



Conservation of the Atlantic Forest through the sustainable management of cocoa agroforestry landscapes

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11052

Countries

Brazil

Project Name

Conservation of the Atlantic Forest through the sustainable management of cocoa agroforestry landscapes

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/1/2024

Review completed by PM

2/25/2024

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

PIF

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
February 7, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
February 7, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

2. Project Summary.

a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

a) and b) Yes, the summary is a bit longer than the limit of 250 words but it is clear and concise. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

- a) **Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**
- b) **Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**
- c) **Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**
- d) **Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**
- e) **Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

a) Yes, cleared.

b) The only monitoring of biodiversity and ecosystem services (output 2.2.1) doesn't appear to be enough to ensure the accomplishment of the outcome 2.2 "Environmental services in rainforest formations ... conserved, restored, and strengthened through improved management of natural resources". The actual conservation, restoration and improved management should be the result of more activities than only monitoring. Please clarify and complete as needed.

c) Please see and address the comment below on gender consideration in the project description.

d) and e) Yes, both contributions represent 5% of of GEF project financing and co-financing. Cleared.

April 15, 2024:

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

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a) No response needed

b) Two changes have been made to better reflect the activities under the outcome 2.2.: firstly, the name of output 2.2.1. was changed to better reflect the activities within it. Besides biodiversity monitoring, this output will also implement strategies to conserve, restore and valorize ecosystem services; secondly, the output 2.1.3. Biological corridors implemented to connect forest patches in private lands (cabruca agroforestry systems) and protected areas (including areas of Permanent Protection and Legal Reserves) was moved from outcome 2.1. to outcome 2.2., because it is better aligned with the activities that will be implemented, such as restoration of Atlantic Forest than with ?outcome 2.1.? that is related to Land use Planning. For more information about the activities that will be implemented under each outcome and output, please refer to ?Annex E: Detailed Description of the Projects Components in the Word ProDoc?

c) Output 1.1.1.,1.1.2,2.1.1,2.1.2, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, ME1 and Outcome 4.1 have been changed to address the comment. Please refer to the other response for more detailed information.

d) e) No response needed

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

a)

a.1 Please write in full the acronyms the first time they appear (such as IBGE, CIMA, OCT...).

a.2. In the Portal entry, the environmental barriers are unclear: how do they undermine/limit the achievement of the proposed objective ? Please clarify what these barriers are and how they are related to the Cabruca production system.

a.3. The description refers to Annex B ?Baseline Scenario and Problem to be addressed?. There is no such annex B in the Portal entry. Please clarify where this annex can be found (in the Prodoc).

b)

b.1. The description refers to "Annex J: Stakeholder Engagement Plan". There is no such annex J in the Portal entry. Please clarify where this annex can be found (in the Prodoc). In general, each time the description refers to an annex which is different from those in the Portal entry, please clarify where it is.

c) N/A

April 15, 2024:

a) We don't find the acronym "IBGE" spelled out. Please clarify this acronym too.

b) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

May 3, 2024

a) Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a)

a.1 Noted, acronyms have been spelled out.

a.2. Please refer to paragraph 44 of Annex B "Baseline Scenario and the problem to be addressed" of the ProDoc word document and in general to this annex to understand project location environmental complexities.

a.3. Please refer to Annex B "Baseline Scenario and the problem to be addressed" of the ProDoc word document.

b)

Please refer to Annex J "Stakeholder engagement plan and grievance mechanisms" of the ProDoc word document.

April 16, 2024

a) Apologies, IBGE is the Geography and Statistics Brazilian Institute and is now spelled out also in the portal entry, please see paragraph 10.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?

b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and

critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) **Incremental/additional cost reasoning:** Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) **Other Benefits:** Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) **Gender:** Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) **Policy Coherence:** Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) **Transformation and/or innovation:** Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 5, 2024:

a) The diagram of the TOC is difficult to read in the Portal and in the Prodoc because of the small letters. We suggest to let as is in the Portal and Prodoc, but also to upload it as a separate document under the document tab of Portal. In addition, please correct the few tips in the "Impact - paradigm shift" box of the diagram.

b), c), d), e). Yes, cleared.

f)

f.1. The project Coordinator should only be covered by the PMC and not the project components. Please correct accordingly.

f.2. In the budget table, we don't see the financial expert responsible for all the project expenses and usually part of the PMU. Please clarify how this role will be covered.

f.3. The budget item "Rural extension services strengthened" is relatively very important (16% of the project budget). Nevertheless, the concrete activities this item includes are not clear. In the output description, please elaborate further on the activities supported by this budget item.

g) By promoting integrated governance and planning and improving the value chain of the targeted cocoa producers, the project enhance the resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs. Cleared.

h) Yes, including in a detailed stakeholder engagement plan annexed to the Prodoc. Cleared.

i) In line with the gender mainstreaming practice of integrating gender considerations in project components, the Agency is requested to reflect gender perspectives in Outputs 1.1.1, 1.1.2., 2.1.1. Please ensure women's organizations are part of Output 2.1.2. Please include gender specific actions to empower and benefit women in Outputs 3.1.2 and 3.1.4., as stated in the GAP. Also, knowledge products and best practices should incorporate gender-related aspects, for example, in output 4.1. Under M&E, please ensure that gender-related results are monitored and reported on, and the GAP is budgeted.

j) Partially. The knowledge management strategy is embedded in the component 4. Under the knowledge management section, please clarify the budget and implementation timeline for key knowledge management and communications deliverables of the KM strategy. This can be done by including a simple table.

k) Yes and considering the harmful policies and regulations is a key element of the project overall strategy. Cleared.

l) Yes, the project will promote innovative practices and integrated approaches to promote the revitalization of the cocoa value chain as a tool to protect the important Atlantic Forest. Improved governance, capacity building and increased incentive mechanisms should be transformative and allow scaling up. Cleared.

April 15, 2023:

a) Thank you for uploading the ToC which is now readable. Cleared.

f)

f.1. We take note of the contribution of the project Coordinator to the component 1 and 4 justifying the associated costs charged to these components. Cleared.

f.2 and f.3. Thank you for the clarification. Ceared.

i) Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

j) Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a) Noted, the diagram has been uploaded as a separate PDF document.

b),c),d),e) No response needed

f)

f.1. The project coordinator will perform activities related to the implementation of components 1 and 4. In component 1 will be responsible for stakeholder engagement and articulation to guarantee the successful implementation of project governance forum and better alignment between policies, programs and projects in the region. In component 4, it will be responsible to coordinate the elaboration and execution of KM Plan, jointly with the project KM Team. Those tasks were included in the National Project Coordinator ToR in annex L of the Prodoc Word Document.

f.2. Apologies for the oversight. Financial aspects will be carried out by the Project Assistant in addition to administrative ones, this has been reflected in the budget table.

f.3 Noted. Through output 3.1.1 the project will directly provide technical assistance for 600 producers, by hiring technicians for 3 years during project implementation. Other 2400 producers will be assisted through partnerships and cofinancing with CIAPRA, ?Povos da Mata? Network and ?Tab?a Fortalecimento Comunit?rio?. Besides that, the project will develop training programs for all technicians hired directly by the project and those hired by the partners mentioned, through the implementation of the Cocoa School, a regional initiative led by CIAPRA. Besides training for the rural technicians, the cocoa School will also promote continuous training for producers, empowering multiplying agents in rural communities to strengthen the producers base and their knowledge. In partnership with cocoa school, the project will support rural exchange between producers in demonstrative areas throughout the project region.

This text has been added in the project description of output 3.1.1 (related to ?Rural Services Strengthened? budget item) in Prodoc Section B. For more detailed information on the activities to be developed in this output and how they will be implemented, please refer to Annex E ? ?Detailed Description of the Project Components? of the Prodoc word document.

g), h) No response needed

i) Noted. Amendments have been made throughout the project document to address this comment. More specifically Output 1.1.1.,1.1.2,2.1.1,2.1.2, 3.1.2, 3.1.3, ME and Outcome 4.1 have been changed. Text has been added in the project description section, in the project framework results (Annex C and in the portal entry), in the GAP (Annex K) and in the ME section (Annex G) (please refer to annexes in the Word ProDoc).

j) Noted. Two tables have been added in the section E ?Knowledge Management and Communication? (both portal entry and Word ProDoc section). One table for KM activities and one table for Communication activities.

k), l) No response needed

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?

b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

a) Yes. One detail: Please correct the typo: "... with **FAO4**".

b) FAO plans to undertake some limited executing role. Please answer "Yes" to the question in the Portal "Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this project?" and describe that role and the justification.

c) The text refers to "ANNEX E - Detailed Description of Projects Components". There is no such annex E in the Portal. Please clarify.

April 15, 2024:

a) We still see the typo. Please correct it.

b) and c) Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

May 3, 2024:

Thank you for the correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a) Apologies for the oversight, this has been corrected

b) FAO does not plan to undertake executing role in the project but plans to have just the role of implementing agency. As usual, FAO will contract the audits and evaluations, but it will not execute any more funding than this.

c) Please refer to Annex E "Detailed Description of Projects Components" of the ProDoc word document

April 16, 2024

a) apologies for the oversight, this has been corrected

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 5, 2024:

a)

a.1. For the indicator 1.2, the METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement) are missing for both PAs. Please complete.

a.2. Under indicator 6.1, please reflect the anticipated start year of accounting and duration of accounting at CEO endorsement stage.

a.3. We understand the project will support the restoration of 12,000 hectares of forest. This is one of the most important contributor of the project climate mitigation benefits (according to the Ex-ACT tool). Nevertheless, there isn't any restoration reported in the core indicators section and in the Project Result Framework. Please clarify and consider adding forest restoration as one of the project expected GEB (under Indicator 3 "Area of land and ecosystems under restoration").

b) Yes, cleared.

April 15, 2024:

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

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a)

a.1 Noted. Mett Score added for both PAs.

a.2 Apologies for the oversight. This has been corrected in the portal entry.

a.3. 12,000 ha of agroforest ecosystem under restoration have been added under GEF core indicator 3, more specifically under indicator 3.1. ?Area of degraded agricultural lands restored?.

d) No response needed

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

a)

a.1. The climate risk is not well identified. At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location or at country level if not available at local scale (including a time horizon, ideally 2050, if the data is available) and list key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios as well as their related mitigation measures. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.

a.2. The risk of low engagement/lack of interest from the involved stakeholders is not identify. Does it mean this risk doesn't exist? Please clarify.

b) Yes, cleared.

c) Yes, an Environmental and Social Risk screening is provided in a document uploaded in the Portal. Cleared.

April 15, 2024:

a)

a.1. Thank you for the improvement of the climate risk analysis. Cleared.

a.2. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a)

a.1. Done. Amendments have been made in Project Rationale Section (problems to be addressed and justification) and on the risk Matrix. key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios at the project location and key potential hazards for the project that are related to the climate scenarios as well as their related mitigation measures were included.

a.2. The risk of low engagement of stakeholders have been included in the Risk Matrix.

b), c) No response needed

5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

The alignment with the MEAs is mentioned but not described. Please elaborate further on what are the countries plans under the Rio conventions and how the project contributes to these plans.

April 15, 2024:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

Amendments have been made in ?Alignment with National Priorities? section.

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

No. The project uses BD resources and aims to generate biodiversity benefits. Please identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and explain how.

April 15, 2024:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

Amendments have been made in ?Alignment with National Priorities? section.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 5, 2024:

Partially. We can see that FAO responded to all the comments provided by STAP but there is no response/acknowledgment to the comments provided by the Council Members from the USA, Germany and Denmark/Norway. Please add 3 lines to the table, in Annex I, copy paste these comments and provide an answer for each.

April 15, 2024:

Thank you for considering GEF Council comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

Apologies for the oversight. Responses to Council comments have been added as indicated.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

Yes, it is the Annex K of the Prodoc. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

Yes, it is the Annex J of the Prodoc. Cleared.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
February 7, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response
LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response
8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)
a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
March 5, 2024:

We take note of the table on the utilization of PPG, but without detailed information on each activity it is not possible to confirm if these activities are eligible for GEF funding. Please provide some level of details on each item line to confirm that all are eligible activities covered by the PPG.

ANNEX D: STATUS OF UTILIZATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION GRANT (PPG)

Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

Project Preparation Activities Implemented	GET/LDOF/SCOF Amount (\$)		
	Budgeted Amount	Amount Spent To date	Amount Committed
Consultants	117,600.00	57,272.00	18,256.00
Contracts	0.00	44,910.00	0.00
Travel	19,000.00	26,033.00	0.00
Training	7,200.00	0.00	0.00
General Operating Expenses	6,200.00	3,529.00	0.00
Total	150,000.00	131,744.00	18,256.00

April 15, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

Duly noted. Please refer to Annex D in the GEF portal as the utilization of PPG table has been updated with detailed information.

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?

Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

No. The updated OFP's LoE dated on 3 May 2023 is not correct as the project funds and fees are reported under the PPG columns and the PPG funds are reported under the project columns. In addition, the PPG and PPG fee numbers are not consistent with the financial tables in the Portal. Please provide a new LoE with the financial numbers placed in the right place and with PPG numbers consistent with the financial tables of the Portal. Please remove the incorrect LoE versions of May 2023.

April 15, 2024:

The corrected LoE is missing. Please provide the LoE.

May 3, 2024:

Thank you for providing the corrected LoE. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

A new LOE with correct numbers is being signed by the OFP.

April 25, 2024

A new LOE has been uploaded in the portal.

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

1. The letter from CEPLAC mentions an co-financing investment of US\$ 1,156,606.18. Nevertheless, the co-financing reported in the Portal is said to be \$1,076,606.00. This is not consistent. Please clarify.
2. The co-financing letter from INCRA is not signed. Please provide a signed letter.
3. The co-financing from INCRA is as loans and grants. Please refer them as "Investment mobilized" in the co-financing table (and not Recurrent expenditures).
4. In the co-financing letter from Taboa, the in kind contribution is US\$439.000 while it is US\$439.600 in the co-financing table. Please correct the co-financing table.

April 15, 2024:

Thank you for the new letters and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

1. Apologies, a wrong translation of the letter had been uploaded in the portal. Please see the new version consistent with numbers in the portal.
2. The letter has been signed by INCRA and uploaded in the portal.
3. Apologies for the oversight, this has been corrected.
4. Apologies, a wrong translation of the letter had been uploaded in the portal. Please see the new version consistent with numbers in the portal.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
February 7, 2024:

Yes, but as mentioned above clarification and correction are needed.

April 15, 2024:

The corrected LoE is missing. Please provide the LoE.

May 3, 2024:

Thank you for providing the corrected LoE. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

A new letter is being signed by the OFP.

April 25, 2024

A new LOE has been uploaded in the portal.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

No. As mentioned above, please clarify the LoE and the numbers to be considered.

April 15, 2024:

The corrected LoE is missing. Please provide the LoE.

May 3, 2024:

Thank you for providing the corrected LoE. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

A new letter is being signed by the OFP.

April 25, 2024

A new LOE has been uploaded in the portal.

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

a) Yes but the GEF names of the core indicators are missing. Please add the exact name of the core indicators as they appear in the core indicator section of the Portal.

b), c) and d) Yes, cleared.

April 15, 2024:

a) No, we don't find the exact names of the GEF core indicators. Please indicate where relevant in the Project Results Framework the following core indicators:

- Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness
- Indicator 3.1 Area of degraded agricultural lands under restoration
- Indicator 4.1 Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity
- Indicator 4.3 Area of landscapes under sustainable land management in production systems
- Indicator 6.1 Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU
- Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

May 3, 2024:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a) Noted, GEF core indicators name have been added.

b), c), d) No response needed

April 16, 2024

a) Noted, GEF core indicators names have now been added.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 23, 2024:

The fields related to the geo location of the project activities are empty. Please complete the table with location name, latitude, longitude, eventual Geo Name ID (if applicable), and the activity description.

ANNEX E: PROJECT MAP AND COORDINATES

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

GEO LOCATION INFORMATION

The Location Name, Latitude and Longitude are required fields insofar as an Agency chooses to enter a project location under the set format. The Geo Name ID is required in instances where the location is not exact, such as in the case of a city, as opposed to the exact site of a physical infrastructure. These IDs are available on the [GeoNames' geographical database](#) containing millions of placenames and allowing to freely record new ones. The Location & Activity Description fields are optional. Project longitude and latitude must follow the Decimal Degrees WGS84 format and Agencies are encouraged to use at least four decimal points for greater accuracy. Users may add as many locations as appropriate. Web mapping applications such as [OpenStreetMap](#) or [GeoNames](#) use this format. Consider using a conversion tool as needed, such as: <https://coordinates-converter.com> Please see the Geocoding User Guide by clicking [here](#).

Location Name

Latitude

Longitude

Geo Name ID

Location & Activity
Description

April 15, 2024:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

Please note that exact geo locations of the projects were included in a table in the text box of the section and also in the ProDoc word version. Portal table has been now completed as well.

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

February 7, 2024:

a) No, the executing partner is missing for each budget line. Please complete.

b) No. Please address the comment above on the project Coordinator who should only be covered by the PMC.

c) Yes, cleared.

April 15, 2024:

a) The information provided is unclear: While the executing partner is said to be "OP" in the budget table, it is CEPLAC in the project description. Please amend the budget table with the same name for the executing partner as the one identified in the project description.

b) The comment above on the project Coordinator has been addressed. Cleared.

May 3, 2024:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 5, 2024

a) Apologies for the oversight. Corresponded column was omitted in copy pasting the table in the portal. Executing partner column has been copied now.

b) Thank you. The project contemplates having its coordinator being in charge of technical implementation, management and oversight of the project. On Component 1, the coordinator will engage with stakeholders to implement a governance forum and allow for better alignment among policies, programs and projects. As for Component 4, the coordinator will coordinate the elaboration of the KM plan and coordinate the communication and KM team. Please see more information in the Annex L of the Prodoc Word Document.

c) No response needed

April 16, 2024

a) Noted, executing partner in the budget table has been changed to CEPLAC to reflect the project description.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 5, 2024:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above. In doing so, please highlight in yellow the modified and added text to facilitate the review (except for the responses to Council comments which are easy to find in Annex I).

April 15, 2023:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments.

May 3, 2024:

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

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/5/2024	4/5/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/15/2024	4/25/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/3/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		