



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>4577</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Bolivia</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agro-biodiversity to Improve Human Nutrition in Five Macro Eco-regions</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>FAO</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Biodiversity</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$2,600,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$6,050,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$8,650,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>November 01, 2011</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Jaime Cavalier</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Charles Riemenschneider</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	July 27, 2011 Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	July 27, 2011 Yes.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	July 27, 2011 FAO has a clear comparative advantage in the areas of agriculture and agrobiodiversity.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency	July 27, 2011	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	capable of managing it?	NA.	
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify how many FAO staff are in the country office in Bolivia with the necessary agricultural expertise and how many of them will be dedicated to the delivery of this project.</p> <p>9-02-11 (Review by JC)</p> <p>Since FAO will not execute any parts of this project, what institution has the installed capacity in Bolivia to carry out the laboratory analysis for nutritional content and genetic erosion trends, and the laboratory/field tests for resistance to climate variability? Thanks,</p> <p>9-15-11 This issue was properly addressed in the Response to Comments to GEFSEC. Cleared</p>	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>NA</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	July 27, 2011 NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	July 27, 2011 NA	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	July 27, 2011 Yes.	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	July 27, 2011 Yes.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	July 27, 2011 Yes, aligned with NBSAP and various Articles of the new state Constitution.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	July 27, 2011 No, please clarify.  In addition, GEF has invested considerable amounts in agrobiodiversity conservation in Bolivia through IADB, FAO and UNEP, however, no mention is made in the document how capacity built through these previous and ongoing investments is being leveraged in this project.  9-02-11  Under Component 4 (Awareness raising and capacity building), there are no	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>investments in the individual and institutional capacities to deliver the outputs of Component 1. This implies that Bolivia has the necessary capacity to do that. Is that correct? See comment under item 5.</p> <p>Is this project building any "durable individual or institutional capacity" that can support the sustainability of the outputs and outcomes of this project?</p> <p>9-15-11 This issue was properly addressed in the Response to Comments to GEFSEC. Cleared</p>	
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify this section as it is confusing.</p> <p>A number of baseline projects are presented which the GEF investment is meant to complement and build upon. However, in the text, the document notes that these baseline projects will provide cofinancing to the GEF project, thereby undermining the notion that these are baseline investments and actually decreasing the amount of the baseline investments. True cofinance would be new monies that were used to help implement the GEF alternative. Therefore, this money is actually not cofinance but rather it is baseline investments that are being re-purposed. Please revise accordingly.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>9-01-11 Please confirm that the co-financing projects listed under C (p.3) will provide new funding in support of the GEF activities. The fact that all sources of co-financing (totalling \$6.05 million) are included in the results framework, suggest that this is the case. If the GEF project is not building on activities of these projects, they should be listed as "funding in parallel".</p> <p>9-15-11 This issue was properly addressed in the Response to Comments to GEFSEC. Cleared</p>	
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Activities under component one should have less investment from GEF given that this component will be generating mainly national benefits. The development and of this database should receive larger amount of support from national sources of funding and cofinance.</p> <p>9-1-11 Co-financing reallocated to this project and explanation provided on the GEBs.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		Cleared	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>No comments will be provided on the project framework until a final version is presented. There is a great deal of variance between the document version submitted by FAO and the PDF version submitted by FAO.</p> <p>9-1-11</p> <p>Please clarify the following.</p> <p>Component 1. i) "Resistance to climate change" and "genetic erosion trends" are mentioned without any development. Please clarify what they actually mean, and if there is the institutional capacity to run these analyses in Bolivia. What are the names of the 3-5 targets? With so much baseline information, this should be available at PIF stage.</p> <p>Component 2. Please clarify the relationship between the "Participatory Market Approach" and agro-biodiversity-friendly and nutritional labels, with the efforts made by the Bolivian Government over the last decade (p.6). What happened to those programs and how is this new investment different? Please clarify if this project will develop action plans for</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>in-situ conservation afresh or if the project will be using existing program and facilities on the ground.</p> <p>Component 3. What is the nature of the "Multi-sectoral Coordination Platform"? Is this a new government structure or an existing one?</p> <p>9-15-11 This issue was properly addressed in the Response to Comments to GEFSEC. Cleared</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Given the submission of two different PIFs, comments here may change once FAO submits one PIF.</p> <p>Based on the document PIF, the global environmental benefits of the systematic information on food sources is actually predominantly a local and national benefit therefore please correct.</p> <p>Based on the document PIF, generation of local income is not a global benefit, please correct.</p> <p>Based on the document PIF, increased awareness of the nutritional benefits of agrobiodiversity is not a global benefit, given that this awareness will likely remain in the project area.</p> <p>9-1-11 Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	July 27, 2011  Yes.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	July 27, 2011  Yes.  Please translate all the Spanish names of the organizations into their English equivalents in Section B.5.  9-1-11 Cleared	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	July 27, 2011  Yes, at PIF stage.  However, a fully developed set of activities on how climate resiliency will be taken into account, particularly under in-situ conservation activities funded under component two, will be taken into account should be presented at CEO endorsement and fully designed during the PPG phase.  9-1-11 Cleared	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	July 27, 2011  UNEP, FAO and IADB are all active in Bolivia in the area of agrobiodiversity and the PIF does not adequately explain	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>how this new investment will take advantage of the existing investment and capacity being developed and how this new investment will be coordinated at a technical level. As presented, it appears that all of these activities are simply running parallel to each other with no coordination and this is not acceptable given the level of activity that is ongoing. Very generic text is presented in the document about coordination that says very little of substance.</p> <p>Please present in the PIF a viable and substantive plan for ensuring coordination and sharing of experiences and lessons with the other projects in the GEF agrobiodiversity portfolio in Bolivia.</p> <p>9-1-11 Addressed in the revised PIF and response to comments from GEF. Cleared</p>	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify the role of the FAO office in Bolivia with regards to implementation and execution.</p> <p>9-1-11 Cleared</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Please provide a full and detailed justification of the project management cost which exceeds 10% of the total project budget and within which the GEF contribution exceeds 10% of the GEF contribution to the overall budget. This is particularly suprising given that FAO has a country office in Bolivia and is managing three ongoing projects which have allocated \$4 million in "cofinance" from three baseline projects. Our assumption would be that there should be considerable opportunities for cost-savings on project management given that FAO is managing all of these initiatives. Please clarify.</p> <p>9-1-11 Following on the communication from GEFSEC subject "Project Management Cost" (June 17, 2011), project management costs shall not exceed 5% of the total grant for projects requesting GEF grants of \$2 million and above. Please adjust accordingly.</p> <p>9-15-11 This issue was properly addressed in the Response to Comments to GEFSEC. Cleared</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Please see comment above on Component One where the GEF is paying too much of a share for what is mostly a national and local benefit. Please revise.</p> <p>9-1-11 Cleared</p>	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>Please clarify whether the Government financing is in-kind or cash.</p> <p>Please see comments above about the use of baseline project funding for cofinancing and provide the requested clarifications.</p> <p>9-1-11 See new comments on co-financing under item 11. Thanks.</p> <p>9-15-11 This issue was properly addressed in the Response to Comments to GEFSEC. Cleared</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>July 27, 2011</p> <p>This is not clear at present, given that the cofinancing is coming from already funded FAO projects that are being presented as the baseline projects as well. Upon clarification of this issue, the amount of FAO cofinancing will be analyzed.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>9-1-11 Please see comments under item 10. Thanks</p> <p>9-15-11 This issue was properly addressed in the Response to Comments to GEFSEC. Cleared</p>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	<p>August 27, 2011</p> <p>No, please address all issues noted above.</p> <p>Please send in only one PIF submission. GEFSEC recieved two PIFs one as a document and one as a PDF and they are not identical.</p> <p>The comments provided in this review sheet were made on the document file for the most part, not the PDF.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Given that the GEFSEC is not certain which is the actual submission, when the revised version is submitted an entire review will be done of the PIF and all sections may be revisited.</p> <p>Please check all spelling and grammar in the document and correct.</p> <p>9-1-11 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 5,10,11,14,23,25,and 26. Thanks.</p> <p>9-15-11 Yes. This PIF is recommended for clearance.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	August 27, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 01, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.

**REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL**

<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Decision Points</b>	<b>Program Manager Comments</b>
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	July 27, 2011  PPG will be reviewed once one PIF document is presented.
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.