

Sustainable Management of Biodiversity and Natural Resources in the Bolivian Altiplano associated to the production of South American camelids

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11798

Countries

Bolivia

Project Name

Sustainable Management of Biodiversity and Natural Resources in the Bolivian Altiplano associated to the production of South American camelids

Agencies

IFAD

Date received by PM

9/4/2025

Review completed by PM

12/21/2025

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

GBFF

PIF

CEO

1. General Project Information

a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners? b) Are the project tags properly selected, i.e. any tag on 'support to IPLCs' or KMGBF target is justified given the project description.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

c) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected with corresponding CCM, CCA, BD and LD benefits made explicit in the project objective, log-frame and/or theory of change?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary

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

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

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

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

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

and budgeted for?

d) For multi-Trust Fund projects with GEFTF financing, are the GEFTFT Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for projects with GEF project financing less than or equal to \$2 million) or 5% (for projects above \$2 million)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) No, please include in the project description overview.

d) NA

e) Yes.

11/19/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

c) Thanks for this comment.

Please note that Knowledge Management and M&E were already described under Component 3 of the Project Description. The associated costs were also included in the budget table.

The gender dimension is described in the project's Gender Action Plan-GAP (Annex F2). However, to properly address this comment, this information has been incorporated at the end of the Project Description section. The activities outlined in the GAP will be mainstreamed across all project components; therefore, the cost of the full implementation of the GAP is already considered in the fund allocation of each component.

Project Outline

4. CHANGES COMPARED to PPG REQUEST

4.1 Are changes to the project design, including to elements put forward in the PPG request to meet GBFF selection criteria, been described and justified. And are they acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Significant changes to the project design have been introduced with regards to the outcomes and the core indicator targets associated with the generation of global environmental benefits.

First, there is no such thing as "indirect" hectares under improved management. Core indicators that measure hectares under improved management are always direct. Please revise the numbers to only include direct and make sure these changes are made throughout the project document.

Second, the project description indicates that the benefits are mainly accruing in the area of land degradation. First, the project states:"Conservation of globally significant biodiversity and

Sustainable use of the components of globally significant biodiversity through the improvement of productive practices in the camelid value chain and biodiversity management in IP&LC territories, covering 23,310 ha of the Altiplano landscape. " and then subsequently it claims the same hectares as a land degradation benefit." Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in productive landscapes by recovering native peatlands and grasslands through nature-based solutions and practices in 23,310 ha of the Altiplano landscape and reestablishing hydrological functions and reduce soil erosion and degradation."

We require greater clarity as to the globally significant biodiversity that exists on the 23,310 hectares that will benefit from the project as it appears from what is presented in this text that this is mainly a restoration project of peatlands and grasslands.

In this regard, given that the presence of KBAs is cited as one of the selection criteria for the project sites, you may consider how to include improved management status of specific KBAs measured in hectares as an outcome indicator in the logframe and perhaps include these hectares under the core indicators.

Once the revisions are submitted, this will be reevaluated. Please also see further comments in the review sheet on this issue.

11/7/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

Noted with thanks. We eliminated the references to indirect hectares.

Thanks a lot for this comment and we understand the reviewer's concern.

The bofedales and grasslands of the Bolivian altiplano host a variety of critically endangered, endangered and vulnerable species (IUCN Redlist of threatened species), which are critical for providing and maintaining the various provisioning, regulating and cultural services of the Bolivian altiplano, which is a globally significant ecosystem. A description of those species and their importance was added to the CER (Section B. Page 10).

While there are Key Biodiversity Areas within the project area, KBAs are integrated in the project as prioritization criteria, and not as an indicator.

The project focuses on the ecological integrity of ecosystems that may overlap with KBAs, but it does not aim to improve the governance structures or management systems of those KBAs. The project will rather operate within a broader landscape restoring and improving the condition and functionality of bofedales and grasslands in the Bolivian Altiplano. This means interventions are centered on ecological processes and land management practices through e.g. reducing grazing pressure, improving water retention, restoring vegetation cover, and supporting local livelihoods through sustainable resource use.

To measure the project's impact on biodiversity, a detailed biodiversity impact assessment has been undertaken as part of Annex J. The indicator *Biodiversity improvements at ecosystem level* of Annex J was also added to the logframe as a project development indicator.

5 B. Project Rationale

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

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

a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is a blended finance project under GBFF Action Area 4, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, comprehensively presented. Cleared.

b) Yes.

c) NA.

Agency Response

6 B. Project Description

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

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

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

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits identified?

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

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

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, IPLCs, private sector, CSOs) and their roles adequately described within the components?

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

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

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

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

m) For blended finance project only, is the financial structure adequately explained?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) The ToC is illegible in the portal and can only be read in the uploaded project document when you increase magnification to 200%. When resubmitting the project please try and improve the presentation of the ToC so it can be read in the portal and in the project document more easily. The reviewer was able to review the ToC and the associated text in the uploaded project

document and while it holds together conceptually, and as noted elsewhere in this review, there are no measurable biodiversity outcomes presented hence the project appears to be a land management project, with no intention on generating GEBs or measuring them objectively and quantifiably. Please revise the document, accordingly, including the TOC to identify and include tangible GEBs in biodiversity.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) In the description of the project components, please focus on what the GBFF grant will do as this is what we are evaluating. The presentation is confusing with references to IFAD cofinancing, GBFF financing, and then some elements that are not linked to any financing. Please clarify and revise.

d) Global environmental benefits in biodiversity are not identified adequately within the incremental reasoning presented in the document, which is mainly an economic analysis and argument. As noted elsewhere in this review, although the project used a biodiversity related criterion for site selection (Municipalities with key biodiversity areas (KBA) and other priority biodiversity conservation areas), there are no indicators of how the proposed initiative will improve the status of biodiversity within the KBAs nor an incremental reasoning justification of the same. Please revise accordingly.

e) Yes, this will be achieved mainly through the activities in component two. Please clarify how the project will measure socio-economic benefits as the logframe appears to be missing an objective measure of this result.

f) Yes, cleared.

g) The project aims to strengthen territorial governance frameworks, develop biodiversity management plans and enhance incentive mechanisms that support sustainable camelid value chains. The project posits that this approach of the project ensures that conservation and sustainable use are embedded in long-term development frameworks and will enable its resilience to future drivers and changes. The project also believes that the National Knowledge Management System will improve monitoring and evidence-based decision-making, enabling adaptive management in response to ongoing environmental and socioeconomic changes. These all seem to be reasonable hypotheses. Cleared.

h) Yes, cleared.

i) Yes, cleared.

j) Yes, cleared.

k) None have been identified, and the project implementation strategy aims to foster policy implementation coherence through the participation of multiple government agencies with different mandates as well as the private sector. Cleared.

l) The project is not specifically innovative and transformative in any respect. Component Two focuses on "Scaling up biodiversity-friendly production practices and incentive mechanisms for a sustainable camelid value chain? that are identified in Component One and a number of project stakeholders through their own programmatic activities may have opportunities to scale up practices that the project identifies. Cleared.

m) NA

11/7/2025

Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results and lessons learned on advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as the implementation of the gender action plan, are regularly monitored and reported on in PIRs, MTR and TE.

11/18/2025

Please respond to the comment above with regards to ME and gender.

11/19/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

a) Thanks for flagging this issue and we will resubmit the TOC in an appropriate format.

We also acknowledge the reviewer's comment regarding measurable biodiversity outcomes. While the outcomes do describe the medium-term state or condition to be achieved, IFAD acknowledges that the indicators weren't well suited as measurable means to verify progress toward each outcome.

IFAD hence modified the outcome indicators for all outcomes.

In particular, for Outcome 1.1, the project will now closely align with GBF indicator 1.b: Project municipalities using participatory, integrated and biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and/or effective management processes addressing land- use change to reduce biodiversity loss For Outcome 2.1, the project will now closely align with GBF Indicator A.2 and measure the Extent (%) of natural ecosystems in selected municipalities

For Outcome 2.2, the project will now measure the Number of positive non-monetary incentives in place to promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, complementing GBF indicator 18.1.

For Outcome 3.1, the following indicator will be used aligning closely with GBF indicator 21.1: Number of information and knowledge products on participatory management of biodiversity and/or traditional knowledge of indigenous peoples developed and disseminated to strengthen awareness-raising, monitoring and knowledge management.

These SMART outcome indicators provide measurable means of verifying progress towards biodiversity objectives. They also ensure direct alignment with national priorities and facilitate reporting to the CBD on progress made towards the GBF through Bolivia's NBSAPs.

The project contributes directly to Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) by promoting the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at the ecosystem and landscape levels. The selected outcome indicators covering participatory spatial planning, ecosystem extent, positive incentives, and knowledge management provide objective and quantifiable measures of progress toward these benefits. By monitoring changes in ecosystem extent, adoption of biodiversity-positive incentives, and dissemination of knowledge products, the project ensures that its interventions translate into measurable improvements in biodiversity conservation, directly supporting GEB generation in a verifiable manner.

IFAD reflected the GEBs in the updated TOC.

a) b) Noted with thanks.

c) Thank you for your comment.

While we understand the reviewers' concern and have adjusted the CER accordingly, we would like to clarify why it is critical to retain the outputs that are not financed by the GBFF. The activities financed by IFAD are essential enabling activities, without which the GBFF investments would not be able to achieve their intended impact. For example, The GBFF financing will strengthen the capacities of municipalities and local communities for informed decision-making and territorial planning in the Altiplano. However, these investments alone will not be sufficient to reduce pressures on natural ecosystems. Without complementary IFAD support adopting a One Health perspective through investments in operational mechanisms for formulating and monitoring production and technical assistance projects, strengthening veterinary services for camelid health systems, and developing genetic improvement systems for domestic camelids the herd size would likely continue to increase at an accelerated pace. In other words, without addressing the interconnections between human, animal, and environmental health, where the camelid herd size is stabilised, territorial planning efforts are unlikely to lead to meaningful improvements in the ecological condition of the bofedales and native grasslands. Hence, the GBFF and IFAD investments are mutually reinforcing, with each addressing complementary aspects of ecosystem management and productive systems in the Altiplano.

IFAD added this description of the interlinkages between the outputs in the narrative of each component to enhance clarity and provide a more coherent overall narrative.

d) Thank you for this comment.

The project's incremental reasoning and biodiversity benefits are explicitly captured in the project description and the Economic and Financial Analysis (EFA) and have now been further strengthened with the measurable outcome indicators.

Indicators to measure improvements in the status of biodiversity: As described above, measurable outcome indicators were added for all outcomes aligning with relevant GBF indicators and their methodology. An additional indicator on Biodiversity improvements at the ecosystem level (which is described in detail in Annex J) was introduced at project objective level.

Global environmental benefits: The project generates several Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) by promoting the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity at the ecosystem and landscape levels. It will directly restore 2,524 hectares of highland peatlands, put 21,786 hectares of native pasturelands in the Bolivian altiplanos under sustainable management practices, mitigate and/or sequester -357,688 tCO₂-eq over 20 years due to improved grassland management, peatland restoration, as well as improved livestock management practices (improved breeding and feeding); and improve and diversify the livelihoods of 6,500 indigenous peoples across key landscapes.

Incremental reasoning: While the GBFF does not require an Economic and Financial Analysis, IFAD went beyond the requirements to show that this project will generate important economic benefits related to the preservation of key ecosystem services of bofedales. The EFA applies a 'with-project vs without-project' (WP vs WOP) approach, assessing the additional benefits generated specifically by the project. Improvements from the WOP to WP scenario are hence not only financial or socio-economic; they directly reflect ecosystem service values on a per-hectare, per-year basis. This includes services such as livestock forage, biodiversity support, cultural and aesthetic services, and water supply.

Link to livelihoods and incentives: Incremental financial benefits for households (average USD 459/year per household) provide direct incentives for adopting biodiversity-positive land and wetland management practices. This mechanism ensures that project interventions generate additional biodiversity benefits that would not occur in the WOP scenario, reinforcing the alignment between ecological outcomes and socio-economic improvements.

e) Thank you very much for this comment. IFAD included an additional indicator on the *average increase in household income for beneficiary households (%)* to measure socio-economic benefits.

The project will therefore have two project-level indicators: one specifically for biodiversity, and another to measure the socio-economic benefits generated by the project.

l) Thanks for this comment. We have added a small subsection on Innovation in section C, which highlights both the One Health approach as well as the holistic value chain approach as key innovations with significant potential for scaling up.

19/11/2025

specific language has been included under output 3.1.3 and related narrative section.

6.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed initiatives (e.g., government, other bilateral/multilateral).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, cleared.

b) NA

c) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

6.3 GEF Core indicators and GBFF indicators

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

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through GBFF indicators, relevant GEF core indicators, and additional listed outcome indicators) reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Elsewhere in this review, concerns have been raised about the lack of biodiversity benefits being generated and measured through this project and this also holds true for the presentation of core indicators. As noted above Global environmental benefits in biodiversity are not identified adequately within the document. Although the project used a biodiversity related criterion for site selection (Municipalities with key biodiversity areas (KBA) and other priority biodiversity conservation areas), there are no indicators of how the proposed initiative will improve the status of biodiversity within the KBAs nor an incremental reasoning justification of the same. In this regard, given that the presence of KBAs is cited as one of the selection criteria for the project sites and that numerous protected areas are referenced in the project documentation, you may consider how to include improved management status of specific KBAs measured in hectares as an outcome indicator in the logframe and perhaps include these hectares under the core

indicators. All of these biodiversity outcomes need to be better linked with the project intervention strategy and activities. Please consider these suggestions and revise accordingly.

b) see above and address.

11/7/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

a) Thank you for this comment. Please note that the GBFF does not provide specific biodiversity-related core indicators but only requires the use of the GEF Core Indicators.

That said, IFAD welcomes the reviewer's suggestion and agrees that including more biodiversity-specific indicators will help measure how and whether the status of biodiversity improves. As mentioned in the responses above, the revised CER includes specific and measurable indicators for each outcome, aligned with or complementing the GBF indicators for GBF Goal A and Targets 1, 18, and 21.

In addition, IFAD has included an indicator on biodiversity improvements at the ecosystem level to measure and monitor the status of biodiversity, as described in detail in Annex J. Please find our detailed response on the use of KBAs as a prioritization criterion (but not as a project indicator) in Section 4.1.

These new Outcome and Project objective indicators, together with the selected mandatory GEF core indicators, adhere to the overarching principles outlined in the Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01) and provide a sound and achievable basis for attaining the project's targeted global environmental benefits.

b) Same as above

6.4 Risks

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7 C. Alignment with Programming Strategies, Country/Regional Priorities

7.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with the GBFF Action Areas and, for MTF projects, with Focal Area objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the project aligned with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans, National Biodiversity Finance Plans, and/or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities. For MTF projects, is the project aligned with other relevant country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and relevant sectors)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, very detailed explanation provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, very detailed explanation provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

8 D. Policy Requirements

8.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

8.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

8.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

11/24/2025

Please clarify and better elaborate in the SEP, the different stakeholders? specific roles, including Autonomous territorial entities, Producer organizations and indigenous peoples, and Non-profit civil society organizations, related to project components and outputs and the specific measures to engage and consult these groups in project implementation.

12/21/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

The SEP Stakeholder Engagement matrix (available in annex F3) has been revised, specifically:
? The roles and responsibilities of each stakeholder group have been clarified and linked directly to the project?s components and outputs, ensuring that their specific contributions to territorial planning, biodiversity management, and community-level implementation are clearly articulated.
? A new column has been added to the table on page 5 detailing engagement and consultation measures for each stakeholder group, describing how each will be engaged throughout project implementation, where known

8.4 IPLCs:

- a) Has the amount of GBFF project financing to support actions by IPLCs been sufficiently justified and have changes compared to PPG request stage, if any, been adequately justified?**
- b) If applicable, does Section C 'Project Description' describe the IPLCs who will benefit from the project and detail their role in the project? Have appropriate project tags related to IPLCs been selected?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Project financing to support IPLCs has increased, and this is fully justified. Cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

9 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

9.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

9.2 Source of Funds

If using GEFTF resources, does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

NA

Agency Response

9.3 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type:

Noting GBFF does not require but encourages co-financing, are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Please submit an English translation of the cofinancing letter.

11/13/2025

The co-financing contribution from IFAD is USD 16,696,314 of grant and USD 468,632 in kind. Please update the cofinancing to reflect the contributions in both in-kind and grant.

11/18/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thanks. The English translation is attached to the co-financing letter.

17.11.2025

Co-financing table updated accordingly

Annex C: Project Results Framework

9.4 a) Have the GBFF indicators and relevant GEF core indicators been included?

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

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Yes, at the objective level they have been included. But as has been noted elsewhere there is a complete absence of any tracking of biodiversity status in the project area and this remains a flaw in the project logframe as well.

b) For example, outcome 1.1 is: Inclusive and sustainable landscape governance systems strengthened to support biodiversity and natural resource management in the Altiplano. Hence, the outcome indicator should be a biological measure of biodiversity status in the target project areas that is an expression of the strengthened governance systems and not the current indicator ?Number of camelid producers who receive targeted support or assistance from the project to improve productive landscapes? which is basically a measure of whether the project conducted activities in the work plan. The project logframe suffers from this logical disconnect between all the activities the project is supporting and the end goal of improving biodiversity status or condition in the project area. Please revise the indicator for outcome one to address this gap.

Outcome 2.1 has the same problem. The outcome is: Peatlands and native grasslands are restored through investments in improved biodiversity, natural resources and land management practices. However, the indicator only measures project effort: ?Number of BNRMP developed and approved through participatory approaches, with prioritized practices to restore and conserve biodiversity and natural resources.? What is the biological change the project will measure that indicates that the peatland and grasslands have reached a restored state? This is what should be measured here with targets for midterm and end of project.

Revise these two primarily and then the logframe will be reevaluated.

c) No, they are not, please revise.

d) Yes, cleared.

11/7/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

a) Thanks for this comment. As previously mentioned, IFAD agrees and revised the logframe accordingly incorporating new Outcome and Project Objective indicators. Please refer to the detailed answers above for more information.

b) Thanks for this comment and agreed. Please refer to the responses above regarding adjustments to the logframe.

c) Thanks for this comment. It has been addressed.

d) Noted with thanks.

Annex D: Status of utilization of PPG

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

No, please provide more details and itemize according to the guidelines.

11/7/2025

Please provide detailed information on the categories such as consultants (which type of consultant), travel (this entails ???), Workshops and meetings (purpose of workshops/meetings)

11/18/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

Thanks for this comment. This was corrected accordingly.

17.11.2025

PPG table revised as indicated

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

Yes, cleared

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

a) Please paste the budget directly into the portal. Otherwise, cleared.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) yes, cleared

11/7/2025

a. There are some budget lines included in "Contractual Services - Company" (i.e. Coordination Specialist / Primary Production and Environment Specialist (3) - in green rectangle below) which seem to be "Contractual Services - Individuals". Please classify these in the correct category. Once we get the correct classification, we will be in a position to assess the percentage of project personnel vis-a-vis the project budget.

b. APROCAM (in red color below) is listed as one of the responsible entities - however, the only executing partner included in the document is the Ministry of Rural Development and Land. Please amend.

c. There are some budget lines without an identified Responsible entity (executing partner) - please amend (each budget line requires a responsible entity).

Contractual Services- Preparation of 16 diagnoses (Including thematic cartography) on status of biodiversity and natural resources and sampling and analysis related to botanical composition, soil profile, water quality and water flow.	1	\$ 511 967			\$ 511 967		\$ 511 967	
Contractual Services- Preparation of 16 Biodiversity and Natural Resources Management Plans.	2	\$ 299 755			\$ 299 755		\$ 299 755	
Contractual Services - Specialized technical assistance contracts to support complementary innovations for enhancing BNRMP implementation	3		\$ 307 470		\$ 307 470		\$ 307 470	APROCAM / M&L
contractual services for development and implementation of a regional level territorial branding strategy for sustainable production cornold products at national market level	4		\$ 274 870		\$ 274 870		\$ 274 870	
Joint Programme Baseline Including production of Biodiversity and NR management Indicators	5				\$ -	\$ 25 701	\$ 25 701	
Joint Programme FINAL evaluation, including production of Biodiversity and NR management Indicators evaluation	6				\$ -	\$ 31 979	\$ 31 979	
Natural Resources and Biodiversity Coordination Specialist	7	\$ 135 829			\$ 135 829		\$ 135 829	
Primary Production and Environment Specialist	8	\$ 41 313			\$ 41 313		\$ 41 313	
3 Departmental Primary production and environment specialists	9	\$ 40 422			\$ 40 422		\$ 40 422	

11/18/2025

Cleared.

Agency Response

a) addressed

b) Noted, thanks.

c) Noted, thanks.

17.11.2025

a. Addressed. These have been reclassified as local consultants

b. amended

c. amended

Annex H: Blended Finance Relevant Annexes

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

NA

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

10. GEFSEC DECISION

10.1 GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/16/2025

No, numerous issues have been identified above. Please revise and resubmit.

11/13/2025

Please revise according to the comments above.

11/18/2025

Please respond to this comment above first noted on 11/7/2025:" Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results and lessons learned on advancing gender equality and women's empowerment, as well as the implementation of the gender action plan, are regularly monitored and reported on in PIRs, MTR and TE."

11/24/2025

Please revise the Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) noted above and repeated here and resubmit:

"Please clarify and better elaborate in the SEP, the different stakeholders? specific roles, including Autonomous territorial entities, Producer organizations and indigenous peoples, and Non-profit civil society organizations, related to project components and outputs and the specific measures to engage and consult these groups in project implementation."

12/21/2025

Project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

2/12/2026

Please review and respond to the STAP comments. Please include a full matrix of responses to all STAP comments. Please also make the needed changes in the project document.

5/12/2026

IFAD has provided extensive responses to the STAP comments and made significant changes in the project document that adequately addressed all comments. Furthermore, they have outlined how STAP concerns will be addressed during project implementation and in the first year of the project implementation. Project is recommended for approval.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/16/2025	11/3/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/7/2025	11/17/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/13/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/25/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/12/2026	