés Pando Avila	Inés Pando Avila	Ministerio del Ambiente	Ministerio del Ambiente (MINAM)	*****	6,376,000.00	*****	2,024,000.00	*****	*****	11,932,415.00	*****	1,073,917.00	*****	300,000.00	*****	26,999.00	
Bolivia	Safeguarding the systems of Bolivia's Amazon Forests	Safeguarding the systems of Bolivia's Amazon Forests	Carlos David Guachalla Terrazas	Carlos David Guachalla Terrazas	Ministry of Development Planning, in collaboration with relevant bodies	Ministry of Development Planning; Ministry of Environment and Water and the Plurinational	*****	13,430,045.00	*****	2,163,955.00			*****	18,782,569.00	*****	1,630,430.00	*****	300,000.00	*****	26,999.00
Surname	Sustainable and Inclusive Development of West Surname (SID-WS)	Sustainable and Inclusive Development of West Surname (SID-WS)	Ivette Paterzon	Ivette Paterzon	Ministry of Spatial Planning, Land, and Forest Management	Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment	*****	2,000,000.00	*****	1,000,000.00	*****	*****	*****	4,742,564.00	*****	426,867.00	*****	150,000.00	*****	13,498.00

Please also check the consistency with the financial tables in the Concept Notes (for instance there is a difference of \$2 in the Concept Note of Peru.

May 11, 2023:

Please address the remaining comment above on the Peru child project.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

Discrepancies have been addressed.

WB 5/17/23:

New LoE for Peru has been uploaded and the necessary changes made to the financing tables.

Annex C: Program Locations

9.7 a) Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the program interventions will take place?

Secretariat's Comments

April 19, 2023:

No, please provide a map with geo-referenced information. Also, it would be useful to have in another and unique map the targeted landscapes of ASL1, 2 and 3 so that we can visualize the evolution in both directions: deepening the interventions in the same areas and scaling-up to new areas. Please consider adding such a map.

May 11, 2023:

Thank you for the additional maps. Comment addressed.

Agency's Comments

WB 5/3/23:

An additional map with the ASL 1, 2, and 3 targeted intervention landscapes has been added to the PFD. Regarding the need to provide a map with geo-referenced information, we consulted with GEF colleagues on the policy team who are responsible for overseeing the geomapping process, and they advised that geo-coordinates are not required at the PIF/PFD stage and therefore the map and cartographic information that we have already provided should be, at this stage, sufficient.

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes* (*only for non IP programs)

9.9 a) Does the program provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

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

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

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Additional Annexes

10 GEFSEC Decision

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the program recommended for clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

April 22, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

May 15, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

May 17, 2023:

All the comments have been addressed. The Program is recommended for clearance.

Agency's Comments

10.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency(ies) during the child project development.

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

10.3 Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/24/2023	5/9/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		