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

GEF ID:	**4481**		
Country/Region:	**Bolivia**		
Project Title:	**Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Bolivia**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**4562 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Multi Focal Area**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**BD-1; BD-2; CCM-3; CCM-5; LD-1; CD-2; CD-5; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$0**	Project Grant:	**$4,166,667**
Co-financing:	**$6,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$10,166,667**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**May 01, 2011**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Danielius Pivoriunas**	Agency Contact Person:	**Nick Remple**

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes, Bolivia is eligible. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	2. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	Not applicable. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	3. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Cleared 3/23/2011	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	4. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	Yes, clearly described. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	5. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Yes, within agreed rules. 3/23/2011	
	6. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes. However, details should be provided about staff's capacity to implement the project including number of staff members that will be working directly. Additional information is requested.	

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

[1] Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only . Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

		3/23/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
Resource Availability	7. Is the proposed GEF/LDCF/SCCF Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, BD, CC and LD. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	• the focal area allocation?	Yes. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?	N/A Cleared 3/23/2011	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	• focal area set-aside?	N/A. Cleared 3/23/2011	
Project Consistency	8. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multi-focal area/ LDCF/SCCF results framework?	UA 03-14-2011 (for LD): Yes, aligned. Consistent and aligned. Cleared DP: 3/23/2011 BD, March 26, 2011: Aligned with BD results framework but please clarify what certfication system will be used for the productive landscapes. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	9. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal area/ LDCF/SCCF objectives identified?	Yes, properly identified. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	10. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, and NCSA?	Please make clear if there are inconsistencies with Plan Nacional para el Manejo Integral del Bosque (2008) which aims to promote the multiple functions of forests and improving the livelihoods of the poorest considering environmental services and climate change mitigation aspects. Also please clarify if this is consistent with Bolivia's UNREDD programme, FCPF, and any other national plans in terms of forest carbon and forest inventory and monitoring plans. BD, March 26, 2011: Yes aligned and supportive of the current NBSAP. Additional information is requested 3/24/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	11. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed will contribute to the	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: The proposal does not clearly articulate how capacities developed will contribute to sustainability	

	institutional sustainability of project outcomes?	of outcomes. Para. 42 addresses this and says Bolivia SGP has a positive track record concerning sustainability and includes securing long term financial support from national governments, etc., but this does not seem to be reflected by named organizational support in terms of co-financing in Table IC. Same with para. 57 which states there have been mutually beneficial long-standing relationships with national and community partners. If part of the issue is that previous work over 15 years by SGP has taken place in a totally different part of the country, saying that would help explain the apparent inconsistency. Additional information is requested. 3/24/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
Project Design	12. Is (are) the baseline project(s) sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	UA 03-14-2011 (for LD): The description of the baseline projects / baseline activities is not comprehensive. Bits of information are scattered throughout the PIF. Please present in a concise way. CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: Agree with UA comments. In addition, there seems to be inconsistencies in presented data. Paragraph 12 describes the predominant vegetation in the Gran Chaco as open dry woodland, then para. 13 says that Bolivian Chaco is a continuation of some plains. It is described as sparsely populated (para. 14) but if these land areas and populations are correct that is 17.6 people per sq kilometer. Then a major problem is deforestation (para 26). Although these descriptions are not necessarily inconsistent, it might help to be more specific about the Bolivian Chaco area. For instance, are the areas of deforestation open dry woodlands, or are there other forest types in this area of the Gran Chaco that are being deforested? The population density doesn't seem that sparse unless what is meant is that it tends to be bunched with	

		most people in a few towns and the rest of the area has a sparse population density. Please clarify. BD March 26, 2011 Please clarify the existing investments and baseline conditions of the four protected areas where the BD investment is being targeted. Additional information is requested. 3/23/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	13. Is (are) the problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: Changes in land use, including deforestation using uncontrolled burning for clearing for agriculture, is blamed for 83% of CO2 emissions, not for gathering of wood for fuel. (see para 26). Although biomass burning is mentioned in this paragraph, there is no discussion of the relative contribution of fuelwood collecting, charcoal production, and use to CO2 emissions. If properly implemented, burning wood for fuel can be sustainable, and is renewable. Please better describe the biomass burning problem. Is lack of access the only barrier to non-wood burning renewable energy alternatives being adopted? BD, March 26, 2011 Adequate. 3/23/2011 Additional information is requested. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	UA 03-14-2011 (for LD): The document refers to land tenure issues as one major driver of unsustainable land management. Securing land tenure is presented as a "long-term solution" in the text. This is welcomed and should be mentioned in the project framework, if possible with quantifiable targets. Further, the achieved land tenure security should be mentioned	March 26, 2011 By the time of CEO endorsement, please include status of species for the outcome indicators for the species management plans in the project logframe. In addition, please also include biodiversity status measures for the buffer zone land use plans that will

		under the socio-economic benefits of the projects. CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: The project framework mentions the use of biomass (see 2.1.2) as a renewable technology whereas para. 33 implies biomass energy is not renewable. Also, 2.1.2 mentions hydroelectric, and if dams have or will be built, reservoirs have GHG consequences too. Please be clear about the renewable technologies under consideration. Also in the text please give a few sentences describing what is being though of concerning these monitoring systems for measuring carbon stocks (2.2.3), for instance, how will these fit into UNREDD or FCPF plans? How will these systems be consistent with other monitoring plans in the area? The text (para. 38) indicates that these monitoring systems will pave the way to access "to REDD of PES incentives." Should that be "REDD or PES incentives"? Is there a reason not to say REDDplus instead of just REDD? BD, March 26, 2011 Please clarify what certification systems will be used for the certified landscapes and what area in hectares will be certified. Please include coverage in hectares of the two watersheds where ecosystem services will be valued. Please clarify how the land use plans for buffer zones are "mainstreaming" BD and how that will be measured. Please clarify what are the economic assumptions that permit the project to identify a likelihood of success for 20 livelihood projects given that the literature has noted for years the very small number of examples in development where these kinds of initiatives are actually economically viable. 3/23/2011 Additional information is requested.	mainstream biodiversity.

		Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	15. Are the incremental (in the case of GEF TF) or additional (in the case of LDCF/SCCF) activities complementary and appropriate to further address the identified problem?	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: The section on incremental activities and resulting benefits includes several paragraphs (Para 44 and 46) on other efforts, one a GEF project which is not listed as being under implementation yet in the GEF project management database (it has gone through CEO endorsement), and the other a government project which may be co-financing in the aforementioned GEF project. Perhaps these should be includes as baseline projects if this effort is incremental to them. Paragraph 48 is useful, but needs to clearly state that these listed benefits are due to incremental activities due to this project. 3/23/2011 Additional information is requested. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	16. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the global environmental benefits/adaptation benefits sound and appropriate?	UA 03-14-2011 (for LD): The estimations for land related benefits are unclear. Why are they so low? Even though the LD investment is only 10% in the SGP, more significant outcomes could be expected (see below). - 200 hectares of community land with sustainable agro-ecosystem management practices; - 100 hectares with improved vegetation cover through silviculture, reforestation and natural regeneration by local communities; - 20 hectares demonstrating soil erosion control. CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: Please provide an estimate of CO2 benefits from enhancing carbon stocks on the 100,014 ha. At this stage, using a documented credible per hectare default per hectare and multiplying is acceptable, but improvements to this estimate are	BD March 26, 2011 By the time of CEO endorsement, identify biodiversity status indicators for the four protected areas that will be tracked during the project. Alternatively, consider threat reduction indicators that will serve as a proxy for biodiversity status in the four protected areas.

		expected over the project as monitoring systems are developed. Also, is there a reason not to include carbon benefits in the certified production landscapes or protected areas? There is a mention of promoting ecotourism to help finance protected areas. Briefly discuss how the additional CO2/GHG emissions from tourism travel will be made climate friendly and not counteract additional carbon storage. BD, March 26, 2011 Please identify: 1) the certification system that will be used for productive landscapes, 2) the eight species plant or animal species that will be the target of the species management plans. Please also explain why these eight species have been targeted including the criteria that were used to select the eight species and why eight were chosen (why was eight deemed to be the right number and not more or less.) 3/23/2011 Additional information is requested. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	17. Has the cost-effectiveness sufficiently been demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?	Yes. However, additional information should be provided on how cost-effectiveness will be ensured in projects funded and what co-financing amount was attracted in the past. 3/23/2011 Additional information is requested. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	18. Is there a clear description of the socio-economic benefits to be delivered by the project and of how they will support the achievement of environmental/ adaptation benefits (for SCCF/LDCF)?	UA 03-14-2011 (for LD): As mentioned above, land tenure security, if achieved, should be listed. CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: The information in para. 49 would be more useful if some of the information was broken down by gender. Please address. 3/23/2011 Please provide additional information. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	

	19. Is the role of civil society, including indigenous people and gender issues being taken into consideration and addressed appropriately?	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: Indigenous peoples are mentioned appropriately in the many parts of the text, but they are not mentioned in the section on socio-economic benefits. Also please be clear in that section (such as in para. 50 and 51), that in addition to analyses to examine the roles of women and men and collection of data that allows gender disaggregation, that activities are targeted to benefit women. 3/23/2011 Please provide additional information. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	20. 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)	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: In terms of risk, what is the risk in terms of resistance to adapting new renewable energy technologies? If it is likely low, then that is fine, not reason to include it in the list. I would think it may not be low. 3/23/2011 Please provide additional information. Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	21. Is the provided documentation consistent?	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: Several of the other comments identified inconsistencies, so dealing with those comments is needed for consistency. SGP is targeting CSOs and CBOs. However, the project objective excludes CSOs, while in the text NGOs are mentioned. Please provide additional clarification. Additional information is requested. 3/23/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	22. Are key stakeholders (government, local authorities, private sector, CSOs, communities) and their respective roles and involvement in the project identified?	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: Some key stakeholders are mentioned, but others are generically mentioned. More specifics are expected by CEO endorsement. Cleared. 3/24/2011	

	23. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	CC/LH/Mar 23 2011: Please describe how carbon inventory and monitoring, and other forest carbon management activities will be coordinated with UNREDD and FCPF. Also, how will this project be coordinated/differ from the UNDP GEF4 project in Bolivia entitle "Biodiversity Conservation through SFM by local communities", which has not yet passed through CEO endorsement? The GEF project "Sustainable Forest Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco Americano Ecosystem" co-implemented by UNDP is listed in our records as not having started implementation yet. Please clarify. Additional information is requested. 3/24/2011 Clarification provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	24. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate. However, total number of projects that will be supported should be provided including details on operational framework, reporting and tracking to be used to track results achieved. Please provide also a number of staff that will be directly working on this project. Additional information is requested. 3/23/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	25. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	26. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
	27. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Yes, appropriate. Cleared 3/23/2011	
	28. Is the GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding per objective appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs according to the	Yes, appropriate. Cleared 3/23/2011	

Project Financing	incremental/additional cost reasoning principle?		
	29. Comment on indicated cofinancing at PIF. At CEO endorsement, indicate if cofinancing is confirmed.	Cash co-financing should be significantly increased including from implementing agency. Additional information is requested. 4/5/2011 Additional cash co-financing provided. Cleared. 4/8/2011	
	30. Is the budget (GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding and co-financing) per objective adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes, adequate. Cleared 4/5/2011	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	31. Has the Tracking Tool been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?	Not provided. Please provide relevant framework. Additional information is requested. 3/23/2011 Information provided. Cleared 4/5/2011	
	32. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	33. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**34. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	Additional information is requested. 3/24/2011 Additional information is provided. However, further details on co-financing should be provided before the project is technically cleared. 4/5/2011 The project is technically cleared and recommended for CEO clearance. 4/8/2011	
	35. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		

Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	36. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	37. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 24, 2010	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 05, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 08, 2011	

* 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.