



Living in harmony with nature: Connecting biodiversity with production systems in the Gualaca Altitudinal Corridor Landscape.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10649

Countries

Panama

Project Name

Living in harmony with nature: Connecting biodiversity with production systems in the Gualaca Altitudinal Corridor Landscape.

Agencies

CAF

Date received by PM

4/27/2023

Review completed by PM

10/15/2023

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project description summary

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

1. In table B the target 2.2.A is not specified. To be consistent with the indicator 2.2.B, please indicate it is a number of hectares of agricultural lands under restoration.

2. The table B doesn't mention the 188,112 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity. Please clarify in table B this target under the relevant outcome(s).

3. The outcome 2.3 "Knowledge, sensitivity, participation, and capacity building of PCAG actors improved" and related outputs are missing in table B. Please complete.

4. Please fully write the acronym "PCAG" the first time it appears in the project description (not the 15th time as now).

October 2, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information and clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Corrected: refers to restored degraded agricultural land (500 ha.).

2. Indicator 1.2 and Target 1.2 are added

Indicator 1.2.

Number of hectares of landscapes under improved management for the benefit of biodiversity

Target 1.2.

Total: 188,112 ha.

3. Added Outcome 2.3 and output 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 and their indicators and target.

Outcome 2.3:

Knowledge, sensitivity, participation, and capacity building of PCAG actors improved, through the implementation of the communication and knowledge management strategy, the gender perspective integration plan, and the adaptive management of the project through its evaluation and monitoring.

Output 2.3.1

A communication and knowledge management strategy for the Project has been developed that allows informing, sharing, disseminating and educating actors and stakeholders on the results, lessons and experiences of the Project with integration of a gender perspective.

Indicator 2.3.1: 25.000 people informed and sensitized about the actions and results of the project through awareness campaign.

Target 2.3.1:

25,000 peoples.

Women = 40%

Men = 60%

Output 2.3.2

Project implementation follows a Results-Based Management (RBM) framework, applies SMART indicators to measure progress and impact through Project Monitoring and Evaluation, employs adaptive management principles and gender mainstreaming.

Indicator 2.3.2

Number of project beneficiaries trained in sustainable and climate-resilient production techniques with a landscape approach.

Target 3.2.2

Total: 1.000 peoples.

Women: 40% (400)

Men: 60% (600)

Youth: 40% (400)

Ethnicity: 10% (100)

4. The meaning of the acronym has been established since the inception of the proposal.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

The co-financing letter from Wetlands International is in Spanish. Please provide a free translation in English of this letter (no need to be signed again by Wetlands International).

October 2, 2023:

Thank you for providing a translation in English of the co-financing letter from Wetlands International. Cleared.

Agency Response The English version of the co-financing note from Wetlands International is attached.

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

1. In Annex C, the sum of the amount spent and committed (\$60,000) is above the total amount of the PPG (\$50, 000), which is not possible. Please correct.

2. There is only one line for expenses in the table provided in Annex C. Please provide more details identifying the different main expenses/outputs funded by the PPG.

October 2, 2023:

1. Thank you for correcting the amounts in the PPG table. Cleared.

2. Not addressed: There is still only one budget line of expenses in the PPG table. The main products need to be budgeted. Please complete the table accordingly.

October 9, 2023:

2. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The annex "C" in attach its orrected and updated amounts.
2. Updated the main products financed during the PPG.

06-10-23

2. Corrected and attachment Annex C.

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

1. In the indicators 1.2 and 2.2 the METT scores are missing. They are required at CEO approval stage. Please complete as required.
2. Under core indicator 1.2, the protected area "Playa Boca Vieja Wildlife Refuge" covers 0 hectares which is not possible. Please correct.
3. The PA "Gulf of Chiriqui Marine National Park" covers an area of 1,474 ha in the core indicator section while it is 14,740 ha in table 3 "Protected Areas of the Landscape of the Altitudinal Corridor of Gualaca", in the baseline scenario and in the components description. Please correct.
4. The PA "La Barqueta Wildlife Refuge" has 2 different names and 2 different areas in the core indicator section and in table 3 "Protected Areas of the Landscape of the Altitudinal Corridor of Gualaca". Please clarify and be consistent.
5. Considering the 2 comments above, please correct the total number of ha covered by the PAs throughout all the project description (it is mentionned 6 times).
6. Considering the planned activities will have an impact on the biomasse and carbon soil, please add a target for the core indicator 6.1 (Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated in the AFOLU sector).

7. Please clarify under the core indicator table how all the different core indicator targets were assessed and who are the expected beneficiaries of the project.

October 2, 2023:

1. No, the METT score are still missing in the core indicators section of the Portal entry. Please complete.

2 and 3. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

4. No, the name of the PA is still different in the table 3 ("Wildlife Refuge Playa La Barqueta Agr?cola") and in the core indicators section of the Portal entry ("La Barqueta Wildlife Refuge"). Please use the same name of PA throughout all the project description.

5. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

6. No, the core indicator 6.1 is still missing in the core indicators section of the Portal entry and in the Annex A (Project Result Framework). Please report this target where needed in the Portal entry and provide the calculation made to assess the target. Please also note the expected target seems very ambitious considering the level of investment and needs to be strongly justified.

7. No, we don't find the required information under the core indicator table and the table 7 is on "Risk analysis and mitigation measures" Please address this comment. Please also correct the sentence "The project contributes to six global GEF goals (GEF Core Indicators) as can be seen in Table 7" as the table 7 refers to risk analysis.

October 9, 2023:

1 and 4. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

6. No. The core indicator 6.1 is still missing in the core indicators section of the Portal entry. Please report this target where needed in the Portal entry and provide the calculation made to assess the target. Please also note the expected target seems very ambitious considering the level of investment and needs to be strongly justified.

7. No, we still don't find the required information under the core indicator section. The table 8.2 is wrongly situated in the section "7. Consistency with National Priorities" . Please move this table under the core indicator table.

October 15, 2023:

6. The expected result is very low and the calculation supporting this result is unclear. In addition the duration of accounting should be 20 years and not 3 years. Please clarify providing the calculation and revise the duration of accounting to 20 years.

7. No the table 8.2 has not been moved and we still don't find the information on the expected beneficiaries of the project which was requested from the review of June 2. Please see and address the comment below made during the last quality control on stakeholders engagement.

October 23, 2023:

6 and 7. The calculation supporting this GHG mitigation remains very low and unclear and the duration of accounting is still 3 years! The table 8.2 has not been moved. This is very surprising and disappointing. As this is not critical for the project BD objectives and considering the close date of cancellation, we accept to move forward with the approval process and expect the GHG mitigation be further clarified at the beginning of the project implementation using a globally recognized methodology and tool.

Agency Response

1. MEET indicators:

METT Baseline:

- Gulf of Chiriqu? National Marine Park:78
- Wildlife Refuge Playa La Barqueta Agr?cola: 65
- Wildlife Refuge Playa Boca Vieja: 33
- Fortuna Forest Reserve: 104

2. Indicator 1.2: Correct names and has.

Note: The number of ha. for the protected areas of indicator 1.1 (Not 1.2) it only corresponds to the terrestrial area, so they cannot be compared with Table 3 that contains the total number of terrestrial and marine ha for the PCAG protected areas.

- Wildlife Refuge Playa Boca Vieja: 0 ha.
- Gulf of Chiriqu? Marine National Park: 1,474 ha.
- Wildlife Refuge Playa La Barqueta Agr?cola: 0 ha.

Table 3. Improved, differentiating ha. terrestrial and marine for each protected area.

Table 3 Protected Areas of the Landscape of the Altitudinal Corridor of Gualaca

Protected Area	Number of Terrestrial Ha	Number of Sea Ha.	Total Extension (ha.)	IUCN Category	Year of creation
Gulf of Chiriqu? Marine National Park	1,474	13,266	14,740	II	Gaceta Oficial N? 22.6177 December 1994.

Wildlife Refuge Playa La Barqueta Agrícola	2,979	3,725	6,704	IV	Gaceta Oficial N° 22.6177 September 1994.
Wildlife Refuge Playa Boca Vieja	0	3,740	3,740	IV	Gaceta Oficial N° 22.6177 September 1994
Managed Resources Area of David Mangrove	16,702	0	16,702	VI	Gaceta Oficial N° 25.884 25 September 2007
Fortuna Forest Reserve	19,500	0	19,500	VI	Ley No. 18 9 April 1976.
TOTAL	40,655	20,731	61,386		

3. Corrected see Point 2.

4. Corrected see Point 2.

5. Differentiate that indicator 1.1 corresponds to number ha. terrestrial and indicator 2.1, which corresponds to the number of hectares. marine. The total number of ha of protected areas corresponds to the sum of indicator 1.1 and 1.2 (Total 61,368 ha.).

6. Goal for indicator 6.1: 8,575.88 tons. of CO2 eq.

Incorporated Table 7: GEF Core Indicator, Table 1 Indicative Project Description Summary and Table 9 Monitoring and evaluation plan

7. Answer on Table 7. GEF Core Indicator: including a column of observations where it is established how the targets of the core indicators were evaluated and who the beneficiaries are

06-10-23

1. Incorporated METT indicators in the Core Indicator Table B (indicators 1.2 and 2.2)

4. The correct names of protected areas Playa La Barqueta Wildlife Refuge and Playa Boca Vieja Wildlife Refuge corrected throughout the document.

7. See Table 8.2

11-10-23

6. Core Indicator 6.1 was included in the portal entry section.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated (metric tons of CO2e): 8,576

Included the information the calculation provided by the Climate Change Directorate of the Ministry of the Environment about Green House Gas Emission Mitigated.

Additionally, we clarify to the GEF that part of the Counterpart funds of the Ministry of the Environment are environmental compensation resources for projects that will be directed to support the reforestation and recovery actions of degraded agricultural areas and degraded forest lands of the PCAG. Therefore, the goals to be achieved by this project will be supported with resources from the counterpart committed by the Government of Panama through the Ministry of the Environment.

7. Table 8.2 was moved below the Basic Indicators Table.

20-10-23

In this section be included the reference to the Annex 10 - tCOeq Estimation & Projection 20 years, and be attach in the annexs.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

1. What does "PGBAG" means? This acronyms is only written once without any explanation. Please clarify.
2. The map 1 is not visible. Please include a visible map associated with the title "Map 1: Location of the study area and administrative political division of the Gualaca Altitudinal Biological Corridor Landscape."
3. Please clarify where is the mentioned "Annex A" on the globally threatened species.
4. The actual environmental threat is unclear. The province of Chiriqu? is said to have recovered some 4,341.86 ha while at the same time it is the second province with the largest number of hectares in transition from forests to agricultural crops with some 5,146.63 ha. Please clarify the reasons of these apparently 2 opposite statements.
5. One of the greatest threats facing the integrity of the landscape is the high fragmentation of the low and medium lands. Please clarify how this fragmentation is measured and be more specific/precise on level of fragmentation in the targeted landscape.

6. The map 2 is not visible. Please include a visible map associated with the title "Map 2: Disaggregation of vulnerability by corregimiento in the Republic of Panama." Please translate "corregimiento in English.

7. Under the section "Causes of the main threats and those that affect the loss of biodiversity", the following threat is listed but not described as the others: "v) the development of incompatible infrastructure". Please complete.

October 2, 2023:

1. No, we don't find where this comment has been addressed in the Portal entry. Please address this comment.

2. The map is visible but its limit goes beyond the portal entry margins on the right. Please ensure the map fits within the portal entry limits.

3. The paragraph 20 refers to an "Annex 1" which doesn't exist in the portal entry. Please clarify in the portal entry that this annex has been uploaded in the Portal as a separate document.

4 and 5. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

6. Partially. Please translate "corregimiento" in English in the title of the Map 3.

7. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

October 9, 2023:

1, 2, 3 and 6. Thank you for the clarification and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Corrected (point 11).

2. Updated map 1.

3. Annex A included in the attach.

4. The province of Chiriqu? is the fourth largest province in Panama according to its surface area (6,548 km²). According to the MiAmbiente study, most of the forest cover is in areas greater than 1,200 meters above sea level and in mangroves. In the Case of the PCAG we do not observe that the data apparently generate opposite positions, since precisely the lower and middle parts of the PCAG are the most degraded by agricultural activities as expressed in the Project document.

5. The landscape fragmentation analysis carried out by Barsev (2017) for the study area shows a high number of fragments for the different categories of cover use and land use, concentrating most of them in the lower and middle zone of the area. study. For example, the

shrubby vegetation that represents 12.44% of the study area presented a total of 38,463 fragments and the pastures and agricultural areas that occupy 33.48% of the area presented a total of 29,678 fragments.

6. Map 2 improved the resolution.

7. Completed, threat: Incompatible Infrastructure Development.

06-10-23

1. PGAG. Corrected. It was a digitization error. the acronym PGAG was replaced by PCAG (You won't find it in the document).
2. Map 1 included (Ver PDF enviado por Octavio, al parecer no se salvó el correcto).
3. Annex A was corrected as Annex 1 and uploaded to the portal as a separate document.

6. Footnote 2 in the project document details the meaning of Corregimiento. The corregimientos are the political-administrative divisions smaller than a district in Panama that have a popularly elected authority (Corregimiento Representative). It is a figure similar to a county but not the same, it does not have an English translation. A district is made up of several corregimientos and at the municipal level (District) decisions are made in the Municipal Council, which is made up of the Mayor of the district and the representatives of the corregimiento that make up the district.

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 6, 2023:

1. The difference is not clear between "The PCAG Landscape" where it is still necessary to develop planning and territorial ordering tools (paragraph 42) and the "Gualaca Altitudinal Biological Corridor" which doesn't have a planning and/or ordering tool (paragraph 43). Please clarify the difference between the two ideas.

2. We learn that the agricultural activities are declining in the region but at the same time the expansion of livestock and agriculture is said to be one of the main threats to the environment. This looks contradictory. Please clarify.

October 2, 2023:

1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Actually, there is no difference, it is the same place. The subtitle has been corrected to avoid confusion.

2. There are districts within the PCAG that are within protected areas or have important extensions of mangroves under special protection regimes, where the change in land use is restricted and area previously dedicated to agricultural use has been recovered (upper and lower part of the PCAG) . But there are also districts in the lower-middle part of the PCAG where the main driver of the loss of coverage in recovery is agriculture and livestock. In this sense, traditional agricultural activities continue to be carried out with unsustainable methods (slash and burn) in areas of bushes or stubble in recovery and in transition to forests.

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

June 6, 2023:

1. We learn that the PAs included in the PCAG currently lack the financial resources to improve their management. In the project description, we find some elements potentially addressing this issue (in particular output 1.1.4) but they remain very vague. Please elaborate further on the projects activities and outputs that will address this important issue for the sustainability of the project results.

2. In the theory of change and in the project component description, it is not clear which strategy and activities will overcome the barrier 5 (lack of sustainable alternatives for local producers). Please clarify and elaborate further on this point which is important for the success of the project.

3. In the project component description, the GEF resources allocated to component 1 and 2 (paragraphs 60 and 73) are different from table B and from the budget in Annex E. Please correct and ensure the numbers are consistent throughout all the project description.

4. Please translate "Barrera 3" in English.

5. In the description of the outcome 1.1 (paragraph 64), the output 3 is actually the output 4 (PCAG financial sustainability strategy) in the table B and in the project description. Please correct.

6. According to the component description, the output 1.1.3 (paragraph 70) includes the implementation of management plans. Isn't it redundant with the output 2.2.2 and what activities exactly under the output 1.1.3 will be supported to implement the management plans? Please clarify.

7. The component description doesn't mention the 188,112 ha of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity. Please clarify in the description of the components the activities leading to this target.

October 2, 2023:

- 1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.
3. The components budget remains different in table B as compared to the project description under the alternative scenario and to the Annex E. Please correct and ensure the numbers are consistent throughout all the project description.
4. Thank you for the translation. Cleared.
5. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.
6. The description of output 1.1.3 is exactly the same as the one in the previous version of the CEO endorsement (saying plans are implemented). Please clarify where and how exactly this comment is addressed.
7. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

October 9, 2023:

3. Thank you for the correction. Cleared.
6. No, under the alternative scenario/project description, the description of the output 1.1.3 still says the plans are "implemented". Please correct the text to reflect the reality of this output.

October 15, 2023:

6. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Including new point on financing the projected areas and their sustainability: With the support of the project, the financing strategy for the PCAG will be prepared, which includes the determination and management of financing alternatives to strengthen the management of the five protected areas of this landscape (output 1.1.4). Additionally, updating and harmonizing the operational plans of the five protected areas based on the results of the management effectiveness evaluation (output 2.1.1) will be key to prioritizing activities and defining strategic investments based on the results of the evaluation of management effectiveness of protected areas (METT), but it will also allow the identification of financing opportunities (internal: Ministry of Environment) and external (other institutions, NGOs, private sector) that complement the limited financing of the State budget and the project, becoming mechanisms for the financial sustainability of the landscape and its protected areas.
2. It is clarified which component will help overcome barrier 5:
The transformation of traditional agricultural and livestock practices towards sustainable production systems (Agroecological Systems and Silvopastoral Systems) also implies the

productive diversification of the farm (integral orchards, beekeeping, aquaculture, firewood, wood, etc.) as a strategy for family food security and generation of income. Income, which is key to overcome the lack of productive alternatives (barrier 5).

3. Corrected budget in the different sections where applicable.

4. Translated barrier to English.

5. Corrected

6. Corrected: the scope of output 1.1.3 is the design of the management plans, not their implementation, which is in output 2.2.2.

7. Including a new paragraph: The establishment of the governance platform for the PCAG (Output 1.1.1), the development of planning tools at the landscape scale (Output 1.1.2) and at the farm scale (Output 1.1.3) and the financial sustainability strategy (Output 1.1 .4) constitute key tools that, through their implementation, will impact through improved management on a total of 188,112 hectares of the Gualaca Altitudinal Corridor Landscape for the benefit of its biodiversity.

06-10-23

3. Corrected.

6. Corrected: the scope of output 1.1.3 is the design of the management plans, not their implementation which is in output 2.2.2. (Table B, Table 8, Table 10 and Project Components).

11-10-23

Corrected:

75. Output 1.1.3 Farm management plans and sustainable fishing exploitation plans are designed by the project with the participation of the beneficiaries.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

As indicated above, please correct the core indicator 1 with the right area.

October 2, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response Outside protected areas, the project will contribute a total of 188,112 hectares. of landscape under improved management to benefit biodiversity.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

The last column of "Table 5 Incremental Cost Analysis Matrix" goes beyond the limit of the Portal page on the right. Please adjust the table 5 so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.

October 2, 2023:

No, the last column of "Table 5 Incremental Cost Analysis Matrix" still goes beyond the limit of the Portal page on the right. Please adjust the table 5 so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.

October 9, 2023:

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

Table 5 was edited, adjusted and uploaded to the portal.

06-10-23

2. Adjusted Table 5.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

1. It's not clear how the 1,500 hectares of land conserved through conservation agreements relate with the core indicators and global environmental benefits. Please clarify.

2. In paragraph 98, the total area of land restored is 1,000 hectares, not 500. Please complete accordingly and add in this paragraph the missing core indicators including climate change mitigation (core indicator 6.1).

October 2, 2023:

1. It is still unclear which GEF core indicator captures the conservation of 1,500 hectares. Please ensure these 1,500 hectares are included in one GEF core indicators.

2. We still don't see in this section any mention of the climate change mitigation benefit (core indicator 6.1). Please complete with this indicator.

October 9, 2023:

1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

The information was clarified with the following paragraph

1. The long-term conservation of 1,500 ha. of forests under the figure of Conservation Agreements, will facilitate the construction of connectivity between core areas of the landscape to facilitate the altitudinal and latitudinal movement of biodiversity and the provision of other long-term ecosystem services (water production, sediment retention, ecotourism, among others), this strategy is key to generating benefits for global biodiversity, especially for threatened and altitudinal migratory species that require large areas of habitat or altitudinal connectivity due to their ecological requirements.

2. Corrected.

06-10-23

1. The information was clarified with the following paragraph:

The long-term conservation of 1,500 ha. of forests under the figure of Conservation Agreements, will facilitate the construction of connectivity between core areas of the landscape to facilitate the altitudinal and latitudinal movement of biodiversity and the provision of other long-term ecosystem services (water production, sediment retention, ecotourism, among others), this strategy is key to generating benefits for global biodiversity, especially for threatened and altitudinal migratory species that require large areas of habitat or altitudinal connectivity due to their ecological requirements.

Table B includes the indicator: 2.2.3 Number of ha under Conservation Agreements with private owners.

Target 2.2.3 1500 ha.

2. The information was clarified with the following paragraph:

The different restoration and reforestation actions of agricultural lands and degraded forest lands (including mangroves) will contribute with an estimated mitigation of about 8,576 metric tons of CO₂e. The project contribution is key to the country's contribution to the global CO₂

mitigation goals, supporting compliance with national Climate Change policies and plans and their determined contributions and also maintaining the Carbon Neutral status as a country.

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

In the Conservation Agreements with private owners (output 2.2.3), the project will be the investor. Please clarify how these agreements will continue and be further promoted after the end of the project.

October 2, 2023:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response The PCAG governance platform, with support for the implementation of the financing strategy, will evaluate compliance with Conservation Agreements with private landowners and promote the establishment of new conservation agreements that contribute to maintaining and improving connectivity in the PCAG. The governance platform, in alliance with private landowners under the figure of conservation agreements, will seek new opportunities to strengthen the strategic investments necessary for conservation on private lands in the PCAG.

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

June 2, 2023:

1. Under the section "1b. Project Map and Coordinates" the map is missing. Please provide a clear map of the project targeted area.

2. In the PIF version, the map only included 4 PAs. Please ensure the map provided at this stage includes the 5 PAs targeted in the project.

October 2, 2023:

1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The map has been incorporated.
2. The updated map includes the five protected areas

Child Project

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

1. The "Table 6 Main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project" includes same information as in the table "Main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project". Please remove the repeated information.
2. The text provided under the section "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" doesn't include the required information. Please revise this section so that it includes all the expected information (and only this information).

October 2, 2023:

1. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.
- 2.1. On the paragraph " 128. The information be contained in the Annex 2.1 Consultation Workshop Report and Annex 2.2 Steakholder Consultation Workshop Report." Please note that the portal entry needs to include all the necessary information and the only reference to

other separate documents is not enough. Please provide the expected information under " "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" .

2.2. In addition, The paragraph 127 and 190 are repeated. Please remove the paragraph 190.

October 9, 2023:

2. Thank you for the clarification and amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Information from table 6 repeated Main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project removed.

2. The communication and knowledge management strategy of the Project (product scheduled at the beginning of the project - output 2.3.1) will establish the key activities to be developed, identify the stakeholders involved, the means of communication that should be used for calls and presentation or dissemination of results and key moments (programming) for these consultations and participation processes to be developed in accordance with the Project Document. The budget allocated to the development and implementation of the communication and knowledge management plan is US\$ 120,000.00 during the execution of the project.

06-10-23

The information was clarified with the following paragraph:

2.1 The communication and knowledge management strategy of the Project (product scheduled at the beginning of the project - output 2.3.1) will establish the key activities to be developed, identify the stakeholders involved, the means of communication that should be used for calls and presentation or dissemination of results and key moments (programming) for these consultations and participation processes to be developed in accordance with the Project Document. The budget allocated to the development and implementation of the communication and knowledge management plan is US\$ 120,000.00 during the execution of the project.

2.2 Deleted paragraph 127 and 190.

20-10-23

In the Stakeholder section be included the table 6.2 with Stakeholders and their roles in the project.

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

June 7, 2023:

1. In table B there is no mention of gender and in the component description, the gender consideration is limited to the knowledge management strategy (outcome 2.3). Please clarify the gender approach in these 2 sections of the project description.
2. The gender gap analysis is said to be in "Annex 3" but we find it in the Annex I uploaded in the document tab of the Portal. Please provide the right reference in the project description.
3. The PCAG Gender Action Plan is said to be in "Annex 4" but we don't find this annex. Please ensure this Annex is provided and clarify where it can be found.

October 2, 2023:

- 1.1. There is no improvement in table B: the gender consideration is limited to the knowledge management strategy (outcome 2.3). Please complete table with gender consideration where appropriate.
- 1.2. The Figure 1 "Elements of the Gender Strategy in the CAG" goes beyond the limit of the portal limit (on the right). Please adjust the format of the figure so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.
2. and 3. Thank you for clarification. Cleared.

October 9, 2023:

1. Thank you for the clarification and adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Corrected:

Integrated in Table B: Communication strategy and knowledge management with integration of a gender perspective.

Component 1: The integration of the gender perspective will be taken in consideration in the development of this component, including the representation of women, youth, and indigenous representatives in the constitution of the PCAG governance platform and in the consultation processes for the development of PCAG financial sustainability planning and strategy tools.

Component 2: The integration of the gender perspective will be taken in in consideration in the development of this component, including the participation of women, youth, and indigenous groups as beneficiaries of productive activities and capacity-building, communication, and awareness-raising processes.

2. Corrected (CAF: ensure that Annexes 3 are uploaded according to the cited order).

3. Corrected (CAF: ensure that Annexes 4 are uploaded according to the cited order).

06-10-23

1. The description of component 1 and component 2 is improved with the inclusion of the gender perspective.

Component 1. Strengthening the governance for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use of the PCAG (BD: US\$ 443,500). This component will generate a planning process with a landscape approach with key actors. A functional governance platform will be established that will integrate actors and stakeholders with considerations of gender inclusion and vulnerable groups for the preparation and implementation of the Sustainable Landscape Management Plan of the Gualaca Altitudinal Corridor that will have a financial sustainability tool that will allow to continue with its management beyond the end of the project. The integration of the gender perspective will be taken into account in the development of this component, including the representation of women, youth and indigenous representatives in the constitution of the PCAG governance platform and in the consultation processes for the development of PCAG financial sustainability planning and strategy tools.

Component 2: Improving the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystems within the PCAG (BD: US\$ 1,169,500). The ecological integrity and long-term viability of the region's landscapes will be protected and improved, repairing historical impacts, reducing and where possible eliminating threats and restoring ecological processes. It implies better management of the key priority areas of the sustainable landscape of the Gualaca Altitudinal Corridor through the updating and harmonization of its management tools, and the reforestation and restoration of key areas of connectivity that will favour the conservation of biodiversity. This will contribute to reduce the impacts from climate change by strengthening resilience and adaptation. The integration of the gender perspective will be taken into account in the

development of this component, including the participation of women, youth and indigenous groups as beneficiaries of productive activities and capacity-building, communication and awareness-raising processes.

1.2 Adjusted the Figure 1 "Elements of the Gender Strategy in the CAG.

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

June 7, 2023:

While private stakeholders are key in this project (such as, among other, for the Conservation Agreements), surprisingly there is no information on the private sector engagement. Please fully complete this section with the expected information: what are the different kind of private stakeholders in the landscape (from ridge to reef), who are those already identified, how precisely they will be engaged and in which outputs exactly.

October 2, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Nevertheless the Table 6.2 "Private sector engagement in the Project" goes beyond the limit of the portal limit (on the right). Please adjust the format of the table so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry. In addition, please explain the reason for the numbering 6.2 as there isn't any table 6.1.

October 9, 2023:

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The table 6.2 contains the participation of the private sector in the Project, according to the type of actor, its location in the landscape and its relationship with the project outputs.

06-10-23

Adjusted table and corrected numbering.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

1. The climate risk is not enough analyzed and the analysis provided in the ESS screening document doesn't include clear mitigation measures related to this project in particular. At this stage, more clarification on threats and impacts related to this specific project are needed to be able to consider appropriate mitigation measures. Please briefly outline the key aspects of the climate change projections/scenarios and list key potential hazards for this specific project that are related to these climate scenarios. For further guidance, the Agency may want to refer to STAP guidance available here: <https://www.stapgef.org/stap-guidance-climate-risk-screening>.
2. There is no risks analysis related to the COVID-19 pandemic. Even if this risk has decreased, it may still impact the project implementation to some extent. Please briefly include this risk with related mitigation measures in the analysis.

October 2, 2023:

1. We don't find the Annex on the climate risk analysis. Please ensure this annex is uploaded and in the risk table, and make a clear reference to this annex.
2. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

October 9, 2023:

1. Thank you for providing the climate risk analysis. Cleared. (please note there are 2 different Annex 5 uploaded! it is confusing)

Agency Response

1. An annex has been included within the project with the analysis of climate change scenarios and key potential dangers for the project, and the mitigation measures planned for their proper management.

2. The COVID -19 risk analysis was incorporated into the risk matrix.

06-10-23

An evaluation of the impact of Climate Change on the PCAG is found in Annex 5.

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

June 7, 2023:

1. We find a reference to the "Global Environment Agreement (GEFTF)". Please note that it should be the Global Environment Facility Trust Fund (GEFTF) and correct accordingly.
2. Please clarify why the PCU will include the "Sustainable Production Specialist" and the "monitoring and evaluation specialist" in particular and not the other project specialists.
3. Please clarify who will be the members of the Project Steering Committee and the Technical Coordination Committee.
4. The Project Manager, the Administrative Coordinator, the Administrative Assistant, the office equipment and supplies and the communication material should be charged to the PMC only (ant not to the components). Please correct the budget table accordingly.

		90,000	90,000	90,000	90,000	360,000	10,800	46,800	417,600	Wetlands Internatio
Salary and benefits / Staff costs	Project Manager	27,000	27,000	27,000	27,000	108,000	3,240	14,040	125,280	Wetlands Internatio
	Technical Coordinator	22,500	22,500	22,500	22,500	90,000	2,700	11,700	104,400	Wetlands Internatio
	Administrative Coordinator	22,500	22,500	22,500	22,500	90,000	2,700	11,700	104,400	Wetlands Internatio
	Asistente administrativo	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	72,000	2,160	9,360	83,520	Wetlands Internatio

5. Please provide the TORs of the Technical Coordinator to justify his/her cost will be charged to the components.
6. Please complete the description elaborating on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

October 2, 2023:

1. Thank you forthe correction. Cleared.
- 2 and 3. Thank you forthe clarification. Cleared.

4. Thank you for the consideration. In addition, the budget item "Office rent" should also be charged to the PMC or provided by the co-financing (sorry for not having raised this point in the previous review). Please adjust the budget accordingly.

5. The paragraph 156 says "Annex 6 contains the Terms of Reference for the hiring of the Project Coordinator". Please note there is no Annex 6 in the portal entry. Please indicate clearly where this Annex can be found.

6. This comment is not addressed. Please address this comment.

October 9, 2023:

4. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

5. No, the uploaded Annex 7 is on the "Indigenous participation plan" . Please indicate clearly where this Annex can be found. In addition, the description says "Annex 6 contains the Terms of Reference for the hiring of the Project Coordinator". It is not correct as the Annex 6 is on the "Results of the Phase of the Free and Informed Consent Process". Please clarify.

6. Thank you for the information provided in the review sheet. Nevertheless, the expected information needs to be in the project description in the portal entry. Please copy this information under the section "6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination" clarifying the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

October 15, 2023:

5 and 6. Thank you for the clarification and the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

?1. Corrected.

2. The Project Coordinating Unit will include the Project Coordinator, the Administrator, the Sustainable Production Specialist and the Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist since they will be the professionals who will continuously support the implementation of the project. Other personnel such as consultants in protected areas, governance, planning and reforestation will be in specific time periods supporting the management of the project.

3. The Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be made up of a representative and alternate from the following institutions and organizations with the right to speak and vote:

? Ministry of Environment (MiAMBIENTE) who will chair the PSC.

? Ministry of Agricultural Development (MIDA),

? Aquatic Resources Authority of Panama (ARAP),

- ? Development Bank for Latin America (CAF)
- ? Wetland International (WI), and
- ? Project Coordinator who will act as Secretary of this Steering Committee with the right to speak.

The Technical Coordination Committee (TCC) will be made up of a representative and alternate from the following institutions and organizations with the right to speak and vote:

- ? Project Coordinator who will preside over the TCC and the Sustainable Production Specialist who will act as Secretary of the TCC with the right to speak.
- ? The Provincial Director of the Ministry of Environment (MiAMBIENTE) in Chiriqu? or whoever he designates.
- ? The Provincial Director of the Ministry of Agricultural Development (MIDA) in Chiriqu?, or whoever he designates.
- ? The Provincial Director of the Aquatic Resources Authority of Panama (ARAP) in Chiriqu?, or whoever he designates.
- ? The Special Project and Alliances of Wetlands International (WI).

The Technical Coordination Committee (TCC) will be made up of a representative and alternate from the following institutions and organizations with the right to speak and vote:

- ? Project Coordinator who will preside over the TCC and the Sustainable Production Specialist who will act as Secretary of the TCC with the right to speak.
- ? The Provincial Director of the Ministry of Environment (MiAMBIENTE) in Chiriqu? or whoever he designates.
- ? The Provincial Director of the Ministry of Agricultural Development (MIDA) in Chiriqu?, or whoever he designates.
- ? The Provincial Director of the Aquatic Resources Authority of Panama (ARAP) in Chiriqu?, or whoever he designates.
- ? The Special Project and Alliances of Wetlands International (WI).

4. Corrected budget.

5. Including the ToR of the Project Coordinator.

06-10-23

4 The cost of office rental has been incorporated into the PMC costs.

5 Annex 7 contains the Terms of Reference for the hiring of the Project Coordinator.

6. Planned coordination with other identified GEF projects includes the following projects:

- ? **Ecosystem-Based Biodiversity Friendly Cattle Production Framework for The Darien Region of Panama Project:** Project implemented by CAF and executed by ANCON. Among the relevant actions is the transformation of traditional livestock farms to silvopastoral systems with the establishment of model farms, development of a connectivity study of the Filo del Tallo Hydrological Reserve and actions to improve connectivity (reforestation-restoration), Creation of a Support Committee to the Management of the Reserve with the participation of interested parties (institutions, NGOs, CBOs, private sector). Important for lessons learned, exchange of experiences and tools developed.
- ? **To strengthen jaguar conservation capacity and connectivity between core protected areas in the Chagres National Park-Darien National Park complex:** Project implemented by United Nations Environment Programme and executed by Jaguar Foundation. The project has a landscape approach to improve connectivity between the Chagres - Darien complex through connectivity improvement and integrates the participation of the private sector in its implementation. It could provide experiences, lessons learned and tools for the management of the PCAG.

Other experiences:

- ? **Protection of Reserves and Carbon Sinks in Mangroves and Protected Areas of Panama project:** Completed project that was implemented by UNDP and left a series of studies, tools, results, capacity building, experiences and lessons learned in the project area that will be important to know to resume and strengthen the actions in this project. For this, a meeting with UNDP is recommended.
- ? **Program for Adaptation to Climate Change through Integrated Management of Water Resources in Panama.** Program financed by the Adaptation Fund and executed by Fundaci3n Natura: Although the program has ended, sustainable production actions were executed in basins near the PCAG that include the Chiriqu3 Viejo River basin and the Santa Mar3a River basin. The project promoted watershed management plans and climate vulnerability studies, developed actions in sustainable agriculture and livestock, establishing model farms that can be used to exchange experiences. Different tools, plans, lessons learned, and experiences can be useful for the project, so it is recommended to establish coordination actions with Fundaci3n Natura.

1111-10-23

Corrected:

5. Corrected paragraph and uploaded Annex 9 containing the ToR of the Project Coordinator

6. Coordination section with other GEF projects and other relevant initiatives was moved to the Coordination and institutional arrangements section

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

1. Considering the recent developments in the last UNCBD COP, please complete the description presenting briefly how this project contribute to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.
2. Considering the importance of sustainable land management and the restoration activities in the project, please also elaborate briefly on the alignment of the project with the UNCCD.
3. The table 8 goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right. Please adjust the format of the table so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.

October 2, 2023:

1. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.
2. The description says "The project contributes to six global GEF goals (GEF Core Indicators) as can be seen in Table 7" . Nevertheless the table 7 refers is about risks. Please provide the correct reference.
3. Not addressed. The table 8 still goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right. Please adjust the format of the table so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.

October 9, 2023:

2. No, the description still says "The project contributes to six global GEF goals (GEF Core Indicators) as can be seen in Table 7". Please provide the correct reference.

3. Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

October 15, 2023:

2. Thank you for the corection. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Incorporated the project's contribution to contributes to the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework.

2. Incorporated the alignment and contribution of the project with the UNCCD.

3. Corrected Table.

Table 9 Knowledge Management Work Plan:

Products	Budget (US\$)	FY1	FY2	FY3
1. Preparation of Communication and Knowledge Management Strategy	10,000			
2. Design of the project's corporate image (logo, banner, etc.).	5,000			
3. Website design and update	10,000			
4. Implementation of the Gender Perspective Integration Plan	30,000			
5. Preparation and implementation of awareness campaign on PCAG	20,000			
6. Preparation and implementation of Environmental Education Plan on PCAG	30,000			
7. Systematization of experiences and lessons learned and their dissemination	15,000			
Total	120,000			

06-10-23

1. Corrected, Table 8.2.

2. Corrected, Table 8.1

11-10-23

Corrected:

2. Fixed reference to the correct Table (Table 8.2).

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

June 7, 2023:

As requested in the project template, please identify the key deliverables and include a budget and a timeline of these deliverables (this information can be clearly presented in a table).

October 2, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response Including plan with key products, budget, and schedule.

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

June 7, 2023:

The uploaded document says "During the PPG stage, it will be relevant to explore ways, through formal FPIC processes, for the different worldviews of indigenous peoples and rural

communities, among other actors in the territory...". As the PPG phase ended, please provide the results of this analysis.

October 2, 2023:

1. No, the uploaded document still says "During the PPG stage, it will be relevant to explore ways...". As the PPG phase ended, please provide the main results of this analysis in the portal entry. In particular, we find the "Preliminary Environmental and Social risk analysis matrix for Infrastructure, Social and Environmental Development Operations", but we fail to find the Environmental and Social Management Framework to manage the project's environmental and social risks and the plan for further development of Environmental and Social Management Plan. Please provide an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA), and Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF) to manage the project's environmental and social risks, particularly including indigenous peoples plan for their full engagement of the project in culturally appropriate manner and plan for further development of Environmental and Social Management Plan to address environmental and social risks at the CEO Approval stage.

2. The link to the document "Annex E Project Map(s) and Coordinates" is wrongly included under the ESS screening section. Please remove it in this section.

October 9, 2023:

1. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

2. Now there are many links/documents wrongly included under the ESS screening section (budget, geolocalization, threatened species list, etc.). Please include in the table under "Supporting Documents" only the relevant ESS supporting documents.

October 15, 2023:

2. Thank you for the amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

Document included in the annexes 5: Results of the Phase of the Free and Informed Consent Process (FPIC) in the elaboration of the project proposal "Living in harmony with nature: Connecting biodiversity with the productive systems in the Landscape of the Gualaca Altitudinal Corridor.

06-10-23

1. Observations taken into account. A new paragraph is included and the developed tools are cited (Environmental and Social risk analysis matrix for Infrastructure, Social and

Environmental Development Operations of CAF ? Annex 8; evaluation of Free Prior Informed Consent ? Annex 6 and Indigenous Participation Plan ? Annex 7).

2. Deleted map.

11-10-23

Corrected:

2. Corrected the Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS) Section

The Supporting Annexes were uploaded in the corresponding section.

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

June 7, 2023:

1. Yes, but the budget of the M&E plan is different in the M&E section and in the project budget in Annex E. Please correct and ensure the financial numbers are consistent throughout all the project description.

2. Please translate "Fuente" in English.

October 2, 2023:

1. The budgeted M&E Plan is under estimated as many budget items are said to be " Included in the overall project budget". So they are not budgeted here. In addition, the sum of the only 2 amounts indicated (\$22,500+\$25,000) is different from the total (\$50,000). Please complete and clarify the table.

2. No "Fuente" is not translated in table 10. Please translate "Fuente" in English.

October 9, 2023:

1. Thank you for the clarification and correction. Cleared.

2. Thank you for the translation. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Corrected and aligned with the project budget Annex B (Budget monitoring and evaluation plan).

2. Corrected.

06-10-23

1. Updated Monitoring and Evaluation Plan (Table 11).

20-10-23

The budget in the M&E Table has been corrected according to the M&E budget (\$48,000).

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

June 7, 2023:

All the text in this section is a copy-paste of the text under the Global Environment Benefits section. Please provide in this section the expected information.

October 2, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

Benefits section incorporated into the table 13 to the project document.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

1. In Annex E, the budget table goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right. Please adjust the format of the table so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.
2. Please provide a budget fully in English (translating any budget items in Spanish such as "Asistente administrativo").
3. The budget includes the purchase of "vehicles". Please clarify what those vehicles are. Also please note that as per GEF guidance, "The use of GEF funds to purchase vehicles is strongly discouraged. Such costs are normally expected to be borne by the co-financed portion of PMCs. Any request to use GEF funding to purchase project vehicles must be justified by the exceptional specific circumstances of the project/program.". Please provide the needed justification and as the vehicles are charged on component 2, please confirm they would not be used by the Project Management team including the Project Manager. Please refer to GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (GEF/C.59/Inf.03) to know the criteria the GEF will use to assess this request and make a decision to accept or reject it.
4. In the budget many technical expenses are supported by the PMC whereas they should be supported by the components. Please amend the budget so that the expenses are charged to the appropriate kind of funding.
5. In the budget table, please correct and complete the following cells in yellow as appropriate:

13:	37,440:	#¡VALOR!
13:	34,050:	Wetlands International
00:	3,390:	
		Wetlands International

6. In the budget table, the amount under the "sub-total column doesn't correspond to the sum of the components and the costs of the components are different than those indicated in the project description and table B. Please check all the financial numbers and correct the table as needed.
7. As the budget is not consistent with the project description, please upload in the Document tab of the Portal the project budget in an Excel file to facilitate the review of the budget.

October 2, 2023:

1. Not addressed: in Annex E, the budget table still goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right. Please adjust the format of the table so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry. In addition, much text is not readable. Please ensure all the text in the table can be read.
- 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.
7. We don't find the uploaded budget table in the Document tab of the Portal. Please address this comment.

October 9, 2023:

1 and 7. Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Adjusted the table.
2. Translated Administrative Assistant.
3. Excluding vehicle purchase, adjusted budget for contracting the rental and fuel service.
4. The requested adjustments have been made.
5. Corrected budget table.
6. Fixed Budget table, component costs and table B.
7. Budget Excel file uploaded.

06-10-23

1. Annex E with tight budget.
7. Budget in Excel uploaded to the portal.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

1. The table of the Project Results Framework goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right. Please adjust the format of the table so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.
2. As indicated above, please add the GEF Indicator 6.1 "Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU".

October 2, 2023:

1. Not addressed. The table of the Project Results Framework still goes beyond the limit of the Portal entry on the right. Please adjust the format of the table so that it fits within the margins of the Portal entry.

2. Thank you for including the indicator 6.1. Cleared.

October 9, 2023:

1. Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Adjusted the results framework table.

2. Added indicator 6.1 ?Carbon sequestered, or emissions avoided AFOLU sector.

06-10-23

1. Adjusted Project Result Framework Table.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

Please address the comments above on the status and utilization of the PPG.

October 2, 2023:

Please address the comments above on the status and utilization of the PPG.

October 9, 2023:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

The details of the use of the PPG are found in the Excel file that contains the uploaded budget.

06-10-23

1. Detailed use of the PPG

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 2, 2023:

In Annex D, the map has not been copied correctly and it is not visible. Please ensure a copy of the map of the targeted area including the 5 PAs is visible in Annex D.

October 2, 2023:

1. No, in Annex D, the map is still missing. Please ensure a copy of the map of the targeted area including the 5 PAs is visible in Annex D.

2. In addition, please copy the geo location information in the appropriate table as below:

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. 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
---------------	----------	-----------	-------------	---------------------------------

October 9, 2023:

1. No, in Annex D of the Portal entry, the map is still missing. Again, please ensure a copy of the map of the targeted area including the 5 PAs is visible in Annex D.
2. Thank you or the amendment. Cleared.

October 15, 2023:

1. Thank you for completing the Annex D. Cleared.

Agency Response

Included map.

06-10-23

1. Project area location map uploaded.
2. Geolocation information of the project area added in the corresponding table.2. Geolocation information of the project area added in the corresponding table.

11-10-23

Corrected

1. Uploaded Annex D with location map including the 5 protected areas of the PCAG.

20-10-23

Decimal point were included in the geographical coordinated.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

June 7, 2023:

Not yet, please address the comments raised above, indicate exactly where the comments have been addressed, and upload a CEO approval version with all the edited and new text highlighted in yellow to facilitate the review. In addition, please upload the PRODOC in the Document tab of the Portal (reference is made to the PRODOC in the Agency responses to GEF Sec comments at PIF stage).

October 2, 2023:

Not yet, please address the remaining comments, indicating exactly were the comments have been addressed, and uploading a CEO approval version with all the edited and new text highlighted in yellow to facilitate the review. URGENT: PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS PROJECT NEEDS TO BE APPROVED BY OCTOBER 27 AT THE LATEST TO AVOID CANCELLATION.

October 9, 2023:

Not yet, please address the remaining comments, indicating exactly were the comments have been addressed. In addition, some annexes are uploaded several times, sometimes with a different number or without any specific name. This is very confusing and time consuming. Please clean the package of uploaded documents in the Documents tab of the Portal, ensuring each annex is uploaded only once and has a unique number and explicit title.

URGENT: PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS PROJECT NEEDS TO BE APPROVED BY OCTOBER 27 AT THE LATEST TO AVOID CANCELLATION.

October 20, 2023:

Not yet. The last quality control reveals the need to address the following comments. Please address them urgently to avoid the cancellation of the project.

1. Stakeholder Engagement: Considering the main component of the project is to improve the management of the Altitudinal Gualaca Corridor and Landscape (PCAG), strengthening governance and conservation, the project document lacks important details related to civil society engagement. The table 6 only describe the main civil society groups with little information on the specific civil society organizations/groups/associations etc .that they will engage as part of project implementation. The agency should, at this stage, be able to provide more details on the specific organizations, groups, or associations that they will engage and their respective roles and responsibilities as well as more details on stakeholder engagement related to component 1, 2 as well as timing and means of engagement.

2. Geolocation: Please review the format of geodata provided in Annex D on Project Map and Coordinates under ?GEO LOCATION INFORMATION?. The decimals are missing leading to incorrect site locations. Please correct them.

3. Totals of M&E Budget table (\$48,000) does not match the totals of the M&E budgeted plan (\$41,000). Please ask the Agency to amend.

4. Core indicator 6.1: The expected result is very low and the calculation supporting this result is unclear. In addition the duration of accounting should be 20 years and not 3 years. Please clarify providing the calculation and revise the duration of accounting to 20 years.

October 23, 2023:

1, 2 and 3. Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

4. Not addressed but we accept to move forward with the approval process considering the comment is not critical for this BD project and the close date of cancellation (see above).

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	6/7/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/3/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/9/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/15/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/20/2023	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations