



Amazon sustainable landscape approach in the Plurinational System of Protected Areas and Strategic Ecosystems of Bolivia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10295

Countries

Bolivia

Project Name

Amazon sustainable landscape approach in the Plurinational System of Protected Areas and Strategic Ecosystems of Bolivia

Agencies

CAF

Date received by PM

12/24/2020

Review completed by PM

4/20/2021

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

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

10/26/2020

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response

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

10/26/2020

No.

Please provide English translations of every cofinancing letter.

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

Please classify the cofinancing from SISCO.

The cofinancing letter from MAYA is confusing as it never references the two cofinanciers of SISCO and SERNAP which are listed as the cofinanciers in the portal. Therefore either edit the MAYA letter clearly referencing SISCO and SERNAP and their amounts and their types or provide letters from SISCO and SERNAP separately.

12/4/2020

Please clarify why the cofinance from SISCO is classified as "other" while from SERNAP it is classified as "recurrent expenditures". The explanation in the CEO endorsement request is not clear in this regard.

All other issues raised above are cleared.

12/7/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

10/26/2020

The PMC costs should be shared between the GEF and the co-financing in a way that is consistently proportional with the overall co-financing ratio per the new policy and guidelines. Please revise this and update all budgets accordingly.

12/4/2020

The overall co-financing ratio of the project is 1:3.8, GEF to co-financing. The current ratio of PMC is 1:2.2, GEF to co-financing. Please revise accordingly.

12/7/2020

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

10/26/2020

Yes. But please fix core indicator one. The PA hectares are currently listed under 1.1 as "new protected areas". Since these protected areas

already exist the hectares should all go under 1.2

12/4/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see, in the PRODOC, 2.1. Barrier analysis, theory of change, strategic rationality and scope.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see PRODOC 1.5. Baseline and 4.2. Learning from past experience

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see PRODOC 2.5. Global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see PRODOC 1.3. Consistency with policies and priorities (national, GEF, SDGs, Aichi)

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see PRODOC 2.5. Global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning, 1.5. Baseline & 2.4. Co-financing projects.

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

Please see PRODOC 2.2. Objectives, expected results and key indicators

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see PRODOC 4.2. Learning from past experience, 4.4. Environmental impact, 4.6. Innovation & 4.7. Sustainability and replicability.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Done. The map that is pasted in the CEO ER lists project areas validated by the ASL2 Program and included in the Program for Bolivia

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see PRODOC 4.1. Economic, financial and fiduciary analysis.

Stakeholders

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

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

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

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

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see 1.4. Stakeholders.

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

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see ProDoc 3.6. Risks and mitigation measures, and Appendix 10. Risk Assessment and Mitigation Measures.

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see ProDoc 3.2. Institutional arrangements, 3.3. Implementation arrangements, and 4.2. Learning from past experience

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
10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see ProDoc 1.3. Consistency with policies and priorities (national, GEF, SDGs, Aichi).

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see ProDoc 2.2. Objectives, expected results and key indicators, 3.4. Monitoring, reports and evaluation, and 3.5. Dissemination of results and visibility

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

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

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see ProDoc 2.5. Global environmental benefits and incremental reasoning, 4.3. Social analysis and stakeholder participation, and Appendix 5. Incremental Cost Matrix

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Please insert a map on 1.b.

Annex A the results framework is illegible. Please enter again and reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the project document where

this information can be found.

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

12/4/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response Please see ProDoc Appendix 2. Logical and Results Framework.
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response Please see ProDoc Appendix 2. Logical and Results Framework.
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Council comments were mainly on the "Program" per se, but the United States provided the following two comments that apply to all child

projects. Please provide a response to each as appropriate:

United States Comments

? Risk assessment. It will be important that the child projects more fully assess and incorporate risk (including a monitoring and tracking component) from infrastructure planned as part of the Initiative for the Integration of the Regional Infrastructure of South America (IIRSA) plan, including the planned trans-amazon railway.

? Recognizing that the intent of these projects is to mitigate or reverse deforestation, the United States needs to officially confirm for internal purposes that the following projects will not involve any logging of primary forests. Can the GEF please affirm that no logging of primary forests will occur during the implementation of projects: 10125, 10184, 10188, 10192, 10198, 10206, 10208, 10220. Please note that the project number 10198 refers to ASL program as a whole. Please confirm that the Bolivia child project of ASL-

2 will not involve any logging in primary forests.

12/4/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

1. The project includes a specific output (Output 1.3.2) within Component 1 (please see ProDoc 2.3. Components, products and schedule, para.108), devoted to facilitating the integrated planning, monitoring and tracking of initiatives with impact over land use, such as infrastructure, between the Protected Area System and other governmental planning tools. Both CAF and the Bolivian Ministry of Development Planning (MPD) participate in both IIRSA and this output, which ensures coordination and the adequate flow of information between the two initiatives.

2. The Bolivia child project of ASL-2 will not involve any logging in primary forests as defined in internal US legislation

3. The correct GEF project ID **10295** has been included. Sorry

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

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

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

NA.

Agency Response
Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
10/26/2020

Information provided in Annex C. 200 000 provided, 148 358 used and 51 642 committed.

Cleared.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

Yes. Cleared.

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

Please delete hyperlinks to drop box.

Agency Response

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

10/26/2020

NA.

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

10/26/2020

NA.

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

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

10/26/2020

No. Please revise per instructions above and resubmit.

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

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

Program)

In the portal CEO endorsement request, in many sections an answer is given: "no change since PIF" or a very limited description is given

when the project document has more elaborate information. Thus, in these cases, as noted above, please reference the page numbers,

annexes, etc in the project document where this information can be found.

CEO endorsement request, in many sections an answer is given: "no change since PIF" or a very limited description is given when the project

document has more elaborate information. Thus, in these cases, as noted above, please reference the page numbers, annexes, etc in the

project document where this information can be found.

12/4/2020

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

12/7/2020

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

12/3/2021

Please address these remaining issues:

1. On Project Information: The duration stipulated between implementation start and completion date is 48 months and not 60 ? please ask the Agency to amend.
2. On Focal/Non-focal Area Elements (Table A): instead of BD 1-1, the correct one is IP SFM Amazon ? please amend.
3. On Funding allocation (Table D): consistent with the allocation included in the LoE, the second row needs to change as follows: (i) under the column ?Focal Area?, instead of repeating Biodiversity, it needs to be Multi Focal Area; and (ii) under the column ?Programming of Funds?, instead of BD STAR Allocation, it needs to be IP SFM Amazon Set-Aside.
4. On co-financing: Letters from the government (SERNAP and SISCO) do not specify the type of co-financing. They also don?t mention the time frame over which the co-financing will be provided. Also, co-financing from SISCO is labeled as ?other? and ?investment mobilized?. By the description provided, this seems to be in the form of ?cash?, please ask the government to specify in the letter. The amount stipulated in numbers does not match the amount written.
5. Audits are charged to M&E Budget but they have to be charged to PMC ? please amend.
6. On Environmental and social safeguards: CAF has attached the Project Concept and Safeguard Triggering (Preliminary Questionnaire) and CEO endorsement document states that the overall ESS risk is classified moderate. They identified several environmental and social risks including impacts on indigenous peoples/communities and protected areas. The preliminary questionnaire/ submission, however, does not elaborate on any information on additional assessments/reviews or any planned mitigation measures. Please provide further information on any planned mitigation measures or management plans to address the identified risks and potential impacts, specifically including the process of FPIC.
7. On budget: the budget does not provide detailed information on what some costs include. As an example please see below: several ?Outputs? are mentioned but there is no information on what that entails. We cannot assess the budget as it is: we need to understand what type of costs are charged to which part of the budget, including PMC, M&E and the Project?s components. Please pay special attention if after utilizing the PMC (both: the GEF and the co-financing portion) some project?s staff is charged to the project?s components, in which case TORs are required. Once re-submitted, we will review the budget accordingly.

3/25/2021

No.

Please address these issues and resubmit:

1. On Focal/Non-focal Area Elements (Table A): The Agency modified the acronym (instead of BD-1, they included IP SFM Amazon), but under "Focal Area Outcomes" the Agency did not include the narrative (instead of Multi Focal Area, it should be "Promoting effective coordination for sustainable forest management"). Please amend.

2. On Audits: Audits are not charged anymore to M&E. However, with the current budget it is not possible to understand from where the Audits will be paid - please ask the Agency to clarify (the current budget still is not self-explanatory - see comment 3 below)

3. On budget: as mentioned above, the budget still is not self-explanatory - as it is, one cannot assess what is being charged to M&E, PMC and Project Components. For example, PMC will pay for "Sub-contract to executing partner/ entity?", but it is not clear what this entails from the presented budget. Another example is that \$249,000 from the project components will pay "office supplies?", when actually these should be charged to PMC (if they are actually "office supplies" for the project execution). In summary, in order to assess the budget, we need to understand what type of costs are charged to which part of the budget, including PMC, M&E and the Project's components. Please provide these details.

4/5/2021

No. These issues remain in the document:

- 1- Formatting for budget uploaded in the portal is very bad and the figures cannot be read as the formatting goes beyond the margins. Please fix.
- 2- Some expenditures are ineligible to be paid from the PMC as they clearly belong to M&E such as "Routine Supervision Trip to project Sites" (\$21,561) and "Project Final Report" (\$5,000). Please revise.
- 3) The "Semi-annual Progress and Operational Reports to CAF" (\$12,000) seems to be a report that is for CAF, not for the GEF. Therefore the cost of these reports cannot be covered by the M&E plan, and should be paid by confinancing resources or the agency fee.

Given that the budget was hard to read because of the formatting issues, more budget questions may be posed after you upload the budget to the portal/

4/22/2021

The comments on the content of the Budget were addressed, but still the Budget in the Portal goes beyond the margins. Please adjust the budget so it can fit within the margins of the page as was indicated in an email communication with CAF.

4/22/2021

Formatting issue is now resolved.

CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	10/26/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/4/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/7/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	12/18/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

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