

# Programme to sustainably manage and restore land and biodiversity in the Guadalquivir Basin

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10627

**Countries**

Bolivia

**Project Name**

Programme to sustainably manage and restore land and biodiversity in the Guadalquivir Basin

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

9/30/2021

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**Focal Area**

Land Degradation

**Project Type**

MSP

## **PIF** ☐

### **CEO Endorsement** ☐

#### **Part I ? Project Information**

##### **Focal area elements**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 8, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

##### **Project description summary**

**2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 13, 2021:**

1. While the component 1 is about governance, planning and capacity building (technical assistance), the component 2 is focused on the ground to improve sustainable production (investment). Nevertheless the component 1 includes the result of 40,200 ha in landscapes under SLM for production systems and the component 2 only includes restoration results. In the project description, the component 2 is not only focused on restoration but also covers SLM. So the distribution of the activities on the ground

between the 2 components is unclear. Please clarify and consider organizing better so that under each component the projects outputs lead to the expected results.

2. In table B, the GEF funding and the co-financing for each component is different from the components description under the alternative scenario. Please correct.

3. The outcome 4.1 isn't formulated as an outcome but as a future activity and is unclear: "The project will strengthen mechanisms for participation...". What are mechanisms for participation which need to be strengthened? the Please reformulate (in table B and in the description of the alternative scenario) and clarify this outcome (in the alternative scenario).

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarifications and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment. The description of the outputs 1.1.2 and 2.1.1 have been edited to address this issue. The scope of the activities of the project under each indicator has also been clarified under the Global Environmental Benefits section and the indicator of the 40,200 hectares has been moved to the component 2.

2. The amounts have been corrected and adjusted in order to match amounts between table B and the description in the alternative scenario.

3. Well noted. The outcome has been reformulated as follows: Improved mechanisms for participation, sustainable territorial management, and LDN monitoring at the river basin level. The description has been corrected in the alternative scenario was expanded (Please refer to paragraphs Paragraph 140-141).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Co-financing**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 8, 2021:**

1. There are 2 different letters from the autonomous municipal Government of Tarija. Both letters begins with "En mi calidad de autoridad del Gobierno Autonomo Municipal de Tarija" and they are signed by the same person. Only one letter is needed by co-financier. Please clarify and amend.
2. The letter from the "Tarija Departmental Autonomous Government" is missing. Please provide the missing co-financing letter as expected according to table C.
3. In table C, the first amount in dollar is higher than the second one while in the corresponding letter (in Bs) it is the opposite. Please correct that mistake.
4. Please specify the type of co-financing from COSAALT
5. The translation in English of the letter from COSAALT is missing. Please provide the missing translation.
6. In the translated letters in English please indicate the exchange rate used to determine the corresponding amount in dollar.

**November 29, 2021:**

- 1, 2, 3 and 5. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
4. It is unclear how granting Bs. 0.50 cents for each of the 42,000 water users can lead to a result of \$217,142. Please clarify including the exchange rate used in the translated co-financing letter. In addition, if the contribution is in cash, isn't it provided as a grant? Why the Financing Type in Table C is reported as "Other"? Please clarify.
6. The exchange rate used is still missing in the translated letter COSAALT. Please complete as needed.

**December 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment and apologies for the confusion. Please note that they are two different letters: A letter from the municipal government and a letter from the departmental government. In the first submission the wrong letter for the departmental government was uploaded, apologies. We are now uploading the correct and updated letters for each case.
2. Please see answer to comment 1, above. The Autonomous Departmental Government of Tarija has also sent FAO a co-financing letter dated September 22, 2021, for an amount of Bs. 83,274,557.00. We are now attaching this letter to the GEF Portal
3. corrected.
4. COSALT's co-financing is in cash and consists in granting Bs. 0.50 cents for each of the 42,000 water users for 12 months during 4 years as a seed for the Water fund that is being proposed by the project. This is equivalent to USD: 217,142. This has been corrected in table C.
5. Well noted. Please refer to the updated file, now uploaded to the GEF portal, including the translations to all co-financing letters.
6. Thank you for the comment. Please refer to the updated file, now uploaded to the GEF portal, that includes the applied exchange rate.

## **December 7, 2021:**

4. Thank you for noting this. The exchange rate used is 6,86 Bs (bolivianos) per 1 USD. This is equivalent to The co-financing from COSAALT has been corrected to USD 146,938. (0,5 Bs for 42,000 user for 48 months = 1,008,000 Bs / 6,86 = 146,938). The tables have been updated in the portal to also reflect the contribution as grant, and as the resources are being reallocated to support this project, it has been categorized as investment mobilized.
6. The exchange rate (1 USD = 6,86 Bs) has been included into the translated letter.

## **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  
**October 8, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**October 8, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**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  
**October 8, 2021:**

There are no changes from the PIF. Cleared.

Agency Response

**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

**October 13, 2021:**

1. The paragraph 1-9 and 18-20 are related to the baseline scenario. Please consider moving them under this more relevant section ensuring there is no repetition in this section.
2. The description from paragraph 21-59 provide useful information but is too long and is not always directly related to the problems the project seeks to solve. Please summarize this part focusing on the main problems and causes the project will address.
3. The main environmental problems related to land degradation in the GRB are summarized using a reference from 1999 (paragraph 60). How do we know the content is still up-to-date? Didn't the PPG phase help updating such information which is critical for the project design? Please clarify and provide updated information.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment, the paragraphs were moved to Baseline scenario and associated projects and were modified to avoid repetition, as requested.
  2. Thank you for the comment. the information has been summarized, as requested.
  3. We have added a new bibliographic citation of 2021, which ratifies the problems described (please refer to paragraphs 22 and 32): The Biodiversity of the Guadalquivir River Basin: Implications of its Conservation for the Region's Water Security. Ministry of Environment and Water (MMAyA), the Foundation for the Development of Ecology (FUNDECO) and the support of the German Cooperation through the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH and the Integrated Management with Watershed Approach project (PROCUENCA, 2021).
- 2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 13, 2021:**

The project description use many acronyms and some them are not fully written not even once in the description (CrG, MST, MSB, GADT, GAMT...). Please ensure the corresponding names are fully written the first time they appear in the project description (except in table B where the space is more limited).

**November 29, 2021:**

We still don't find the names for CrG, MST, MSB and GAMT. Please clarify.

**December 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

Thank you for the comment. The acronyms were revised and translated into English and added in the text and in the list of acronyms, as requested.

**December 7, 2021:**

Corrected CrG for GRB. MST and MSB are with their English equivalents SLM, SFM, included into the Acronyms section in the updated agency project document.

**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

**October 13, 2021:**

1. Illegal land clearing is mentioned as a cause of environmental degradation in the targeted project area. Please clarify how the project will address this problem and ensure the improved local capacity will not lead to additional clearing.

2. The component 1 includes the implementation of LMMPs which "generate multiple benefits" (output 1.1.2). Nevertheless, we learn that the LMMPs are also implemented under the output 2.1.1. Please clarify the scope of the output 1.1.2.



3. Under the output 3.1.1, the activity "Attract international money to feed the seed capital" is unclear and its scope is limited to international resources. Please clarify what is the concrete activity being considered here by the project and clarify how other potential partners including the private sector will be sought.

4. Some partners who will make contributions to the Regional Water Fund are already identified (COSAALT, Production Development Bank and microfinance entities). Nevertheless, the lack of funding is identified as a barrier. Please clarify the kind of stakeholders which will participate with the needed additional resources and provide potential examples.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarifications and additional information. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**November 24, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment, the following information has been added to the alternative scenario section to clarify this issue: The SLM and SFM practices to be implemented are aimed at achieving sustainable production systems at the farm scale, which as a whole will contribute to halting degradation (including land clearing processes) and improving environmental conditions in the GRB. The integrated approach promoted by the project will seek to improve awareness of the importance of preserving environmental functions as well as their integration into the different instruments of integrated territorial planning. Through capacity building and its communication strategy, the project will seek to raise awareness and involve the population in the sustainable management of land, biodiversity and forests.

2. Thank you for the comment. Please note that to avoid confusion we have now rephrased Outputs 1.1.2 and 2.1.1. While component 1 will focus in the enabling environment and the formulation of LMMP, Component 2 will focus in the implementation of SLM and SBM practices as formulated under the LMMPs in a participatory manner with component 1.

3. Thank you for the comment. Please note that this activity has been rephrased for clarity as: "Develop dialogs and agreements at the national and international level to capitalize and feed the seed capital for the Tarija Regional Water Fund". The description

of the output has also been completed to include the roles of the national and international stakeholders in the development of the Water Fund.

4. Please refer to the alternative scenario section where the roles of these stakeholders have been described to clarify this point. With regards to the lack of funding as a barrier and the contributions of the stakeholders, please note that the contributions, and in particular those from COSAALT were leveraged during project preparation. Moreover, in order to work, these contributions need to be complemented with the management plans, feasibility studies and capacity building mechanisms that the project is proposing with its Results Framework.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 13, 2021:**

In this section and in the rest of the project description, please use the acronym GEF-7 instead of FMAM-7.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

Well noted. This was corrected in the GEF Portal and attached agency project document.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 13, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

**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

**October 8, 2021:**

The description consists in the list of the core indicators with no further presentation for the core indicators 3 and 4, which is vague and can apply in many different situations. Please elaborate further on the expected environmental benefits: the different kinds of restoration under the indicator 3, and which improved practices under indicator 4.

**November 29, 2021:**

We don't find the improvements. Please elaborate further on the core indicators 3 and 4 under this section "6) Global Environmental Benefits (GEFTF) and/or Adaptation Benefits (LDCF/SCCF)".

**December 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

Thank you for the comment. Please refer to the alternative scenario section where this has now been clarified.

**December 7, 2021**

The text included in para 170 has been highlighted in the updated agency project document version for better visualization. The text is as follows:

170. The main benefits expected for the global environment based on the project are as follows:

\* Core indicator 3: Surface of valleys with agriculture, slopes, and restored forest areas of 2,500 ha. These areas refer to restoration activities, as follows:

- Subindicator 3.1: 200 hectares of degraded farmlands undergoing restoration
- Subindicator 3.2: 460 hectares of forests and forestlands

- Subindicator 3.3: 1,840 hectares of shrub and/or pasture (including livestock and ranch management)

At a global level, the implementation these practices and the generation of sustainable production systems will have a positive impact on the increase of carbon sequestration, erosion control, environmental functions, biodiversity conservation and sustainable food production.

Core indicator 4: Area of landscape under improved practices (hectares; excluding protected areas) measuring in at 40,200 ha

- Subindicator 4.3: At least 40,200 hectares benefiting in terms of ecosystem functions, biodiversity, productivity, livelihoods, and climate resilience. This indicator includes the surface area of two priority microbasins (Yesera and Pinos), which will benefit from the development of the LMMPs and SLM and SBM practices with an LDN approach. It will contribute to increase the resilience of communities to climate change, reduce vulnerability to desertification and drought, and strengthen food security with sovereignty, among others.

**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

**October 8, 2021:**

1. The section titled "Scale Up/Scale Out" appears to be under the sustainability section while it should be at the same level. Please amend accordingly.

2. The GEF support will contribute to create and implement non-reimbursable financial mechanisms. Please clarify how such mechanisms will be sustainable over time after the project termination.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment. This has been corrected as requested.

2. Thank you for the comment. The sustainability section has been complemented to address this concern. The participation of multiple stakeholders, contributors, and the appropriation of the financial mechanism at the national level is the basis for the sustainability of the proposed financial mechanism (Water Fund).

#### **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  
**October 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the map. In addition, please provide the geo-referenced data of the project intervention areas.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**November 24, 2021**

The Coordinates of the GRB have now been included in the GEF Portal and attached agency Project Document.

**Child Project**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
N/A

Agency Response  
**Stakeholders**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?**  
**Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the**

**implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 11, 2021:**

1. We note the Stakeholder Engagement Matrix uploaded as a separate document includes the details on the stakeholder consultation during the project formulation. Please provide a brief summary in the Portal entry of the stakeholders consulted and the main results which informed the project design.
2. Under the section "Select what role civil society will play in the [project:](#)", only the category "Co-financier" is inform with a "No". Please inform the other categories.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional information and adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Well noted, The stakeholder has now been included under the portal entry.
2. The role of the Civil society has been corrected and adjusted in the GEF Portal and Agency Project Document. Please refer to the updated stakeholders section.

**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

**October 11, 2021:**

Thank you for the information provided and the uploaded Gender Action Plan as a separate document. Cleared

Agency Response

**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  
**October 11, 2021:**

We learn that the plan to work in coordination with public-private partnerships ... will be done via the use of a national ecological seal in the framework of the PGS. Nevertheless the alternative scenario doesn't mention any seal nor PGS. Please clarify the engagement of the private sector and ensure it is well aligned with the proposed alternative scenario.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**November 24, 2021**

Thank you for this comment. Well noted. Please note that the references to the PGS have now been removed from the project. Consistently with the alternative scenario, this project will no work with PGS. The Private sector section has been adjusted to be consistent with this arrangement.

**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  
**October 11, 2021:**

1. On the climate risk, please refer in the table to the climate risk screening uploaded as a separate document.
2. The risk of the actual establishment and operation of the financial mechanism is not mentioned. Please justify why or consider that risk too.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment and additional information. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Completed as requested.
2. Thank you for the comment. Well noted. Please refer to the Risk section where this information has now been added.

#### **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

**October 11, 2021:**

1. The project coordinator should be charged under the PMC and not the project components, unless 1- his technical role is justified and clearly presented in the project description and the ToRs (including the definition of outputs) and 2- his/her capacity to handle the role of coordinator is demonstrated. In any case, it is difficult to understand how the project can be coordinated if the cost of the project coordinator charged under the components is higher than the cost charged under the PMC. Please clarify and amend.
2. The budget doesn't show which entity is executing which budget item (columns W, X, Y and Z of the uploaded excel file). Please complete the budget with this missing information and ensure this information is also included in the Annex E of the Portal entry.
3. There should be proportionality between the PMC covered by co-financed amounts and the PMC covered by the GEF funding. In the proposal, the PMC covered by co-financed is 5% of the project budget and the PMC covered by the GEF funding is 10%. Please amend.

**November 29, 2021:**

- 1, 2 and 3. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.
4. In addition, please provide an English version of the project budget (both in Annex E and as an uploaded document). Please apologies for not having raised this issue in the previous review.



**December 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the English version of the budget. Cleared

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment. The coordinator has now been fully included under the PMC, in the budget.
2. The budget was completed showing the executing entities.
3. Thank you for the comment. This has been corrected, as requested. Please refer to the updated amount of PMC from co-financing.

**December 7, 2021**

4. An english version of the budget has been included in Annex E and uploaded as requested. Thank you noting this.

**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

**October 11, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**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

**October 11, 2021:**

1. The description doesn't mention how existing lessons informed the project concept and plan. Please clarify. In particular, please provide the lessons learnt and references which led to the design of the proposed financial mechanism including the Regional Water Fund which is critical for the project success.
2. Some outputs are listed in paragraph 275 but it is not clear whether they are all the key ones, when they will be provided and their cost. With the Knowledge Management Approach, please include the budget, the key deliverables and a timeline (we suggest in a table as it is easy to read).
3. Please also explain how the knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability.

**November 29, 2021:**

1. The paragraph 265 doesn't clearly refers to any existing lessons/experiences informing the project design including the proposed financial mechanism with the Regional Water Fund. Please clarify.
2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
3. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

**December 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

## Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment. Well noted. This has now been clarified under the Knowledge Management Section. Please refer to paragraph 265.
2. Thank you for the comment. Please refer to the newly added table 7 for the explanation.

3. Thank you for the comment. This is now explained on the Knowledge management section. Please refer to paragraphs 267-271.

**December 7, 2021**

1. Apologies, the correct paragraph is 263. Please see below.

263. Actions related to knowledge management will also be carried out with respect to existing financial mechanisms that contribute to guaranteeing water of sufficient quality and quantity for human consumption, ecological flow and productive systems. In this sense, information, knowledge and capacity exchange processes will be carried out between financial mechanisms such as the Quito Water Fund, the Lima Water Fund - AQUA Fund, the Productive Development Bank, the experience on financial mechanisms of the GEF - LDN project in Panama, among others that could contribute to strengthen the financial sustainability scheme of the Regional Water Fund. However, it is important to mention that in the design phase of the project the technical, financial and environmental feasibility study of the Fund has not yet been carried out; however, progress has been made in the process of sensitizing the civil society in general and the institutions that carry out various productive activities in the Central Valley of Tarija, so that they can guarantee water for their productive systems, but above all for the human consumption of the local population 365 days a year, in sufficient quality and quantity, to avoid shortages and any possibility of social conflict. All this associated to the implementation of SLM and SWM practices with NDT approach.. It is important to mention that Agua Capital is part of the group of Water Funds supported by the Latin American Alliance of Water Funds, an agreement between the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the FEMSA Foundation, the Global Environment Facility (GEF- GEF) and The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in order to contribute to water security in Latin America and the Caribbean through the creation and strengthening of Water Funds. We currently have 23 Water Funds in 8 countries of the region, a space in which the dialogue of the bodies that direct and manage the water funds will also be sought.

**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  
October 8, 2021:**

1. There is no appendix 11 in the Portal entry. Please clarify.
2. In the Portal, the supporting document doesn't include a complete screening of the risks but only a part of it with identified risks. Please upload the complete ESS screening document.

**November 29, 2021:**

1. There is still a reference to the appendix 11 (first line of paragraph 165). Please note that the numbering of this paragraph is incorrect as the previous one is 276. Please correct.
2. Thank you for uploading the complete ESS screening. Cleared.

**December 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. The text on the section has been edited to delete the reference to appendix I1.
2. A Complete ESS screening has now been uploaded to the GEF Portal.

**December 7, 2021**

1. Thank you for the comment. The correct Appendix is I1, referring to the risk certification found in the agency project document, it has been corrected. The numbering was altered when copying the information into the portal, it has been corrected to reflect the same paragraph as the project document.

**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

**October 8, 2021:**

In the budget provided, the cost of M&E is \$97,633 while it is \$81,083 in the M&E section in the Portal entry. Please correct so that the numbers are consistent.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

Well noted. This has now been corrected on the Project Document, GEF portal and attached Project Budget.

**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

**October 8, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 8, 2021:**

1. In Annex D, please only provide the map of the geographical location of the project area and ensure the other maps are in the Prodoc and/or uploaded as a separate document under the document section of the Portal.

2. In Annex E, please provide a budget using the GEF template showing the executing agency for each of the expenses and the M&E (available here: <https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update>).

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

1. According to the comment, the complementary maps are presented in an attached document and will be uploaded to the portal. Only the map of the location of the project and coordinates remain in Annex D.

2. The Budget has been inserted as requested including the executing agencies.

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 8, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 11, 2021:**

The GEF Secretariat comments at PIF approval were the following:

1. For the establishment of the funds, please consider possible links with and lessons learned from the relevant initiatives on sustainable landscape finance that are currently being developed, such as the GEF funded project "Green Finance for Sustainable Landscapes", among others.
2. Please explore in depth the engagement possibilities from the private sector.
3. To elaborate the KM approach, please consider the following important aspects that are not clearly explained in the PIF: an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project design, plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives

& evaluations and processes to capture, assess and document the information, lessons, best practices & expertise generated during implementation.

Please clarify in the Annex B how these comments were addressed.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

**November 24, 2021**

Well noted. Please refer to Annex B in the GEF Portal and attached Project document where a table has been included explaining how the secretariat comments were addressed during project preparation.

**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response  
**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**October 8, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**October 8, 2021:**

Thank you for the map. Please see the comment above on the missing geo-referenced data.

**November 29, 2021:**

Thank you for adding geo-referenced data. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**November 24, 2021**

The missing data has been included.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A



#### Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

#### Agency Response

#### GEFSEC DECISION

#### RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**October 13, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above and clarify exactly where the text is amended in the Portal entry (the new text can be highlighted in yellow).

**November 29, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

**December 8, 2021:**

Thank you for addressing the comments. The CEO approval is now recommended.

#### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	10/13/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	11/29/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	12/8/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**