



Amazon Sustainable Landscape Approach in the National System of Protected Areas and Strategic Ecosystems of Bolivia

Part I: Project Information

Name of Parent Program

Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program - Phase II

GEF ID

10730

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

CBIT/NGI

CBIT

NGI

Project Title

Amazon Sustainable Landscape Approach in the National System of Protected Areas and Strategic Ecosystems of Bolivia

Countries

Bolivia

Agency(ies)

CAF

Other Executing Partner(s):

MMAYA (Ministry of Environment and Water)

Executing Partner Type

Government

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Taxonomy

Focal Areas, Forest, Amazon, Biodiversity, Financial and Accounting, Conservation Finance, Mainstreaming, Extractive Industries, Tourism, Protected Areas and Landscapes, Terrestrial Protected Areas, Community Based Natural Resource Mngt, Influencing models, Strengthen institutional capacity and decision-making, Stakeholders, Indigenous Peoples, Local Communities, Gender Equality, Gender Mainstreaming, Sex-disaggregated indicators, Capacity, Knowledge and Research, Capacity Development

Rio Markers**Climate Change Mitigation**

Climate Change Mitigation 1

Climate Change Adaptation

Climate Change Adaptation 1

Submission Date

10/15/2020

Expected Implementation Start

1/30/2021

Expected Completion Date

1/30/2025

Duration

60In Months

Agency Fee(\$)

905,057.00

A. FOCAL/NON-FOCAL AREA ELEMENTS

Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	GEF Amount(\$)	Co-Fin Amount(\$)
IP SFM Amazon	Biodiversity	GET	10,056,189.00	38,371,258.00
			Total Project Cost(\$)	10,056,189.00
				38,371,258.00

B. Project description summary

Project Objective

Strengthening the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) and strategic ecosystems, based on social participation and on the sustainable production of natural resources, focusing on the Bolivian Amazon

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
--------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
1. Effective management of the SNAP, based on community participation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Bolivian Amazon (Program component: Integrated Protected Landscapes)	Technical Assistance	Outcome 1.1. Improved institutional framework allowing for enhanced management effectiveness of the SNAP by PY2	Output 1.1.1. Updated SNAP and strategic ecosystems program prepared by PY2	GET	1,874,100.00	18,894,988.00
			Output 1.1.2. Standardized monitoring protocols developed for at least four protected areas by PY2 and for the remaining 3 until EOP			
		Outcome 1.2. Improved monitoring and management effectiveness of SNAP as of PY3	Output 1.1.3. Standardized Management Effectiveness Tool updated and validated in four protected areas by PY2 and for the remaining 3 until EOP			
		Outcome 1.3. Enhanced governance structures across the SNAP by PY3	Output 1.2.1. Systematic monitoring and assessment of management effectiveness implemented in at least seven protected areas in PY3 to PY5			
		Outcome 1.1. Improved institutional framework allowing for enhanced management effectiveness of the SNAP by PY2	Output 1.2.2. Accurate technical data available on the flora and fauna populations of globally significant, endangered or threatened species in at least seven protected areas and three RAMSAR sites by PY5			
		Outcome 1.2. Improved monitoring and management effectiveness of	Output 1.3.1. Management Plans of protected areas updated to ensure coordination and alignment with other planning			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
2. Improved Financial Sustainability of the SNAP (Program component: Integrated Protected Landscapes)	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 2.1. Evaluation of funding baseline and gaps of the SNAP in accordance with the updated SNAP ECOS program by PY1</p> <p>Outcome 2.2. Investigation of new revenue mechanisms for PA financing by PY3</p> <p>Outcome 2.3. Development of frameworks for sustainable income and revenue generating activities that are compatible with the management objectives of the protected areas by PY4</p> <p>Outcome 2.4. Sustainable financing of the SNAP increased by 10% above the baseline by EOP</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1. Detailed assessment of current funding from all sources, needs, and gaps, at the system level and for each protected area performed by PY1</p> <p>Outcome 2.2. Investigation of new revenue mechanisms for PA financing by PY3</p> <p>Output 2.2.1. At least two funding mechanisms, designed to fill funding gap, developed by PY3</p> <p>Output 2.3.1. Guidelines and protocols for increased uptake of SLWM practices (agroforestry, cattle ranching, fisheries, biotechnology entrepreneurship, and eco-tourism among others) developed and implemented in at least seven protected areas and three RAMSAR sites by PY4</p> <p>Output 2.3.2. Prioritisation of protected areas conducted by PY2, with improvements in operational and tourism infrastructure completed within at least 4 protected areas by PY4</p>	GET	1,608,000.00	5,269,463.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
3. Capacity Building in support of effective management and improved financial sustainability of the SNAP (Program Component: Policies/Incentives for Protected and Productive Landscapes)		<p>Outcome 3.1. Enhanced capacity for effective management of the SNAP and strategic ecosystems starting in PY3</p> <p>Outcome 3.2. Strengthened capacity in achieving the financial sustainability of the SNAP and strategic ecosystems starting in PY3</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1. Training in the development and implementation of management plans (integrated planning in case of RAMSAR sites), protected areas monitoring, and assessment of management effectiveness, conducted for personnel of protected areas and partner agencies for at least seven protected areas and three RAMSAR sites between PY3 and EOP</p> <p>Output 3.1.2. Essential equipment needed to conduct systematic monitoring and assessment of management effectiveness provided to at least seven targeted protected areas and three RAMSAR sites by PY3</p> <p>Output 3.2.1. Training of community organisations to introduce or strengthen sustainable practices in production models currently in place within or adjacent to protected areas (agroforestry, cattle ranching, coffee, cacao, sustainable mining, among others), within at least seven protected areas and three RAMSAR sites starting in PY3</p>	GET	2,088,200.00	1,486,259.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
4. Sustainable use of biodiversity (Program Component: Integrated Productive Landscapes)	Investment	Outcome 4.1. Improved sustainable use practices by indigenous territories of CIPOAP in their territories	Output 4.1.1. Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) practices implemented in selected communities in the five (Yaminahua, Tacana, Cavineño, Machineri and Esse ejja) indigenous territories of CIPOAP	GET	2,489,500.00	10,561,105.00
		Outcome 4.2. Enhanced capacity for effective management of freshwater ecosystems (in particular RAMSAR sites) starting in PY2	Output 4.1.2. Training of selected community organisations in the five (Yaminahua, Tacana, Cavineño, Machineri and Esse ejja) indigenous territories of CIPOAP implemented to increase uptake or strengthening of sustainable agriculture and SLWM practices			
			Output 4.2.1. Local agreements for aquatic resources use (in agreement with the Ministry of Rural Development and Lands) signed and enforced in selected communities			
			Output 4.2.2. Basic water sanitation projects leveraged with the correspondent authorities to reduce water pollution			
			Output 4.2.3. Agreements signed with the customs, Commerce Ministry, Mining Ministry, local mining organisations and			

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
5. Project Management, Monitoring & Evaluation, and Knowledge Management (Program component: Capacity building and regional cooperation)	Technical Assistance	<p>Outcome 5.1. Effective project management, monitoring & evaluation, as per the technical, administrative, and fiduciary standards defined by CAF/GEF and the Bolivian legal framework, through-out project implementation</p> <p>Outcome 5.2. Systematisation of lessons learned, experiences and results, on a continuous basis through-out project implementation</p>	<p>Output 5.1.1. Annual Work Plans, Annual Progress Reports, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation Report, Terminal Evaluation report drafted, and GEF Tracking Tools completed according to established deadlines</p> <p>Output 5.2.1. Systematized information on lessons from the eleven project sites continuously disseminated using web-based tools (among others), targeting lessons with replication potential in remaining protected areas of the SNAP and strategic ecosystems</p> <p>Output 5.2.2. Communication Strategy for the SNAP and strategic ecosystems, including project-specific actions, developed and under implementation by beginning of PY2</p>	GET	1,517,523.00	60,000.00

Project Component	Financing Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	GEF Project Financing(\$)	Confirmed Co-Financing(\$)
				Sub Total (\$)	9,577,323.00	36,271,815.00
Project Management Cost (PMC)						
				GET	478,866.00	2,099,443.00
				Sub Total(\$)	478,866.00	2,099,443.00
				Total Project Cost(\$)	10,056,189.00	38,371,258.00

C. Sources of Co-financing for the Project by name and by type

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Amount(\$)
Recipient Country Government	SERNAP	Public Investment	Recurrent expenditures	25,858,551.00
Recipient Country Government	SISCO	Other	Investment mobilized	1,891,602.00
GEF Agency	CAF	Loans	Investment mobilized	10,561,105.00
GEF Agency	CAF	Grant	Investment mobilized	60,000.00
			Total Co-Financing(\$)	38,371,258.00

Describe how any "Investment Mobilized" was identified

• Recipient Country government (SERNAP & SISCO, Other; USD 27 750 154): a conservative estimate of new income to be generated for the project areas as a result of improved planning and participative management capacities. SISCO assigns this income to each PA, so income generated in project areas will be retained in each of them. • GEF Agency (CAF, Loan; USD 10 561 105): investment in a new phase of the MiAgua and MiRiego Programs will be coordinated with activities in the project area to ensure that water-infrastructure investments align with the project's environmental requirements. • GEF Agency (CAF, Grant; USD 60 000): CAF is willing to provide a grant for the strengthening of sewage treatment capacities in the project area.

D. Trust Fund Resources Requested by Agency(ies), Country(ies), Focal Area and the Programming of Funds

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
CAF	GET	Bolivia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	6,900,226	621,020
CAF	GET	Bolivia	Biodiversity	BD STAR Allocation	3,155,963	284,037
Total Grant Resources(\$)					10,056,189.00	905,057.00

E. Non Grant Instrument

NON-GRANT INSTRUMENT at CEO Endorsement

Includes Non grant instruments? **No**

Includes reflow to GEF? **No**

F. Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

PPG Required

PPG Amount (\$)

PPG Agency Fee (\$)

Agency	Trust Fund	Country	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Amount(\$)	Fee(\$)
				Total Project Costs(\$)	0.00	0.00

Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	6,201,689.00	0.00	0.00

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

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

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	----------------------------	--	----------------------------	---------------------------

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)
0.00	6,201,689.00	0.00	0.00

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
----------------------------	---------	---------------	----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------------	--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Área Natural de Manejo Integrado y Parque Nacional Madidi	125689 98183 303894	Select National Park		1,895,750.00			63.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Parque Nacional y Patrimonio Natural de la Humanidad Noel Kempff Mercado	125689 31 220295	Select National Park		1,646,756.00			59.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Reserva de la Biosfera Estacion Biologica del Beni	125689 9308 12472	Select Protected Landscape/Seascape		135,274.00			56.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
Akula National Park Reserva de Vida Silvestre Bruno Racua	125689 303899	Select Habitat/Species Management Area		74,152.00			30.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Reserva Nacional Amazonica Manuripi	125689 35 303897	Select Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		747,000.00			64.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Territorio Indigena y Parque Nacional Isiboro Secure	125689 30 303897	Select Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		1,302,757.00			53.00		<input type="checkbox"/>
Akula National Park Territorio Indigena y Reserva de la Biosfera Pilon Lajas	125689 303898 20011	Select Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources		400,000.00			62.00		<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

0.00	7124915.00	0.00	0.00
------	------------	------	------

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

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

6,941,173.00			
--------------	--	--	--

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

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

Type/Name of Third Party Certification

Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems

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

183,742.00			
------------	--	--	--

Indicator 4.4 Area of High Conservation Value Forest (HCVF) loss avoided

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

Documents (Please upload document(s) that justifies the HCVF)

Title

Submitted

Indicator 6 Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)	0	5282619	0	0
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)	0	0	0	0

Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)		5,282,619		
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting		2025		
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.2 Emissions Avoided Outside AFOLU (Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use) Sector

Total Target Benefit	(At PIF)	(At CEO Endorsement)	(Achieved at MTR)	(Achieved at TE)
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (direct)				
Expected metric tons of CO₂e (indirect)				
Anticipated start year of accounting				
Duration of accounting				

Indicator 6.3 Energy Saved (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Total Target Benefit	Energy (MJ) (At PIF)	Energy (MJ) (At CEO Endorsement)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at MTR)	Energy (MJ) (Achieved at TE)
Target Energy Saved (MJ)				

Indicator 6.4 Increase in Installed Renewable Energy Capacity per Technology (Use this sub-indicator in addition to the sub-indicator 6.2 if applicable)

Technology	Capacity (MW) (Expected at PIF)	Capacity (MW) (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at MTR)	Capacity (MW) (Achieved at TE)
-------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------------------

Indicator 11 Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female		2,600		
Male		3,260		
Total	0	5860	0	0

Part II. Project Justification

1a. Project Description

No changes from PIF.

1b. Project Map and Coordinates

Please provide geo-referenced information and map where the project interventions will take place.



1c. Child Project?

If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.

No changes from PIF.

The objective and proposed activities of the project are well aligned with the programming priorities and the ToC outlined for the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program - Phase II (ASL2) Impact Program. The project will produce the higher-level outcomes of increased strengthened management capacity in the SNAP and strategic ecosystems, increased actors and capacity for ZND production, improved land use landscape planning and strengthened policy frameworks for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use and increased knowledge and awareness on conservation and SLWM in the Bolivian Amazon. Please see, in the PRODOC, 2.1. Barrier analysis, theory of change, strategic rationality and scope.

Cross-border activities will focus on improving coordination between the project's protected areas and RAMSAR sites with those in neighbouring countries (Madre de Dios department in Peru; the states of Acre, Rondônia and Mato Grosso in Brazil, among others).

2. Stakeholders

Select the stakeholders that have participated in consultations during the project identification phase:

Civil Society Organizations Yes

Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities Yes

Private Sector Entities

If none of the above, please explain why:

Please provide the Stakeholder Engagement Plan or equivalent assessment.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Each intervention area will oversee its project activities through its Management Committee. The project keeps a subsidiary, incremental role with respect to existing and new institutional arrangements in each protected area and in the SNAP and SNAP ECOS as a whole. To that end, the PMU will participate in planning coordination mechanisms defined at the national, subnational or site level in order to facilitate new co-financing and to ensure that the project fulfills its aims with the maximum uptake and sustainability. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be composed by five members, two of whom will be representatives from the participating Management Committees, elected by their assembly. Of the five persons conforming the PSC, at least two must be of indigenous origin and at least one woman. Please see PRODOC 1.4. Stakeholders, 3.3. Implementation arrangements & Appendix 6. Public Consultation Process & Stakeholder Engagement Plan, with Special Attention to Indigenous Peoples.

In addition, provide a summary on how stakeholders will be consulted in project execution, the means and timing of engagement, how information will be disseminated, and an explanation of any resource requirements throughout the project/program cycle to ensure proper and meaningful stakeholder engagement.

Please see PRODOC 1.4. Stakeholders, 3.3. Implementation arrangements & Appendix 6. Public Consultation Process & Stakeholder Engagement Plan, with Special Attention to Indigenous Peoples.

Select what role civil society will play in the project:

Consulted only;

Member of Advisory Body; Contractor;

Co-financier;

Member of project steering committee or equivalent decision-making body; Yes

Executor or co-executor; Yes

Other (Please explain)

3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Provide the gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assesment.

Please see PRODOC 4.3. Social analysis and stakeholder participation, 4.5. Gender analysis, and Appendix 9. Appendix 9. Gender Evaluation & Action Plan with a Gender Approach.

Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment?

Yes

Closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources;

Improving women's participation and decision making

Generating socio-economic benefits or services or women

Does the project’s results framework or logical framework include gender-sensitive indicators?

4. Private sector engagement

Elaborate on the private sector's engagement in the project, if any.

No changes from PIF. Private sector actors will have an important role as collaborative partners in order to improve local capacities, specifically in the research, monitoring, and sustainable use activities.

5. Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Risk	Probability	Significance	Overall Risk Rating	Discussion	Proposed measure	Monitoring
Political Risk: political will (response) is not maintained through administrations	Low	High	Medium	General and subnational (departments and municipalities) elections are due in 2020, within a transitional political climate. Nonetheless, protected areas and its sustainability are not contentious political issues. The project will assure adequate dialogue and stakeholder-friendly communication before, during and after these dates	A major policy-dialogue process is at the core of Component 1	The adaptive management process established for the project establishes a recursive cycle of internal evaluation and planning adaptation on a yearly basis. The MTE provides an instance for major external evaluation at midterm, when the riskiest period from this perspective will likely be already over, and the opportunity for adapting the project to the resulting scenario

Risk	Probability	Significance	Overall Risk Rating	Discussion	Proposed measure	Monitoring
Climate Change Risk: conditions under climate change (state) differ substantially from those modelled along the project period	Medium	Medium	Medium	According to numerous studies, the Amazon is approaching a tipping point (v.gr. Nepstad et al., 2008; Lovejoy & Nobre, 2018). The Project is precisely aimed at diminishing such possibility, although it cannot avert it on its own. In addition to the evidence signalling that repeated droughts do not compound their effects (Feldpausch et al., 2016), it can be expected that the Bolivian Amazon will be one of the last parts of the Amazon to suffer dire consequences for such an event during the period in which the project will be executed (2020-20205) and produce GEB (2025-2045), for its position near the water sources feeding the basin. The project reduces the vulnerability of both ecosystems and population to the expected impacts of such threshold-reaching and contributes to build adaptive capacities. The measures supported by the project would only turn from preventive to mitigative in an accelerated-change scenario, but its financial, environmental and social performance and production of GEB is unlikely to be affected except marginally by that change during the design period. Given that the exact pace and intensity of this potential change is a known unknown, the marginal risk it poses for the project and its outcomes out of this analysis is not actionable save as Uncertainty Risk (see below)	Output 1.1.2 will provide the SNAP with an improved monitoring framework that will be able to detect changes in this direction from PY2	The implementation arrangements for the project include mechanisms for a two-way exchange of information and coordination between local and national levels that will allow for alert signals to trigger

Risk	Probability	Significance	Overall Risk Rating	Discussion	Proposed measure	Monitoring
<p>COVID-19 Risk: project start is hampered by movement restrictions. The post-pandemic situation makes project assumptions invalid</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>The final stage of the formulation process (including public consultation) has demonstrated that it is possible to provide continuity to project activities during the acute phase of the pandemic. A combination of virtual and physically-distanced meetings has taken place, showing that means are available for participative decision-making in the post-pandemic situation in which the project will start its execution.</p>	<p>The final stage of the formulation process, including public consultations on site, has demonstrated the feasibility of organising and carrying out the kind of participative decision-making that is central to project governance.</p>	<p>Key staff will receive specific training on participation in times of COVID-19.</p> <p>Assumptions on the promise of tourism as a sustainable income source have been reviewed in order to reflect 1-2 years of reduced traveling. The possibility of increased cost of certain inputs has also been taken into account in budgeting.</p>
<p>Implementation Risk: at different levels (policy-making process, private participants, finance) information is not actionable due to other barriers not being removed (response)</p>	<p>Medium</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Low</p>	<p>Coordination between the different measures in this project is key to its success and has been received major attention during the design phase. Knowledge-related actions, technical and financial measures and institutional and regulatory measures are to be phased in in a stakeholder-friendly form</p>	<p>The project has established the necessary implementation arrangements, including the necessary capabilities and budget, and a robust chronogram</p>	<p>The M&E mechanisms in place during project implementation explicitly measure key indicators that provide alert signals and trending. The adaptive management process established for the project contains a recursive cycle of internal evaluation and planning adaptation on a yearly basis</p>

Risk	Probability	Significance	Overall Risk Rating	Discussion	Proposed measure	Monitoring
Cultural Risk: cultural differences, pre-existing conflicts or other reasons make it unfeasible to exchange and transfer knowledge (response)	Low	Medium	Low	The project is built over deep awareness of the cultural reality it works in and values and supports indigenous knowledge and its proven results with respect to conservation. It is built too over deep awareness of the problems that indigenous populations face for their participation in sustainable development. As the project supports established protected areas, it benefits from and strengthens existing intercultural-dialogue mechanisms (PA Management Committees and others)	Capacity and budget for the necessary interaction with stakeholders, with special attention to the needs and specificities of indigenous peoples, has been included in the project's implementation arrangements and budget	The adaptive management process established for the project contains a recursive cycle of internal evaluation and planning adaptation on a yearly basis
Uncertainty Risk: actual values of (state) critical indicators (BOB-USD exchange rate, rainfall, internal migration) differ substantially from those modelled along the project	Low	Medium	Low	The project's models have been prepared through a thorough expert review process, submitted to sensitivity analysis and results from it are incorporated, thus rendering the model and key variables risk-explicit	The M&E mechanisms in place during project implementation explicitly measure key indicators that provide key-value signals and trending	The adaptive management process established for the project contains a recursive cycle of internal evaluation and planning adaptation on a yearly basis. The MTE provides an instance for major external evaluation at midterm
Innovation Risk: it is not possible to align livelihoods incentives with the sustainable management of land and water (response)	Low	Low	Low	The technologies that the project applies and transfers are well-known and tested, and its application has already been effected in similar conditions. The project provides support and monitoring capabilities to ensure the detection of any shortcoming during that process	The project considers the participation and access to knowledge of all stakeholders. Capacity and budget for the necessary interaction with stakeholders has been included in the project's implementation arrangements and budget	The adaptive management process established for the project contains a recursive cycle of internal evaluation and planning adaptation on a yearly basis. Particular innovation processes have been equipped with its own specific M&E processes (Outputs 2.3.1, 2.3.2, 4.1.2)

6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination

Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

SERNAP will execute the project on behalf of MMAYA for national protected areas. In the case of subnational areas, RAMSAR sites and other sites, SERNAP will propose and the VMA will delegate mandates as appropriate. The general design and institutionalisation of shared-management processes for RAMSAR sites and other novel situations will be proposed by SERNAP and instituted by VMA in close consultation with the involved municipalities, TCOs and other relevant stakeholders. Each intervention area will oversee its project activities through its Management Committee. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be composed by five members: A representative from MMAYA-VMA, who chairs the Committee, A representative from SERNAP, two representatives from the participating Management Committees, elected by their assembly, and a representative from CAF. Of the five persons conforming the PSC, at least two must be of indigenous origin and at least one woman.

7. Consistency with National Priorities

Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions from below:

NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.

- National Action Plan for Adaptation (NAPA) under LDCF/UNFCCC
- National Action Program (NAP) under UNCCD
- ASGM NAP (Artisanal and Small-scale Gold Mining) under Mercury
- Minamata Initial Assessment (MIA) under Minamata Convention
- National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan (NBSAP) under UNCBD
- National Communications (NC) under UNFCCC
- Technology Needs Assessment (TNA) under UNFCCC

- National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) under UNCBD, UNFCCC, UNCCD
- National Implementation Plan (NIP) under POPs
- Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP)
- National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE) under GEFSEC
- Biennial Update Report (BUR) under UNFCCC
- Others

SERNAP works in a decentralisation strategy in the framework of its Master Plan (2012), which establishes a strategic framework and general and specific objectives within a 10-year framework that has been proven compatible with subnational protected areas (MMAyA, 2012). Within this framework, SERNAP seeks to enhance the mechanisms, capacities, management and sustainable funding of national and subnational protected areas and strategic ecosystems (RAMSAR sites and indigenous territories) in the Bolivian Amazon, with a view to promote the sustainable management of the represented ecosystems.

The project advances Bolivia's contribution to the Aichi Targets, in particular Targets 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14 & 19.

The project also contributes to SDG targets 1.4, 1.5, 2.4, 3.9, 4.5, 4.7, 5.5, 6.3, 6.6, 10.2, 12.2, 12.4, 12.8, 15.1, 15.2, 15.5, 15.9, 16.7, 17.3 & 17.7.

8. Knowledge Management

Elaborate the "Knowledge Management Approach" for the project, including a budget, key deliverables and a timeline, and explain how it will contribute to the project's overall impact.

Systematized information on lessons from the seven targeted protected areas will be continuously disseminated using web-based tools (among others), targeting lessons with replication potential in remaining protected areas of the SNAP and strategic ecosystems. Also, a Communication Strategy focused on the dissemination of best practice from project actions will be developed and under implementation from PY2.

In order to maximize the impacts and sustainability of activities, the Project will seek to coordinate its actions with existing government programmes and policies, as well as programmes and projects financed by CAF. In particular, the project will address the identified gender differences and gaps, gender-differentiated impacts and risks, and opportunities to promote the empowerment of women that support project objectives and outcomes. In particular, this means the implementation of comprehensive, gender-disaggregated indicators

for all possible project elements (M&E and MRV implementations) and the monitoring of stakeholder participation (decision focus), knowledge management and capacity development activities (process focus), and any resulting new employment (impact focus).

The project institutional and implementation arrangements include specific provisions for Monitoring and Evaluation, Knowledge Management and Lessons-Learning. The project will act as a coherent device in the origination of data, refinement of information and knowledge being obtained from its activity.

9. Monitoring and Evaluation

Describe the budgeted M and E plan

M&E of Project implementation will be conducted through three main mechanisms (i) assessment of progress at the activity level (specific M&E systems will be developed for the different investment activities) which will generate data required for the purpose of the project (e.g., validate relevance of activity and provide feedback to management instruments); (ii) the measurement of progressive achievement of expected project outputs and results (outcomes) as per indicators defined in the Project Results Framework; status of progress will be reported every six months as part of the project progress reports; and (iii) evaluation of the project at certain moments of its implementation: a) progress reviews during CAF implementation support missions; b) mid-term review of project implementation; c) final evaluation report to be carried out by the PMU with input from the PSC; and d) the Implementation Completion and Results Report (ICR).

Activity	Responsibility	Estimated Budget (Excluding MMA Staff Time and costs covered by CAF)	Time Frame
----------	----------------	---	------------

Activity	Responsibility	Estimated Budget (Excluding MMA Staff Time and costs covered by CAF)	Time Frame
Inception Workshop and Report[1] ¹	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Project Steering Committee members · CAF · PMU (Project Coordinator) · Facilitator 	5 000	Within 3 months of project start-up
Long-term monitoring, reporting and evaluation plan[2] ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · CAF · PMU (Project Coordinator) 	10 000	To be developed at start up and applied throughout the project
GEF Core Indicators Reporting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · PMU 	3 000	At Inception, MTE & FE
Project Steering Committee meetings[3] ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Project Steering Committee members · PMU (Project Coordinator) 	15 000	One physical meeting per year and at least one virtual meeting per year
Quarterly Financial Reports & SOEs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · PMU 	20 000	Within 30 days of each completed quarter
Project Progress Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · PMU 	–	At least every 3 months and due within 15 days of each completed quarter

Activity	Responsibility	Estimated Budget (Excluding MMA Staff Time and costs covered by CAF)	Time Frame
External Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Project Steering Committee · CAF · PMU · International Consultant (1) · National Consultants (2) 	40 000	Within 90 days of project's mid-term
Final Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Project Steering Committee · CAF · PMU · Consultant 	15 000	At least one month before the end of the project
External Final Evaluation (FE)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Project Steering Committee · CAF · PMU · International Consultant (1) · National Consultants (2) 	60 000	Within 90 days of EOP

Activity	Responsibility	Estimated Budget (Excluding MMA Staff Time and costs covered by CAF)	Time Frame
Nationally Mandatory Audits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · PMU · Audit Firm to be hired by PMU (after no objection from CAF) 	20 000	At least annually ^[4]
Monitoring visits to project sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · PMU · Project stakeholders 	52 500	At least annually
TOTAL INDICATIVE COST, EXCLUDING STAFF TIME AND CAF STAFF TRAVEL		240 500	

Please see ProDoc 3.4. Monitoring, reports and evaluation & Appendix 7. Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation Plan.

[1] To review and approve the first Annual Work Plan, review and approve Operations Manual, and discuss and approve PSC's internal rules.

[2] Includes vetting of means of verification in the field through-out project implementation.

[3] With formally prepared minutes and resolutions.

[4] CAF reserves the right to request a partial or complete audit at any time

10. Benefits

Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, as appropriate. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The project will increase the forest area under integrated sustainable management, based on the framework of established policies, focusing on forests where agricultural expansion and forest resource extraction activities are common. A dual emphasis approach to strengthen the management of protected areas is planned, consistent with prioritizing policy frameworks on protected areas as an engine for sustainable development, together with the sustainable use and management of natural resources both within and outside of protected areas. Environmental governance will be improved by strengthening the capacities of a wide range of stakeholders, both men and women, to achieve conservation benefits that will go beyond SNAP and the project's lifespan. Concrete socioeconomic benefits of the project are designed to be:

- **Enhanced Capacities:** at least 2600 women will be beneficiaries of the project. A majority (likely the vast majority) of beneficiaries will belong to indigenous peoples.
- **Sustainable Use:** in a rough estimation of socioeconomic benefits, the project increases income within its direct beneficiaries in at least four million USD per year, on average increasing their household income by 12%.
- **Adaptive Management:** the participation of new stakeholders in the SNAP and strategic ecosystems reduces conflict and increases ownership and stewardship, and therefore contributes to the main aim of improving management effectiveness and reducing deforestation and biodiversity loss.

11. Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Risks

Provide information on the identified environmental and social risks and potential impacts associated with the project/program based on your organization's ESS systems and procedures

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification*

PIF

CEO Endorsement/Approval

MTR

TE

Medium/Moderate

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

Elaborate on the types and risk classifications/ratings of any identified environmental and social risks and impacts (considering the GEF ESS Minimum Standards) and any measures undertaken as well as planned management measures to address these risks during implementation.

Please see ProDoc Appendix 11 for the ESS form. It is also pasted below

PROJECT CONCEPT PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE	
PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION	
Interested Organization Name: CAF	Project Location: Bolivia
Projected amount of required project funding (\$ /USD): TOTAL: _____ GEF: _____ OTHER(S) (Specify) _____	

Project Sector or Similar: Protected Area management	Brief project description:
GEF focal Area(s): Multifocal	Project Duration (months): 60



Focal Area Strategy Framework (other Program strategies)		
Objectives / Programs (Focal areas, Others)	GEF Project Financing (USD)	Co- Financing (USD)

Project Description Summary (Please include available information)					
Project Component	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	GEF Project Financing (USD)	Co- Financing (USD)	
Project cost (No project Management included)					

Indicative Sources of Co-financing (Please include available information, comprised type of co-financing: grants, loans, equity, guarantees, in-kind, unknown)

Source of co -financing	Name of co-financer	Type of cofinancing)	Amount (USD)

Total co-financing			

Potential Environmental Impacts

Air emissions

X Vehicles and equipment

Heating /air conditioning equipment

Others (describe) _____

Waste water

Domestic waste water

Water treatment unit

Others (describe) _____

Solid waste

X Solid waste produced

Types of solid waste _____

Organic residue from NTFP and agricultural

production _____

Hazardous waste _____

Waste disposal (where, how) _____

Household composting facilities and recycling for inorganic residue

Hazardous Chemical substances / Combustibles / Pesticides

Storage within the facilities Protective measures against spills

Leaks / spills traces

Spill containment / cleanup equipment Heating /air conditioning equipment

X Chemical substances and combustibles management training

Training in the use and disposal of fuel and oil

Pesticide use and Management

Resource consumption

X Materials used _____
Local materials

Renewable natural resources use

Tools and equipment use

X Water source _____
Local sources. Basic WASH systems leverage

X Energy source _____
Local energy sources. Renewable sources leveraged

Environmental nuisances

Dust

Noise

Odors

Vapors / fumes

Noise

Traffic jams and obstructions

ed

es

Other Environmental Issues

Impacts on health, and forest quality and natural habitats in general (rivers, lakes, aquifers, paramo, ocean/marine ecosystems, mangroves, wetlands, biodiversity, among others),

Please specify on which one(s) _____

Positive impact on freshwater _____ ecosystems

Impacts on health protected areas (parks, reservoirs, etc.)

Please specify on which one(s) _____

Positive impact on six national PAs _____

Impacts on other singular / sensible / high value (scientific, landscape, traditional, others) / places,

Please specify on which one(s) _____

Interactions with the Community

With a person in charge of answering community questions With Community complaints management procedure
Safety personal use

Social Issues

Land acquisition required

Resettlement of local communities is required

Impacts on local livelihoods

Impacts on Indigenous Peoples

Neighbors or community complaints

Cultural Resources to be affected or close to project location.

Dams involved in Project

Pesticides to be used

Land property condition, Please specify (public property, private property, community property, others)

Public land (protected areas),

communal land and some individual

properties

Questionnaire answer date:

6 March 2020

Questionnaire answer responsible officer:

Cecilia Guerra

Additional comments:

Empty rectangular box for additional comments.

CAF Environmental and Social Officer / National expert Preliminary concept related to project site conditions and potential project impacts

Questionnaire answer date:

Additional technical review required (to be answered by CAF): Yes

Questionnaire answer responsible officer (name, position):

No

Environmental considerations and recommendations

The intervention sites are mostly protected areas that count with a management plan and ranger corps who enforce planning and zoning.

Community considerations and recommendations

Local common and traditional regulations that contribute to the sustainability of livelihoods must be supported. The intervention sites are extensive areas where communities are organized through different governance systems at different levels, and these governance systems must be respected to minimize negative social impacts.

Other social considerations and recommendations

Demonstrative and pilot activities will be accompanied by widespread training and knowledge exchange activities to foster the uptake of improved practices.

Additional comments:



PART II: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS TRIGGERING				
Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment
	ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL ASSESSMENT (ESA)			
	Safeguard always applicable (at least preliminary environmental and social assessment)			

1

Considering the following variables of the project, is there a possibility that the project will generate environmental and social side, multiple and complex impacts? If the answer is no, please briefly justify.

- (a) The potential environmental and social impacts that the project may have on its area of direct influence and, when required, indirect, cumulative and similar impacts;
- (b) The impacts on physical physical, biotic, social, economic, cultural resources, and health and safety of people;
- (c) Global environmental problems;
- (d) The alternatives to improve the selection, location, planning, design and execution of the project, including the "without project" as well as capital and recurrent costs and the comparison of the



X

Project activities aim at reducing negative impacts of unplanned human activity on biodiversity. The project causes no negative environmental impacts of its own but reduces existing impacts and restores and promotes sustainability.

	<p>environmental benefits and costs of the project;</p> <p>(e) The design of measures to prevent, mitigate and / or compensate the identified impacts, including the use of positive impacts and other opportunities that may be identified by both the project itself and by the communities affected by the project. (Probable category A)</p>			
2	<p>Considering the project variables described above in Question 1, is there a possibility that the project will generate environmental and social impacts that although they are not classified as moderate, adverse, multiple and complex, they can be significant? If the answer is no, please briefly justify. (Probable category B)</p>		X	

3

Considering the project variables described above in Question 1, is there a possibility that the project will generate low environmental and social impacts that can be prevented, mitigated or compensated on the basis of best environmental practices and engineering, along with measures environmental management widely known and accessible? If yes, please briefly justify.
(Probable category C)

X

4

Can the project be included in any of the following groups?

(I) projects related to excavation, demolition, earthwork, flood or other significant environmental changes;

(ii) projects located on a site with physical cultural resources, or in their area, and recognized by the proponent.

(iii) projects specifically designed to support the management or conservation of physical cultural resources.

If yes, please document the relevant requirements of national legislation, your procedures to identify, mitigate and monitor impacts on physical cultural resources, and a procedure for handling chance findings).

(Probable category A or B)

X

5	Is there a possibility that the project will generate potential or significant conversion or degradation of critical forest or other natural habitats? (Probable category A)		X	
---	---	--	---	--

6	Is there a possibility that the project violates environmental legal framework in force in the country, and / or applicable international agreements or conventions? (Probable unacceptable project)		X	
7	Does the organization, in its activities and projects, extend to its contractors and third parties its Policy Commitments and Programs in Environmental and Social Management, and Health and Safety?	X		
Environmental and Social Assessment (ESA) Practices				

8	Does the organization carry out a process of Social and Environmental Assessment that considers holistically the potential social and environmental impacts of its activities and projects (including labor, health and safety)?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
9	Does the E SA identifies individuals or groups as vulnerable or disadvantaged, and are proposed and implemented for them differentiated measures?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP) and Action Plans				
10	For its activities and projects, does the organization establish and implement a plan / program of measures and mitigation and performance improvement that addresses the environmental and social impacts and consider the major findings of the ESA and the result of the consultation with affected communities?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	

11	Does the ESMP defines the desired outcomes as measurable events (performance indicators, targets or acceptance criteria), with estimation of resources and responsibilities for implementation?	X	
12	Has the organization allocated sufficient resources to implement the ESMP?	X	
13	Has the organization planned and implemented the action plans necessary to comply with regulations and applicable Performance Standards?	X	
Participation and involvement of stakeholders			
14	Has the organization properly identified all the relevant stakeholders for their activities?	X	
15	Have these stakeholders played a part in planning their activities or services?	X	
16	Does the organization have a community engagement process for the benefited / affected communities?	X	

17	Does such process guarantee free, prior and informed participation to communities?	X		
18	Has the organization implemented a complaints			

	mechanism for addressing and responding to communities?	X		
--	---	---	--	--

External Communications and Grievance Mechanisms

19	Has the company implemented procedures for external communications?	X		
----	---	---	--	--

20	Has the company established a complaints mechanism to receive and facilitate resolution of the concerns of the communities on environmental and social performance of their activities?	X		
----	---	---	--	--

Continuous report to affected communities

21	Does the company provide periodic reports to the communities that describes its activities that involve 1. risk or impact running or developing communities; and 2. the consultation or complaints mechanism?	X		
----	---	---	--	--

Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment
NATURAL HABITATS AND FORESTS				
Safeguard triggering conditions				
1	Do the design and development of the project include the conservation or sustainable use of natural habitats or the maintenance of the ecological functions of natural habitats?	X		
2	Do the design and development of the project include the rehabilitation/reforestation of degraded natural habitats?		X	
3	Do the activities and development of the project may eventually cause impacts on the health and quality of forest and natural habitats in general (rivers, lakes, aquifers, moors, ocean / marine ecosystems, mangroves, wetlands, biodiversity, etc.)?		X	

4	Do the activities and development of the project may affect the rights and welfare of people depend ing on forests or interacting with them?		X	
5	Do the activities and development of the project may generate changes in management, protection and use of natural or planted forests, whether they are public, private or community property?	X		
6	Is there any possibility that access to information and knowledge about project impacts on natural habitats prevent that such information and knowledge become complete or conclusive? (UNFEASIBLE PROJECT)		X	
7	Does the project include forest plantations or any other			
	activity that involves a significant degree of conversion or degradation of critical habitats or critical wooded areas? (UNFEASIBLE PROJECT)		X	

8	Does the project include forest plantations or any other activity that involves a significant degree of conversion or degradation of critical habitats or critical forest areas or forests and natural habitats that are not critical, and it is foreseen to implement an alternatives study? (CONDITIONALLY FEASIBLE PROJECT)		X	
9	Does the organization have implemented Procedures or Guidelines for the Management of Environmental and Social impacts related to natural habitats or forest?	X		
10	Have the organization designated responsible officers (employees or consultants) for the Environmental and Social Management of its activities and projects related to natural habitats or forests? Describe briefly	X		
Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment
	INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMET			
	Safeguard triggering conditions			

1	<p>Considering the activities that:</p> <p>i) Are directly or indirectly related to the project; (ii) are required to achieve the objectives of the evaluation; and (iii) are conducted or planned to be held concurrently with the project;</p> <p>During the project development, any of the following cases of involuntary taking of lands is foreseen?</p> <p>(i) displacement or loss of shelter (ii) loss of assets or access to those assets (iii) loss of income sources or means of livelihood, whether the person concerned is forced to move elsewhere or not. (iv) Loss of social networks in the local environment that may be sources of consumer goods for exchange by non-financial mechanisms (such as barter, gifts exchange and other) or loss of safety networks?</p>		X	
2	<p>Considering the activities that:</p> <p>i) Are directly or indirectly related to the project; (ii) are required to achieve the objectives of the evaluation; and (iii) are conducted or planned to be held concurrently with the project;</p> <p>During the project development, involuntary</p>			
	restriction of access to parks and protected areas legally established is foreseen ?		X	

3	<p>Does the environmental assessment of the project envisage the development of alternatives analysis, and that analysis includes the verification of the measures to prevent and minimize, to the extent possible, involuntary resettlement? (MANDATORY CONDITION IN CASE OF SAFEGUARD APPLICABILITY)</p>			
	Other Ones			
4	Does the organization have implemented Guidelines or Procedures for the Management of Environmental and Social impacts related to involuntary resettlement?			
5	Have the organization designated responsible officers (employees or consultants) for the Environmental and Social Management of its activities and projects related to involuntary resettlement? Describe briefly			
6	Can displacement be avoided?			
7	Will displacement be physical?			

8	Will Land rights or land use rights be acquired through expropriation or other compulsory procedures in accordance with the legal system of the host country?			
9	Will Land rights or land use rights be acquired through negotiated settlements with property owners or those with legal rights to the land if failure to reach settlement would have resulted in expropriation or other compulsory procedures?			
10	Will displacement be economic?			
11	Will the project situations where involuntary restrictions on land use and access to natural resources cause a community or groups within a community to lose access to resource usage where they have traditional or recognizable usage rights?			
12	Will certain project situations requiring evictions of people occupying land without formal, traditional, or recognizable usage rights?			

13	Because of the project, there will be restriction on access to land or use of other resources including communal property and natural resources such as marine and aquatic resources, timber and non-timber forest products, freshwater, medicinal plants, hunting and gathering grounds and grazing and cropping areas?		
14	Is the Involuntary Resettlement Safeguard triggered?		X

Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment
	INDIGENOUS PEOPLES			
	Safeguard triggering conditions			
1	Is it anticipated that there is presence of indigenous peoples in the area of project development or in its area of influence?	X		
2	Are there indigenous peoples with community links to the project area, whether it is the project development area or its area of influence?	X		

3	<p>Does the planned project involve the physical relocation of Indigenous Peoples or restriction of access of Indigenous Peoples to parks and protected areas legally established? (CONDITION THAT TRIGGERS THE INVOLUNTARY RESETTLEMENT SAFEGUARD, IN ADDITION TO THAT OF INDIGENOUS PUEBOS).</p>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	
	Other ones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4	<p>Does the organization have implemented Guidelines or Procedures for the Management of Environmental and Social Impacts relating to indigenous peoples?</p>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5	<p>Has the organization designated responsible officers (employees or consultants) for the Environmental and Social Management of its activities and projects related to indigenous peoples? Describe briefly</p>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment

	PEST MANAGEMENT			
	Safeguard triggering conditions			
1	Does the project include potential aspects of control and management of pests or vectors, which may affect agriculture or public health?	X		
	Other ones			
2	Does the organization have implemented Guidelines or Procedures for the Management of Environmental and social impacts related to managing pests or vectors?	X		
3	Has the organization designated responsible officers (employees or consultants) for the Environmental and Social Management of its activities and projects related to pest or vectors management? Describe briefly	X		
Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment
	PHYSICAL CULTURAL RESOURCES			
	Safeguard triggering conditions			

1	Is it anticipated that project includes major activities excavations, demolition, earthworks, floods or other	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	---	--------------------------	--------------------------

	alterations to the landscape?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	
2	Is it anticipated that project is located in a place where there are physical cultural resources recognized by the competent authorities or where they are expected to be found?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3	Is it anticipated that the project is aimed at supporting the management of Physical Cultural Resources?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	
	Other ones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4	Does the organization have implemented Guidelines or Procedures for the Management of Environmental and social impacts on physical cultural resources?	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5	Has the organization designated responsible officers (employees or consultants) for the Environmental and Social Management of its activities and projects related to Physical Cultural Resources? Describe briefly.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment

SAFETY OF DAMS			
Safeguard triggering conditions			
1	Is it anticipated that the project involves the construction of a new (s) dam (s) or the rehabilitation or performance of a (n) existing dam (s)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
2	Is it anticipated that the project involves the rehabilitation or performance of (an) existing dam (s). NOTE: THIS INCLUDES THE USE OF WATER FROM AN (S) DAM (S).	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
3	Is it anticipated that the project includes power plants or water supply systems that benefits directly from a reservoir controlled by an existing dam or construction?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
4	It is anticipated that the project includes diversion dams or hydraulic structures downstream from an existing dam or a dam under construction that due to failure of a dam upstream could cause extensive damage to or failure of the new structure that is part of the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	X

5	Do you anticipate that the project includes works or irrigation activities or water supply that depends on the storage capacity and performance of an existing dam or a dam under construction, and that any dam failure will cause project failure?		X	
6	Is it anticipated that the project includes increasing the capacity of an existing dam or changes in the characteristics of materials, whereas a failure of the existing dam could cause extensive damage or deterioration of facilities that are part of the project?		X	
	Other ones			
7	Does the organization have implemented Guidelines or Procedures for the Management of Environmental and Social impacts related to dam safety?			
8	Has the organization designated responsible officers (employees or consultants) for the Environmental and Social Management of its activities and projects related to dam safety? Describe briefly.			

Q	Question	Yes	No	Comment
	GENDER MAINSTREAMING			
	Safeguard always applicable			
1	Has there been any assessment or analysis of gender in relation to the possible roles, benefits, impacts and risks that can generate the project for women and men of different ages, ethnicities, state and social structure?	X		
2	Does the organization have implemented Guidelines or Procedures for the Management of Environmental and social impacts related to mainstreaming gender issues?	X		
3	Has the organization designated responsible officers (employees or consultants) for the Environmental and Social Management of its activities and projects related to mainstreaming gender issues? Describe briefly.	X		

Supporting Documents

Upload available ESS supporting documents.

Title

Module

Submitted

Title	Module	Submitted
NOV 20.11.2020_AS2 Bolivia - ESS screening form (ProDoc Appendix 11)	CEO Endorsement ESS	

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Project Results Framework

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
ve: Strengthening the management effectiveness and financial sustainability of the National System of Protected Areas (SNAP) and strategic ecosystems, based on social participation and on the sustainable prod es, focusing on the Bolivian Amazon											
nagement of the SNAP, based on community participation and sustainable use of biodiversity in the Bolivian Amazon (Program component: Integrated Protected Landscapes)											
. Improved institutional framework allowing for enhanced management effectiveness of the SNAP by PY2											

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
1.1. SNAP ECOS is prepared	Central SERNAP and PAs staff, research institutions, NGOs, CBOs	National updating and dialogue process on the conceptual, normative and administrative framework of SNAP ECOS concluded by PY2	Outdated national regulation that is not harmonized with other current sectorial regulations. Institutional framework presents gaps for new types of protected area. Administrative model disconnected from monitoring and lacking managerial cross-control. SNAP and SNAP ECOS are instituted but lack development	A new framework for SNAP and SNAP ECOS is in place, including technical regulations. The consultation includes adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	There exists political will for the harmonisation of procedures and tools at the landscape level The public perceives value in protected areas and strategic ecosystems Key technical elements make it through the participatory and political processes	Drafting of a multilevel, multi-stakeholder proposal National consultation	National consultation and final proposal	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Initial final v Record meeting assembly works agreement Outre

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
2. Improved monitoring and management effectiveness of SNAP in four areas identified for 2013	Central SERNAP and PAs staff	Standardised monitoring protocols for key and indicator species, including adjustment to specific biophysical and social characteristics of 7 Pas	Monitoring protocols are not coherent across taxa, ecosystems and institutions	Robust, standardised monitoring protocols allow for comparable conservation indexes to be built Participation in the process ensures adequate gender representation	Specialists can reach consensus Proposed methodologies are feasible in the existing logistical and financial conditions	Proposal, general standardised protocol for biodiversity monitoring Specialist consultations	Specialist consultations Consensual general standardised protocol for biodiversity monitoring 3 PAs adjust the protocol to its specific biophysical and social characteristics	3 PAs adjust the protocol to its specific biophysical and social characteristics	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Initial final v Recon meeting works agreement Outre user m
3. Improved monitoring and management effectiveness of SNAP in four areas identified for 2013	Central SERNAP and PAs staff	EGEM tool updated and validated in at least 4 Pas by PY2	An EGEM tool is in use, which presents need for adjustments and for the availability of user guides and training	An improved, METT-compliant EGEM tool is integrated in SNAP ECOS management. Participation in the process ensures adequate gender representation	SERNAP and PAs staff participate in the development of the improved tool	EGEM updated Staff training	4 PAs validate the updated tool	3 PAs validate the updated tool	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Initial final v Recon meeting works agreement Outre user m

Improved monitoring and management effectiveness of SNAP as of PY3

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
1.1. Standardised monitoring protocols and EGEM tool implemented in 7 PAs by EOP	Central SERNAP and PAs staff	Standardised monitoring protocols and EGEM tool implemented in 7 PAs by EOP	Updated Monitoring protocols and EGEM tool available	Implementation and permanence of the updated protocol and EGEM tool. Participation in the process ensures adequate gender representation	Availability of Outputs 1.1.2 and 1.1.3	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Implementation in 4 PAs	Implementation in 3 PAs	Permanence evaluation	Original format System databases Permanence analysis
1.2. Reliable biodiversity information and knowledge has been collected and systematised, and means for its use and updating are available in 7 PAs by EOP	Central SERNAP and PAs staff, research institutions, NGOs, CBOs	Reliable biodiversity information and knowledge has been collected and systematised, and means for its use and updating are available in 7 PAs by EOP	Some PAs count on information on key species and natural history. There are no partnerships for permanent research	A permanent research program that responds to the needs of PAs involves external partners. Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	Relevant research institutions are interested in participating in long-term programming	Consensual research program proposal Consensual mechanism for data sharing and systematisation At least 2 research agreements	At least 4 research agreements	At least 3 research agreements	At least 2 research agreements	All project sites have updated flora & fauna databases	Research agreements Database Evaluation

1. Enhanced governance structures across the SNAP by PY3

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
1.1. Ensure research and monitoring in at least 7 specific areas, as well as the area's representation by PY3	Central SERNAP and PAs staff, research institutions, NGOs, CBOs	Management Plans updated in at least 7 protected areas by PY3 Participation in the process ensures adequate generational (+20% elders and teenagers), gender (+20% women) and indigenous (+40%) representation	Management plans are outdated and lacking implementation	Updated and feasible management plans, and a methodological approach to ensure they stay so	There exists political will for the harmonisation of procedures and tools at the landscape level There exist conditions for wide participation	Evaluation of the current status of management plans, methodological streamlining and work plan Elaboration of management plans	Elaboration of management plans	Elaboration of management plans	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	7 Upd manag includ the re partic proces

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
2.2.2. Final protocol to the land-use planning area of the MDRyT, by	MMAYA, SERNAP, Instituto Nacional de Reforma Agraria (INRA), Ministerio de Desarrollo Rural y Tierras (MDRyT), Ministerio de Planificación del Desarrollo (MPD)	Sectorial agreements reached on planning protocols and public disclosure tool for works and projects within PAs under SNAP ECOS regulations by PY2	No formal mechanism exists for intersectoral coordination over works and projects within PAs	Formal, mandatory mechanisms for the planning, design, consultation and execution of works and projects within SNAP ECOS areas. Participation in the process ensures adequate gender representation	A special regime for PAs is regulated and accepted within other branches of government There exists political will for the harmonisation of procedures and tools at the landscape level	High-level coordination Proposed protocol and disclosure tool Consultations	Final protocol Disclosure tool Training	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	High-coordination minutes Proposed protocols Recording meeting works agreements Outreach Disclosure user manual

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
3. At least 4 agreements signed by PY3, implemented and evaluated by EOP	Local communities, national and regional institutions, public and private companies, MMAYA and Central SERNAP and PAs staff	At least 4 agreements signed by PY3, implemented and evaluated by EOP	Scattered, non-strategic agreements with no monitoring and evaluation	After the identification of priorities and potential partners, far-reaching agreements with clear financing and M&E contribute to advance SNAP ECOS. Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	Accountability is relevant in Bolivian leadership	Identification and prioritisation of collaboration opportunities Draft collaboration agreement/s Identification of potential partners	Outreach campaign At least 2 agreements signed	Outreach campaign At least 2 agreements signed	Evaluation of current agreements and adjustment At least 2 agreements signed	At least 2 agreements signed	Report Master Record meeting works At least agreement Evaluation Outreach

Financial Sustainability of the SNAP (Program component: Integrated Protected Landscapes)

4. Evaluation of funding baseline and gaps of the SNAP in accordance with the updated SNAP ECOS program by PY1

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>1.1. Investigation of new revenue mechanisms for PA financing by PY3</p>	MMAYA, Central SERNAP and PAs staff	Assessment at the system level and for each protected area performed by PY1	Scattered, outdated studies. No criteria for state responsibility at different levels. No accountability mechanism for external funding or system-wide financial monitoring system	<p>Detailed, updated assessment of current funding from all sources, needs, and gaps, at the system level and for each protected area. A unified financial monitoring system allows analysis and forecasting.</p> <p>Participation in the process ensures adequate gender representation</p>	<p>Accountability is relevant in leadership</p> <p>There exists political will for the harmonisation of procedures and tools</p>	<p>Detailed, updated assessment of current funding from all sources, needs, and gaps, at the system level and for each protected area</p> <p>Proposed financial monitoring system</p> <p>Consultations</p>	<p>Financial monitoring system in place</p> <p>Training</p>	(intentionally void)	Evaluation and adjustment	(intentionally void)	<p>Assessment</p> <p>Proposed financial monitoring system</p> <p>Records meeting works</p> <p>Databases</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>Outreach user m</p>

1.1. Investigation of new revenue mechanisms for PA financing by PY3

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
1.1. At least two funding mechanisms, to fill the gap, to be developed by	MMAYA, Central SERNAP and PAs staff	At least two funding mechanisms developed by PY3	No systematic approach to SNAP funding. Lack of results and previous evaluations undermine trust	New, sustainable funding mechanisms provide stability to SNAP and SNAP ECOS. Participation in the process ensures adequate gender representation	Accountability is relevant in leadership There exists political will for the harmonisation of procedures and tools	Diagnostic report Participative brainstorming and prioritisation of proposed funding mechanisms	Implementation of at least 2 new funding mechanisms	Evaluation and adjustment			

1.2. Development of frameworks for sustainable income and revenue generating activities that are compatible with the management objectives of the protected areas by PY4

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>1.1. Capacity building, training, and for uptake of technology, entrepreneurship, tourism (operators) and implemented in ten sites</p>	<p>Central SERNAP and PAs staff, research institutions, NGOs, CBOs</p>	<p>Up to 26 guidelines and manuals for sustainable practices in protected areas (taking into account relevant zoning and management plans)</p>	<p>Scattered, outdated information and technical knowledge. No criteria for the coordination of PA planning and productive activities</p>	<p>Knowledge is readily available and used for the coordination between better livelihoods and conservation objectives.</p> <p>Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation</p>	<p>Technical know-how is critical for sustainability</p>	<p>3 guidelines and manuals on hydrobiological resource management (PNNKM, Yata, Blanco)</p> <p>1 guidelines and manual on sustainable gold mining (PNM, RNAM, Matos, Blanco)</p>	<p>1 guidelines and manual on sustainable agricultural practices (10 sites)</p> <p>1 guidelines and manual on sustainable livestock breeding (Yata, Matos, Blanco, EBB)</p> <p>10 guidelines and manuals on sustainable wildlife use (10 sites)</p>	<p>6 guidelines and manuals on sustainable timber extraction in PAs (PNM, EBB, NAM, TIPNIS, TIRBP, Matos)</p> <p>1 guidelines and manual on alternatives to fire as a land management tool (10 sites)</p>	<p>1 guidelines and manual on meliponinae honey production (EBB, TIRBPL, Yata, Matos, Blanco)</p> <p>2 guidelines and manuals on IAS control (PNM, TIRBPL)</p>	<p>Best practice evaluation and systematisation</p>	<p>26 Guidelines and Manuals Evaluation</p>

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
2. Promotion of ecotourism areas by entrepreneurs in rural and peri-urban areas	Central SERENAP and PAs staff, research institutions, NGOs, CBOs	At least 4 PAs have built ecotourism infrastructure after prioritisation and under operation agreements between companies and communities by PY4	Scattered experience on ecotouristic entrepreneurship has never been systematised and learnt from, no systematic approach	SNAP counts with specific regulations for ecotouristic operation that incentivise best practice. Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	There is demand for what PAs have to offer	Comprehensive market-niche analysis (supply and demand) Diagnostic report on installed capacity (hard & soft) in 11 project sites Prioritisation and detailed description of perceived opportunities	Strategic analysis and draft collaboration agreement (incl. M&E arrangements) Consultations	Ecotouristic infrastructure enhanced in 4 PAs	Evaluation and adjustment	(intentionally void)	Market analysis Diagnostic report Prioritisation Master plan Recording meeting works End-of-report Evaluation
3. Development of ecotourism & marketing Plan in rural and peri-urban areas and implementation	Central SERENAP and PAs staff, research institutions, NGOs, CBOs	Tourism development, marketing & networking Plan developed and under implementation by PY4	Incipient development of ecotouristic products although there is a perception of valuable supply. Generalised lack of managerial, networking and marketing skills	Prioritised PAs benefit from sustainable ecotouristic operations. Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	There is demand for what PAs have to offer	Tourism development, marketing & networking Plan	Marketing campaign Business roundtable	Collaboration agreements Implementation	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Reporting Recording meeting works Agreement Outreach

4. Sustainable financing of the SNAP increased by 10% above the baseline by EOP

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>1.1. Increase of the SNAP sustainable financing of 10% above the baseline by EOP, sequence of areas, number of natural use derived newly as</p>	<p>MMA YA, Central SERNAP and PAs staff</p>	<p>Increase of SNAP sustainable financing of 10% above the baseline by EOP</p>	<p>SNAP funding gap is volatile year on year. There exist no reliable funding sources for SNAP ECOS</p>	<p>Increase of SNAP sustainable financing of 10% above the baseline by EOP</p>	<p>There exists political will for the monetisation of visitation and other sustainable use of PAs</p> <p>The public perceives value in protected areas and strategic ecosystems</p>	<p>Report on legal requirements of new SISCOs</p>	<p>Proposal for the regulation of fees on entrance and sustainable use of PAs</p>	<p>Operational evaluation and adjustments</p>	<p>(intentionally void)</p>	<p>Final evaluation of Component 2</p>	<p>Report on meeting works</p>

Building in support of effective management and improved financial sustainability of the SNAP (Program Component: Policies/Incentives for Protected and Productive Landscapes)

Enhanced capacity for effective management of the SNAP and strategic ecosystems starting in PY3

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
1.1. The project and implementation integrated in case of RAMSAR protected areas monitoring, assessment process, for protected areas or at protected areas sites in PY3 and	Central SERNAP and PAs staff, research institutions, NGOs, CBOs	Training in the development and implementation of management plans (integrated planning in case of RAMSAR sites), protected areas monitoring, and assessment of management effectiveness, conducted for personnel of protected areas and partner agencies for at least 80 persons (at least 15 female) between PY3 and EOP	High staff turnover means about 40% of personnel lacks training on the implementation of PA management plans	Trained staff implement sound and feasible management plans. Participation in the process ensures adequate gender and indigenous representation	Staff turnover will diminish with increased training	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Training activities for PA staff, Management Committees and other key stakeholders	Training activities for PA staff, Management Committees and other key stakeholders	Training activities for PA staff, Management Committees and other key stakeholders	Records, workshops, tours, training Training Participating

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
2.	Central SERNAP and PAs staff	Essential equipment for systematic monitoring and assessment of management effectiveness provided to at least 7 PAs and 3 RAMSAR sites by PY3	Essential monitoring equipment is incomplete	7 PAs and 3 RAMSAR sites count with the essential equipment for biodiversity monitoring. Participation in the process ensures adequate gender and indigenous representation	Staff turnover will diminish with adequate equipment	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Acquisition of essential equipment	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Requirements from 1 Records acquisition process Receipt

Strengthened capacity in achieving the financial sustainability of the SNAP and strategic ecosystems starting in PY3

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>1.1.1. Community organisations (agroforestry, cattle ranching, coffee, cacao, mining) in 7 PAs and 3 RAMSAR sites</p> <p>Community organisations trained to introduce or strengthen sustainable practices in productive activities (agroforestry, cattle ranching, coffee, cacao, among others), within at least 7 PAs and 3 RAMSAR sites starting in PY3.</p> <p>At least one women organisation per site (7+3)</p>	<p>Local practices and technologies vary in sustainability across project sites. Activities not necessarily go in harmony to PA zoning and compatible use</p>	<p>Communities share and develop more sustainable productive practices.</p> <p>Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation</p>	<p>Communities have interest in enhancing their productive practices</p> <p>The project can develop a compelling value proposal for local communities</p>	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	<p>Training on hydrobiological resources such as freshwater fish, <i>Cheloniidae</i>, <i>Crocodylidae</i> (PNNKM, Yata, Blanco)</p> <p>Training on mercury-free gold mining (PNM, RNAM, Matos, Blanco)</p> <p>Training on IAS control through use (PNM, TIRBPL)</p> <p>Training on permanent agriculture and intensive cattle farming (7 areas y 3 RAMSAR sites)</p>	<p>Training on sustainable agricultural practices (11 sites)</p> <p>Training on sustainable forestry (PNM, EBB, RNAM, TIPNIS, TIRBPL, Matos)</p> <p>Training on sustainable cattle farming (Yata, Matos, Blanco, EBB)</p>	<p>Training on sustainable wildlife use (11 sites)</p> <p>Training on meliponinae honey production (EBB, TIRBPL, Yata, Matos, Blanco)</p>	<p>Training on sustainable wildlife use (11 sites)</p> <p>Participatory certification</p> <p>Participatory evaluation</p>		

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
2.2. Sustainable use of biodiversity (Program Component: Integrated Productive Landscapes) Improved sustainable use practices by indigenous territories of CIPOAP in their territories	Community organisations (agroforestry, cattle ranching, coffee, cacao, mining) in 7 Pas	Community organisations trained in the design and implementation of management plans (tourism, natural resources use), in at least 7 protected areas by PY3. At least one women organisation per site (7+3)	There exist scant capacities for sustainable resource management, entrepreneurship and cooperative management, administration and marketing	Communities develop capacities for sustainable resource management in Pas. Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	Only sustainable resource management is allowed and supported	(intentionally void)	(intentionally void)	Training on ecotourism (4 sites)	Training on sustainable management of species (11 sites)	Follow-up, on-demand training (11 sites)	Training Training Participatory certification Participatory evaluation

Sustainable use of biodiversity (Program Component: Integrated Productive Landscapes)

2.2. Improved sustainable use practices by indigenous territories of CIPOAP in their territories

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>1.1. Sustainable Land Management</p> <p>ent</p> <p>ed in</p> <p>es in</p> <p>na,</p> <p>and</p> <p>of</p>	CIPOAP	<p>Sustainable SLWM practices implemented by EOP.</p> <p>An adaptive and transparent process selects participants, who reflect adequate generational and gender representation</p>	<p>Communities entertain unsustainable cattle and agricultural practices. Training on offer is not appropriate, incoherent and not adapted to local needs</p>	<p>Communities enhance their livelihoods through sustainable cattle, agricultural and other land management practices.</p> <p>The definition of beneficiaries considers local options</p>	<p>Selected thought leaders have interest in enhancing their productive practices</p> <p>The project can develop a compelling value proposal for local communities</p>	<p>Training and support program design</p> <p>Consultations</p>	(intentionally void)	<p>Support to best practice in Brazil nut recollection and commercialisation</p> <p>Support to best practice in sustainable agriculture and livestock breeding</p> <p>Support to best practice in sustainable pisciculture</p> <p>Support to best practice in sustainable fauna use and its regulation as a common</p>	<p>Support to best practice in Brazil nut recollection and commercialisation</p> <p>Support to best practice in sustainable agriculture and livestock breeding</p> <p>Support to best practice in sustainable pisciculture</p> <p>Support to best practice in sustainable fauna use and its regulation as a common</p>	(intentionally void)	<p>Training support</p> <p>Requirements from participants</p> <p>Records acquisition process</p> <p>Receipts</p>

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
2.2. Enhanced capacity for effective management of freshwater ecosystems (in particular RAMSAR sites) starting in PY2	CIPOAP	<p>Community organisations trained to increase uptake or strengthening of sustainable agriculture and SLWM practices by EOP.</p> <p>An adaptive and transparent process selects participants, who reflect adequate generational and gender representation</p>	<p>Communities entertain unsustainable cattle and agricultural practices. Training on offer is not appropriate, incoherent and not adapted to local needs</p>	<p>Communities enhance their livelihoods through sustainable cattle, agricultural and other land management practices.</p> <p>The definition of beneficiaries considers local options</p>	<p>Communities have interest in enhancing their productive practices</p> <p>The project can develop a compelling value proposal for local communities</p>	(intentionally void)	<p>Training on best practice in Brazil nut (<i>Bertholletia excelsa</i>) recollection and commercialisation</p> <p>Training on best practice in sustainable agriculture and livestock breeding</p> <p>Training on best practice in sustainable pisciculture</p> <p>Training on best practice in sustainable fauna use and its regulation as a common</p>	<p>Training on best practice in Brazil nut (<i>Bertholletia excelsa</i>) recollection and commercialisation</p> <p>Training on best practice in sustainable agriculture and livestock breeding</p> <p>Training on best practice in sustainable pisciculture</p> <p>Training on best practice in sustainable fauna use and its regulation as a common</p>	(intentionally void)	Training and support program evaluation	<p>Training and support program evaluation</p> <p>Participatory certification</p> <p>Participatory evaluation</p> <p>Evaluation</p>

2.2. Enhanced capacity for effective management of freshwater ecosystems (in particular RAMSAR sites) starting in PY2

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
1.1. Agreements (in partnership with Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources)	Local communities in 3 RAMSAR sites, Ministerio de Desarrollo Rural y Tierras (MDRyT)	Local agreements for aquatic resources use signed and enforced by EOP	There exist conflicts overfishing zones and overexploitation of turtles, which diminishes both stewardship and populations and carrying capacity for subsistence consumption	Agreements over shared resources reduce conflicts and overexploitation. Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	Other sources of conflict are insufficient to impede agreements	Stakeholder map and conflict analysis report	Agreement proposals	Monitoring of agreements	Evaluation and adjustment	Monitoring of adjusted agreements	Conflicts resolved Records meeting works Agreements signed Evaluation completed
2.1. Drinking water with dependent to other	Drinking water and sanitation authorities	Basic water sanitation projects leveraged by EOP	Drinking water supply, sanitation facilities and discharge treatment are deficient	Agreement on the optimisation of resources between MiAgua program and the project	Communities assign value to the environmental aspects of basic drinking water, sanitation and discharge treatment facilities	(intentionally void)	High-level meetings Action plan	Implementation	Implementation	Implementation Evaluation	Action plan Evaluation

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>3.3.3. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) and Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) for small-scale mining operations and local mining organisations, environmental organisations and community groups, ensuring that the proposed projects do not have a negative impact on the environment, including the mercury cycle, and that the proposed projects promote the use of good practices to reduce mercury emissions throughout the project life cycle, as stated in the EIAs/EMPs.</p>	<p>Customs, Ministries of Commerce and Mining, local miners' organisations, environmental organisations</p>	<p>Signed agreements</p>	<p>In Bolivia it is estimated that about 300 tonnes of mercury are disposed of in Amazonian rivers per year</p>	<p>The impact of gold-mining mercury use diminishes. Participation in the process ensures adequate gender representation</p>	<p>There exists political will for the introduction of environmental considerations in the mining sector Mercury-free alternatives for gold concentration are cost-effective</p>	<p>(intentionally void)</p>	<p>High-level meetings Action plan</p>	<p>Proposal for use and availability reduction</p>	<p>(intentionally void)</p>	<p>Evaluation</p>	<p>Action plan Evaluation</p>

Management, Monitoring & Evaluation, and Knowledge Management (Program component: Capacity building and regional cooperation)

Effective project management, monitoring & evaluation, as per the technical, administrative, and fiduciary standards defined by CAF/GEF and the Bolivian legal framework, through-out project implementation

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>1.1. Work plans, Progress Reports, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation Report, Terminal Evaluation report drafted, and GEF Tracking Tool completed according to established deadlines.</p> <p>Participation ensures adequate gender and indigenous representation</p>	Project partners	<p>Annual Work Plans, Progress Reports, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation Report, Terminal Evaluation report drafted, and GEF Tracking Tool completed according to established deadlines.</p> <p>Participation ensures adequate gender and indigenous representation</p>	<p>Annual Work Plans, Progress Reports, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation Report, Terminal Evaluation report drafted, and GEF Tracking Tool completed according to established deadlines.</p> <p>Disaggregated indicators are monitored, available, and considered in decision-making</p>	BOB-USD exchange rate does not vary more than 20% below or over design rate for any six-month period during the project	<p>Operations Manual, Inception workshop and report, Annual Work Plan, Progress Reports, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports</p>	<p>Annual Work Plan, Progress Report, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports</p>	<p>Annual Work Plan, Progress Reports, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports, Mid-Term Evaluation Report, and GEF Tracking Tool completed</p>	<p>Annual Work Plan, Progress Report, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Reports</p>	<p>Annual Work Plan, Final Reports, Budgeted Monitoring & Evaluation Plan, Annual Financial Audit Report, Terminal Evaluation report drafted, and GEF Tracking Tool completed</p>	<p>Plans</p> <p>Reports</p> <p>Audit</p> <p>Tracking</p>	

1.2. Systematisation of lessons learned, experiences and results, on a continuous basis through-out project implementation

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verifications
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
<p>1.1. ...</p> <p>... areas of ...</p>	Project audiences	Number of information pieces disseminated reflecting adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	There is information and knowledge about the project's thematic, but access to it is time-consuming	Knowledge is made available to different audiences (generational, gender and indigenous representation), through different media and formats adapted to local and specific-audience conditions, in the form of actionable lessons learnt and validated best practice to support decision making	Practitioners are willing to share their experiences	<p>Long-term monitoring, reporting and evaluation plan</p> <p>Protocol for the permanent documentation and systematisation of activity, experiences, learning, and knowledge</p> <p>Documentation and systematisation of activity, experiences, learning, and knowledge</p> <p>Outreach products</p>	<p>Documentation and systematisation of activity, experiences, learning, and knowledge</p> <p>Outreach products</p>	<p>Documentation and systematisation of activity, experiences, learning, and knowledge</p> <p>Outreach products</p>	<p>Documentation and systematisation of activity, experiences, learning, and knowledge</p> <p>Outreach products</p>	<p>Documentation and systematisation of activity, experiences, learning, and knowledge</p> <p>Outreach products</p>	<p>Protocols</p> <p>Records</p> <p>Meeting minutes</p> <p>Workshops</p> <p>System databases</p> <p>Outreach products</p>

Outputs	Stakeholders	Indicator/s	Baseline	Goal	Assumptions	Milestones					Verification
						PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	
.2. ation or the s, project- tions, and ation ng of	Project audiences	Disaggregated engagement track records	Knowledge on communication strategies is available. It needs to be adapted to the specific needs of the project	An effective communication strategy transcends the project and helps SNAP ECOS achieve its aims. Participation in the process ensures adequate generational, gender and indigenous representation	SNAP ECOS is not affected by internal or near reputational problems	Participative design of a SNAP ECOS communication strategy, including a project-specific section Project media infrastructure (website, social media accounts, SEO profile)	Implementation and evaluation on a rolling basis	Implementation and evaluation on a rolling basis	Implementation and evaluation on a rolling basis	Implementation and evaluation on a rolling basis	Comm strate Evalu

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

**GEF Secretariat Review for Full Sized Project – GEF - 7
Basic Information**

GEF ID
10730
Countries
Bolivia

Project Title

Amazon Sustainable Landscape Approach in the National System of Protected Areas and Strategic Ecosystems of Bolivia (Integrated project as part of the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes 2 SFM Impact Program)

GEF Agency(ies)

CAF

Agency ID

CAF: CAF/GEF 005

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	Agency Response
CEO Approval Request	
Part I – Project Information	
1. Focal area elements. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	

2. Project description summary. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
4. Co-financing. Are the confirmed 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, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
No.	

Please provide English translations of every cofinancing letter.	Done																																
Please provide a signed letter to cover the CAF grant and loan. They can be referenced in the same letter.ç	Done																																
Please classify the cofinancing from SISCO.	Done. SISCO refers to new income generated by sustainable economic activity within and around protected areas, to be reinvested in the protected area system. Thus, it is to be classified as CASH and INVESTMENT MOBILIZED.																																
<p>The cofinancing letter from MAYA is confusing as it never references the two cofinanciers of SISCO and SERNAP which are listed as the cofinancers in the portal. Therefore either edit the MAYA letter clearly referencing SISCO and SERNAP and their amounts and their types or provide letters from SISCO and SERNAP seperately.</p>	<p>Letters from MMAYA and SERNAP have been updated. In the previous MMAYA (and SERNAP) letters, total cofinancing was classified by component. SISCO refers to the payment collection system (<i>Sistema de CObro</i>) that SERNAP implements for PAs. The breakdown by component is laid in the table below, and also presented in the Incremental Cost Matrix.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="609 643 2020 922"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>SISCO</th> <th>SERNAP</th> <th>TOTAL</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>C1</td> <td></td> <td>19 944 710</td> <td>19 944 710</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C2</td> <td>1 891 602</td> <td>3 377 861</td> <td>5 269 463</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C3</td> <td></td> <td>1 486 259</td> <td>1 486 259</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C4</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PMC</td> <td></td> <td>1 049 722</td> <td>1 049 722</td> </tr> <tr> <td>SUBTOTAL</td> <td>1 891 602</td> <td>25 858 551</td> <td>27 750 154</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		SISCO	SERNAP	TOTAL	C1		19 944 710	19 944 710	C2	1 891 602	3 377 861	5 269 463	C3		1 486 259	1 486 259	C4			-	C5			-	PMC		1 049 722	1 049 722	SUBTOTAL	1 891 602	25 858 551	27 750 154
	SISCO	SERNAP	TOTAL																														
C1		19 944 710	19 944 710																														
C2	1 891 602	3 377 861	5 269 463																														
C3		1 486 259	1 486 259																														
C4			-																														
C5			-																														
PMC		1 049 722	1 049 722																														
SUBTOTAL	1 891 602	25 858 551	27 750 154																														
<p>12/4/2020</p> <p>Please clarify why the cofinance from SISCO is classified as "other" while from SERNAP it is classified as "recurrent expenditures". The explanation in the CEO endorsement request is not clear in this regard.</p> <p>All other issues raised above are cleared.</p>	<p>The mistake has been corrected. Sorry.</p>																																

<p>5. GEF resource availability. 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):</p>	
<p>Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request</p>	
<p>10/26/2020</p>	
<p>The PMC costs should be shared between the GEF and the cofinancing in a way that is consistently proportional with the overall cofinance ratio per the new policy and guidelines. Please revise this and update all budgets accordingly.</p>	<p>Done. PMC costs have been updated in the CEO ER and PRODOC.</p>
<p>12/4/2020</p> <p>The overall cofinancing ratio of the project is 1:3.8, GEF to cofinance. The current ratio of PMC is 1:2.2, GEF to cofinance. Please revise accordingly.</p>	<p>The mistake has been corrected. Sorry.</p>
<p>STAR allocation?</p>	
<p>Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request</p>	
<p>10/26/2020</p>	
<p>Yes. Cleared.</p>	
<p></p>	
<p>Focal Area allocation?</p>	
<p>Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request</p>	

10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
Focal Area Set Aside?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
Impact Program Incentive?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	

Yes. Cleared.	
6. Project Preparation Grant. If PPG is requested in Table E.1, has its advanced programming and utilized been accounted for in Annex C of the document?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
7. Non-Grant Instrument. If this an NGI, are the expected reflows indicated in Annex D?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
8. Core Indicators. Are the targeted core indicators in Table E calculated using the methodology in the prescribed guidelines? (GEF/C.54/Infxxx)	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	

Yes. But please fix core indicator one. The PA hectares are currently listed under 1.1 as "new protected areas". Since these protected areas already exist the hectares should all go under 1.2	Done.
9. Project taxonomy. Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as in Table G?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Part II – Project Justification	
1. Project Description. Is there 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see, in the PRODOC, 2.1. Barrier analysis, theory of change, strategic rationality and scope.

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
2. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 1.5. Baseline and 4.2. Learning from past experience
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
3. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there more clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 2.5. Global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning.

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
4. Project Description. Is there an elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 1.3. Consistency with policies and priorities (national, GEF, SDGs, Aichi)
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
5. Project Description. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 2.5. Global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning, 1.5. Baseline & 2.4. Co-financing projects.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done

6. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 2.2. Objectives, expected results and key indicators.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
7. Project Description. Is there a better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 4.2. Learning from past experience, 4.4. Environmental impact, 4.6. Innovation & 4.7. Sustainability and replicability.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done

8. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Done. The map that is pasted in the CEO ER lists project areas validated by the ASL2 Program and included in the Program for Bolivia.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
9. Child Project. If this is a child project, an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 4.1. Economic, financial and fiduciary analysis.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done

<p>10. 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?</p>	
<p>Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request</p>	
<p>10/26/2020</p>	
<p>Yes. Cleared.</p>	
<p>Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.</p>	<p>Please see PRODOC 1.4. Stakeholders, 3.3. Implementation arrangements, and Appendix 6. Public Consultation Process & Stakeholder Engagement Plan, with Special Attention to Indigenous Peoples.</p>
<p>Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.</p>	<p>Done</p>
<p>11. 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?</p>	
<p>Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request</p>	
<p>10/26/2020</p>	
<p>Yes. Cleared.</p>	

Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see PRODOC 4.3. Social analysis and stakeholder participation, 4.5. Gender analysis, and Appendix 9. Appendix 9. Gender Evaluation & Action Plan with a Gender Approach.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
12. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see 1.4. Stakeholders.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
13. Risk. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	

Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc 3.6. Risks and mitigation measures, and Appendix 10. Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
14. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc 3.2. Institutional arrangements, 3.3. Implementation arrangements, and 4.2. Learning from past experience.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
15. Consistency with national priorities. Has the project described the consistency of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	

Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc 1.3. Consistency with policies and priorities (national, GEF, SDGs, Aichi).
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
16. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Plase see ProDoc 2.2. Objectives, expected results and key indicators, 3.4. Monitoring, reports and evaluation, and 3.5. Dissemination of results and visibility.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
17. 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	
10/26/2020	

Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc 3.4. Monitoring, reports and evaluation & Appendix 7. Monitoring, Reporting and Evaluation Plan.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
18. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc 2.5. Global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning, 4.3. Social analysis and stakeholder participation, and Appendix 5. Incremental Cost Matrix.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
19. Annexes: Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	

Please insert a map on 1.b.	Done.
Annex A the results framework is illegible. Please enter again and reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc Appendix 2. Logical and Results Framework.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
20. 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	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
The portal entry for the ESS is ineligible due to the formatting result. Please reenter.	The portal entry has been re-uploaded.
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see also ProDoc Appendix 11. Environmental and Social Management Framework.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done

12/4/2020	Done
The portal entry for the ESS is still illegible due to the formatting result. Please fix this.	
Project Results Framework	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes. Cleared.	
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc Appendix 2. Logical and Results Framework.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done
GEF Secretariat comments	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
Council comments	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	

<p>Council comments were mainly on the "Program" per se, but the United States provided the following two comments that apply to all child projects. Please provide a response to each as appropriate:</p>	
<p>United States Comments</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk assessment. It will be important that the child projects more fulsomely assess and incorporate risk (including a monitoring and tracking component) from infrastructure planned as part of the Initiative for the Integration of the Regional Infrastructure of South America (IIRSA) plan, including the planned trans-amazon railway. 	<p>The project includes a specific output (Output 1.3.2) within Component 1 (please see ProDoc 2.3. Components, products and schedule, para.108), devoted to facilitating the integrated planning, monitoring and tracking of initiatives with impact over land use, such as infrastructure, between the Protected Area System and other governmental planning tools. Both CAF and the Bolivian Ministry of Development Planning (MPD) participate in both IIRSA and this output, which ensures coordination and the adequate flow of information between the two initiatives.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognizing that the intent of these projects is to mitigate or reverse deforestation, the United States needs to officially confirm for internal purposes that the following projects will not involve any logging of primary forests. Can the GEF please affirm that no logging of primary forests will occur during the implementation of projects: 10125, 10184, 10188, 10192, 10198, 10206, 10208, 10220. 	<p>The Bolivia child project of ASL-2 will not involve any logging in primary forests as defined in internal US legislation.</p>

Please note that the project number 10198 refers to ASL program as a whole. Please confirm that the Bolivia child project of ASL-2 will not involve any logging in primary forests.	The correct GEF project ID 10730 has been included. Sorry.
STAP comments	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
No specific comments by STAP on the Bolivia project, thus, not applicable.	
Convention Secretariat comments	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
Other Agencies comments	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
CSOs comments	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	

NA.	
Status of PPG utilization	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Utilized or committed and annex provided. Cleared.	
Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
NA.	
Project maps and coordinates	
Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Please insert the project map into the CEO endorsement request in the appropriate space.	Done. The Map has been pasted within the CEO ER.
Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.	Please see ProDoc Appendix 1. Forest Cover Loss Maps.
Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.	Done

Part III – Country and Agency Endorsements	
1. 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 CEO Endorsement Request	
10/26/2020	
Yes.	
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 CEO Endorsement Request	

10/26/2020	
NA.	
Review Dates	
Response to Secretariat comments	
First Review	10/26/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/04/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional Review (as necessary)	<input type="checkbox"/>

ANNEX C: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG). (Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent Todate</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
Consultancy	177 000	146 785	30 215
Tickets and per diem	10 000	0	10 000

Seminars, training	10 000	0	10 000
Publications, printing, translate	3 000	1 573	1 427
Total	200 000	148 358	51 642

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Trust Funds or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA

ANNEX E: Project Map(s) and Coordinates

Please attach the geographical location of the project area, if possible.



ANNEX F: Project Budget Table

Please attach a project budget table.

Detailed Budget

	Expenditure category															
	Works	Goods	Vehicles	Grants/ Sub- grants	Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	Sub- contract to executing partner/ entity	Contractual Services – Individual	Contractual Services – Company	International Consultants	Local Consultants	Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Travel	Office Supplies	Other Operating Costs	Grand Total
SO1	-	69 000	-	125 000	-	-	-	436 000	-	375 000	435 600	256 000	117 000	32 000	28 500	1 874 100
Outcome 1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37 000	-	170 000	435 600	115 000	60 000	10 000	2 250	829 850
Output 1.1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 000	-	90 000	435 600	80 000	45 000	5 000	2 250	687 850
Output 1.1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5 000	-	55 000	-	20 000	10 000	3 000	-	93 000
Output 1.1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 000	-	25 000	-	15 000	5 000	2 000	-	49 000
Outcome 1.2	-	35 000	-	-	-	-	-	4 000	-	75 000	-	50 000	27 000	5 000	-	196 000
Output 1.2.1	-	35 000	-	-	-	-	-	2 000	-	35 000	-	35 000	10 500	5 000	-	122 500
Output 1.2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2 000	-	40 000	-	15 000	16 500	-	-	73 500
Outcome 1.3	-	34 000	-	125 000	-	-	-	395 000	-	130 000	-	91 000	30 000	17 000	26 250	848 250

	Expenditure category															
	Works	Goods	Vehicles	Grants/ Sub- grants	Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	Sub- contract to executing partner/ entity	Contractual Services – Individual	Contractual Services – Company	International Consultants	Local Consultants	Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Travel	Office Supplies	Other Operating Costs	Grand Total
Output 1.3.1	-	14 000	-	-	-	-	-	350 000	-	-	-	35 000	14 000	7 000	26 250	446 250
Output 1.3.2	-	10 000	-	-	-	-	-	45 000	-	30 000	-	40 000	-	-	-	125 000
Output 1.3.3	-	10 000	-	125 000	-	-	-	-	-	100 000	-	16 000	16 000	10 000	-	277 000
SO2	320 000	68 333	-	100 000	-	-	100 000	280 000	-	500 000	-	114 000	69 000	11 667	45 000	1 608 000
Outcome 2.1	-	35 000	-	-	-	-	-	85 000	-	95 000	-	20 000	15 000	5 000	6 375	261 375
Output 2.1.1	-	35 000	-	-	-	-	-	85 000	-	95 000	-	20 000	15 000	5 000	6 375	261 375
Outcome 2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 000	-	15 000	-	10 000	5 000	-	2 250	62 250
Output 2.2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 000	-	15 000	-	10 000	5 000	-	2 250	62 250
Outcome 2.3	320 000	33 333	-	100 000	-	-	100 000	165 000	-	310 000	-	79 000	47 000	6 667	36 375	1 197 375

Expenditure category																
	Works	Goods	Vehicles	Grants/ Sub- grants	Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	Sub- contract to executing partner/ entity	Contractual Services – Individual	Contractual Services – Company	International Consultants	Local Consultants	Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Travel	Office Supplies	Other Operating Costs	Grand Total
Output 2.3.1	-	15 000	-	100 000	-	-	100 000	105 000	-	100 000	-	54 000	27 000	-	7 875	508 875
Output 2.3.2	320 000	13 333	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	160 000	-	10 000	12 000	6 667	24 000	546 000
Output 2.3.3	-	5 000	-	-	-	-	-	60 000	-	50 000	-	15 000	8 000	-	4 500	142 500
Outcome 2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 000	-	5 000	2 000	-	-	87 000
Output 2.4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80 000	-	5 000	2 000	-	-	87 000
SO3	-	188 000	-	-	-	-	-	296 000	-	360 000	150 000	776 000	201 000	70 000	47 200	2 088 200
Outcome 3.1	-	158 000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150 000	120 000	119 000	29 000	25 000	601 000
Output 3.1.1	-	8 000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	150 000	120 000	99 000	4 000	-	381 000
Output 3.1.2	-	150 000	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20 000	25 000	25 000	220 000

	Expenditure category															Grand Total
	Works	Goods	Vehicles	Grants/ Sub-grants	Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	Sub- contract to executing partner/ entity	Contractual Services – Individual	Contractual Services – Company	International Consultants	Local Consultants	Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Travel	Office Supplies	Other Operating Costs	
Outcome 3.2	-	30 000	-	-	-	-	-	296 000	-	360 000	-	656 000	82 000	41 000	22 200	1 487 200
Output 3.2.1	-	20 000	-	-	-	-	-	208 000	-	240 000	-	448 000	56 000	28 000	15 600	1 015 600
Output 3.2.2	-	10 000	-	-	-	-	-	88 000	-	120 000	-	208 000	26 000	13 000	6 600	471 600
SO4	-	465 000	-	185 000	-	-	-	930 000	-	102 000	315 000	333 000	87 000	5 000	67 500	2 489 500
Outcome 4.1	-	445 000	-	160 000	-	-	-	150 000	-	20 000	150 000	298 000	22 000	-	11 250	1 256 250
Output 4.1.1	-	420 000	-	150 000	-	-	-	150 000	-	-	150 000	-	20 000	-	11 250	901 250
Output 4.1.2	-	25 000	-	10 000	-	-	-	-	-	20 000	-	298 000	2 000	-	-	355 000
Outcome 4.2	-	20 000	-	25 000	-	-	-	780 000	-	82 000	165 000	35 000	65 000	5 000	56 250	1 233 250

Expenditure category																
	Works	Goods	Vehicles	Grants/ Sub- grants	Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	Sub- contract to executing partner/ entity	Contractual Services – Individual	Contractual Services – Company	International Consultants	Local Consultants	Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Travel	Office Supplies	Other Operating Costs	Grand Total
Output 4.2.1	-	20 000	-	25 000	-	-	-	-	-	-	165 000	25 000	50 000	-	-	285 000
Output 4.2.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	750 000	-	40 000	-	5 000	10 000	5 000	56 250	866 250
Output 4.2.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30 000	-	42 000	-	5 000	5 000	-	-	82 000
SO5	-	63 523	-	50 000	-	-	-	305 000	20 000	50 000	386 000	100 000	177 500	86 250	58 750	1 297 023
Outcome 5.1	-	25 000	-	-	-	-	-	5 000	20 000	50 000	170 000	40 000	97 500	36 250	36 250	480 000
Output 5.1.1	-	25 000	-	-	-	-	-	5 000	20 000	50 000	170 000	40 000	97 500	36 250	36 250	480 000
Outcome 5.2	-	38 523	-	50 000	-	-	-	300 000	-	-	216 000	60 000	80 000	50 000	22 500	817 023
Output 5.2.1	-	19 000	-	25 000	-	-	-	150 000	-	-	108 000	30 000	40 000	25 000	11 250	408 250
Output 5.2.2	-	19 523	-	25 000	-	-	-	150 000	-	-	108 000	30 000	40 000	25 000	11 250	408 773

Expenditure category																
	Works	Goods	Vehicles	Grants/ Sub- grants	Revolving funds/ Seed funds / Equity	Sub- contract to executing partner/ entity	Contractual Services – Individual	Contractual Services – Company	International Consultants	Local Consultants	Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Trainings, Workshops, Meetings	Travel	Office Supplies	Other Operating Costs	Grand Total
Subtotal	320 000	853 856	-	460 000	-	-	100 000	2 247 000	20 000	1 387 000	1 286 600	1 579 000	651 500	204 917	246 950	9 356 823
M&E	-	-	-	-	-	20 000	-	20 000	50 000	50 000	28 000	20 000	52 500	-	-	240 500
PMC	-	-	-	-	-	458 866	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	458 866
Grand Total	320 000	853 856	-	460 000	-	478 866	100 000	2 267 000	70 000	1 437 000	1 314 600	1 599 000	704 000	204 917	246 950	10 056 189

Disbursement Schedule

	PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	Grand Total
SO1	579 280	864 595	196 550	137 375	96 300	1 874 100
Outcome 1.1	249 205	547 595	33 050	-	-	829 850
Output 1.1.1	206 355	481 495	-	-	-	687 850
Output 1.1.2	23 250	46 500	23 250	-	-	93 000
Output 1.1.3	19 600	19 600	9 800	-	-	49 000
Outcome 1.2	36 750	3 675	46 550	40 425	68 600	196 000
Output 1.2.1	-	-	42 875	36 750	42 875	122 500
Output 1.2.2	36 750	3 675	3 675	3 675	25 725	73 500
Outcome 1.3	293 325	313 325	116 950	96 950	27 700	848 250
Output 1.3.1	133 875	223 125	89 250	-	-	446 250
Output 1.3.2	62 500	62 500	-	-	-	125 000
Output 1.3.3	96 950	27 700	27 700	96 950	27 700	277 000
SO2	334 289	569 704	473 855	189 555	40 597	1 608 000
Outcome 2.1	52 275	130 687	-	78 413	-	261 375
Output 2.1.1	52 275	130 687	-	78 413	-	261 375

	PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	Grand Total
Outcome 2.2	18 675	24 900	18 675	-	-	62 250
Output 2.2.1	18 675	24 900	18 675			62 250
Outcome 2.3	241 589	392 367	433 430	111 142	18 847	1 197 375
Output 2.3.1	75 389	226 167	131 930	56 542	18 847	508 875
Output 2.3.2	109 200	109 200	273 000	54 600		546 000
Output 2.3.3	57 000	57 000	28 500			142 500
Outcome 2.4	21 750	21 750	21 750	-	21 750	87 000
Output 2.4.1	21 750	21 750	21 750		21 750	87 000
SO3	-	-	751 433	732 773	603 994	2 088 200
Outcome 3.1	-	-	334 300	152 400	114 300	601 000
Output 3.1.1			114 300	152 400	114 300	381 000
Output 3.1.2			220 000			220 000
Outcome 3.2	-	-	417 133	580 373	489 694	1 487 200
Output 3.2.1			344 579	380 850	290 171	1 015 600
Output 3.2.2			72 554	199 523	199 523	471 600
SO4	171 625	453 450	860 138	707 688	296 600	2 489 500

	PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	Grand Total
Outcome 4.1	114 625	281 125	485 500	319 000	56 000	1 256 250
Output 4.1.1	114 625	114 625	319 000	319 000	34 000	901 250
Output 4.1.2		166 500	166 500		22 000	355 000
Outcome 4.2	57 000	172 325	374 638	388 688	240 600	1 233 250
Output 4.2.1	57 000	57 000	42 750	85 500	42 750	285 000
Output 4.2.2	-	86 625	303 188	303 188	173 250	866 250
Output 4.2.3	-	28 700	28 700	-	24 600	82 000
SO5	365 107	276 256	218 553	194 553	242 553	1 297 023
Outcome 5.1	120 000	72 000	96 000	72 000	120 000	480 000
Output 5.1.1	120 000	72 000	96 000	72 000	120 000	480 000
Outcome 5.2	245 107	204 256	122 553	122 553	122 553	817 023
Output 5.2.1	122 475	102 063	61 238	61 238	61 238	408 250
Output 5.2.2	122 632	102 193	61 316	61 316	61 316	408 773
Subtotal	1 450 301	2 164 005	2 500 529	1 961 944	1 280 044	9 356 823
M&E	41 500	25 500	66 500	25 500	81 500	240 500
PMC	183 546	45 887	45 887	45 887	137 659	458 866

	PY1	PY2	PY3	PY4	PY5	Grand Total
Grand Total	1 633 847	2 209 892	2 546 416	2 007 831	1 417 703	10 056 189