

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

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10730

Countries

Bolivia

Project Name

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

Agencies

CAF

Date received by PM

10/16/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

Please provide a signed letter to cover the CAF grant and loan. They can be referenced in the same letter.

Please classify the cofinancing from SISCO.

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.

12/4/2020

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.

All other issues raised above are cleared.

12/7/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response The mistake has been corrected. Sorry.

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):

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

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.

12/4/2020

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.

12/7/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response The mistake has been corrected. Sorry.

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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

12/4/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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.

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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?

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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?

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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.

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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.

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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

12/4/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

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 illegible due to the formatting result. Please reenter.

Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

12/4/2020

The portal entry for the ESS is still illegible due to the formatting result. Please fix this.

12/7/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response Done
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 delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

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:

United States Comments

- 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.
- 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. 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.

12/4/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

No specific comments by STAP on the Bolivia project, thus, not applicable.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

Utilized or committed and annex provided. Cleared.

Agency Response
Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response
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.

Please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

12/4/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

1. RECOMMENDATION.

Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

No. Please revise per instructions above and resubmit.

Please remove all references and hyperlinks in the submission and add the appropriate text in these sections.

Please delete this from the project title in the portal: (Integrated project as part of the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes 2 SFM Impact Program)

In the portal CEO endorsement request, in many sections an answer is given: "no change since PIF" or a very limited description is given when the project document has more elaborate information. Thus, in these cases, as noted above, please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.

CEO endorsement request, in many sections an answer is given: "no change since PIF" or a very limited description is given when the project document has more elaborate information. Thus, in these cases, as noted above, please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.

12/4/2020

No. Please address the remaining issues highlighted above and resubmit.

12/7/2020

There is a technical issue with the project document that was uploaded by CAF on December 4. We can not access it. Please delete it from the portal and then upload again. This is the only remaining issue that needs to be addressed.

Review Dates

1SMSP CEO Approval

Response to Secretariat comments

First Review	10/26/2020	10/26/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/4/2020	12/4/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/7/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/8/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project aims to improve the management, capacities and sustainable financing of the protected areas and strategic ecosystems (RAMSAR sites) of the Bolivian Amazon (national and sub-national) and the sustainable management of natural resources in the ecosystems that the protected areas represent, providing a boost to existing areas that are currently undervalued and unsustainably managed, and opportunities for integrated landscape management and conservation. The project will do this through direct intervention in and around protected areas, in the national system (Components 1 and 2) and in and around other conservation sites (Components 3 and 4), and through systemic intervention to modernize the institutional framework, regulatory scenario, institutional scope, competencies, staff and other assets, which will aim for producing adequate levels of governance and technical capacities.