



Sustainable Integrated Management of Biodiversity in the Indio-Ma?z Biological Reserve

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10674

Countries

Nicaragua

Project Name

Sustainable Integrated Management of Biodiversity in the Indio-Ma?z Biological Reserve

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

1/18/2022

Review completed by PM

3/18/2022

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

3/3/2022

Please include the correct the Focal Area Outcomes:

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
BD-1-1	Programme 1	GET	1,000,000.00	7,000,000.00
BD-2-7	Programme 7	GET	1,977,626.00	13,843,382.00
			Total Project Cost(\$) 2,977,626.00	20,843,382.00

TOTAL	468,700	400,000	1,563,111	404,115	141,700	2,977,626	156,000	2,164,626	660,000	150,000
-------	---------	---------	-----------	---------	---------	-----------	---------	-----------	---------	---------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Strengthening the enabling environment to improve the governance	Technical Assistance	1.1 Existing legal, regulatory and institutional	1.1.1 Five-year Management Plan and Annual Plan of	GET	474,700.00	5,517,505.00
3. Participatory management of the Indio-Maiz Biological Reserve (RBIM).	Technical Assistance	3.1 Increased restoration and improved conservation of natural resources, ecosystem	3.1.1 Implementation of environmental restoration activities with the inclusive participation of	GET	1,562,999.00	9,100,000.00
4. Knowledge management, follow-up and evaluation.	Technical Assistance	4.1 Improved information and knowledge management in	4.1.1 The National Environmental Information System (SINIA) is	GET	398,135.00	1,833,333.00

3/18/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

08 March 2022

Noted. Amounts in Table B and budget are now aligned.

9 Feb 2022

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

As will be noted below, numerous Council members requested clear articulation of the cofinancing being provided by the GCF. Please include a more detailed explanation of this per Council inquiries.

2/14/2022

The explanation is cumbersome and some language is unintelligible, for example, "The articulation of component 2 with the Bioclima project focuses on the articulation of component 2 with the Bioclima project focuses on Component 3 Capacity development for productive landscape restoration and forest conservation."

You may wish to consider presenting this in a tabular format by component to distinguish what GEF and GCF are supporting and how each investment stream is contributing collectively to the outcomes under each component.

3/3/2022

Please submit co-financing letters, including English translated versions.

3/18/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

21 Feb 2022

Thank you for the comment. We have updated paragraph 36 in the project description in the Agency project document and GEF portal. In this description, we now use a table to map the activities and outputs of the GCF (Bio-CLIMA) project to those of this project. We also explain how the two sets of activities interact to co-fund each other.

9 Feb 2022

The following text was included in section 1a-(2), paragraph 36:

The Sustainable Integrated Management of Biodiversity in the Indio-Ma'z Biological Reserve project will begin its implementation in year 1, just like the Bioclima project, and this represents a good opportunity to establish the expected synergies and complementarities as follows:

- ? **The articulation of component 1** with the Bioclima project focuses on supporting the preparation of the following instruments for the management of the RBIM: (i) the formulation and adoption of a Management Plan (MP) for a period of five years and your Annual Operating Plan (APO); ii) update the Autonomous Territorial Administration and Development Plan (PADA, 2009), including statutes and regulations for Rama and Kriol territorial governance. The Bioclima project includes these activities in component 2: Good Governance. Output 2.1.2 Updated legal and regulatory framework. Activity 2.1.2.3.[1]¹ Expert support will be co-financed to update the management plan, including ecological, social and geospatial studies, as well as participatory processes involving all male and female stakeholders in and around the protected area, especially indigenous communities and governments. indigenous territories, and promote the resilience of livelihoods, intercultural gender equality and the empowerment of women.

Additionally, work will take place in coordination with Bio-CLIMA to Output 1.1.2 Provisions whereby a landscape approach to the RBIM buffer zone is used, including landscape restoration, forest conservation, protection of ecosystemic goods and services and support to climate-resilient production systems in the surrounding area. That activity is facilitate a participatory comprehensive soil use planning process in the municipalities of Bluefields, El Castillo and San Juan. Support will be offered to small farmers and cattle-ranching or cacao-growing cooperatives, as well as to Rama and Kriol ITGs (outside the protected areas) in order to design plans for landscape restoration through silvopastoral and cacao agroforestry systems, forest restoration, protection, reforestation and the sustainable management of native forestland.

The Bioclima project includes these activities in component 1: Conserving and producing for life. Output 1.1.1 Land use/management plans formulated; and restoration/conservation agreements signed/formalized with beneficiaries. Activity 1.1.1.1 Assist small producers to formulate Land Use-Management Plans (LUMPs) with business plans (BPs). Activity 1.1.1.2 Assist indigenous communities to formulate Territorial Development Plans (TDPs) including business plans (BPs). Activity 1.1.1.3 Assist middle sized producers to formulate Land Use-Management Plans (LUMPs) with business plans (BPs).

The activities of product 1.1.3 will be coordinated with Activity 1.1.1.4 of Bioclima, which focuses on facilitating the celebration and formalization of landscape and forest restoration conservation agreements. These dialogue and agreement processes within the framework of the Bioclima project will be facilitated by independent and specialized entities in charge of this process that will be selected and supervised by MARENA as the Executing Entity. To this end, coordinated action and collaboration will be sought with the Property Institute of the Attorney General's Office (Attorney General's Office) and its Second Land Management Project (PRODEPII); as well as with the Directorate for Alternative Conflict Resolution of the Supreme Court of Justice (DIRAC of the Supreme Court of Justice) that has worked in mediation in land tenure conflicts in the Caribbean Coast and are recognized by indigenous organizations.

Finally work will take place in coordination with Bio-CLIMA to Output 2.1.3 Public-private dialogue and cooperation strengthened. Activities will include support to the Ministry of Family and Rural Economy (MEFCCA), to MARENA and partner institutions to convene relevant public, private and community actors to improve the climate for sustainable investment opportunities between the private sector and indigenous communities and farmer cooperatives.

? **The articulation of component 2** with the Bioclima project focuses on the articulation of component 2 with the Bioclima project focuses on Component 3 Capacity development for productive landscape restoration and forest conservation. Output 3.1.1 Technical personnel, extension workers and promoters trained. Technical personnel, extension workers and promoters from environmental authorities and public extension services present at the regional and local level will

be trained in the use and implementation of the new land and territory climate responsive planning instruments (LUMP-b and the TDP-s), legal and normative framework and Productive Landscape Restoration Models that will be introduced by the Project.

Research actions will be coordinated with sub component 3.2 of Bioclima, which focuses on the development of tools and instruments. Activity 3.2.1.5 Monitor biodiversity indicator species. The monitoring of biodiversity indicator species on the Caribbean Coast will be supported, for which experts, training and methodological assistance and operating expenses will be supported.

- ? **The articulation of component 3** with the Bioclima project focuses on the articulation of component 1 with the Bioclima project focuses on Activity 1.2.2.1 Finance Sustainable Community Enterprises (SCEs) in indigenous territories. This activity will be located within the core and buffer zone of the Indio Ma?z protected area where the forest cover is conserved. In accordance with the Management Plan of the protected area and in accordance with the TDP, indigenous communities will be helped to prepare and present subprojects, called "Sustainable Community Enterprises (SCEs)" that will be co-financed by the Bioclima project through donations or through donations through loan concessions, depending on the nature of the SCE and its social, environmental and financial return on investment.

To be considered for support SCEs will have to include a business and investment plan (?+bin?) to assure their technical, social, environmental and financial and market feasibility. SCE+bin?s will need to promote the wellbeing and livelihood resilience of the communities through forest and biodiversity conservation. Each SCE and ?+bin? will need to have a gender action plan (GAP) that conforms with the overall Project GAP.

These sub-projects could include ecological and ethnic tourism activities, handicrafts, goldsmith and indigenous jewelry, fine wood artisan making and fine wood products, non timber forest products, resins and medicinal substances and/or other productive community enterprises. These subprojects will be supported on a competitive basis with an average estimated financial contribution of US\$ 54,000 per sub-project, but the level of financial support shall be tailored to

each project depending on the merits and needs guided on criteria and ceilings to be further defined in the Operational Manual the Bioclima.

On these basis and the assumption that each SCE supports the protection of at least 3,000 ha of natural forests, it is estimated that Bio-CLIMA will be able to co-finance 95 SCEs benefitting 9,487 people of the indigenous territories of Miskitu Indian Tasbaika Kum, Kipla Sait Tasbaika Kum, Mayagna Sauni Bu, Mayagna Sauni As, Li Lamni Tasbaika Kum within BOSAWAS, and Rama and Kriol in Indio Ma?z.

[1] Link to Funding Proposal:

https://www.greenclimate.fund/sites/default/files/document/fp146-cabei-nicaragua_0.pdf

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Please clarify whether there will be a target for Core Indicator 4 which is now zero. If it is zero, please remove core indicator 4.

3/3/2022

Please un-click the GEF Core Indicator 4 (Area of landscapes under improved practices). There is no value provided for this indicator in the annex 1 ?results framework?.

3/18/2022

Noted. We will work on fixing this on the backend of the portal.

Agency Response

08 March 2022

Noted. Unfortunately, the portal does not allow us to untick Core Indicator 4, even if there are no amounts inserted under it.

9 Feb 2022

There are no data included for Core Indicator 4. We don't understand why the portal shows as if there were data in the cells.

Core Indicators

To calculate the core indicators, please refer to Results Guidance

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use	Add / Edit	✓
Indicator 2 Marine protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use	Add / Edit	
Indicator 3 Area of land restored	Add / Edit	
Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)	Add / Edit	✓

Core Indicators at CEO Endorsement (CEO)

Indicator 4 Area of landscapes under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified)

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
	<input type="text"/>		

Indicator 4.2 Area of landscapes that meets national or international third party certification that incorporates biodiversity considerations (hectares)

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

3/3/2022

Audits cannot be charged to the M&E budget and should be charged to the PMC portion of the budget. Please amend. In the overall budget Audits and spot checks have been accurately reported in the PMC.

Audits and Specific Verification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FAO NI • FAO-GEF • External Consultant Auditors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Audits: US\$50,000 • Specific Verification: US \$25,000 	Audits and ns
Mid-term Independent Evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project General Coordinator and work team • FAO NI • FAO-GEF • External Consultants (evaluation team) 	GEF: \$30,000	Mid-Year 3 entation
Terminal Independent Evaluation (Including Terminal Report)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project General Coordinator and work team • FAO NI • FAO-GEF • External Consultants (evaluation team) 	GEF: \$45,000	At least five roject comp
Terminal Workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project General Coordinator • FAO Country Office • FAO-GEF 	GEF: \$ 3,000	Two months completion
Total M&E Budget		GEF	\$ 156,000

3/18/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

08 March 2022

Noted. Audits / Spotchecks have been removed from the M&E budget. They are solely charged to the PMC budget.

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

No. Annex B, the responses to all Council member comments (UK, France, Germany, USA, Denmark) are all missing. Please include.

3/3/2022

Annex E:

The M&E expenses have been included under the component 4. Since component 4 includes not only M&E expenses but knowledge management and follow-up we request that all M&E expenses clearly detailed in the M&E column of the budget. Expenses like M&E Specialist should be reported entirely in the M&E column

4. Knowledge management, follow-up and evaluation.	Technical Assistance	4.1 Improved information and knowledge management in	4.1.1 The National Environmental Information System (SIMIA) is	GET	398,135.00	1,8
--	----------------------	--	--	-----	------------	-----

ANNEX E: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

FAO Cost Categories	Unit	No. of units	Unit cost	C1	C2	C3	C4	PMC	Total GEF	M&E (Accounted for in Component 4)	Operational Partner Budget (M&E)
				Total	Total	Total	Total				
5013 Consultants											
National Project Coordinator	Month	60	2,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	48,000	120,000		120,000
Financial Specialist	Month	60	1,100	0	0	47,300	0	18,700	66,000		66,000
Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist	Month	60	1,100	0	0	66,000	0		66,000		66,000
Gender Specialist	Month	60	1,100	0	0	66,000	0		66,000		66,000

Pick up trucks and motorcycles have been charged to the PMC. The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Can you please clarify and justify the number of transport vehicles (8 in total) and why cofinancers are not able to pay for any of these costs.

3/18/2022

Thank you for the explanation about the vehicles. All previous issues Cleared.

Agency Response

08 March 2022

a) M&E Expenses

The M&E Specialist has been reported entirely in the M&E column. M&E budget now amounts to USD 147,000.

b) Pick up trucks and motorcycles

Requested budget :

6100 Non-expendable procurement				US\$
Pickup truck (1 RACCS y 1 R?o San Juan) (A.1.1.1.1)	Truck	2	33.200	66.400
Mountain motorcycles (2 per municipality) (A.1.1.1.1)	Motorcycle	6	4.000	24.000
Motorcycle tires (A.1.1.1.1)	set	40	300	12.000
6100 Sub-total non-expendable procurement				102.400

These purchases are proposed to equip MARENA's park rangers who take care of the San Carlos, El Castillo and San Juan de Nicaragua protected areas in the department of R?o San Juan and also protect and manage the Nueva Guinea and Bluefields Reserve in the Autonomous Region of the South Caribbean Coast. One truck would be located in San Carlos and another one in Nueva Guinea.

The purchase of the vehicle and motorcycles is more cost-effective (than rental) over time to guarantee the participation of MARENA's park ranger personnel in activities and workshops to prepare the management plan and support the execution of the annual operational plan of the Reserve. Moreover, it will facilitate the monitoring to prevent land use change and accompany the research and monitoring missions of biodiversity per month to carry out the monitoring of the areas according to the project activities.

The project will strengthen MARENA's capacity in the use of territorial monitoring systems to evaluate the effectiveness of the application of standards and policies in the Indio Ma?z Biological Reserve. In order to strengthen its presence and response capacity for the planning and protected area management, it will support the teams involved by providing them with the necessary basic means and tools. Means of transportation are one of these tools, given that the park ranger and the Directorate of Protected Areas staff will develop the capacities of the population, regional /local authorities and indigenous /non-indigenous, men and women who will participate in periodic monitoring activities and will be part of the process of preparing and implementing the Reserve's management plan. These means of transportation will also guarantee biodiversity conservation in more than 300,000 hectares of the core area and in more than 20,000 hectares of the buffer zone in the department of R?o San Juan and in the RACCS. In 5 years, at least 200 producers will be involved in sustainable land management activities in the area of ??influence of the municipalities of El Castillo, San Juan de Nicaragua, Nueva Guinea and Bluefields. To achieve this, producers' farms must be visited to prepare their restoration plans and monitor their implementation. These means of transportation will also be used in the implementation of subprojects to promote sustainable community entrepreneurship activities in the Rama and Kriol indigenous territory.

Finally, due to budgetary restrictions of the Government of Nicaragua, there are no available vehicles that could be used exclusively for this project activities. Logistical resources are limited.

9 Feb 2022

Comments have been addressed and included both in the portal and the PRODOC

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

As noted above responses to UK, France, Germany, USA, Denmark are missing, please include.

2/14/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

Comments have been addressed and included both in the portal and the PRODOC

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Please include the response to the STAP comments.

2/14/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

Comments have been addressed and included both in the portal and the PRODOC

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

NA

Agency Response

9 Feb 2022

No response required

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

1/26/2022

No. Please address all issues raised above and resubmit. Please translate the Theory of Change diagram into English also.

2/14/2022

No. Please rewrite the text explaining the relationship between the GEF and GCF investments. For example, language such as this is unintelligible: **The articulation of component 2** with the Bioclima project focuses on the articulation of component 2 with the Bioclima project focuses on Component 3 Capacity development for productive landscape restoration and forest conservation.

You may wish to consider presenting this in a tabular format by component to distinguish what GEF and GCF are supporting and how each investment stream is contributing collectively to the outcomes under each component.

3/3/2022

Numerous issues have been raised on the submission. Please review, revise and resubmit.

3/18/2022

CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/26/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/14/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/28/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/18/2022	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project area is in the Indio-Ma?z Biological Reserve (RBIM), which was established in 1999 by Presidential Decree 66-99. The entire area, the size of which is 316,720.62 ha., is an integral part of the R?o San Juan Biosphere Reserve, declared as such by UNESCO in 2003. RBIM is the second largest lowland tropical forest in Nicaragua.

The project tackles fundamental elements related to conservation and production as pillars crucial to the country?s social, environmental and climate-related development. The aim is to reduce the deforestation rate by 50% cut in 2040 by means of a model that brings together the improvement of intensive production systems, employment and biodiversity conservation.

The project objective: to conserve biodiversity and improve ecosystem services in the Indio-Ma?z Biological Reserve by working in association with Indigenous peoples and local communities. The project is to be implemented via the following components: (1) strengthen an environment conducive to ensuring better governance and management of the Reserve; (2) strengthen capacities among Indigenous communities as well as national, regional, and municipal authorities regarding landscape management to conserve biodiversity; (3) participatory management of the Indio Ma?z Biological Reserve; and (4)

knowledge management, follow-up, and evaluation. The project will generate the following global environmental benefits:

- 1) Improved biodiversity habitats through the conservation of 316,720.62 ha. in the RBIM
- 2) A reduction by 3,300.000 metric tons of CO₂-e (avoided and eliminated greenhouse gas emissions over a period of five years).