



Safeguarding the systems of life of Bolivia?s Amazon Forests

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11204

Countries

Bolivia

Project Name

Safeguarding the systems of life of Bolivia?s Amazon Forests

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

6/27/2024

Review completed by PM

7/20/2024

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Project Type

FSP

CEO

Part I - General Project Information

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 17, 2024:

The GEF Agency Project ID is missing. Please complete.

September 26, 2024:

Thank you for raising the Portal issue. Cleared.


Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

The GEF Agency Project ID (9649) is included in the General Child Project Information table of the CEO Endorsement and in the cover page of the ProDoc.

With regard to the GEF Portal entries, we are requesting Portal Helpdesk to add this ID (CC GEF PM to the email) as there is no field available for such entries from GEF Agency side.

Portal Review Mode - shows empty space with no entries:

GENERAL CHILD PROJECT INFORMATION 			
Parent Project Title:	Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program Phase 3		
Child Project Title:	Safeguarding the systems of life of Bolivia's Amazon Forests		
Region:	Bolivia	GEF Project ID:	11204
Country(ies):	Bolivia	Type of Project:	FSP
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Project Executing Entity(s):	Ministry of Development Planning	Project Executing Type:	Government
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area	Submission Date :	6/27/2024
Type of Trust Fund:	GET	Project Duration (Months):	84
GEF Project Cost (\$)	10,700,500.00	Agency Project Cost (\$)	1,000,000.00

Portal Entry mode - no field for entries from GEF Agency side:

Part I: Project Information

Name of Parent Program

Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program Phase 3

GEF ID

11204

Project Type

FSP

Type of Trust Fund

GET

Project Title

Safeguarding the systems of life of Bolivia's Amazon Forests

Countries

Bolivia,

Agency(ies)

UNDP,

Executing Partner

Ministry of Development Planning

Executing Partner Type

Government

[+ Add Executing Partner](#)

GEF Focal Area

Multi Focal Area

Duration

84

In Months

Agency Fee (\$)

1,690,430

Sector 

AFOLU

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 17, 2024:

Considering the important target of forest restoration in the project, please tag the Land Degradation Rio Marker as " Significant Objective (1)".

September 26, 2024:

Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

As indicated, the Land Degradation Rio Marker was tagged as "Significant Objective (1)" in the General Child Project Information table and in the Portal.

2. Project Summary.

- a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**
- c) [If a child project under a program] Does the project summary include adequate and substantive link with the parent program goal and approach?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 17, 2024:

- a) Partially. Please also identify briefly the barriers the project needs to tackle to meet its objective.
- b) and c) Yes, cleared.

September 26, 2024:

Thank you the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

A summary of the barriers that need to be tackled to address the problems of primary forest loss and degradation has been added in the project Summary Section of the CEO Endorsement Request as indicated.

3. Project Description Overview

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 17, 2024:

a) Yes, cleared.

b) Yes but some text in the diagram is difficult to read because the letters are very small. Please also upload the TOC as a separate document in the document tab of the Portal.

c)

c.1. There is no need to include the METT improvements for 18 areas under the outcome 1.1 (this information should be in the results framework and in the core indicator table). Please remove this information and only include the total area where the management effectiveness will be improved.

c.2. Considering the intervention on the ground and notably the area of restoration, the component 2 should be referred as "investment" instead of "Technical assistance". Please consider amending accordingly.

d) In the Project Description Overview and in the description of the components, Gender dimension is not clearly reflected in the outputs and is missing in component 1. As per GEF guidance, please ensure that the outputs and activities developed in the gender action plan are also integrated into the project components, outcomes, and outputs.

e) No, the GEF Project Financing contribution to PMC is 5% while the Co-Financing contribution to PMC is 2.2%. Both contributions are not proportional. Please revise either decreasing GEF contribution to PMC or increasing co-financing contribution to PMC to make them proportional.

f) Yes, the PMC is equal to 5% for FSP. Cleared.

September 26, 2024:

b) Thank you the consideration. Cleared.

c)

c.1. Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

c.2. For some reason unfortunately, the change is not reflected in the Portal. Please proceed with the suggested change.

d) Thank you for the consideration. Cleared.

e) Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

October 25, 2024:

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

b) The font size of the TOC was increased to make it easier to read and included in Section B. Child Project Description in the CEO Endorsement Request. In addition, a new document of the TOC has been provided/uploaded to the Portal.

c.1 As indicated, the METT improvements for 18 areas under Outcome 1.1 were removed from the Child Project Description Overview in the CEO Endorsement Request and only included in the results framework and in the core indicator table. In addition, the total area where the management effectiveness will be improved has been included under this outcome.

c.2 Amended as suggested in Child Project Description Overview within the CEO Endorsement Request; Component 2 is now labeled as "investment" instead of "Technical assistance".

d) The gender dimension has been thoroughly integrated into the Project Description Overview and the description of the components (B. Child Project Description in the CEO Endorsement Request). The outputs and activities in the gender action plan are now reflected and integrated in the project components, outcomes, and outputs, including Component 1.

e) The co-financing contribution to PMC was increased to make it proportional to the GEF contribution (5%). Please refer to the Project Description Overview in the CEO Endorsement Request.

UNDP response, 18 October 2024:

c.2 Amended as suggested in Child Project Description Overview within the CEO Endorsement Request; Component 2 is now labeled as "investment" instead of "Technical assistance".

2. Enhancing sustainable production and landscape restoration	investment	2.1. Improved management of the Amazon biome and livelihoods ensured through the implementation of	2.1.1. Guidelines and protocols for the implementation and verification of best restoration and production	GET	5,533,380.00	33,860,160.00
---	------------	--	--	-----	--------------	---------------

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

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

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and

how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 17, 2024:

a) and b) Yes, cleared.

c) N/A

Agency Response

5 B. Project Description

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

b) [If a child project under a program] Is the Theory of change aligned with and consistent with the overall program goal and approach?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region? [If a child project under a program] Does the description include how the alternative aligns with and contributes to the overall program goal and approach?

d) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

l) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the

intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

m) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? [If a child project under an integrated program] Are the specific levers of transformation identified and described? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2024:

a)

a.1. The description identifies pathways but these pathways are not presented. Please elaborate further on the project logic including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective through the identified causal pathways,

a.2. Please clarify what the acronym LMT means.

b) and c) Yes, cleared.

d) The description of the component is not clear as it doesn't reflect the project structure. The concrete activities allowing the achievement of the outputs are also unclear. Please present the components identifying clearly their outcomes and outputs (as in the Project Description Overview table) and elaborate further on the concrete activities that will be carried out under each outputs.

e) Yes, cleared.

f) The socio-economic benefits are not clearly and explicitly presented in the project description. Please elaborate further on that aspect.

g)

g.1. Per Guidelines, the budget table is recommended in excel format. Please upload a budget in excel format so that we can check the calculations.

g.2. The total cost of the project inception, MTR and TE workshops is very high (\$294,000) and doesn't correspond to the sum of the cost of each individual workshop . Please clarify and amend as needed.

g.3. The travel costs related to organizational strengthening program for producers (\$240,000) and related with assessing training and awareness-raising needs of stakeholders (\$350,000) look very high. Please clarify.

g.4 The cost of the participation in workshops, business conferences, fairs, etc. also looks high (\$126,000) and doesn't correspond to the details provided in the description column (\$37,500; \$7,500/year; years 2 to 6). Please clarify and amend as needed.

g.5 In general there are many mis-categorization, please revisit all expenditure categories and use the correct categories which match with the detailed description, for example:

- a. Please categorize ?travel costs? as ?Travel? but not ?Equipment? or ?Grants?.
- b. Please categorize ?project audit? as ?Other operating costs? but not ?Sub-contract to executing partner?..?
- c. Please categorize ?workshops, training and meetings? as such but not as ?Contractual services-Individual/company?.
- d. Please categorize ?audio and visual equipment? as ?Equipment? but not as ?Training, workshops, meeting?.

g.6 The expense "Fuel and other materials to support PA management" should be more specific to ensure it is eligible. In particular, if this expense includes buying vehicles, please note that as per GEF guidelines, 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. The GEF Secretariat will assess such request and decide whether to approve it, based on following criteria: type of project, operating environment, contribution to achievement of project results, and share of costs covered by co-financing, among others. Please clarify (including how many vehicles in total) so that the GEF Secretariat can assess the request.

h) The description doesn't clearly explain how the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and include adaptive management. Please elaborate on this aspect.

i) No. The description is focussed on the project design elements and doesn't clearly mention the role of the stakeholders involved. Please clarify what will be the specific role of the each stakeholder in relevant components, ouputs, outcomes or activities.

j) As mentioned above, the gender consideration is very limited in the components description. As GEF Guidance, please ensure that the outputs and activities developed in the gender action plan are also integrated in the project document addressing the following:

j.1. Gender responsive mechanisms, frameworks and policies (e.g. Outputs 1.1.2. 2.1.1, 2.1.4, 3.1.1)

j.2. Meaningful and active engagement of women and women's organizations in capacity training, coordination platforms, and financial opportunities, Outputs 1.1.1 , 3.1.1, 3.1.4, 3.1.5;

j.3. Please ensure that all KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment, Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2;

j.4. Under M&E, ensure that gender dimensions are integrated, and during project implementation, that the PIRs, the MTE and the FE include an analysis and review of all dimensions of the GAP and relevant gender dimension of the project

k) Yes, cleared.

l)

I.1. While the baseline presents a comprehensive description of the various relevant laws and policies in the area, please also consider including information on the implementation of these laws and plans to give a better perspective of the current scenario. For example, are these laws being efficiently implemented? How can they be strengthened? How effectively are they being monitored? Are all the stakeholders (governmental and non-governmental) aware of and abiding by these laws? Such questions can help better frame the baseline and its implications for the area in developing a narrative for the project.

I.2. In addition, it will also be beneficial to understand further how this child project will interact with the different plans and government departments mentioned in this section and in the section on Institutional Arrangements. Where possible, please consider including the different governmental departments and policies that might be relevant to or involved in the different components and/or outcomes of the projects. The involvement of different departments can contribute to enhancing domestic/local policy coherence for forest conservation and environmental benefits in the area.

I.3. Along with multi-stakeholder platforms and policies/regulations at different levels, please also consider the development of cross-sectoral policies and cross-sectoral engagement between the different governmental departments for increased coherence in forest conservation, management, and use. Such platforms can enable the different departments to compare and align priorities as well as opportunities for peer-to-peer learning.

m) Yes, the specific levers of transformation are included in the project design. Cleared.

September 26, 2024:

a), d), f), g), h), i), j) and l) Thank you for the clarification, corrections and substantive additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

a.1 As suggested, information regarding the pathways of change has been updated Section B. Child Project Description of the CEO Endorsement Request (paragraphs 23 to 26).

a.2 LMT = landscape management tools; clarified in the text (paragraph 29 in the CEO Endorsement Request document).

d) The description of the components has been updated to reflect the structure of the Project Description Overview table and the concrete activities that will be carried out under each output has been included.

f) The following text was added in the Project Description in the CEO Endorsement Request to clearly describe the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project (paragraphs 72 and 73):

The Project generates various socio-economic benefits, primarily through Component 2, which refers to enhancing sustainable production and landscape restoration. This component will improve the conservation of the Amazon biome by implementing best practices in restoration and production. This will include comprehensive and sustainable management of forest and hydrobiological resources, biodiversity-friendly agricultural practices (BFAP), and climate-smart agriculture (CSA), among others, based on interculturality, ancestral, and local knowledge, with the support of the national and local government. Through this component, the project will provide technical and financial assistance in accordance with the principle of "Living Well in Harmony with Mother Earth". The project will support value chains of non-timber products (NTFP) and other economic activities (e.g., ecotourism) through production, marketing, research, and capacity building assistance. Producer organizations and other organized groups will have access to economic and financial incentives, improved market access, and new financial products for NTFP and other sustainable practices. The project will also foster ecosystem conservation and restoration by providing technical, financial, and non-financial assistance to de-risk finance for biodiversity/forest-friendly activities. Best practices and experiences in sustainable production and restoration will be systematized and shared with other stakeholders as part of Output 4.1.1 to promote replication and raise awareness.

With the project, at least 32 comprehensive sustainable production actions are under implementation with a gender approach. At least 1,326 (50% women) will be participating in training using the learning route methodology to implement best restoration and production practices. In addition, at least three sustainable production and diversification initiatives that improve food security and nutrition locally will be implemented. Thus, through these activities, the project will generate socioeconomic benefits by improving the income, food security, and organizational capacities of indigenous and rural families living in the Bolivian Amazon.

g.1 As indicated, the budget in Excel format has been uploaded to the Portal. The budget is uploaded in the Documents section, as the budget annex only accepts Word files.

g.2 Please note that the submitted table has been corrected as there was a formatting issue, therefore categories, description and amounts were moved to the wrong cells. This issue has been fixed and the attached budget should reflect the actual amounts with and MTR and TE workshops for a total of \$19,000.

g.3 Same as above.

g.4 Same as above.

g.5 Same as above.

g.6 The project does not include the purchase of vehicles with GEF funding; the description of the expense has been clarified as follows: ?Fuel for operating existing vehicles in the PAs/municipalities (cars and boats) and other materials to support the PA management, including patrolling and surveillance based on a prioritization analysis (\$143,910; \$7,995/PA; years 2 to 7).?

h) The project has been designed to ensure resilience to future changes by addressing drivers of biodiversity loss and forest and habitat fragmentation, in particular deforestation due to agricultural expansion and extensive cattle ranching, illegal activities such as logging, and climate change. The project design considers different future scenarios with changes in climate change and changes in demand for forest resources. The future with accelerated climate change is likely to see a significant increase in fires, shifting rainfall patterns, and heightened migration from the highlands to the Amazonian lowlands. These changes could undermine government planning and investment capacity in biodiversity conservation and climate change mitigation efforts. A future with slower demand for forest resources will lead to uncertain livelihoods for IPLCs, increasing pressure on intact forest and existing PAs (e.g., deforestation and forest degradation) as communities seek alternative and rapid economic solutions. This scenario could also result in heightened social conflict over access to forest resources and land. A future with slower climate change and higher demand for forest resources and economic growth will create opportunities to enhance ecosystem resilience through increased investment in strengthening PAs, OECMs, and connectivity, along with incentives to promote sustainable production. In addition, there is an opportunity for increased multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral dialogues, facilitating adaptation and ensuring enduring outcomes (paragraph 28 in the CEO Endorsement Request).

The project design focuses on strengthening conservation across various protection regimes (PAs, and OECMS) while enhancing sustainable and alternative production methods such as NTFP, ecotourism, agroforestry, sustainable livestock farming, and sylvopastoral systems. It also emphasizes diversification and ecosystem restoration to improve connectivity in the Bolivian Amazon. Additionally, the project addresses the reinforcement of governance and institutional frameworks and promotes multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral dialogues. This comprehensive strategy, outlined in the updated project description, aims to ensure resilience to the plausible futures summarized above and deliver enduring global environmental benefits.

i) The specific roles of each stakeholder in the relevant components, outputs, outcomes or activities are as follows (paragraphs 75-78 in the CEO Endorsement Request): a) Component 1 primarily focuses on strengthening biodiversity and forest conservation in the Bolivian Amazon by enhancing institutional and territorial capacities. The key stakeholders involved include municipalities and departmental governments, represented by their authorities and technical staff. Indigenous

peoples and local communities also play a crucial role through their participation in PA management committees. Additionally, other public institutions and CSOs contribute to these efforts. This component also aims to evaluate and implement innovative financial sustainability mechanisms, leveraging the successful experiences of key actors in the field, such as SERNAP-ABA mechanism, BDP loans, and ecotourism initiatives in the Eduardo Avaroa Andean Fauna National Reserve and Madidi National Park, among others.

b) The project outlines the involvement of various stakeholders in Component 2, which focuses on enhancing sustainable production and landscape restoration. This component engages both public institutions and local institutions and actors. Among the public institutions, the Ministry of Productive Development and Plural Economy, the Production Development Bank, and the Forest and Land Inspection and Social Control Authority play critical roles by providing technical assistance, implementing financial incentives, and regulating the use of NTFPs. NGOs also provide their technical expertise and information for sustainable production. Finally, Indigenous Peoples' Organizations and individual indigenous people are actively involved in initiatives for the restoration and management of natural resources. Producers' and Farmers' Organizations also play a key role in the implementation of activities for the sustainable production of Brazil nuts, acai, coffee, cacao, agroforestry, silvopastoral systems, BFAP, CSA, etc. Women will have a significant role in restoration and management initiatives, as evidenced by the indicators of this component. Detailed information on stakeholder roles is provided in the stakeholders' roles table.

c) Component 3 aims to enhance territorial governance and institutional frameworks for evidence-based planning, contributing to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the Amazon forests. This component will involve the participation of prioritized ministries and public entities (i.e. MPD, MMAyA, MDEyEP, BDP, APMT etc.), local authority members, Farmer Organizations, IPLCs (with gender approach) and international cooperation organizations. Also, the component will focus on strengthening economic actors as part of a sustainable value chain approach. This will help generate environmental and social benefits while ensuring stakeholder rights. The involvement of governmental authorities, local authority members, IPLCs, and the private sector will be essential for this component's success.

d) Component 4 will promote knowledge and learning as well as dialogue among various stakeholders. Knowledge sharing will consider the needs of the multiple stakeholders present in the target landscape (municipalities, PA managers, IPLCs, producers and harvesters of Amazon products, and women and the youth). In addition, the project will integrate scientific knowledge with indigenous and local knowledge by engaging key informants from IPLCs at the sub-landscape level. Key stakeholders (e.g., municipalities, subnational PA managers, IPLCs, producers and harvesters of Amazon products, and women and the youth), will benefit from knowledge management and training actions to strengthen capacity and coordination for improved integrated

landscape management and conservation in the Amazon through their participation in the Knowledge Management Platform of the ASL Program and other similar platforms.

j.1 In the descriptions of each component (par 29 to 65 in the CEO Endorsement Request), the actions outlined in the gender action plan have been integrated, ensuring that gender considerations are woven into the project's overall scope. This integration aligns with the results and activities established in the Project Results Framework. Specifically, the gender action plan has been incorporated into Outputs 1.1.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.4, 3.1.1, among others, to promote gender equity and inclusion throughout the project's implementation. This approach ensures that the project's outcomes are inclusive and consider the needs and perspectives of all stakeholders, particularly women and marginalized groups.

j.2 The components (par 29 to 65 in the CEO Endorsement Request), describe and highlight the actions considered in the gender action plan to promote the significant and active participation of women and women's organizations in the different participatory activities (i.e., decision-making, productive issues, access to income, development of management plans, access to technologies and innovation, and others).

j.3 and j.4 : Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 (paragraphs 64 and 65 in the CEO Endorsement Request) were updated to ensure that all KM and communications products feature good practices and lessons learned on gender mainstreaming/women's empowerment. In addition, the M&E Component now highlights activities aimed at including a gender approach in the framework of the GAP, as well as ensuring the inclusion of this approach in the various medium and long-term evaluations.

l.1 For a better perspective of the current scenario regarding the various relevant laws and policies in the area, the following information has been included as part of the description of Component 3 (paragraph 47 in the CEO Endorsement Request): ?The project will strengthen existing laws. Although laws and policies on protected areas and forests are in force and implemented, most were approved in the 1990s and do not align with the new constitution approved in 2009. Therefore, the project will develop technical standards to fill existing gaps. For example, the General Regulation of Protected Areas (from 1997) does not detail procedures for the creation and management of subnational areas and does not consider other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs). Thus, the project will establish standards relating to the strengthening and management of subnational PAs; create technical standards for other OECMs; and promote intergovernmental agreements so that Departmental Governments take responsibility for managing departmental protected areas. The same applies to the forestry sector, where the Forestry Law dates to 1996, and the project will support the development of technical standards for access to forest resources within the framework of this law, which will contribute to its implementation. Finally, it is worth highlighting that the project will support the implementation of the Law of

Mother Earth, approved in 2012, which encourages the integrated and sustainable management of forests, as agreements for sustainable management and conservation in Amazon communities are planned; this detail is in the Output 3.1.1 (Outcome 3.1). In all cases, the project will strengthen the capacity of environmental authorities (e.g., municipalities, subnational PA managers, and land use and planning staff), which will contribute to their implementation and more effective monitoring.

1.2 As suggested, different governmental departments and policies that might be relevant to or involved in the different components and/or outcomes of the projects have been included as part of the project description (par 29 to 65 in the CEO Endorsement Request).

1.3 The platforms to be developed and/or strengthened by the project will also promote cross-sectoral and cross-level engagement for decision making. While some platforms are local (e.g., Amazonian Fruits Platform, the Conservation Areas Network of Pando, the Departmental Agroecology Platform of La Paz, and the Indigenous Women Producers Platform of Concepción) others have a broader reach. For example, the Network of Municipalities with Protected Areas has a national scope with a multilevel participation (National, Departmental y Municipal Governments). This will allow aligning priorities as well as opportunities for peer-to-peer learning, the development of cross-sectoral engagement among multilevel entities in favor to forest conservation, management, and use. Additionally, with project support, a territorial platform will be created within the framework of the Joint Adaptation and Mitigation Mechanism. This platform will define cross-sectoral policies as it involves public entities from different sectors and levels, indigenous and farmer organizations, productive associations, other civil society organizations, and various actors from the project's intervention area. Activities 3.1.2.2 and 3.1.2.2 in par 52 of the CEO Endorsement Request were update to reflect this answer.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

- a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**
- b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?**
- c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).**
- d) [If a child project under an integrated program] Does the framework for coordination and collaboration demonstrate consistency with overall ambition of the program for transformative change?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2024:

a) Yes, cleared.

b) A letter from the OFP is uploaded to support executing functions undertaken by the GEF Agency such as procurement, recruitment, contracts... A justification is provided but we note in the OFP letter that the executive role of UNDP would be charged to the project budget with a 1% fee. This is not allowed as no direct projects support service costs should be charged to the GEF budget. Please amend as needed and confirm this fee will not be an expense in the budget table.

c) and d) Yes, cleared.

September 27, 2024:

b) We agree that each request for an exception to GEF policy to allow execution support, including the request from the government of Bolivia, can be assessed objectively on a case-by-case basis. Nevertheless, in other cases UNDP has been able to provide support covered by the Agency Fee. I have consulted internally here and would like to confirm that any execution support provided in the case of Bolivia should be limited and cover only specific, defined services that cannot be executed by the national partner due to capacity or regulatory limitations, e.g. financial transfers, procurement support, etc. We would expect the associated costs of providing such support to therefore be limited, and the administration thereof by UNDP covered by the Agency Fee. It should also be clear that the national executing entity remains the accountable party for execution activities under any agreement with UNDP. Please amend the budget accordingly and confirm this fee will not be an expense in the budget table.

October 25, 2024:

Thank you for the clarification and amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

b) UNDP considers that this is the most cost-effective option to provide support services to the Implementing Partner (i.e., Ministry of Development Planning of Bolivia) for the successful implementation of the project. The proposed amount to be charged to the budget is not a fee but the recovery cost for these support services. We would appreciate it if you could direct us to the specific GEF policy document that states agencies cannot charge execution support service costs (i.e., DPC) to the project budget.

UNDP response, 18 October 2024:

Thank you for your explanation. The budget has been amended accordingly and the fee (cost of support services to the Project Executing Entity) is not included as an expense in the budget table; the UNDP Country Office in Bolivia will cover these costs through co-financing.

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)? [If a child project under a program] Is the choice of core indicators consistent with those prioritized under the parent program?**
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 18, 2024:

1. Under the core indicator 1.2, the METT scores (Baseline at CEO Endorsement) are missing. Please complete.
2. The expected result for the core indicator 6.1 appears high considering the investment and we don't find the EX-ACT tool uploaded in the Portal. According to the Prodoc, such a high results comes from a decrease of forest degradation (forest management). Please 1- upload the EX-ACT tool so that assumptions and areas can be checked and 2- either demonstrate the capacity of the project to have such impact on forest degradation level or consider a more conservative approach lowering the expected impact.
3. Under the core indicator 4.5, the total of the areas reported is equal to 4,487,662.4 ha. This doesn't correspond to the 5,293,763.50 ha reported under the core indicator 4.1. Aren't them the same areas? If yes, then the numbers should be the same. If no, the 4,487,662.4 ha of OECM should be also reported under 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 or 4.4 where it is most relevant (in addition to the areas reported under 4.5).

September 27, 2024:

1. Some METT scores are still missing. Please complete or clarify why.
2. Thank you for the consideration and adjustment. The ambition remains relatively high due to the selected levels of forest degradation with the project. To be cautious in terms of achieving the results, the Agency may consider more conservative levels of degradation with the project such as below. The expected results can also be kept as they are now. Cleared.

Forest degradation level			Fire occurrence		Fire periodicity		Fire impact (% burnt)		Forested area (ha)			Total emissions (tCO2-e)		Balance		
Start	Without	With	Without (y/m)	With (y/m)	Without (year)	With (year)	Without	With	Start	Without	With	Without	With			
Large	Extreme	Moderate	YES	NO	1	8	60.0%	10.0%	254	254	D	254	D	43,514	-28,782	-72,296 ▼
Moderate	Large	Moderate	YES	NO	3	10	40.0%	0.0%	9,174	9,174	D	9,174	D	1,259,157	0	-1,259,157 ▼
Low	Moderate	Low	YES	NO	5	12	20.0%	0.0%	99,272	99,272	D	99,272	D	12,285,954	0	-12,285,954 ▼
Low	Moderate	Moderate	YES	YES	5	5	0.0%	0.0%	196,823	196,823	D	196,823	D	22,276,882	22,276,882	0
Low	Moderate	Moderate	YES	YES	5	5	0.0%	0.0%	1,552,394	1,552,394	D	1,552,394	D	21,413,902	21,413,902	0
Moderate	Large	Large	YES	YES	3	3	0.0%	0.0%	438,535	438,535	D	438,535	D	6,049,195	6,049,195	0
Large	Extreme	Extreme	YES	YES	1	1	0.0%	0.0%	17,314	17,314	D	17,314	D	238,831	238,831	0
Large	Extreme	Moderate	YES	YES	1	8	60.0%	10.0%	10,000	10,000	D	10,000	D	770,410	-329,815	-1,100,225 ▼

3. The strengthening/recognition of OECMs is an important element of the project and should be reported under the core indicator 4.5. Please complete this core indicator accordingly and report the same areas under the core indicator 4.1, 4.2, 4.3 or 4.4 where it is the most relevant (there is no double counting as the core indicator 4.5 is contextual).

October 25, 2024:

1. No, some METT scores are still missing. Please include all the METT scores **in the core indicators section of the Portal entry** or clarify if it can't be done for some reason. In addition, please note that we don't find a document named "GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Worksheet" uploaded in the Portal.

3. Thank you for the consideration. Nevertheless, 2 OECMs (Marka Cololo Copacabana Antaquilla and Takana III IT -Beni) don't have any number in terms of area (Total ha expected at CEO Endorsement). Please indicate the area of these OECMs or remove them if you don't expect any result for these OECMs.

October 28, 2024:

1 and 3. Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

1. Core indicator 1.2 was completed with the METT scores (Baseline at CEO Endorsement) for 18 subnational PAs.

2. Core indicator 6.1 the EX-ACT tool (excel file) was updated, and assumptions and areas were checked. According to the scenarios and the difference in values between emissions released and avoided, the new estimates indicate a reduction of 32,036,738 tCO₂e over 20 years. In addition, the EX-ACT tool has been uploaded in the Portal. Annex 12(2): GHG Calculations of the UNDP-GEF Project Document was updated accordingly.

3. Core indicator 4.5 was updated during the PPG and reported as 0 ha at Endorsement. Core indicator 4.1 was also updated during the PPG and reported as 5,293,763.5 ha of landscape under improved practices at Endorsement.

UNDP response, 18 October 2024:

1. All METT scores have now been included. Please refer to the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Worksheet.
2. Thank you for the comment; UNDP will take this into consideration during the implementation phase of the project.
3. As indicated, OECMs are now reported under Core Indicator 4.5 and included as part of Core Indicator 4.1. Please refer to the GEF-8 Results Measurement Framework Worksheet.

UNDP Response 28Oct2024

1. The project will only include 18 subnational PAs at Endorsement. The GEF-8 Core Indicators Worksheet has been updated to only include these PAs (see Annex 12 of UNDP's ProDoc for details).
2. The project will not include Marka Cololo Copacabana Antaquilla and Takana III IT ?Ben at Endorsement. Thus, these OECMs were removed from GEF-8 Core Indicators Worksheet (see Annex 12 of UNDP's ProDoc for details).

5.4 Risks

- a) **Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?**
- b) **Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?**
- c) **Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

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

b) [If a child project under an integrated program] Is the project adequately aligned with the program objective in the GEF-8 programming directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

a) and b) Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

1. On the role civil society will play in the project, we learn it is "Consulted only" and also "Co-financier". It can't be both at the same time. Also, won't the civil society be involved in any decision-making process on the project? Please clarify.

2. As the component description is limited, the role of the private sector is unclear. Please clarify in the project description.

September 27, 2024:

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

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

1. the role civil society will play in the project has been updated to "other?"; the project uses a broad concept of civil society, which includes indigenous peoples, local communities, NGOs, and other territorial actors. These actors are not part of the Steering Committee, although they will actively participate in the governance platforms provided for in Component 3. The "Consulted only" mark has been removed, and the "Co-financier" mark has been maintained as several NGOs have sent co-financing letters. All actors will coincide in the previously mentioned platforms since their objective is to strengthen and articulate territorial governance and institutional frameworks that favor agreements, policies, planning and monitoring, ensuring participation in decision-making for the conservation and sustainable use, and integrated management of the project landscape.

2. The project description has been updated clarifying the role of the private sector (Stakeholders Role table 47 of the CEO Endorsement Request).

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

8.3 Source of Funds

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 20, 2024:

1. In the co-financing letter of BDP, the support is said to be in-kind and not loans. Please correct in the table.
2. The 2 co-financing letters from ACEAA for the amounts of \$1,510,000 and \$1,000,000 are missing. Please provide the missing letters.

3. The co-financing letter from WWF Bolivia for the amounts of \$822,000 is missing. Please provide the missing letter.

4. Please indicate the exchange rate used for the co-financing of 20 million Euros from Embassy of Sweden in Bolivia.

5. Please replace "donor agency" to "other" for Embassy of the Republic of Germany in Bolivia and Embassy of Sweden in Bolivia as source of co-financiers.

September 27, 2024:

Thank you for the consideration and amendments. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

1. The support from BDP is indicated as loans in the corresponding table in the CEO Endorsement Request; it has also been updated in the Portal.
2. There is one co-financing letter from ACEAA indicating a contribution in the amounts of \$1,510,000 in grants and \$1,000,000 in-kind has been uploaded to the Portal.
3. Please refer to last paragraph of page 1 and to page 2 of the cofinancing letter from WWF Bolivia for information regarding the in-kind contribution in the amount of \$822,000.
4. the exchange rate of 1.07 used for the co-financing of 20 million Euros from Embassy of Sweden in Bolivia is now indicated in the Portal.
5. As indicated, "donor agency" to "other" was replaced for the Embassy of the Republic of Germany in Bolivia and the Embassy of Sweden in Bolivia as source of co-financiers; this was done in the CEO Endorsement Request and in the Portal.

Annex B: Endorsements

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 17, 2024:

Yes, the endorsement letter was uploaded at PFD. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 17, 2024:

Yes, the endorsement letter was approved at PFD. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

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

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

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

e)[If a regional/global coordination child project under an integrated program] Does the results framework reflect the program-wide result framework, inclusive of results from child projects and specific to the regional/global coordination child project? [If a country child project under an integrated program] Is the child project result framework inclusive of program-wide metrics monitored across child project by the Regional/Global Child project?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 17, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Documentation and Rating

8.8 Have the relevant safeguard documents been uploaded to the GEF Portal? Has the safeguards rating been provided and filled out in the ER field below the risk table?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 19, 2024:

As mentioned above, please upload a budget in excel format so that we can check the calculations.

September 27, 2024:

Thank you for uploading the budget in excel format. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNDP response, 16 Sept 2024:

Uploaded in the Documents section, as the budget annex only accepts Word format.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

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

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

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 29, 2024:

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above. In addressing the comments, please clearly indicate in the review sheet where the amendments/additions have been made and highlight them in yellow to facilitate the review (except for the description of the components which is easy to find).

September 27, 2024:

Not yet. Please address the remaining comments and consider the following:

1. In the Portal, please remove the highlighted yellow corresponding to the comments that have been addressed.
2. In addition, the Annex I "Responses to project reviews" is not complete. Please complete this Annex adding responses to Council comments at PFD stage that are relevant at country level. Please apologize for not having made this comment in the previous review.

October 25, 2024:

Not yet, please address the remaining comments AND complete the Annex I reponding to the Council comments as requested in the previous review.

October 28, 2024:

Thank you for addressing the remaining comments. The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

First Review	7/29/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	9/27/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/25/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/28/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		