

# Mesoamerica Critical Forest Biome Integrated Program

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11273

**Countries**

Regional (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama)

**Project Name**

Mesoamerica Critical Forest Biome Integrated Program

**Agencies**

IUCN, FAO

**Date received by PM**

4/14/2023

**Review completed by PM**

**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 24, 2023

1. Program Commitment Deadline is missed ? please include it.
2. The Anticipated Program Executing Entities only shows IUCN, but child projects show other executing entities? please fill out this information using individual rows so each executing entity can be correctly classified

Lead GEF Agency:	IUCN	GEF Agency Program ID:	
Other GEF Agenc(ies):	FAO	Submission Date :	
Type of Trust Fund:	GET		
Anticipated Program Executing Entity(s):	IUCN	Anticipated Program Executing Partner Type(s):	GEF Agency
Sector (only for Programs on CC): <input checked="" type="radio"/>	AFOLU	Program Duration (Months):	60
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Program Commitment Deadline:	

3. The Program duration is planned to be 60 months. Considering some the duration of the national child projects and the uncertainty of when they start implementation, it may be advisable to extend a bit this period to 72 months for instance.

May 12, 2023:

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

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

1. Program Commitment deadline of December 29, 2024 added
  - 2) PFD amended to include all identified Executing Entities
  - 3) Program duration amended to 72 months in duration
- b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

April 24, 2023

Considering the overarching objective of reducing the deforestation, the CCM Rio Marker should be raised to 2. Also, as the investments should be sustainable they have to take into account future climate change and as such, some co-benefits in terms of climate change adaptation are also expected (especially when it comes to restoration and livelihood improvement). So the CCA Rio Marker should be raised to 1. Please adjust the Rio Markers accordingly.

**May 12, 2023:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

CCM and CCA Rio Markers amended as advised.

**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 24, 2023**

a)

a.1. We suggest to change "six selected Mesoamerican countries" with "six participating Mesoamerican countries" which corresponds better to the reality.

a.2. Instead of "deforestation and degradation" (degradation of what?), please use either "forest loss and degradation" or "deforestation and land degradation".

a.3. The summary describes clearly the problems, drivers and and key expected environmental target. Some other important features of the Program need to be highlighted: the "integrated" approach (across sector and scales - not only "coordinated"), the policy coherence, the focus on IPLCs inclusion/management, the restoration of degraded forest, and the transboundary forests with the necessary promotion of a regional movement/vision to increase impact. Please reformulate accordingly (the last paragraph and especially on the GBF is relevant but can probably be shortened).

a.4. There is some repetition in the first paragraph with "...address drivers of deforestation and degradation through a targeted set of interlinked interventions" and the second paragraph with "...address these drivers through coordinated interventions". Please consider a formulation which avoids such repetition.

b) The program's geographical coverage is explicit but the covered sectors and how the program is transformative (the indication of using GEF-8 levers is vague) or innovative are unclear. We are aware of the word limit constraint but please briefly include more clearly these aspects too.

**May 12, 2023:**

a) and b). Thank you for the improvements, Cleared,

#### Agency's Comments

##### **IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**A1)** Text amended as advised to ?participating countries?

**A2)** Text amended as advised to ?deforestation and forest degradation? or ?degradation and loss of primary forests.?

**A3)** Program summary text updated as advised

**A4)** Summary text amended as advised to avoid repetition

**B)** PFD summary text revised to more clearly describe transformative impacts of the program

##### **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 24, 2023**

a) Please complete the program objective statement considering also the elements of restoration and fostering regional cooperation (regional cooperation is an important element to scale up and increase the impact).

b) Component 2 and 3 are referred as "Technical Assistance". Please consider these components as "Investments" instead, which should reflect better to the reality.

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. The restoration of 300,000 hectares of forest looks ambitious (especially considering that nearly all of it comes from one unique country). Please clarify how this number is estimated based on an average cost per hectare and confirm or adjust the target.

c.3 There isn't any consideration of integrated and sustainable land use planning. As it is an important element of the Program strategy, the Agency is invited to consider the relevance of adding such output eventually under component 3 (along with the increased investments).

c.4. There is no consideration in the outputs of any IPLCs and CSOs inclusion in planning and implementation processes. Couldn't this be a relevant output or at least more explicit? As IPLCs are very important in the Program strategy, please consider adding this aspect, eventually through a new output.

c.5. The output "4.1. Improved national and regional coordination" is very vague as it could apply to any topic. Please be more specific adding the context of the conservation of primary forests.

d) Yes, the GEF program Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC are proportional with 5% and 5,2% respectively. Cleared.

e) Yes, the PMC is equal to 5%. Cleared.

**May 12, 2023:**

a) Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

b) Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

c)

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

**Agency's Comments**

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**a)** Program objective statement amended to include restoration and fostering of regional cooperation: *?To conserve Mesoamerica primary forests through strengthened governance, protection, restoration, regional cooperation, and the mobilization of stable long-term funding, ensuring a sustainable flow of ecosystem services for people and planet.?*

**b)** Components 2 and 3 amended as advised to ?Investments?.

**C1.** Gender is integrated throughout the Program including in the description of the Outcomes and Outputs. In addition, a new output was added, **?Output 1.1.3,** Affirmative actions to integrate IPLCs, women and rural youth into decision-making processes.?

**C2.** The aggregate restoration target was revised based on further consultation with countries. The new target is 63,600 ha under restoration and reflects anticipated contributions from many of the participating countries.

**C3.** The program will address land use planning as part of outcome 1.2. Land use plans are part of the set of instruments that need to be revised and updated with a focus on policy coherence. A specific mention of land use plans has been included in output 1.2.1.

**C4.** The work with organizations of IPLCs, women and youth are mainstreamed along the program. Though, more specific mention was included in the description of the outcomes and outputs. Also, a new specific output was included: 1.3.3. Affirmative actions to integrate IPLCs, women and rural youth into decision-making processes.

**C5.** The text of outcome 4.1 was revised: ?Improved national and regional coordination for primary forest protection and conservation?

#### **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 NGI, 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 25, 2023**

a) Yes, the current situation is clearly and adequately described. Please address the following limited comments for more clarity:

a.1. We learn that "Of the remaining large intact primary forests over 1,125,000 ha were lost from 2000-2016 representing a 19% total reduction in area". Please indicate explicitly what was the total area of intact primary forests or what it is today.

a.2. The period of reference for the deforestation is 2000-2016, showing an average deforestation rate of more than 1% for all the region, but with important differences among the countries. As the situation can change rapidly with important deforestation observed in the last years, please add more recent data such as the one used to elaborate the figure 2 which is very informative and interesting.

a.3. Please consider copying all the figures in the project description of the Portal (rather than having them in a separate uploaded document). It will make the reading easier.

a.4. Figure 1 doesn't have any legend. Please clarify.

b) The role of stakeholders, including the private sector and local actors is not clearly described in the current baseline and we don't see how they can contribute to GEBs. Please elaborate further on this aspect.

c) The baseline projects look very abundant and well documented. Nevertheless the baseline situation in each participating country is missing (institutions involved, main policies, environmental commitments...). Please complete briefly with one paragraph for each country.

d) We learn that the program will take advantage of the experiences and learning from the several well identified projects but we don't know what are the lessons learned that have been considered in the Program design. Please clarify with a summary of the lessons learned.

e) N/A

**May 12, 2023:**

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

b), c) and d). Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

### Agency's Comments

#### **IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**A1 and A2)** Text on IFL loss and Tables 1 and 2 amended to include more detailed analysis of IFL loss by country using IFL Mapping data for years 2000, 2013, 2016 and 2020. Table 2 shows high rates of IFL loss occurred despite most Mesoamerican IFL under some form of WCPA protection.

**A3.** Figures copied into Portal

**A4.** Legend added to Figure 1

**b)** A section on 'key stakeholders' was included after the barriers section. It is challenging at this stage of Program development to describe the role of the wide range of stakeholders at the regional, national, sub-national and local levels. Some groups have divergent views regarding the present and future uses of the areas and resources where the primary forests are located and, therefore, their contribution to global environmental benefits is quite varied. During the PPG detailed stakeholder analyses will be prepared at the program and national levels to identify the key stakeholders that will need to be engaged into multi-level intersectoral dialogue processes.

c) Summary paragraph on key institutional partners, commitments and policy environment added for each participating country.

d) Summary of key lessons added to the theory of change section

## **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 25, 2023**

a)



a.1. Please include the main diagrams related to the Theory of Change in the main text (the Agency may want to summarize some items of the TOC so that it can fit in the Portal). As it is now, it is very difficult to read, even printed in a big format. Also, please, keep in mind that the STAP and Council may not have access to the annexes.

a.2. The narrative of the TOC is not clear. We don't see the logic and causal pathways from the problems and barriers to the solutions enabling the achievement of the objectives and taking into account the assumptions (problems, barriers and assumptions are missing). Please improve the description of the key causal pathways underlying the TOC including the problems, barriers and assumptions leading to the expected outcomes.

b) No, it is not clear how the Program will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences (as mentioned above). Please explain.

c)

c.1. The outcome 1.1. is about strengthening local, national, and regional governance mechanisms in support of primary forests conservation. Nevertheless, the only strengthened mechanisms described are at regional levels. Please clarify how this outcome also apply at local and national levels.

c.2. What does the "strengthening the effectiveness of primary forests" mean? Please clarify.

c.3. Please don't use OECM and OMEC (Spanish) but only OECM.

c.4. The Outcome 1.2. is about key national policy and regulatory instruments prioritizing primary forest conservation. Nevertheless the proposed activities at national level are only focussed on assessment and improving data/knowledge and don't consider any policy and regulatory instruments. Please clarify the activities enabling the improvement of key national policy and regulatory instruments as such outcome is very important for the Program.

c.5. Limited governance on land tenure and rights is an important barrier. Nevertheless, we don't see clear interventions in the proposed outputs to tackle this problem. Please clearly include activities related to this aspect in the component description.

c.6. Under the output 1.3.2, please correct the typo: "at the national al regional levels."

c.7. As presented the outputs under the outcome 2.1 focus on information and capacity building and don't fully cover the identified needs to actually improve the protection of primary forests in protected areas. Please clarify how the missing elements will be covered such as building the support and engagement of key stakeholders, strengthening cross-border collaboration on protected areas and actual effective management of protected areas.

c.8. Under the outcome 2.3, the outputs only include evaluation, knowledge and training and they are only described for the regional coordination project. How will restoration be actually supported by national projects? What kind of restoration will be supported? Please clarify the restoration activities on the ground supported at national level.

c.9. The component 3 has only one outcome which includes several very different topics/results such as the establishment of high-level dialogue, the preparation of a facility, the identification of innovative financing, tools and business models, sustainable production... For a better clarity, we suggest to structure this component with 2 or 3 key outcomes.

c.10. Under the output 4.1.1, we learn that the RCP will support the establishment of a regional coordination platform under SICA regional bodies. But Mexico isn't a member of SICA. How the Program will ensure the participation and engagement capacity of Mexico in the platform at the same level as the other participating countries? Please clarify.

c.11. Under the output 4.1.1, please also consider explicitly the participation of the private sector in the coordination platforms, especially at national level.

c.12. The Forestry and Climate Change Fund is expected to support timber harvesting. Please clarify this operation (kind of forests, species harvested, intensity of harvesting...) and ensure such activity is consistent with the Program and GEF strategy.

d) The incremental/additional cost reasoning is not clearly described. Please clarify.

e) The levers of transformation are not clearly identified and described. Please elaborate on the levers of transformation used for this Program.

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

g) There is indeed a description on gender issues under the Program description introduction but this is not strongly considered in the component description (only under Output 1.1.3 and outcomes 2.3). Please clarify where it is relevant how gender issues are taken into account in the description of the components outputs/outcomes.

h) Much emphasis is placed on the communication strategy, which is well explained. On the Green List in particular, we would like to remind the need to make the demonstration during the PPG in which way the use of a tool X or a method Y will help in generating or maximizing Global Environmental Benefits. At this stage, we are not convinced with the use of the GEF resources to finance the IUCN Green List.

i) The policy coherence is explained particularly through the national and regional coordination platforms. Cleared.

**May 12, 2023:**

a) Thank you for providing the diagram of the TOC (it's figure 5, not 6) and clarification . Cleared.

b) Thank you for te additional information. Cleared.

c) Thank for all the amendments improving the clarity of the proposal. Cleared.

d), e), f), g) and h). Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

### Agency's Comments

#### **IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**A1)** A revised Theory of Change diagram was added to the main text (Figure 6).

**A2)** ToC narrative revised with more clearly defined assumptions, logic and causal pathways from problems and barriers to solutions.

**b)** A summary of key lessons from previous relevant initiatives in the region and elsewhere has been added to section on Theory of Change.

**C1)** Descriptive text for Outcome 1.1 revised to cover both regional, national- and sub-national level work

**C2)** Typo has been corrected in the revised PFD.

**C3)** OECM terminology now used throughout PFD

**C4)** Outcome 1.2 includes both generation of information to support fact-based decision-making processes and integrating primary forest conservation into key national policies and instruments. The text of outcome 1.2 and the corresponding outputs has been updated.

**C5)** Interventions focused on addressing issues of limited governance and land tenure and rights found in **Output 1.1.2.**

**C6)** Typo has been corrected

**C7)** Text of **Outcome 2.1** updated to more clearly define proposed interventions focused on improving protection of primary forests in PAs.

**C8)** The text of **Outcome 2.3** revised to more clearly define interventions supporting restoration.

**C9)** **Component 3** revised to include two outcomes: 3.1 focuses on increasing funding and 3.2 focuses on business development.

**c.10)** As indicated in the PFD, since 2004, Mexico actively participates in the SICA as a "regional observer". Text has been included to indicate that the formal integration of Mexico into the regional coordination platform will be based on the mechanisms of the agreement signed in 2004.

**C11)** Text of **Output 4.1.1.** revised to now explicitly include participation of the private sector in the coordination platforms

**C12)** The FCCF's theory of change indicates that the focus of this fund is on secondary and degraded forests (SDFs). FCCF fosters viable local enterprises that develop timber

value chains based on improved management of the SDFs. This in turn, reduce pressure on primary forest. Please see <https://fccf.lu/our-focus/theory-of-change/>

**D)** Explanatory text was added (?rationale for incremental cost?) at the end of the program description.

**E)** Specific text on the levers of transformation included in the section ?program theory of change?.

**F)** Text added on stakeholder contributions in Component sections

**G)** Gender equality and youth actions have been mainstreamed as appropriate in the following outputs: 1.1.2, 1.1.4, 1.3.3, 2.3.2, 3.1.3, 3.1.4, 3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 4.1.1, 4.2.2 and 4.2.3.

**H)** Agree that the case for use of the IUCN Green list for Protected and Conserved Areas to adequately position and profile PA improved management and achievements, as well as to attract finance, will have to be made during PPG in all countries. In the PFD, the use of the Green List is left as a possibility for countries, not a ?must-do?.

## **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 26, 2023**

a) Yes, the resilience is sought through the strong articulation of already established regional processes such as SICA and the adaptive management is considered under the M&E strategy. Cleared.

b) No, at Program level the transformation objective is not clearly demonstrated, the PFD misses to demonstrate the transformative and innovative nature of proposed activities and outcomes. Please, include these aspects clearly making the link with the 4 levers of transformation.

c) Yes, selected countries and themes are well aligned with the overall program objective. Nevertheless, please consider the following:

c.1. The project duration in El Salvador and Honduras is 48 months while the duration of the Program and the other child project is at least 60 months. Please consider aligning the duration of the child projects. It is important especially in the case of El Salvador and Guatemala working on a shared watershed with IW FA resources.

c.2. Guatemala and Nicaragua don't plan any creation of new PA nor support to terrestrial OECMs. This is not aligned with the 30x30 ambition. Considering the outcome 2.2 of the Program, these child projects should at least include a target for OECMs. Please improve the targets on this aspect.

d)

d.1. In the Concept Note of El Salvador, the co-financing table is not filled out. Please complete.

d.2. In the Concept Note of Guatemala, some sources of co-financing in the co-financing table are missing. Please complete.

d.3 In the Concept Note of Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and Nicaragua, the letters of the sections e), f), g) ... r), s) and t) are wrong (it should be a, b, c and d). Please correct.

d.4. In the Concept Note of Honduras, the GEF financing table is not fully filled out. Please complete.

d.5. In the Concept Note of Honduras, the first 2 components both focuses on enabling conditions (governance policies, regulatory framework...) while the components of the PFD clearly separate the enabling conditions (component 1) and the actual protection and restoration of primary forests (component 2). Support to OECMs is in component 1 in the child project while it is in component 2 in the PFD. The same misalignment is observed in the Concept Note of Nicaragua. Please make sure all the child projects clearly align with the PFD.

d.6. In the Concept Note of Mexico, most of the co-financing table is not filled out. Please complete.

e) Yes after the restoration objective has been clarified. Cleared

**May 12, 2023:**

b) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

c)

c.1. This comment is not addressed. Considering this is not critical at this concept stage, the comment is cleared and we expect the project duration in El Salvador and Honduras be further considered during PPG.

c.2. No OECM target has been added in the Guatemala proposal but this is not critical at this concept stage. Point well taken on the improvements of OECMs targets during the PPG phase. Cleared.

d)

d.1. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

d.2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

d.3. Not addressed for Nicaragua but this is not important. Cleared.

d.4. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

d.5. It was not a question of numbering but thank you for the consideration. The alignment of the child projects of Honduras and Nicaragua can be further refined during PPG. Cleared.

d.6. Thank you for completing the co-financing table in the Concept Note of Mexico. Cleared.

#### Agency's Comments

##### **IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**b)** Theory of change section revised to more clearly link with GEF Levers of Transformation

**c1)** Project duration for El Salvador and Honduras national child projects revised to 60 months

**C2)** A target on OECMs has been added to the Guatemala child project; Nicaragua and Panama focal points confirmed to FAO and IUCN that they will explore the establishment of a framework for OECMs, however since this is not yet defined yet, they indicate that it's premature to set targets for this work.

**D1)** Co-financing table for El Salvador filled in

**D2)** Co-financing table for Guatemala filled in

**D3)** Typos on section lettering corrected in Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico and Nicaragua

**D4)** GEF Financing table filled in on Honduras concept note

**D5)** Component numbering of child project concepts revised to align with the PFD.

**D6)** Co-financing table for Mexico filled in

**E)** A target for restoration was added to the Honduras child project concept.

##### **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 26, 2023**

a) Yes, a concise description of program level institutional arrangements for governance and coordination with identified partners is provided. In the case of WCS, we learn that this partner will support output 1.2 and 2.1 throughout the Five Great Forests. Please clarify how such support will be provided to El Salvador which doesn't host any of the Five Great Forests.

b) Yes, cleared.

**May 12, 2023:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared

#### Agency's Comments

##### **IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

WCS support to El Salvador described in the PFD section on Program Areas of Interventions vs the Five Great Forests. WCS will implement actions in El Salvador through several related projects WCS is executing as well as through the Mesoamerica Forest IP activities.

##### **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 26, 2023**

a) The ambition of the integrated and programatic approach is to maximize the Global Environment Benefits. Please, explain how such approach and notably the coordination project succeeds in increasing the global environment benefits from child projects.

b)

b.1. Based on the language in the PFD, and especially the expected results under the component 2, as mentioned above, please provide a target for the core indicator 4.5 on OECM for each child project. It is important that OECMs be part of the entire spectrum of conserved areas.

- Please note that the OECM indicator does not feed into the main Core Indicator 4, as it is of contextual nature. As a result, kindly report the sub-indicator 4.5 in the sub-indicators 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 or 4.4. Presumably most of these OECM should reflected in 4.1. There will not be double counting between 4.5 and other sub-indicators.

- In the following link, you will find the guidelines for the core indicators for GEF-8. On pages 13 and 14 you will find instructions on the application of core indicator 4.5 for Terrestrial OECMs ([https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results\\_Framework\\_Guidelines\\_2022\\_06\\_30.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results_Framework_Guidelines_2022_06_30.pdf)).

b.2. Indicator 1.2: Please consider listing the Name of the PAs, WDPA ID, IUCN Category of the PAs covered, as available.

b.3. Indicator 4.2: Please add the type/name of third party certification for the covered areas, as available.

b.4. The numbers differ slightly with the 'five key targets' presented in the program description. Please indicate the numbers are rounded in the program description or ensure consistency across numbers.

b.5. For all the child projects (except Panama), the calculation of the GHG emission mitigation is unclear. Please clarify the methodology used and provide the calculation. Please explain why a recognized and widely used methodology (such as Ex-ACT tool for instance) is not used.



b.6. For the child projects (except Panama), please explain how indirect GHG emission mitigation results will be obtained and what is the difference with direct mitigation. Please note that results after the completion of the project and until 20 years need to be accounted as direct mitigation.

b.7. In Panama, the expected result in terms of GHG emission mitigation is extremely and surprisingly low and the methodology presented in Annex 3 (and not in Annex 2 as indicated) is very confusing and seems to consider a 10 years period instead of 20 years. Please use a recognized tool such as Ex-ACT tool or simplify the explanation by indicating exactly the numbers of hectares of avoided deforestation and restoration (and any other relevant land use) and provide the calculation over a 20 years period using these numbers of hectares.

b.8. In El Salvador, the expected result in terms of GHG emission mitigation is also extremely low and there is no indication of the methodology used. Please indicate the methodology used, and also revise and provide the calculation to reflect the reality of expected results which should be much higher.

b.9. The creation of new PAs is 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 none of the participating countries include a target for this core indicator. Please explain why the countries doesn't consider this option despite its importance in the Program strategy and for the implementation of the GBF (only Panama is above 30% of total land area as terrestrial protected areas).

b.10. There is no forest restoration planned in Honduras whereas it is an important element of the Program strategy. Please explain why this is not relevant and considered in this country.

b.11 The GHG emissions avoided in Honduras and El Salvador are wrongly reported under the indicator 6.2 (outside AFOLU sector). Please correct reporting under 6.1 (in the AFOLU sector).

c) The area of forest restoration planned in Nicaragua is very high and more or less 100 times higher than the other countries. Please explain, justify and eventually improve the balance among the participating countries if it is justified.

d) Yes, socioeconomic benefits constitute an important focus of Component 3. Cleared.

e)

e.1. The second part of the Program objective statement implies at least one indicator per activity area should be used to assess each of the activities listed ?strengthened governance, protection, and mobilization of stable long-term funding, ensuring a sustainable flow of ecosystem services for people and planet?. Since this is not the case as per the related indicators listed under the Program objective in the Monitoring and

Evaluation section of the PFD, then it may be more appropriate to remove these aspects from the Program objective to avoid risking being evaluated negatively on these aspects at completion. We noted these aspects listed in the Program Objective are listed under the Program Outcomes, but with some indicators which stay at output level.

e.2. The M&E section lists the indicators that will assess the Program objective. While useful to monitor, Indicators 1 and 2 may be at a too high level to be attributed to the results of Program activities. In this context, the Agency may wish to replace or complement this indicator with Core Indicators 1 and 4.

**May 12, 2023:**

a) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

b)

b.1. No, as mentioned above target on OECM has not been added for Guatemala and Nicaragua. But this is not critical and can be improved during PPG phase. Cleared.

b.2. Thank you for completing the missing IDs for PAs where available. Cleared.

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

b.6., b.7, b.8 and b.11. We don't see clearly the changes in the Portal entry but we take note of the calculations provided and the overall target CI 6.1 is much improved. Cleared.

b.9 Thank you for the clarification. At PPG stage, please consider the possibility to improve the target for CI 4.5 and/or CI 1.1.

b.10. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

b.11.

**Agency's Comments**

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**a)** Explanatory text on maximizing GEBs through a programmatic approach added at the end of the new section "Maximizing GEBs through programmatic approach", in Section B, Program Description

**B1)** Target on OECMs added for Guatemala. Nicaragua and Honduras don't yet have a specific standard on the declaration of areas considered as OECM, so it is not possible to identify how many of these hectares can be considered under this category at the concept note stage. However, during the implementation of the project it is possible to analyze if within the connectivity areas foreseen in core indicator 4, there are areas that could be considered as OECM(s). While there are no national standards in Nicaragua and Honduras

that guarantee that OECMs can be included, the countries will advance this process through the work of the national child projects.

**B2).** Missing IDs for PAs where available in WDPA database have been added.

**B3)** For indicator 4.2, expected certification scheme in all countries is Forest Stewardship Council. This is identified in the Programme monitoring indicator annex.

**B4)** PFD target numbers are rounded and now indicated as such in the text.

**B5)** In Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, El Salvador GHG estimates were revised and EX ACT used. Corresponding EX-ACT Excel spreadsheets have been uploaded as an annex to GEF portal.

**B6)** Estimate of indirect GHG revised based on GEF result measurement framework guidelines and is no longer significant compared with direct GHG emissions mitigation. In Nicaragua, indirect emissions refer to catalytic conservation action for replication across biological corridors that link both Critical Forest Biomes (Indio Maiz and Moskitia).

**B7)** Corrected, EX ACT form for Panama attached.

**B8)** Corrected, EX ACT form for El Salvador attached

**B9)** The countries have already established a large number of protected areas which have significantly contributed to preserve primary forests. However, at the moment, the countries do not have sufficient means to sustain the range of protected areas (i.e., barrier 4). This is why OECMs become a valuable instrument to strengthen land tenure and management of indigenous territories and to mobilize action from non-government actors.

**B10)** A target of 1,000 ha of high priority forest restoration was added in Honduras.

**B11)** Reporting under 6.1 for Honduras and El Salvador corrected

**E1)** The list of program objective indicators updated, and two new indicators have been included to measure strengthened governance and regional cooperation.

**E2).** M&E Section revised so that Core indicators 1 and 4 included in the list of Program objective indicators

#### **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 26, 2023**

a) The climate risk is too briefly described. 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) While the risk dimensions are assessed and rated, no mitigation measure is presented. Please consider adding mitigation measures, as relevant.

c) Yes, an initial identification of the relevant types of risks associated with the Program and the risk rating for each identified risk are provided. cleared.

**May 12, 2023:**

a) Thank you for considering an in-depth analysis of the climate risks during PPG. Cleared.

b) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

**Agency's Comments**

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**A)** An in-depth country-level climate risk analysis is beyond the scope of the preparation of the PFD. The most conspicuous climate risks are those from anticipated more intense and frequent El Niño Southern Oscillation events and stronger tropical cyclones in the Caribbean. A detailed analysis will be prepared during the PPG phase.

**B)** Table in the section "Risks to Achieving Program Outcomes" updated to include preliminary risk management measures. The risks and the corresponding management measures will be further developed during the PPG phase.

**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 26, 2023**

Yes, but as requested above, the focus on timber harvesting 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 26, 2023**

Yes, all the country child projects are part of the Mesoamerica region and the identified landscapes focus on primary forests. 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 27, 2023**

We need to measure how outcomes and outputs contribute to the GBF Targets. To do so, the Program has to either use Program Level Indicators that are created to track outputs and outcomes related to the GBF Targets or use the GEF Core Indicators to track outputs and outcomes related to the GBF Targets. We suggest to use a table presenting the link between the IP outcomes, the IP expected results and the GBF targets.

For this IP, the Agency can use the following links (at least the most relevant one):

- Improved management effectiveness of 5.3 million hectares of protected areas (GBF TARGET 3)
- Improved management practices in 1.4 million hectares of land through a variety of approaches including OECMs, community forest concessions, and agroforestry (GBF TARGET 10 and 11)
- 315,000 hectares of high-priority land under restoration to support health of primary forest biome (GBF TARGET 2)
- 15Mt CO<sub>2</sub>e emissions mitigation (GBF TARGET 8 and 11)
- Conservation status for Mesoamerican Forest biomes using the Red List of Ecosystems (GBF Target 1)
- Realized contributions of IPLCs, OECMs and PAs in addressing the loss of IFL to reduced risk of extinction of threatened species (GBF TARGET 4)
- Outcome 1.2/Indicator 1.2.2. Number of updated policies and regulations that support primary forest protection and conservation (GBF TARGET 14)

- Outcome 2.1/Indicator 2.1.1.: Increased management effectiveness of the protected areas that include primary forests with METT scores that improved at least by 10%. (GBF TARGET 3)

- Outcome 2.2/Indicator 2.2.1.: Area (ha) of newly established OMECs that protect primary forests integrity and expand functional connectivity (GBF TARGET 3)

- Outcome 2.2/Indicator 2.2.2: Area of landscapes under improved practices (=GEF CI-4) (ha) (excluding sub indicator 4.5. ? terrestrial OECMs supported) (GBF TARGET 10 and 11)

- Outcome 2.3/Indicator 2.3.1: Area of land restored (=GEF CI-3) (ha) (GBF TARGET 2)

- Outcome 3.1/Indicator 3.1.1.: Amount (USD) of new public and private financial resources that contribute to protect and conserve primary forests and to develop local livelihoods is available. (GBF TARGET 19)

- Outcome 4.2/Indicator 4.2.3.: Level of capacities, technical cooperation and technology transfer on CFB within and between participating countries (measured by tailor-made KAP survey among stakeholders). (TARGET 20 and 21?to be assessed by IP lead agency)

- the IP Coordination Grant and its function should address Targets 20 and 21 to some degree but the Lead Agency should make this assessment after having reviewed the Target language and the planned actions of the Coordination Grant.

- the IP should also contribute to the Targets 22 and 23 through the GEF policies on participation and IPLCs.

**May 12, 2023:**

Thank you for the additional information provided in Annex 1 and uploaded as a separate document. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

A table presenting the links between the Mesoamerica Forest IP outcomes and outputs and relevant GBF targets has been added to the PFD as Annex 1 attachment.

#### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

**7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?**

Secretariat's Comments

**April 27, 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 27, 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 27, 2023**

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**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 24, 2023**

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

**Non-STAR Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

**April 24, 2023**

No. \$2,260,000 was made available from the IW FA. Nevertheless \$2,599,252 is requested because \$339,251 is being requested for the regional platform. Please remove the \$339,251 from the requested IW FA amount so that the total requested does not exceed \$2,260,000.

**May 12, 2023:**

Indeed, the change requested couldn't be made in the Portal and the Agency followed GEF guidance. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

Regional coordination project financing left unchanged following May 3, 2023 email guidance from GEF Sec.

**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 24, 2023**

The total amount requested for the regional coordination project of \$8,5 million is aligned with the resources made available for this project. Nevertheless it includes additional IW resources which were not budgeted. Please remove the requested IW resources from the RCP and adjust the other FA of this project to keep the total budget of this child project at \$8,5 million.

**May 12, 2023:**

Indeed, the change requested couldn't be made in the Portal and the Agency followed GEF guidance. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

Regional coordination project financing left unchanged following May 3, 2023 email guidance from GEF Sec.

**IP Contribution**

Secretariat's Comments

**April 24, 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 24, 2023**

b) and c) Yes, but please check the financial numbers in the Portal to ensure they correspond to those in the LoEs and in the Concept notes (sometimes some rounded numbers slightly differs).

d) Child project ID 11279- Nicaragua: 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 childs 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
11274	Mexico	11273	Mesoamerica Cri	10,000,000			10,000,000	11274	10,000,000			10,000,000	11274	-	-	-	-
11279	Nicaragua	11273	Mesoamerica Cri	6,919,742	1,102,840	1,750,990	9,773,572	11279	6,919,742	1,750,990	1,102,840	9,773,572	11279	-	(648,150)	648,150	-

e) Yes, cleared.

f) N/A

g)

g.1. Please, explore with Conservation International the possibility to include the Positive Conservation Partnerships as a cofinancing partner. Some countries may be eligible to this \$100 million fund launched at the Libreville Meeting.

g.2. Grant is normally classified as 'investment mobilized'. Please revise the below which are classified as 'recurrent expenditures' and change to 'investment mobilized'.

Civil Society Organization	Heifer (Expansión Programa Negocios Verdes)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	300,000.00
Civil Society Organization	NPV (Sinergias FDN-ACOFOP-IAF-TNC)	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	7,000.00

g.3. The agencies below are GEF agencies. Both IUCN and FAO are implementing agencies for this program. Please revise the 'Donor Agency' to 'GEF Agency'.

Donor Agency	IUCN – KfW (Enlazando Paisaje)	Grant	Investment mobilized	500,000.00
Donor Agency	IUCN – KfW (Selva Maya II):	Grant	Investment mobilized	5,000,000.00
Donor Agency	IUCN – AECID (Gobernanza y GIRH)	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,600,000.00
Donor Agency	FAO Mountain Partnership (Italy)	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,000.00
Donor Agency	FAO/IADB: Support for Post-COVID Economic Recovery for indigenous coffee producers	Loans	Investment mobilized	300,000.00

**May 12, 2023:**

b), c) and d) addressed.

g)

g.1. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

g.2. Partially addressed: NPV co-financing is still considered as "recurrent expenditures".

g.3. Not addressed: FAO and IUCN are still considered as "Donor agencies".

### Agency's Comments

#### **IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

**b and c)** Financial numbers in Portal match LOEs (in some cases, the total amount in the LOE is a few dollars higher than the figures in the Portal to account for the need to round down dollar amounts in the GEF Portal. In all cases when rounding down, the dollar(s) have been taken from the Agency fee rather than the Project or PPG financing.

**D)** Financing table error for Nicaragua corrected

**G1)** IUCN discussed with CI possibility of including the PCP partnership as a co-financing partner. CI responds that 'The PCP is under early stages of development and we

don't know yet the geographies that it will target. It is also unclear when the partnership will start disbursing. We take note of IUCN's interest and will provide more info as it becomes available?

**G2) Grant co-financing now classified as ?investment mobilized?**

**G3) FAO and IUCN classification in child project co-financing tables corrected**

**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 24, 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 24, 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 24, 2023**

Yes, with a cofinancing ratio of 1:7.5 including 80% of investments mobilized. 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 24, 2023**

1. According to GEF database, the OFP in Guatemala is Mr. Norman Octavio Mendoza Dominguez (Mr. Gerson Elías Barrios Garrido is the Political Focal Point). Please provide a letter signed by the OFP.
2. In the LoE from Panama, the position of the OFP is missing. Please confirm responding to this comment in the review sheet that his position is "Planning Analyst" as indicated in GEF database (<https://www.thegef.org/who-we-are/focal-points?filter=P>).

**May 12, 2023:**

1. Thank you for providing the new letter of endorsement from the OFP of Guatemala. Cleared.
2. We don't find the new letter LoE from Panama but this comment is not critical.

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

- 1) Identified OFP for Guatemala corrected in new LOE
- 2) Title of Panama OFP clarified in the new LOE

**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 24, 2023:**

In the table "Record of Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Point (s) on Behalf of the Government(s):", please add the link to access to each letter directly from this table.

**May 12, 2023:**

2 links are still missing for Panama and Nicaragua. Considering the LoE from these countries are uploaded in the Document tab of the Portal, this comment is cleared.

### Agency's Comments

#### IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:

A link to access each LOE added to the table ?Record or Endorsement of GEF Operational Focal Points??

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

### Secretariat's Comments

**April 24, 2023**

1. 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). However, the financial information needs to be carefully reviewed considering the guidance provided by the GEF Secretariat as well as the figures that allow the submission to go through. The LoEs need to reflect those figures that allowed the submission included in the Sources of Funding in Portal (please check Mexico, Honduras and El Salvador).

PFID	PFID Title	Child Project ID	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 LOE	BD STAR Allocation Requested \$ in Portal's Source of fund table	CC STAR Allocation Requested \$ in LOE	CC STAR Allocation Requested \$ in Portal's Source of fund table	LD STAR Allocation Requested \$ in LOE	LD STAR Allocation Requested \$ in Portal's Source of fund table	Total GEF Project Financing requested \$ in LOE	Total GEF Project Financing requested \$ in Portal's Financing table	Total Agency fee requested \$ in LOE	Total Agency fee requested \$ in Portal's Financing table	Total PPG requested \$ in LOE	Total PPG requested \$ in Portal's PPG table	Total PPG fee requested \$ in LOE	Total PPG fee requested \$ in Portal's PPG table
11273	Mesoam	11274	Mexico	Mexico's	Mexico's	Laura Eli	Laura Eli	Pronatur	Pronatur	10,000,000.00	10,000,000.00					11,332,416.00	11,332,416.00	1,073,317.00	1,073,317.00				27,000.00
11273	Mesoam	11275	Guatemala	Guatemala	Guatemala	Gerson E	Norman O	Ministry of	Ministry of	8,000,000.00	8,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00			10,708,870.00	10,708,870.00	563,738.00	563,738.00				26,338.00
11273	Mesoam	11276	Honduras	Conserva	Honduras	Malcolm	Malcolm	Secretar	Secretaria	2,000,000.00	2,000,000.00	200,000.00	200,000.00	800,000.00	800,000.00	3,519,725.00	3,519,725.00	316,776.00	316,773.00				13,500.00
11273	Mesoam	11277	El Salvador	Promotin	El Salvador	Eva Maria	Eva Maria	Food and	Ministry of	1,653,300.00	1,653,300.00	106,875.00	106,875.00	234,025.00	234,025.00	3,746,343.00	3,746,343.00						13,443.00
11273	Mesoam	11278	Nicaragua	Protectio	Nicaragua	Javier S	Javier S	Ministry of	Ministry of	6,318,742.00	6,318,742.00			1,102,840.00	1,102,840.00	11,855,440.00	11,855,440.00						26,333.00
11273	Mesoam	11280	Panama	IP - Critic	Panama	Raul Pind	Raul Pind	No Ex Ent	Ministry of	7,000,000.00	7,000,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,000,000.00			9,585,334.00	9,585,334.00	882,732.00	882,732.00				17,939.00

2. The LoE from Honduras doesn't include resources requested from the LD FA. Please revise the financial numbers in the Portal so that they reflect what the OFP agreed on.

3. In the LoE of Nicaragua, the amount used for the CCM FA is higher than the amount requested by the OFP. Please correct the amounts of the CCM and LD FAs in the Portal or provide a revised letter of endorsement that is consistent with the numbers in the Portal.

4. In the LoE of Mexico, resources are requested for BD, LD and CCM FAs while in the financial tables of the Portal, resources are only used for BD FA. As a result, more BD FA

resources than what the OFP authorized are used in the project. Please correct the amounts in the Portal or provide a revised letter of endorsement that is consistent with the numbers in the Portal.

5. In the LoE from El Salvador, STAR resources are requested for BD FA only while in the financial tables of the Portal, resources are used for BD, CCM and LD FAs. As a result, more CCM and LD FA resources than what the OFP authorized are used in the project. Please correct the amounts in the Portal or provide a revised letter of endorsement that is consistent with the numbers in the Portal.

**May 12, 2023:**

1. The Agency addressed the comment.
2. The new LoE from Honduras now match the financial numbers in the Portal. Cleared.
3. The financial numbers in the Portal have been adjusted in the Portal to match the LoE from Nicaragua. Cleared.
4. The new LoE from Mexico now match the financial numbers in the Portal. Cleared.
5. The new LoE from El Salvador now match the financial numbers in the Portal. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

Updated LOEs for the six participating countries match resources entered into the GEF Portal

**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 24, 2023**

No, please provide a map with geo-referenced information.

**May 12, 2023:**

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

**IUCN Agency response to GEF Sec April 24 review comments:**

Map with geo-referenced information is found in Annex C

**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 24, 2023**

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

**May 12, 2023:**

The program can be recommended for clearance after final checking by PPO.

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**

**4/27/2023**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**5/12/2023**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**

**Additional Review (as necessary)**