



Securing a Living Amazon through Landscape Connectivity in Southern Guyana.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10288

Countries

Guyana

Project Name

Securing a Living Amazon through Landscape Connectivity in Southern Guyana.

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

2/11/2022

Review completed by PM

3/30/2022

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
2/15/2022

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
2/15/2022

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
2/15/2022

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
2/15/2022

The contributions from CI and WWF should be labeled as recurrent expenditure if these are in-kind donations. Investment mobilized is used as a categorization for cash contributions to the project. Please clarify and revise the letters and the categorization accordingly.

3/8/2022

(i) Conservation International: change to ?Conservation International ? Guyana?. Change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?Donor Agency?.

(ii) WWF Guianas: change ?Civil Society Organization? to ?Donor Agency?.

3/30/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
03/25/22

Changes addressed.

03/01/22

The contributions from CI are 'In-Kind' and 'recurrent expenditure'. WWF contributions are now labeled as 'grant' and 'investment mobilized'. The letters have been revised.

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

2/15/2022

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

2/15/2022

There is a large amount of money not spent; please clarify. In addition, the column on amount committed is empty; please clarify.

3/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

03/01/22

The PPG table has been corrected. The column on amount committed is now updated.

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

2/15/2022

Please provide the METT baseline score.

Please note that an increase of 3 points in the METT score is unacceptable as a result. That would be a cost of \$1 million per point in the METT score. Please review and present a more ambitious METT increase.

3/3/2022

Thank you. The METT baseline score is still not entered in the actual portal, it is only in the written description below. Please enter in the portal.

Given the high baseline score of 76, please clarify what elements of the METT will be the focus of the modest 7 point increase and what indicators are included in the logframe to assess this progress.

3/8/2022

Please elaborate more on how you arrived at the GHG mitigation target for indirect impacts (core indicator 6) including your hypothesis that underpin this assessment.

3/30/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

03/25/2022

Thank you for your comment. The project will undertake a planning process for the North Rupununi Wetlands. The type of plan, and governance system for executing this plan, will be decided and put in place by a multi-stakeholder platform by project close. It is expected that the plan will be implemented for at least 5 years after project close (e.g. a 5 year plan), and that the plan will put in place measures to alter the level of degradation for at least 1% of the NRW (or 15,128 hectares) from ?very low degradation? to ?none? by limiting land uses that cause degradation in the wetland core

or other management measures to reduce degradation. According to the EX-Ante Carbon Balance Tool, developed by FAO, moving 15,128 hectares of this land type from 'very low degradation' to 'no degradation,' 'with no changes to the burning regime,' will result in 774,917 metric tons of CO2 mitigated over 5 years. This is considered 'indirect' because it will take place post-project, following the GEF core indicator guidelines which state 'for emission reductions in the post-project period that will have a causal link to GEF intervention, indirect emission reductions should be calculated.'

03/03/22

Thank you for your comment. METT baseline score has been entered in the portal. Indicators have been included in the logframe to assess progress.

The project aims to increase the scores of the following METT indicators:

7. Is there a management plan or equivalent and is it being implemented?

7a. The management planning process allows adequate and equal opportunities for stakeholders to influence management

9. Do you have enough information to manage the area?

11. Do the people managing the area have the necessary knowledge and skills?

15. Are equipment and facilities sufficient for management needs

30. Are indigenous people involved in management decisions?

31. Do local communities living in or near the protected area have input to management decisions?

03/01/22

Thank you for your comment. The baseline METT score is provided in the document. The targets now present a more ambitious MET increase of 7 points.

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
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

2/15/2022

Please resubmit the map as the resolution in the portal is very fuzzy and the map can not be read.

3/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

03/01/22

A higher resolution map has been submitted in the Portal.

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
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

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
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
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
3/8/2022

It is well noted that the project has submitted a gender analysis and action plan. Please summarize the relevant findings of the gender analysis as well as key components of the action plan in the portal section.

3/30/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

03/25/22

The Gender Analysis and Gender Action plan have been summarized in the portal.

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

2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
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
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
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
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
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

2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2022

Please reformat Annex A and B so the margins on the right do not run off the page in the portal.

The font of Annex E is so small it can not be read. Please resubmit with larger font and at that point it will be reviewed.

3/3/2022

If you can possibly do so, increase the font size of Annex E. It is better than before but still barely legible.

3/8/2022

1. Budget table:

(i) Please include one column for M&E budget in the budget table ? whenever it is included, we will be in a position to assess the reasonability for some budget lines being charged to this specific source.

(ii) Project manager is charged to component 4 and PMC, while project assistant is charged to components but not PMC and the Finance Officer is charged to PMC but no to the project? components. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution (those mapped to the Project Management Unit) have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. Requesting the costs associated with the execution of the project to be covered by the PMC is reasonable ? by so doing, asking the proponents to utilize both portions allocated to PMC (GEF portion and co-financing portion) is also reasonable. That said, *when the situation merits* (i.e. not enough co-financing funds ? which for this projects is not the case), the project?s staff could be charged to the project?s components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). For this project, the co-financing portion allocated to PMC is 220K, and out of 4.6 Million, 1.45 (31%) is represented in grants.

(iii) Office supplies is charged to component 4 and PMC ? this has to be changed to PMC

3/30/2022

The spirit of the proportionality is clearly stated in the Guidelines: GEF trust funds should not bear a disproportionate burden of the total management costs for GEF-financed projects, when co-financing is included (page 50). Therefore, please allocate cash cofinancing to the PMC, that is proportional to the overall cofinancing provided to the GEF project.

4/20/2022

Thank you for the explanation. Cleared.

Agency Response

04/19/22

Thank you for your comment. The co-financing provided by EPA is in-kind, but represents a critical contribution towards the overall management costs associated with this project. The EPA and PAC in-kind co-financing is covering much of the PMC 'real costs' such as office space, utilities (internet, phone, electricity, etc), vehicles and fuel, office furniture, and existing staff time for overseeing the PMU, accounting, procurement, administration, and human resources. Given that existing government staff cannot play a part-time role, the project needs to recruit a full-time position ? the project manager role is covered under PMC; the other part of this role (technical advisor) will support the incremental work and technical capacities needed to deliver Component 2.

03/25/22

(i) The M&E budget is included in the column ?Output 4.1.1 Monitoring and Evaluation Reports.? This is now shown in the Portal.

(ii) The Project Manager is charged to Component 2, 4 and PMC. The Project Manager will have technical roles under Component 2, and responsibilities related to M&E under Component 4. The TOR in the ProDoc (Appendix VI) explains these responsibilities and justifies the budget being included under both PMC and Components. The position title has been adjusted to ?Project Manager/Technical Advisor to reflect these responsibilities. The Project Assistant and M&E Officer role have been merged, the salary for this position is now budgeted under Component 4 (M&E), PMC, and a small amount under Component 2 to reflect some of the technical responsibilities noted in the TOR for this position (Appendix VI). The Finance Officer is fully charged to PMC, given their role is 100% dedicated to project management activities. The co-financing portion of PMC is in-kind and cannot be dedicated to these salaries, rather this co-financing covers other project management costs (e.g. rent, HR, legal services, office cubicle with table and executive chair, and other existing government staff positions that will support the project).

(iii) Office Supplies are now charged only to PMC.

03/03/22

Annex E updated for better resolution.

03/01/22

- Annex A and B have been reformatted.
- Annex E has been resubmitted.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared. Please fix the right margin formatting.

3/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response
03/01/22

- Annex A has been reformatted.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2022

NA.

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2022

There is a large amount of money not spent; please clarify. In addition, the column on amount committed is empty; please clarify.

3/3/2022

Cleared per comments provided above.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/15/2022

Please fix the map so it can be read. It is not legible in the portal, too fuzzy.

3/3/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

•03/01/22

•Annex B has been reformatted.

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

2/15/2022

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

2/15/2022

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
2/15/2022

NA.

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
2/15/2022

No. Please address comments above and resubmit.

3/3/2022

Please address the comments provided above on Annex E AND on the core indicators and the METT score, revise the submission, and resubmit.

3/8/2022

Please address the issues raised above and resubmit.

3/30/2022

No. Please address the issue highlighted above with cash cofinancing of Project Management costs as noted above under "Annexes".

4/20/2022

Yes, project is recommended for CEO endorsement.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement****Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review	2/15/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/3/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/30/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/20/2022

CEO Recommendation**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The project objective is to strengthen landscape connectivity through improved management of the Kanuku Mountains Protected Area and North Rupununi Wetlands in southern Guyana. In particular, the project will work to integrate productive activities (forestry, agriculture, tourism) and sustainable land and water management considerations so that the landscapes long-term environmental health, functioning and associated ecosystem services are secured, while at the same time ensuring the landscapes provide livelihood and productive benefits.

The project has four components. The first component involves improving the management of the Kanuku Mountains Protected Area (KMPA). The project will support the strengthening of protected area management at the site level, with the involvement of Indigenous communities living around and utilizing the resources of the protected area. The second component will support improved management of the NRW landscape through participatory approaches, an integrated wetland management strategy, which incorporates strategies for multi-stakeholder planning and decision-making, participatory resource monitoring, reduction of threats and pressures, and sustainable resource use practices and livelihoods. The third component will support a review of the PA Act, to identify gaps and develop recommendations for consideration by the Government. This will not only strengthen how the KMPA is managed, but also the wider NPAS. The fourth component addresses regional and national coordination, cooperation, monitoring and evaluation, and knowledge sharing of experiences and lessons learned through the wider network of ASL initiatives.

The project will generate the following global environmental benefits: a) strengthening the management of the Kanuku Mountains Protected Area (KMPA), which is 611,000 hectares; b) improve planning for and management of the North Rupununi Wetlands an area of 901,800 hectares; and, c) 774,917 metric tons of carbon emissions mitigated which will be achieved post-project.

The project has an adequate COVID-19 mitigation strategy.