

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

Review PIF 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

6/25/2020

Review completed by PM

12/16/2020

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Land Degradation

Project Type

MSP

PIF**Part I ? Project Information****Focal area elements**

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
July 7, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response**Indicative project/program description summary**

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
July 7, 2020:

1. The number of hectares impacted by the project appears low considering the total budget of the project (\$13 million). Please revise the numbers and provide an explanation of the assessment of expected results.

2. Alongside sustainable and resilient productive landscape, biodiversity conservation is an important and explicit focus of the project. Nevertheless, this focus is not reflected in the core indicators table, notably through the sub-indicator 4.1. Please consider

quantifying also area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (sub-indicator 4.1).

3. In table B and in the alternative scenario, only the the core indicator 3.1 (1,270 ha of degraded slopes under silvopastoral management restored) and 11 (number of beneficiaries/families) are mentioned among the indicators. Please complete with the other core indicators (3.2, 4.1 and 4.3) so that we can relate the outputs with their expected results.

October 12, 2020

1. Thank you for the adjustments and improvement. Nevertheless, the overall results remain too low considering the important total investments including the co-financing as investments mobilized (in total, the amount is around \$14 million in cash). As indicated in the previous comment, please consider increasing further the results and provide an explanation of the assessment of these results (including the costs assumption per hectare).

2. Thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless, the biodiversity outputs are mentioned extensively throughout the project description (120 references in total!). In this case, as the biodiversity benefits are not measured, please take out entirely of the PIF the references to biodiversity outputs and objectives and only focus on Land Degradation Focal Area objectives.

3. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

December 16, 2020:

1. and 2.: Thank your for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020:

1. The number of hectares has been revised and adjusted throughout the document. In particular, We have revised core indicators 3 and 4. The changes are reflected in the core indicators, results framework and global environmental benefits. In the previous proposal we considered a total of 5,689 hectares for indicators 3 and 4. We now consider 6,799 (Core indicators: 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 and 4.3).

2. The following information was added to explain the role of biodiversity for the project. Nevertheless, please note that originally the project was being designed with a bigger budget to consider explicitly biodiversity outputs. Nevertheless, after the budget was reduced, we consider biodiversity outputs as a co-benefit of all the other core indicators.

We have included the following information:

The solution of the considered barriers in the project resolves consecutively problems of biodiversity reducing deterioration of the plant cover, reducing fire or burning of plant cover and environmental threats due to expansion of human settlements and climate change effects by recovering the vegetal cover thus, increases biomass and protect soils increasing the carbon stocks (also a global benefit) which recovers biodiversity and greater availability of the water resources indeed integrity of actions a virtuous cycle as the nature is.

3. The updated information of core indicators is now included in Table B, and the alternative scenario.

December 4, 2020

1. Please note that we now consider the following for Core Indicator 4.3: Two Sub-Basin Integrated Territorial Plans PTDIs and community agreements (Yesera and los Pinos) leading to multiple benefits in terms of sustainable biodiversity and land use, restored ecosystem services, enhanced productivity and livelihoods and climate resilience (40,200 ha).

This is considerably higher than the 4,299 ha proposed before. This fraction will be part of specific activities of the project: Support the process to prepare and generate financing for the pilot execution of two sub-basin Territorial Plans of Integrated Development (PDTI-SC, in Spanish) covering an area of 4,299 ha. This includes a Yesera basin (2,597 ha) and Pinos basin (1,702 ha)

2. We have deleted references to biodiversity throughout the document. In particular in the objective and results framework. This project will focus only on Land Degradation Focal Area Objectives.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 7, 2020:

1. For 2 co-financiers (Gobierno Autonomo Municipal de Padcaya and Gobierno Autonomo Departamental de Tarija), it is not specified whether the support will be "Investment mobilized" or "Recurrent expenditures". Please fully complete the Table C.

2. In addition, please clarify what kind of contribution can be at the same time as "grant" and "recurrent expenditures" (it is the case for the participating local Governments).

October 12, 2020:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020

The Co-financing table has been revised. We clarified the type of support in each case.

Please note that we have corrected the contribution ?grant? is now listed as investment mobilized.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 7, 2020:

Yes. The proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines. Cleared.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 7, 2020:

Yes. The total STAR resources allocated to Bolivia is \$17,821,027.75 and the total amount utilized including this project is \$13,489,246. Cleared.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 7, 2020:

Yes, considering the use of marginal adjustment. The total LD resources allocated to Bolivia is \$3,192,226.67 and the total amount of LD resources utilized including this project is \$3,250,000. The country needs to withdraw \$57,773.33 from either CC or BD focal area where this amount is still available.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020

Thank you for the comment, it is well noted.

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 7, 2020:

Yes, the PPG request is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 7, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 7, 2020:

The private sector is expected to be involved in the project but it is not mentioned in the taxonomy. Please complete the taxonomy accordingly.

October 12, 2020:

We don't see the Taxonomy table uploaded in the package (Annex C of the PIF). Please provide the Taxonomy table with the appropriate fields selected.

December 16, 2020:

Thank you for the adding the Taxonomy table to the package. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020

The taxonomy has been revised to include the private sector: the box individuals/entrepreneurs was selected.

December 4, 2020:

The updated Taxonomy is now included in the portal and Annex C of the latest attached word document to the submission.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Yes but there are some typos like "3,194.69 km2 (319,469 hectares)" in paragraph 2, the livestock increase with numbers without unit in paragraph 3... There are two section referred with an "i)"... Please check and correct the typos throughout the project description.

October 12, 2020:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020:

The document has been revised for typos. In particular, we have included in paragraph 2 pg 8: ?3,194.69 km2 (equivalent to 319,469 hectares)?. We added units ?heads of cattle? in paragraph 3 and we corrected the enumeration of the section.

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

1. The baseline scenario, and particularly the baseline projects and programs are mostly focused on water management and irrigation. Please further elaborate on the baseline related to agriculture development and biodiversity the project can harness to meet its objectives.

2. All the baseline scenario refers to national and local initiatives. Please explore the potential baseline also supported by the international cooperation.

October 12, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.

Agency Response
September 14, 2020:

The following information was added to the document to address this comments:

1. We have added paragraph 29 page 18:

In Guadalquivir basin there is a very limited existing governance structure that is weak and limited in scope to only the water sector and not including an integral approach of water management across all relevant sectors (such as agriculture, energy, land use, rural and urban development).

In this context, it is necessary to incorporate an integral view of challenges and solutions focusing at basin level where it is necessary to take actions of preservation of the natural resources on the geographic levels of landscapes and water basins.

In this way, the project objectives aim to avoid land degradation that reduces water availability to human consumption and agricultural irrigation in a holistic manner.

We have added to paragraph 27, page 17:

Actually the mean yields of some crops in Guadalquivir valley are: maize 1,5t/ha, potato 7 t/ha, green pea 1,5t/ha, peach 16 t/ha, grape 12t/ha.

2. We have added paragraph 35:

The German GIZ, in coordination with the Vice-Ministry of Water Resources and Departmental authorities in Tarija, has the objective of implementing the project called PROCUENCA, which aims at strengthening the capacities of the stakeholders at the basin level to improve integrated water resource management. To this end, plans and projects are prepared to increase water security and the resilience of the population vulnerable to climate change. It seeks to implement programs and projects related to water resources related to drinking water, sanitation, for productive issues through intelligent conservation agriculture and environmental services considering the basin.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
July 8, 2020:

1. While the project is focused on the Guadalquivir River Basin, the description says it aims to generate a favorable national context and a governance system for Land Degradation Neutrality. Please explain how this local project will articulate and influence the national context.
2. In component 2, selected activities under the plans will be implemented but these activities are vague. Please clarify what kind of activities are considered on the ground to achieve the project objectives. In particular, please clarify what kind of agriculture and forest restoration is considered and with what species.
3. The description of component 2 says it aims to implement sustainable practices that contribute to the mitigation and adaptation of climate change. Considering the land degradation and biodiversity focus of the project, addressing climate change should not be the first objective of this component. Please reformulate ensuring the objective of this component is aligned with the project objectives.
4. In component 3, the regional fund is for conservation and integrated management of water, soil and biodiversity. Nevertheless, the expected investments focus on productive enterprises. Please clarify how the investments will serve the Fund purpose of biodiversity conservation.
5. Some clarification is needed about the regional fund and its feasibility: beyond the elaboration of documents and regulations for the administration and operation of the Fund, it is unclear how it will be capitalized. Please elaborate further on what stakeholders are expected to capitalize the Fund, what is the strategy that will be put in place to convince the potential financiers, what kind of funds (grants, loans) is considered and how much financial resources are expected to be raised.
6. The description is unclear on how the project will address the barrier of inadequate attention to biodiversity. Please explain.

October 12, 2020:

- 1, 2, 3. Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.
4. The response provided doesn't address comment 4. We can accept it if the comment above in Part I/Box 2 on biodiversity focus is addressed.
5. The response doesn't fully address the comment and is not always clear, particularly regarding: the strategy that will be put in place to convince the potential financiers, the kind, role and motivation of the private sector that will engage and the amount of financial resources which are expected to be raised. In addition, the following part of the paragraph is unclear "...but fundamentally orders local contributions for the conservation of Water Sources: State bodies, cooperatives, private companies, among others, but,

does not." Please clarify as needed the regional fund which is a key element of the project.

6. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

December 16, 2020:

4. and 5.: Thank you for the clarification. For the establishment of the funds, please consider during the PPG phase 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. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020

The following information was added to the document to address this comments:

1. We have included in the alternative scenario:

One of the main sources of income for the inhabitants of the Guadalquivir basin is agriculture. Thus, all investments in technical assistance services that will be directed for the optimization of water use and improved management of natural resources will be realized through improved governance structures. This improvement in local governance structures for Land Degradation Neutrality, that will be achieved through a participatory model involving not only the local institutions but also the local communities. Experiences and lessons learned from this improved governance system will be monitored and evaluated and best practices can be applied in other areas of the country.

Furthermore, we would like to refer to the following sentences of paragraph 1:

This will inform lessons learned and identification of best practices for scaling up to address priority land degradation problems in the interlinked mountain and valley landscapes which are typical of the central mountainous region of Bolivia, or the Valleys Macroregion where 3,290,000 people live, equivalent to 30 percent of the national population. The Guadalquivir basin is a sample territorial area that can be a catalyst for national public policies/strategies and participatory planning processes for conservation, sustainable use and restoration of land, biodiversity and water resources, based on the LDN hierarchy, for application across the Valleys Macroregion.

We have reformulated Outcome 1.1 Pg23.

Effective governance mechanisms for water, soil and biodiversity management in landscapes of the Guadalquivir River Basin have been designed, validated and implemented contributing to the goals of LDN, biodiversity conservation, sustainable production systems

2 & 3. We have reformulated Component 2, please see component 2

We have reformulated paragraph 54 pg 24.

The component aims to implement sustainable practices that contribute to a reduction of land degradation and a restoration of the biodiversity through implementation of basin management plans, holistic management of pastures, reforestation of mountain landscapes, and conservation agriculture. The main beneficiaries are at least 200 family farmers in the project intervention area that practice organic agriculture (output 2.1.1). Additional benefits would include the mitigation and adaptation of climate change, and sustainable income generation for the communities in the Central Tarija Valley.

We have reformulated paragraph 55, page 25.

At mountain landscape level the component seeks to implement rotational silvopastoral management to recover pastures reducing overgrazing, creating conditions to improve biomass and protect microbasins improving water availability and restoring biodiversity. The component further seeks technical support for the establishment of 12 Farmer Field Schools (output 2.1.2) and the establishment of a data and information monitoring system (Output 2.1.3)

4 & 5. We have reformulated rephrased the description of component 3. Paragraph 59 and 60 pg 27:

The regional fund practices are closely related with 20 ventures implemented by associations and complemented by natural resources management, the project and other technical institutions have to bring technical assistance. Two options have to be established: a revolving fund or grants/ counterparts by associations depending the economical conditions of family farmers. The project will work in a first instance under administrative, operational mechanisms and financial management arrangements established by the Regional Institutions, catalyzing the economical resources capture based on State and private sectors on annual budgets.

The project will work in a first instance under administrative, operational mechanisms and financial management arrangements established by the Regional Institutions, catalyzing the economical resources capture based on State and private sectors on annual budgets ensuring access for rural families and associations.

We have rephrased paragraph 58:

A regional financial mechanism (RFM) will have to be established by the Bolivian State, and thus, can legally receive funds from State entities (Central Government, Departmental Government, Municipalities, etc.). The mechanism will have an autonomous management and a board composed by civil society and the State which manages the funds and technical cooperation, but fundamentally orders local contributions for the conservation of Water Sources: State bodies, cooperatives, private companies, among others, but, does not. In this sense, for the execution of actions, the fund should resort to entities that already have installed capacity; government, municipalities, decentralized entities, which manage resources; that is broadly participative where the project can be involved and involves all the actors linked to the subject: social organizations, business people, universities, and that contributes from its board of directors to adequate water governance in the Central Valley of Tarija

6. We refer to paragraph 21, page 15:

The solution of the considered barriers in the project resolves consecutively problems of biodiversity reducing deterioration of the plant cover, reducing fire or burning of plant cover and environmental threats due to expansion of human settlements and climate change, the effects of vegetal recover: increases biomass availability, protect soils increasing the carbon organic stocks (also a global benefit) consecutively recovers biodiversity and enhance water availability resources indeed integrity of actions a virtuous cycle as the nature is.

Furthermore, **In outcome 1.1** aims at: Effective governance mechanisms for water, soil and biodiversity management in landscapes of the Guadalquivir River Basin have been designed, validated and implemented.

Thus, outcome 1 looks at, through intensive stakeholder engagements, raise awareness for the challenges related to land degradation and biodiversity recovery.

In outcome 2, the objective is to implement practices (such as conservation agriculture, holistic silvopastoral management, reforestation) that can showcase the actual benefits of these practices for the protection and restoration of the natural resources, including water resources, as well as the biodiversity.

In outcome 3, through the work of the regional financial mechanism, the protection of biodiversity will be one of the criteria to select beneficiaries of the regional financial mechanism, and thus further sensitizing biodiversity conservation efforts.

December 4, 2020:

4. We addressed the comment, this project will deal only with land degradation area objectives. References to biodiversity objectives have been removed throughout the document.

5. Please see the revised information in the alternative scenario section. We have now clarified in component 3 that the strategy to convene stakeholders and capitalize the fund will

be develop by the present project to support the development of the fund.

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

In this section, the project mainly describe its alignment with multilateral environmental agreement (UNCCD and UNCBD) and national priorities. There is no clear presentation of the project incremental cost reasoning. Please elaborate on how the project will articulate with and build on the baseline scenario to meet its objectives taking into account the identified barriers. Please clearly demonstrate the added value of the project to what is already in place in terms of existing policy, framework, initiatives, eventual other internationally funded projects...

October 12, 2020:

The added text remains vague, such as the project "resolves problems of landscape degradation", "environmental benefits are related to the restoration of ecosystems"... and there is no link with the existing described baseline and what is lacking in this baseline that the project will cover. What will the project add to, for instance, the nascent Platform for the Guadalquivir Basin, the existing projects such as Procuenca and the existing programs that provide the co-financing of this proposal? Please clarify and justify the additional contribution of GEF investment to what is already in place.

December 16, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020:

The following information was added to the document to address this comments:

We included Paragraph 68 pg 30

The present GEF Project, resolves problems of landscape degradation which will be almost irreversible in the short term, especially due to climate change trends; The environmental benefits are related to the restoration of ecosystems that will allow the increase of carbon stocks, the improvement of biodiversity and the recovery of the water resources of the Guadalquivir River Basin and productivity. The project will work in conservation, sustainable management and restoration of the land resource and its sustainable use systems and will increase connectivity which could include many aspects such as upstream and downstream mountain and valley landscapes, managed production systems of rural and urban communities and all sectors to be involved under participative land use planning, improving the effectiveness of management approaches at the river basin and sub-basin levels, considering a platform that takes into account existing and new civil society entities through a monitoring system that tracks progress according to LDN and other relevant national objectives.

We included Paragraph 70 pg 31

(?)by improving the effectiveness of existing basin management approaches especially at sub-basin level, this means the recovery of ecosystems and biodiversity through the restitution of vegetation cover and water basin areas this allows to recover biodiversity, improve soil conditions reduce soil runoff in an integrated manner, improve the availability of water resources and the fixation of organic carbon, thus increasing its productive capacity and promoting biodiversity, (?)

December 4, 2020:

Please note that we have revised the first part of the incremental cost section to build upon the baseline and co-financing and to explain how the project addresses the barriers explained in the first section of the project description.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

1. As mentioned above, the targets in terms of number of hectares are too low and BD target are missing (sub-indicator 4.1). Considering the total investment and the importance of the biodiversity focus, the targets notably for the sub-indicators 4.1 and 4.3 should be higher. Considering and exploring impacts beyond the pilot sites could be a way to increase the expected results of the project.

2. The paragraph 71 mentions "40,200 ha (Core Indicator 4.1)". This is confusing as neither this number of hectares nor this core indicator is mentioned among the targets. Please explain and correct as needed.

October 12, 2020:

1. Please refer to the comments above in Part I/box 2 on the expected overall results of the project.
2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

December 16, 2020:

Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020:

1. Please note that we have revised core indicators, results framework and alternative scenario following the comment above.
2. Please note that we have revised the section on Global Environmental Benefits to clarify.

December 4, 2020:

1. In line with the comment mentioned, we have deleted references to biodiversity throughout the document. In particular in the objective and results framework. This project will focus only on Land Degradation Focal Area Objectives.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

The description says the economic sustainability implies the opening of a financial mechanism, including the regional Fund, which is indeed one of the key project outcomes allowing the achievement of the results over time. Nevertheless, the sustainability of this Fund is not explained. Please elaborate further how this Fund will be sustainable.

October 12, 2020:

The explanation remains unclear: it refers to so-called "institutional Annual Operational Plans" which are not mentioned anywhere else in the document (what are these plans and who manages them?). In addition, we don't know who are the targeted stakeholders from the private sector and their motivation to engage in this process. Please clarify.

December 16, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. During PPG phase, please explore in depth the engagement possibilities from the private sector.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020:

The following information was added to the document to address this comments:

We have added paragraph 84 pg 35

The economic sustainability implies a public-private partnership through which economic resources will be collected for the Fund maintenance, the resources will be registered in the institutional Annual Operational Plans as well as will be part of the private sector.

A mixed Board of Directors will be organized taking as a reference base the government of Tarija and the municipalities of Tarija, Padcaya, Uriondo, San Lorenzo.

December 4, 2020:

We have revised and cleared the information for the economic sustainability of the project. The project will contribute to the development of the fund and will also develop the strategy to involve the private sector.

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

1. The proposal states that the following stakeholders have participated in consultations during the project identification phase: Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities, Civil Society Organizations and Private Sector Entities. Please present briefly how concretely these stakeholders have been consulted.
2. In addition, please explain in the table what the stakeholder "PROMETA" is and ensure CSOs are clearly involved in the project implementation.

October 12, 2020:

1. The description still doesn't present how concretely the stakeholders, including the family farmers, the CSOs and private sector entities, have been consulted in the context of the elaboration of this proposal. Please clarify as needed.
2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

December 16, 2020:

Thank you for the additional inputs. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020

The following information was added to the document to address this comments:

Please note that we have unchecked the box indigenous peoples and local communities. There are no indigenous people in Guadalquivir river Basin.

Previously we were considering the box considering family farmers as local communities. Although the box was unchecked we added into the section ?family farmers who request the project through the Sindical Federation of Farmer Association of Tarija?

2. We have updated the table with a description of PROMETA. It leads the design of the Fund of the Water under consultation with public and private institutions in addition to local governance actions and departmental environmental initiatives and programs among them. PROMETA has implemented the GEF-MSP Grant TF 051578

December 4, 2020:

1. We have included a description as to when the different stakeholders were consulted in the process of identification of this project.

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
July 8, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
July 8, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

The main project risks are identified in the description and the climate risk is addressed in a separate uploaded document. Cleared.

October 12, 2020:

The continuous evolution of the COVID-19 pandemic and its already observed and potential consequences on project design and implementation unfortunately obliges us now to consider that important risk too. Some risk and opportunity analysis needs to be undertaken at this stage. Please add a the risk analysis and consider eventual opportunities this project could provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics (it can be a specific separate note after the risk table). For further clarification and possible guidance, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14.

December 16, 2020:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

December 4, 2020:

Thank you, point taken. We have now added a description of COVID-19 mitigation measures and opportunities to enhance resilience in the risk section.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with

relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

1. The institutional arrangement is briefly described but the management, monitoring and evaluation and their responsible entity are not explicitly outlined. Please clarify who will undertake these activities and what will be the respective contribution of FAO and the involved government authorities.
2. The description refers to a project "GEFID 10xxx" and explains "proposed project will coordinate with GEF IA and EA? (to be specified)". Please note that this project has been approved by the GEF Council in December 2019 and update the paragraph accordingly.

October 12, 2020:

1. Please clarify whether the "day-to-day management of the Project" implemented by the Project Coordination Unit also includes the Monitoring and evaluation.
2. Thank you for the update. Cleared.

December 16, 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020:

The following information was added to the document to address this comments:

1. We have clarified that the Project Coordination Unit will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the Project.

2. Included paragraph 95 pg 45.

"GEFID 10393" and explains "proposed project will coordinate with GEF IA and EA

The project will coordinate by exchanging intervention experiences and how from local level can retrieve the National Strategy of Land Degradation Neutrality.

December 4, 2020:

We have revised the text to clarify that the day to day M&E of the project will be conducted by the project coordination unit. The evaluations (MTR, Final Evaluation, audits if necessary) will be conducted by FAO, in compliance with FAO and GEF guidelines.

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed knowledge management (KM) approach in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Yes, the knowledge management approach is in particular embedded in component 4. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Yes, a "Project Risk Certification" Document is uploaded in the Portal assessing the overall risk as "moderate". Cleared.

In addition, please note that this document also mentions that the project budget is 6,081,782 USD, which is not the case. For CEO approval, please ensure the ESS screening documentation is fully consistent with the project.

Agency Response

September 14, 2020

Thank you for the comment, well noted. We will take it into account for CEO endorsement. The cause of the difference is that the initial request by the country was \$US 6,081,782 that was later changed by the Ministry of Environment to \$US 1,750,000.

Part III ? Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Yes, the project has been endorsed by the current GEF OFP in Bolivia, Mr. Alfredo Alvarez Saavedra. Cleared.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

July 8, 2020:

Thank you for submitting this potentially good proposal. The PIF is not yet recommended as some improvements are still needed. Please address the comments made.

October 12, 2020:

Thank you for the improvements. Please address the remaining comments.

January 4, 2021:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. Nevertheless, further analysis reveal that while this project has provided good considerations of gender, it is unclear whether any gender assessments are planned to be carried out during the PPG stage. Please elaborate further on the Agency plans to carry out analytical work to inform project development and ensure gender responsive implementation of the project. Please apologize for not having raised this issue earlier. In addition, as the project is expected to improve women access to natural resources, please also consider checking the box "closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources".

January 7, 2021:

Thank you for clarifying the Agency plans on gender consideration during the PPG phase. Cleared.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please consider the following comments during the PPG phase:

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.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	7/8/2020	9/14/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/13/2020	1/6/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/4/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/7/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Context:

Land degradation is a key environmental problem of Bolivia which established LDN voluntary targets in 2017. In the Department of Tarija in the south of the country, the main problems that affect livelihoods and natural resources are land degradation and biodiversity loss due to extensive grazing and burning for clearing land, uncontrolled fires, intensive cropping systems that cause runoff and erosion and affect land productivity and the quality and availability of water in the valley, as well as the settlement expansion and the effects of climate change. In this Department, the situation of the Guadalquivir basin, where the project will take place, is particularly

representative of the problem of land degradation in Bolivia's central mountainous region.

To promote the sustainable use of natural resources and contain the increasing pressure of agriculture production in the project area, the involved stakeholders face institutional weaknesses for integrated management and planning and for the implementation of policies, inefficient use of water in production systems, low land productivity, inadequate attention to the importance of conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, and absence of intersectoral and financial mechanisms promoting the integral and sustainable management of lands.

Project:

To combat land degradation considering the existing barriers, the present proposal aims to implement an integrated and systemic model of Land Degradation Neutrality (LDN) in the Plurinational State of Bolivia, that considers the sub-basin as the unit of analysis and implementation of participatory LDN action plans.

The project is composed of 4 components: 1. Strategic framework for strengthened and gender sensitive governance and integrated territorial management enabling the restoration of vegetation and environmental functions and sustainable socio-economic development in the Guadalquivir River Basin; 2. Demonstration of sustainable land and forest management practices in the Central Tarija Valley; 3. Financial mechanism for the conservation and integrated management of water, soil and vegetation, as well as the establishment of productive ventures composed by associated farmers; and 4. Project management, monitoring evaluation and dissemination of experiences.

The project is well aligned with the country priorities, particularly under the UNCCD framework, developing a model to promote sustainable land management at scale to achieve LDN.

sustainability, scaling-up and Innovation:

In addition to institutional and policy reforms and capacity building, the establishment of a public-private partnership and a dedicated trust fund are expected to provide sustainability and innovation to the project. In addition, the Guadalquivir basin is approached as a sample territorial area that can then be a catalyst for national public strategies and participatory planning processes for conservation, sustainable use and restoration of lands.

Global Environment Benefits:

The project foresees the delivering of the following Global Environmental Benefits and co-benefits: the restoration of 2,500 ha of degraded lands including 200 ha of agriculture lands, 460 ha of forests and 1840 ha of natural grass and shrublands; 40,200 ha of

landscapes under improved practices with SLM and improved water management; and 1,836 direct beneficiaries (gender balanced) with improved access to resources and services.

Even if it is not a direct objective of the project, the rich biodiversity of the protected area Sama Mountain Biological Reserve, which is part of the central valley of Tarija, should also benefit from its results.

Co-financing:

Nearly all the expected co-financing of \$12.25 million is provided by national and local Governments as investments mobilized. Some in-kind support from the targeted communities will also support the project.