

# Building human well-being and resilience in Amazonian forests by enhancing the value of biodiversity for food security and bio-businesses, in a context of climate change

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10248

**Countries**

Peru

**Project Name**

Building human well-being and resilience in Amazonian forests by enhancing the value of biodiversity for food security and bio-businesses, in a context of climate change

**Agencies**

FAO, UNIDO, IFAD

**Date received by PM**

1/29/2021

**Review completed by PM**

4/15/2021

**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

4/14/2021

No.

Table A should only have one objective where all resources are allocated given that this is an impact program per GEF policy as below, please revise.

IP SFM Amazon	Integrated conservation and sustainable development of the Brazilian Amazon.
	5/5/201
	Cleared

#### Agency Response

**April 14, 2021:**

Point taken. Table A has been corrected as requested.

#### **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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

Please clarify the reason you identified large amounts from SERNANP and PNCB and OEFA as in-kind and as investment mobilized? Normally amounts of this size are grants or public investment and are classified as Investment Mobilized while in-kind contributions are classified as recurrent expenditures. This is particularly true with the 8 million from SERNANP and the 39 million from PNCB.

Please provide English translations of the cofinancing letters.

4/14/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

**April 14, 2021 :**

The co-financing letters for MINAM-PNCB, SERNANP, IIAP and OEFA have been revised, and Table C. Co-financing has been updated accordingly.  
Please find a revised version of the English translations in the GEF Portal

**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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

Yes, cleared.

However, please explain why METT scores for Alto Nanay and Murunaha are not listed.

4/14/2021

An adequate explanation has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

**April 14, 2021 :**

The Regional Conservation Area (ACR) Alto Nanay-Pintoyacu-Chambira is a protected area complementary to the National System of Protected Areas (SINANPE). ACR Alto Nanay is one of largest conservation areas managed by the Regional Government of Loreto. Loreto has been hardly hit by the COVID pandemic.

The Murunahua territory is an Indigenous Reserve, regulated under the Act of Indigenous Peoples in Isolation or Initial Contact (PIACI), with stricter legal protection. The Murunahua Reserve is not registered as a SINANPE Natural Protected Area. For this reason, Murunahua is managed by the Ministry of Culture.

Both Murunahua and Alto Nanay face substantial management challenges due to: i) the lack of adequate verification means to measure biodiversity status and threats and, ii) the difficult and restricted access to undertaking monitoring activities. During full project

preparation, the COVID-19 limitations have impeded the collection of baseline information and target setting in a participatory way. Consequently, the METT for these areas have missing scores.

The work plan for both areas is detailed below:

In Alto Nanay: 1) Conclude the capacity building of the Government of Loreto's staff to operate the METT tool; 2) preliminary apply the METT score; 3) validate the METT score in close consultation with key stakeholders during the 1<sup>st</sup> semester of the project implementation phase.

In Murunahua: 1) Select a pertinent tool to measure the baseline, in cooperation with the Ministry of Culture and respecting the rights of indigenous peoples; 2) Coordinate actions with local stakeholders; 3) Apply the tool and share the findings with FAO and GEF in Project Year 1; 4) Transfer the outputs of the selected tool to the METT questionnaire, in collaboration with FAO.

The Murunahua Indigenous Reserve will also learn from experiences and good practices of other Child projects of the ASL Impact Program dealing with areas of similar characteristics.

This explanation has been included in the Global Environmental Benefits section 1.6 of the CEO Endorsement Document (Please refer to paragraphs 127-133).

## **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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

Coordinates are provided but please provide maps in the portal per the usual practice.

4/14/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

**April 14, 2021 :**

To follow the usual practice, maps have been included in the corresponding sections in the GEF portal and attached Word Project Document. Please see Section 1b and Annex E of the CEO Endorsement Request and Appendix E of the Agency Project Document.

**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

2/22/2020



Please clarify within the CEO endorsement in the portal how the project is contributing to overall program impact. Please also reference where in the Project Document this is elaborated.

4/14/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

**April 14, 2021 :**

In the previous version, an analysis with the alignment of the child project with the ASL-2 Impact Program was included under the Section 1.4: *Alignment with focal area objectives*. To follow the portal order, we now include this analysis in the Section 1c (see Agency Project Document - page 77 - and GEF portal paragraphs 149 - 152).

**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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response  
**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  
2/22/2020

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  
2/22/2020

Yes, and includes COVID 19 mitigation measures.

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  
2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2020

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2020

Yes, but please try and insert a more legible entry into the portal if possible.

4/14/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

**April 14, 2021 :**

We have now corrected the format for the table in the Agency Project Document and GEF portal to improve legibility as much as possible.

**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/22/2020

Yes, all comments by GEFSEC were addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/22/2020

Yes, all comments by council were addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/22/2020

Yes, all comments by STAP were addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/22/2020

NA

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
2/22/2020

NA

Agency Response

**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2020

NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

2/22/2020

Please include maps to complement the coordinate tables that are presented in the portal.

4/14/2021

Cleared.

Agency Response

**April 14, 2021 :**

Maps included, as requested.

**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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

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

2/22/2020

No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.

4/14/2021

No.

Table A should only have one objective where all resources are allocated given that this is an impact program per GEF policy.

4/14/2021

Thank you for correcting Table A.

The budget uploaded in the portal in the CEO endorsement request is not sufficient. Please note that a complete budget is required per paragraph 2 ? page 42 of the Guidelines, *“The Budget Template in Appendix A should be completed by the Agency and submitted at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval as an annex in the Portal.”* The same Budget Template in excel format should be uploaded in the Portal - section ?Documents?.

Please revise accordingly and resubmit.

4/21/2021

No. Please resolve these remaining budget issues and resubmit:

1) Some expenditures that are related with the project’s execution (i.e. Technical Project Coordinator; Travel Technical Project Coordinator; Stationery & Office; Laptops and Supplies; Furniture; Courier Service; Internet Charges; Cab; Water and Energy) are partially or totally charged to the project’s components - they must be charged to the Project Management Costs from both the GEF portion and the co-financing portion (see Guidelines paragraph 5 ? page 49). Please revise.

2) With regards to vehicle purchases and associated costs please have these be financed by cofinancing.

3) There is an expenditure represented in Machinery for added value 3.1.2. for \$450,000. However, once one goes to 3.1.2 in Table B, it is not possible to understand the linkage between the Machinery and the Products and services derived from biodiversity have added value, with duly strengthened value chains and have access to the market under quality and sustainability criteria within the new economic model. Please clarify and justify accordingly.

5/5/2021

An extensive explanation was presented regarding the points raised on the budget. They were all satisfactory. 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**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>2/22/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/14/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>4/20/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/5/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**CEO Recommendation****Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**

The objective of the Project is to contribute to the conservation of wild Amazonian ecosystems, both terrestrial and aquatic, so that they remain healthy, functional, and resilient to climate change, maintaining important carbon reserves, avoiding greenhouse gas emissions, and generating human well-being for the men and women of the local populations of the Peruvian Amazon. The Project will be implemented in two landscapes of great environmental and cultural value: Upper Ucayali-Inuya, in the provinces of Atalaya and Satipo, located in the departments of Ucayali and Jun?n, respectively; and Tigre-Mara?on, in the province of Loreto Nauta, located in the department of Loreto. These high-value landscapes are suffering from troubling rates of deforestation and ecosystem degradation.

The Project is divided into four interrelated components. Component 1 promotes collaborative, coherent and synergistic governance actions across all sectors and levels of the State to achieve the sustainable development of the Amazon. Component 2 drives the strengthening of Amazonian connectivity through landscapes managed as mosaics of conservation and sustainable use, in the areas of influence of protected areas (PAs) and buffer zones (BZ). Component 3 promotes sustainable production practices to enhance biodiversity under sustainable protocols; and Component 4 promotes knowledge management, and coordinated project and programme monitoring and evaluation.

Various risk mitigation measures will be employed vis a vis COVID-19 impacts on project implementation including:

- Set up remote communication mechanisms using e-mails, video-conferences, and telephone conferences to adjust to the new context.
- Apply adaptive management. Work plan and stakeholder engagement plans would be adjusted accordingly.
- If travel restrictions remain in force, local facilitators and officials shall receive information remotely and ensure adequate involvement of local stakeholders (including FPIC and the gender mainstreaming action plan)
- Meetings may be held with small targeted groups, taking into account the relevant sanitary measures
- During implementation of project, the protocols and measures established by the national, regional governments and community will be taken into account and respected against of COVID - 19.