REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project
TYPE OF TRUST FUND:GEF Trust Fund

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title:	Sustainable management of forest ecosystems in Amazonia by indigenous and local communities to generate multiple environmental and social benefits		
Country:	Bolivia	GEF Project ID:	5755
GEF Agency(ies):	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4743
Other Executing Partner(s):	Plurinational Authority for Mother Earth	Submission Date:	December 23, 2015
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management	Project Duration (Months):	60
Name of parent program (if applicable):	N/A	Agency Fee ($):	589,841

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK:

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Indicative Grant Amount ($)	Indicative Co-financing ($)
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation.	Output 1: Policies and regulatory frameworks for production sectors. Output 3: Certified production landscapes and seascapes.	GEFTF	1,792,829	3,351,541
	Outcome 2.2: Measures to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity incorporated in policy and regulatory frameworks.		GEFTF	1,792,829	5,027,312
LD-3	Outcome 3.1: Enhanced cross-sector enabling environment for integrated landscape management	Output 3.1 Integrated land management plans developed and implemented Output 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested Output 3.3 Appropriate actions to diversify the financial resource base Output 3.4 Information on INRM technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated	GEFTF	212,309	8,378,852
	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities		GEFTF	636,926	5,027,311
SFM/REDD-1	Outcome 1.3: Good management practices adopted by relevant economic actors	Output 1.3. Types and quantity of services generated through SFM	GEFTF	1,478,296	3,351,542
		Sub-Total		5,913,189	25,136,558
		Project Management (Including Direct Project Costs: $128,646)	GEFTF	295,659	1,256,828
		Total Project Cost		6,208,848	26,393,386

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK:

Objective: Forest ecosystems of Amazonia are managed by indigenous and local communities (TIOCs) to generate multiple environmental and local benefits that motivate the continued participation of local communities in their protection.						
Project Component	**Grant type**	**Expected Outcomes**	**Expected Outputs**	**Trust Fund**	**Indicative Grant Amount ($)**	**Indicative Co-financing ($)**
1: Enabling environment at national and regional levels in support of integrated and sustainable management of forests and life systems in Original Indigenous Peasant Territories (TIOCs)		Government and community-based actors have increased awareness of the concepts and determining factors of sustainable management of forests and associated life systems Government and community-based actors regularly dialoguing and coordinating their actions in relation to SFM Considerations of sustainable management of life systems incorporated and harmonized in principles and procedures for the development of Municipal Development Plans, Municipal Territorial Land Use Plans (PMOT) and General Plans for the Integrated Management of Lands and Forests (PGIBT) for application in the Amazon region Bi-departmental platform established covering the entirety of the two target departments, involving Departmental and Municipal Governments, CIRABO/CIPOAP, Private sector, APMT and other relevant entities of central Government, NGOs, Universities and technical schools ABT, APMT and departmental and municipal Governments participating in monitoring systems/applying indicators of the condition of the natural resources of relevance to the model of forest management promoted by the project. 1,600,000ha of other TIOCs elsewhere in the Bolivian Amazon covered by planning instruments and regulations that support SFM, as a measure of the indirect (replication) effect of the project Indicators of ecosystem function remain stable, as measured by: - Abundance and occupancy of Brazil nut disperser species remain stable - Population status of pollinator species - Numbers of animals hunted (by species) per unit of effort, as a measure of the population status of fauna populations - Indicators of ecosystem status as defined through knowledge dialogue between scientists and community members. - Quantities of Brazil nuts harvested per unit of effort.	**1.1: Institutional mechanisms and capacities at national and regional levels** support the sustainable management of life systems in TIOCs: a) Harmonized principles and procedures for territorial planning, and planning of forest management and life systems b) Consultative platforms and agreements at the regional level to support multi-stakeholder decision-making **1.2: Monitoring, systematization and communication of knowledge** including dialogue between the scientific community and indigenous actors: a) Agreed indicators of the biological and social sustainability of resource management, with baseline values, within a life systems approach b) Applied studies to generate key information necessary for the definition of resource management strategies c) Monitoring systems to support adaptive management at institutional and community levels d) Access to best practice and technical and conceptual knowledge	GEFTF	1,211,168	8,378,853
2: Integrated management of natural resources in TIOCs		TIOC communities have enhanced capacity for sustainable forest management and sustainable use of natural resources, including generation of forest-based sources of income: - 2,000 people have increased their income by at least 10%, as a result of adding value to	**2.1: Local/community-based institutions with technical and organizational capacities** to support sustainable forest/resource management a) Capacities for resource	GEFTF	4,702,021	16,757,705

		forest products, gaining access to improved prices and diversifying forest-based sources of income - 50 target communities with plans developed and implemented for the use and commercialisation of products, contributing to the sustainable management of the target forests - 300 families with access to sustainable sources of finance that allow the development of their businesses based on the use and sale of products, contributing to the sustainable management of the target life systems - Increases in the average prices received for selected forest products by community members, due to improvements in their capacities to add value and market, relative to control communities (Brazil nut 15%, Paiche 100%) 700,000 ha (61% of the total forest area in the target TIOCs) managed in accordance with PGIBTs, including areas where: - Extraction of products is within ecologically sustainable limits; - Timber is sustainably harvested; - NTFPs are actively managed (e.g. through thinning, assisted regeneration) - Measures are being actively taken to protect plant species of importance as alternative food sources for pollinators **and/or** - Conservation zones are established to protect ecologically sensitive areas or those under processes of recovery. creating conditions that will allow the avoided deforestation of 6,948ha of forest (and the consequent avoided emission of 2,560,894tC) in the 10 years following the project All four target TIOCs are covered entirely by PGIBTs (1,626,536ha) 1,147,643ha (total area of dryland, flooded and varsea forest) in the target TIOCs covered by effective provisions (norms and human/logistical resources) for the inspection and control of the target forests and life systems, based on traditional mechanisms for oversight and control, in coordination with central authorities 100% of the area of the target TIOCs where local stakeholders are applying local level holistic monitoring of forests and life systems 160ha (80 families) of cropping areas, and 500ha of savannah, with improved fire management due to establishment of Farmer Field Schools	management planning b) Capacities for resource governance c) Capacities to provide technical support to resource users and managers d) Capacities to provide or channel financial support to resource users and managers **2.2: Local communities with technical, organizational, marketing and financial capacities** required to carry out sustainable use and management of natural resources a) Plans for the sustainable extraction and marketing of forest products b) Capacities for adding value, product handling and processing c) Effective commercialization of selected forest resources from the TIOCs **2.3: Enhancement of regeneration** a) Low technology nurseries producing seedlings planted in understocked locations b) Pilots of alternative approaches to regeneration (e.g. direct sowing, transplanting of wildlings) **2.4: Instruments for planning and enforcement at community level** a) Plans at territorial, forest/life-system and community levels favouring SFM b) Regulatory and governance frameworks at local level **2.5: Sustainable agriculture and agroforestry practices in non-forest areas** a) Participatory models for learning and experimentation (e.g. Farmer Field Schools) b) Community capacities for meeting long term technical support needs			
				Sub-Total		5,913,189	25,136,558
				Project Management Cost	GEFTF	295,659	1,256,828
				Total Project Costs		6,208,848	26,393,386

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME ($)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier[1]	Type of Co-financing	Amount ($)
Government	Vice-Ministry of Hydrological Resources and Irrigation	In kind	3,343,420
Government	National Forest Fund (FONABOSQUE)	In kind	14,000,000
Bilateral	DANIDA"Integrated and Sustainable Management of Forests and Energy" Programme, including strengthening of the Joint Mechanism for Mitigation and Adaptation for the Integrated and Sustainable Management of Forests and Mother Earth	Grant	6,000,000
Bilateral	GIZ: "Proindigena" Programme	Grant	500,000
Bilateral	GIZ: Support Programme for the Initiative for the Reduction of Deforestation and the Integrate Management of Forests (PROBOSQUE)	Grant	2,162,220
GEF IA	UNDP	Grant	387,746
Total Co-financing			**26,393,386**

TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Fund	Focal Area	Country Name/Global	Grant Amount (a)	Agency Fee (b)	Total c=a+b
UNDP	GEFTF	BD	Bolivia	3,764,940	357,670	4,122,610
UNDP	GEFTF	LD	Bolivia	891,697	84,711	976,408
UNDP	GEFTF	SFM/REDD	Bolivia	1,552,211	147,460	1,699,671
Total Grant Resources				**6,208,848**	589,841	6,798,689

D. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	*Grant amount ($)*	*Co-financing ($)*	*Project total ($)*
Local consultants*	547,660	2,683,534	3,231,194
International consultants*	60,000	294,000	354,000
Total	607,660	2,977,534	3,585,194

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? No

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF

A.1 National Strategies and Plans:

1. The project remains fully aligned with relevant national strategies and plans, as described in the PIF. In addition to the information provided in the PIF, the Project Document now also makes detailed reference to the contribution that the project will make to the targets of the General Plan for Economic and Social Development in the Framework of Integrated Development and Living Well (known as the *Plan Quinquenal*) for the period 2015-2020, with which the project is fully compatible.

A.2 GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities:

2. No change in relation to the PIF.

A.3 The GEF agency's comparative advantage:

3. No change in relation to the PIF.

A.4 The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address

4. No change in relation to the PIF.

A.5 Incremental/additional cost reasoning

[1] The amount represents initial cash contribution for one site (only) for the first year. Also NCIP intends to provide (as yet unquantified) "in kind" co-financing through the services of its field offices. Please also see Section 4.3.3 on Government inputs in the Project Document.

5. There are no significant changes to the overall incremental/additional cost reasoning relative to that presented in the PIF. The following modifications have however been made to the proposed outputs:

- The outputs in Component 1 remain the same except for the former Output 1.1 c), which has been moved to become Output 1.2 b) (studies to generate information needed for resource management strategies) because it fits better here with issues related to monitoring, than with issues related to institutional mechanisms and capacities.

- In Component 2, the previous Output 2.3 is now further broken down into Outputs 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 to enable more emphasis to be placed on activities related to regeneration of forests, community planning and enforcement, as well as sustainable agriculture and agroforestry.

6. The cofinancing total remains exactly the same as in the PIF, however the distribution between cofinancing sources has been modified.

7. The indicators proposed in the PIF have been revised and expanded, and additional indicators have been added at objective and output level. The only significant modifications that have been made in the project's targets in relation to the PIF are as follows:

PIF Outcome	Indicators in the Results Framework, as Modified at CEO Endorsement	Explanation
PIF Component 1		
Improvements in capacity development and coordination indicators of key institutions (measures to be developed and baseline and target values to be determined during PPG phase)	**2.7:** Government and community-based actors with increased awareness of the concepts and determining factors of sustainable management of forests and associated life systems	Conceptual awareness, knowledge, dialogue and coordination were defined as key capacity requirements
	2.8 Government and community-based actors regularly dialoguing and coordinating their actions in relation to SFM	Separated out as a distinct indicator.
Stable populations of Brazil nut tree pollinators (e.g. Eulaema spp. and Xylocopa spp. and dispersers (Dasyprocta variegata or D. agouti) (baseline values to be determined during the PPG phase)	**O5.** Abundance and occupancy of Brazil nut disperser species remain stable	It was not feasible to determine baseline values of these indicators during the PPG stage; these will be determined at start-up, once methodologies have been validated and capacities developed.
	O6. Population status of pollinator species remain stable	
	O7. Numbers of animals hunted (by species) per unit of effort, as a measure of the population status of fauna populations	Introduced as a locally appropriate validation of indicator O7.
	O8. Trends in indicators of ecosystem status, as defined through knowledge dialogue between scientists and community members.	A more holistic indicator than O5-8, that provides the opportunity for knowledge dialogue between scientists and local communities and may be converted into a long term (post project) monitoring tool.
	O9. Numbers of boxes of Brazil nuts harvested per unit of effort remain stable	Introduced as a complementary measure of productivity and sustainability, which are assumed to be determined in part by pollinator and disperser populations.
Specific provisions for inter-sector coordination and integration in policy and planning instruments of key institutions, as measured by BD2, LD and SFM tracking tools	**1.1** Considerations of sustainable management of life systems incorporated and harmonized in principles and procedures for the development of the following instruments for application in the Amazon region: - Municipal Development Plans - Municipal Territorial Land Use Plans (PMOT) - General Plans for the Integrated Management of Lands and Forests (PGIBT)	The Tracking Tools are insufficiently specific to function as indicators in this regard. The indicator as now formulated lists specific instruments into which the provisions will be incorporated.
	1.2 Bi-departmental platform covering the entirety of the two target departments, involving: - Departmental Governments - Municipal Governments - CIRABO/CIPOAP - Private sector - APMT and other relevant entities of central Government	The Tracking Tools are insufficiently specific to function as indicators in this regard. The indicator as now formulated specifies the exact mechanism for coordination.

PIF Outcome	Indicators in the Results Framework, as Modified at CEO Endorsement	Explanation
	- NGOs Universities and technical schools	
	1.3 ABT, APMT and departmental and municipal Governments participating in monitoring systems/applying indicators of the condition of the natural resources of relevance to the model of forest management promoted by the Project.	The Tracking Tools are insufficiently specific to function as indicators in this regard. Monitoring systems/indicators were identified as a key set of planning instruments to which attention was required.
Increased budgets assigned to research, capacity development, planning and enforcement in support of TIOC SFM model	**1.4** Degree to which specific provision is made in budgetary instruments to support SFM in TIOCs	Broad categories of budgetary allocations have been defined in the *Plan Quinquenal*, which will have been approved by the time the project is CEO Endorsed. The project will therefore not be able to increase overall budgetary allocations, but can instead ensure that specific provision is made within these for issues of direct relevance to the TIOC SFM model.
Planning instruments and regulations applied to 100,000 ha of other ICCAs, as a measure of the indirect (replication) impact of the project	**O4.** 1,600,000ha of TIOCs elsewhere in the Bolivian Amazon covered by planning instruments and regulations that support SFM, as a measure of the indirect (replication) effect of the project	The close involvement of indigenous organizations in the project will create favourable conditions for them to act as channels for replication, allowing a more ambitious target to be set for this indicator (which furthermore relates to more easily achievable 'structural' issues rather than changes in resource management practices per se).
2,000 people in the 4 target ICCAs have diversified their means of life and generated increased revenues, through the diversification of the forest products used and sold and improvements in quality and efficiency in harvesting, processing and marketing, to sustain the integral management of the biodiversity resources.	**0.2:** 2,000 people have increased their income by at least 10%, as a result of adding value to forest products, gaining access to improved prices and diversifying forest-based sources of income	A quantifiable percentage increase in income has been included, in order to make the indicator more objectively verifiable.
	2.4: 50 target communities with plans developed and implemented for the use and commercialisation of products, contributing to the sustainable management of the target forests	These indicators have been introduced as measures of the marketing and value-adding capacities of local stakeholders, as complements to the impact indicator (O.2) on income levels; these will allow progress to be measured regarding the processes leading to increased income levels, and also regarding the development of the capacities required to sustain the income benefits in the long term.
	2.5: 300 families with access to sustainable sources of finance that allow the development of their businesses based on the use and sale of products, contributing to the sustainable management of the target life systems	
	2.6: Increases in the average prices received for selected forest products by community members, due to improvements in their capacities to add value and market, relative to control communities: - Brazil nut: 15% above prices received by control communities - Paiche: 100% above prices received by control communities	
PIF Component 2		
500,000ha in TIOCs, (including around 350,000ha of forest) are subject to landscape-wide planning, zoning and regulatory frameworks that provide for ecosystem sustainability and resilience, and	**O1.** 700,000 ha (61% of the total forest area in the target TIOCs) managed in accordance with PGIBTs, including areas where: - Extraction of products is within ecologically sustainable limits; - Timber is sustainably harvested;	PGIBTs are a newly-introduced instrument that provide for extractive and non-extractive management, and cover both forest and non-forest areas,

PIF Outcome	Indicators in the Results Framework, as Modified at CEO Endorsement	Explanation
promote the rights and abilities of indigenous communities to manage and use natural resources in a sustainable manner.(as recorded by BD2 tracking tool).	- NTFPs are actively managed (e.g. through thinning, assisted regeneration) - Measures are being actively taken to protect plant species of importance as alternative food sources for pollinators **and/or** - Conservation zones are established to protect ecologically sensitive areas or those under processes of recovery	
	2.1 All four target TIOCs are covered entirely by PGIBTs (1,626,536ha)	Process indicator of the coverage of planning instruments, required for the achievement of impact target O1.
	2.2 1,147,643ha (total area of dryland, flooded and varsea forest in the target TIOCs covered by effective provisions (norms and human/logistical resources) for the inspection and control of the target forests and life systems, based on traditional mechanisms for oversight and control, in coordination with central authorities	Process indicator of the coverage of governance conditions, required for impact indicator O1.
	2.3 100% of the area of the target TIOCs where local stakeholders are applying local level holistic monitoring of forests and life systems	Process indicator of the coverage of monitoring instruments, required for impact indicator O1.
Rates of deforestation and degradation of native forests (as recorded by LD3 tracking tool) reduced by 50%, due to improved governance and market-based incentives among indigenous communities, resulting in improved status of globally-important habitats, avoided deforestation of 8,250ha and avoided carbon emissions of 709,500tC (as measured by the SFM/REDD1 tracking tool)	**O1**This will create conditions that will allow the avoided deforestation of 6,948ha of forest (and the consequent avoided emission of 2,560,894tC) in the 10 years following the project	Given current deforestation rates and the expected lead-in time for project actions, it is unrealistic to judge project success by measurable levels of avoided deforestation during its lifetime. Instead the indicator is framed in terms of the creation of conditions (implementation of sound forest/life system management practices) that would allow such impacts to be achieved post-project. Reviews of deforestation data and carbon content of different land uses during PPG also led to adjustments to the avoided deforestation/emissions predictions.
125,000ha of communal non-forest lands in the wider landscape (out of a total of 496,396ha of non-forest land in the target ICCAs) are subject to sustainable management practices (e.g. diversified cocoa plantations and silvopastoral systems), as a result of technical support to community organizations.	**O.3:** 160ha (80 families) of cropping areas, and 500ha of savannah, with improved fire management due to establishment of Farmer Field Schools	PPG studies revealed fire to be the main threat to forests, arising from practices in the non-forest elements of the landscape. In the absence of hoped-for concrete cofinancing for technology transfer in the non-forest landscape, the target of 125,000ha was reviewed and considered to be unfeasible without diverting project actions unacceptably from its core focus on the management of forest areas. Actions will be concentrated in strategic "buffer areas" in order to maximize the effects of actions there in terms of reduced risks of fires entering forest areas. The participatory FFS approach will maximize the likelihood of future scaling up beyond these immediate target areas.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

8. Overall the risk analysis presented in the PIF remains valid. PPG analyses have however highlighted a number of issues of emphasis:

Risk	Risk of occurrence	Severity in the event of occurrence	Potential for mitigation	Risk mitigation strategies
Limited coordination and harmonization of approaches between State institutions at different levels	Medium	High	High	- Creation of mechanisms for inter-institutional dialogue and coordination, including the bi-departmental platform (see Output 1.1b). - Facilitation of information flow to actors at different levels and sectors, and promotion of communication between them in matters related to the project (see Output 1.2)
Limited buy-in by State institutions	Medium	High	High	- Development and implementation of communication strategy focusing on project potential to combine social and environmental benefits; the technical feasibility of the management approaches proposed; the capacities of local communities and their organizations; the potential of community-based initiatives to complement conventional approaches to NRM/ conservation; and systematizing and disseminating successful experiences.
Limited buy-in by members of local communities	Medium	High	High	- Extensive and effective consultation and participation during project design, involving existing indigenous organizations at regional and national levels. - Development and implementation of communication strategy (and corresponding instruments) to keep local stakeholders fully aware of the objectives and activities of the project, and of its potential to generate multiple social benefits - Development and implementation of strategy and corresponding mechanisms for stakeholder participation, taking advantage of existing mechanisms and including participation of stakeholder representatives in the Project Board and (as appropriate) local/regional advisory committees. - Direct involvement by local communities and indigenous organizations in the delivery of project outputs (subject to negotiation and capacity assessments during the PPG phase)
Market and price instability for NTFPs	Medium	High	Medium	- Developing of capacities for market intelligence among producer organizations at local, regional and/or national levels - Emphasis on diversified NRM and livelihood support options, including diverse NTFPs (see **Error! Reference source not found.**) to buffer against failures of individual products/elements
Climate change (affecting e.g. fruiting patterns of target NTFP species and increasing vulnerability of forest ecosystems to fire) and/or invasive species)	High	High	High	- Emphasis on diversified NRM and livelihood support options to buffer against failures of individual products/elements - Strengthening institutional and community-based capacities for monitoring and responding to effects of climate change on forest ecology, productivity and vulnerability - Working with scientific national and international institutions to forecast and prevent the damaging effects of climate change.
Hydrocarbon exploration	High (specifics to be defined)	Unclear	Medium/ high	- Strengthening of community-based capacities for analysis and decision-making - Diversification of productive options to insure against the potential impacts of petrochemical exploration on any one of them

A.7 Coordination with other relevant GEF-financed initiatives:

9. The *Programme for the Sustainable Management of Forests and Energy* (2014-2018) and the *Programme for Support to the Sustainable Conservation of Biodiversity* PACSBIO (2012-2018), which

constitute important elements of the project baseline (see paragraphs **Error! Reference source not found.** and **Error! Reference source not found.** of the Prodoc) will also be considered as co-financing, and the project will be closely coordinated with them in order to realize synergies, for example in relation to the strengthening of policy and institutional frameworks, capacities for management, promotion, enforcement, monitoring and evaluation, and the provision of long term interinstitutional technical assistance.

10. The GEF/UNDP project *SFM Biodiversity Conservation through Sustainable Forest Management by Local Communities* (GEFSec Project ID: 3971, GEF Agency Project ID: 4197) is being implemented in the area of the Vilcabamba-Amboro corridor, and is focused on strengthening processes of certification. The two projects will be complementary, given that the one proposed here is more focused on specifically strengthening TIOCs and their management capacities, as well as the development of an active dialogue between science and traditional knowledge regarding the use of natural resources on indigenous lands This project will be developed in an area located to the north and east of the area covered by project 3971, and furthermore includes activities in aquatic, as well as forest ecosystems.

11. The project will also be coordinated with the *Programme for Financial Support and Technical Assistance for the Conservation and Strategic Sustainable Management of Forest Resources in Pando* (COMSERBO Pando), implemented by the Autonomous Government of Pando Department, particularly in relation to the application of mechanisms for financial support to SFM for timber and NTFPs. Funding is currently being sought to extend the period of COMSERBO until 2019, to complement that provided by the Plurinational Fund. It will also be coordinated with the *Project for the Integrated Community-Based Territorial Development of Remote Communities in the Amazon* (funded by Japan and administered by the World Bank through FUNDESNAP), particularly in relation to the provision of support for productive initiatives within a framework of community participation and municipal land use planning.

12. The Implementing Agency UNDP also has wide experience with projects in support of sustainable forest management elsewhere in Latin America. Some lessons may be drawn from the project "Transforming management of biodiversity rich community production forests through building national capacities for forest certification" (PIMS 4015) in Mexico, on building national and international markets for timber products from sustainably managed forests, thus garnering economic benefits and incentives to reward sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation, while enhancing the capacity of forestry stakeholders to participate in this market. The GEF Small Grants Programmes, implemented by UNDP in different countries in the region (especially Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru) have also generated extensive and valuable experiences with sustainable forest management. A key difference between those projects and the one proposed here is that this one has a much broader focus: it aims at the sustainable management of a wide range of forest products in addition to timber, and recognises the multiple ways in which indigenous people value and manage their forests, which go beyond solely commercial motivations.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation

13. Table 1 summarizes the roles of the project's different stakeholders in its implementation.

Table 1. Stakeholder roles in project implementation

Stakeholder	Roles
UNDP	Implementing agency: channels GEF funds, oversees project implementation, carries out contracts and purchases; member of the Project Board.
APMT	Implementing Partner; president of the Project Board, and nominates the National Project Director; participates in the incorporation of aspects of life system sustainability and knowledge dialogue in procedures and instruments; coordinates processes of policy dialogue at national level, supports dissemination and facilitates meetings; supports the transparency of local processes associated with the project, including budget execution by local organizations. APMT will receive project funds to cover the travel costs (tickets and DSA) associated with the participation of the NPD in project supervision and oversight, and for workshops and other associated costs related to the role of the APMT, as Executing Agency, in coordinating processes of policy discussion at national level, as well as dissemination and systematisation.
ABT	Possible advisory participation in Project Board; participation (with support from the project) in the

Stakeholder	Roles
	incorporation of aspects of life system sustainability and knowledge dialogue in procedures and instruments; beneficiary of improved information flow in support of its roles in control and oversight.
CIRABO and CIPOAP	CIRABO will be a full member of the Project Board, in representation of the interests of local stakeholders; members of the inter-departmental platform/regional project advisory committee; counterparts of PMU members; beneficiaries of capacity strengthening in relation to the management and analysis of information, knowledge dialogue, monitoring and adaptive management, planning of resource/life system management, market intelligence, and identifying and channelling financial resources to benefit local communities and to ensure the financial sustainability of project outputs. Recipients of project funds to cover costs (tickets, subsistence allowance, stipends and workshop costs) directly associated with, and necessary for, the fulfilment of the roles of members in relation to the project.
TIOC representatives	Beneficiaries of capacity strengthening in relation to the management and analysis of information, knowledge dialogue, monitoring and adaptive management, planning of resource/life system management, market intelligence, and identifying and channelling financial resources to benefit local communities. Recipients of project funds to cover costs directly associated with, and necessary for, the fulfilment of the roles of members in relation to the project, and for the construction and/or purchase of items approved by the Project under budget line "72600 Grants".
Community-based technicians	Beneficiaries of capacity development on monitoring and knowledge transfer; responsible for knowledge transfer/dialogue with other community members, facilitation of local marketing initiatives for forest products, managing relations between local communities, the project and external actors, local facilitation of community-based processes, and field-level monitoring of life system indicators. Recipients of project funds in the form of travel costs and incentives.
Community representatives and leaders	Beneficiaries of capacity strengthening in relation to planning and governance of life system management; responsible for overseeing the distribution of external benefits among community members, control and oversight of compliance with community-based norms, and management and care of local observatories/resource centres.
Community assemblies	Responsible for the definition of norms governing the use and management of life systems, and decisions regarding the distribution of external benefits among community members; beneficiaries of capacity strengthening in relation to community-based decision-making.
Community members	Harvesting, processing and marketing of ecosystem products; beneficiaries of capacity strengthening on technical aspects of production and marketing.
Municipal and Departmental governments	Beneficiaries of capacity strengthening on planning processes; members of the inter-departmental platform/regional project advisory committee; support to productive processes, dialogue, governance and planning, and counterpart financing.
Academic institutions (universities, technical institutes, research centres), NGOs, and individual researchers	Conduct of studies under trilateral agreements with the project and the target TIOCs, with funding provided by the project. Local universities (UAB, UAP etc.) and/or NGOs will provide training courses to members of local organizations with funding provided by the project. Members of the *ad hoc* technical advisory group
Ministry of Environment and Water (MMyA)	Members of the Project Board and the *ad hoc* technical advisory group
Ministry of Planning	Members of the Project Board (to be confirmed) and the *ad hoc* technical advisory group
Ministry of Rural Development and Lands	Members of the Project Board (to be confirmed) and the *ad hoc* technical advisory group
INIAF, IBIF, SENASAG	Members of the *ad hoc* technical advisory group

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels; gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environmental benefits

14. The project will result in the generation of direct socioeconomic benefits for local communities, especially indigenous peoples, by developing capacities and an enabling framework for the sustainable extractive management of their forests and associated life systems. This will result in increases in forest-based income from the sale of NTFPs; the project will promote gender equity and women's participation and empowerment in decision-making and control of the factors of production, enabling them to realize opportunities for obtaining social and economic benefits from participation in processing and marketing activities. The promotion of community-based SFM will generate other, indirect benefits, helping indigenous communities to reassert ownership and occupancy rights over forests, thus contributing to consolidating and stabilizing their sociocultural capital in the face of risks of encroachment and undermining by external actors.

15. In concrete terms, it is expected that by the end of the project 2,000 people will have increased their income by at least 10%, as a result of adding value to forest products, gaining access to improved prices and diversifying forest-based sources of income. The project will take steps to maximize the benefits of such initiatives for women and to safeguard against the risk of generating unintended negative impacts.

16. The project will preferentially support productive activities with potential to generate particular benefits for women, as defined by the women's groups themselves. Again subject to consultation with women, preference will be given to marketing through women's groups, in order to reduce the risk of revenues being captured and controlled by male members of the family as may happen when sales are family-based. Each productive option will be analyzed with the participation of the target women in order to identify and guard against the risk of unintended negative consequences such as competition with other activities of social or economic importance to women; in general, forest fruit tend to be produced during times of the year when there are few other such activities.

B.3 Explain how cost-effectiveness if reflected in the project design

17. Cost-effectiveness will be promoted through a range of strategies, including the following:

- **Selection of target sites:** the selection of four contiguous TIOCs, with favourable conditions of social organization and tenure, will facilitate the cost-effective implementation of the model of community-based forest management, and thereby the generation of lessons on best practice suitable for adaptation and replication in other more scattered sites post-project: the model of forest management that is proposed here is directly replicable to other sites in the north of Bolivia where Brazil nut is native, as well as elsewhere in its native range (see **Error! Reference source not found.** in the Prodoc), and to other sites nationwide and beyond containing other species that lend themselves to such forms of sustainable extractive management;
- **Community-based technicians:** the involvement of appropriately-compensated technicians, drawn from local communities, selected by their members and trained by the "in-house" technicians attached to the project team ("training of trainers"), will be a cost-effective way of maximizing the number of communities covered by the project's actions in support of knowledge transfer.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN

Project start:

18. A Project Inception Workshop will be held within the first 2 months of project start with those with assigned roles in the project organization structure, UNDP country office and where appropriate/feasible regional technical policy and programme advisors as well as other stakeholders. The Inception Workshop is crucial to building ownership for the project results and to plan the first year annual work plan. The Inception Workshop will address a number of key issues including:

a) Assist all partners to fully understand and take ownership of the project. Detail the roles, support services and complementary responsibilities of UNDP CO and RCU staff vis à vis the project team. Discuss the roles, functions, and responsibilities within the project's decision-making structures, including reporting and communication lines, and conflict resolution mechanisms. The Terms of Reference for project staff will be discussed again as needed.
b) Based on the project results framework and the relevant GEF Tracking Tool if appropriate, finalize the first annual work plan. Review and agree on the indicators, targets and their means of verification, and recheck assumptions and risks.
c) Provide a detailed overview of reporting, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) requirements. The Monitoring and Evaluation work plan and budget should be agreed and scheduled.
d) Discuss financial reporting procedures and obligations, and arrangements for annual audit.
e) Plan and schedule Project Board meetings. Roles and responsibilities of all project organisation structures should be clarified and meetings planned. The first Project Board meeting should be held within the first 12 months following the inception workshop.

19. An Inception Workshop report will be a key reference document and will be prepared and shared with participants to formalize various agreements and plans decided during the meeting.

Quarterly:

- Progress made shall be monitored in the UNDP Enhanced Results Based Management Platform.
- Based on the initial risk analysis submitted, the risk log shall be regularly updated in ATLAS. Risks become critical when the impact and probability are high. Note that for UNDP GEF projects, all financial risks associated with financial instruments such as revolving funds, microfinance schemes, or capitalization of ESCOs are

automatically classified as critical on the basis of their innovative nature (high impact and uncertainty due to no previous experience justifies classification as critical).
- Based on the information recorded in Atlas, a Project Progress Reports (PPR) can be generated in the Executive Snapshot.
- Other ATLAS logs can be used to monitor issues, lessons learned etc... The use of these functions is a key indicator in the UNDP Executive Balanced Scorecard.

Annually:

- Annual Project Review/Project Implementation Reports (APR/PIR): This key report is prepared by the Project Coordinator to monitor progress made since project start and in particular for the previous reporting period (30 June to 1 July). The APR/PIR combines both UNDP and GEF reporting requirements.

20. The APR/PIR includes, but is not limited to, reporting on the following:

- Progress made toward project objective and project outcomes - each with indicators, baseline data and end-of-project targets (cumulative)
- Project outputs delivered per project outcome (annual).
- Lesson learned/good practice.
- AWP and other expenditure reports
- Risk and adaptive management
- ATLAS QPR
- Portfolio level indicators (i.e. GEF focal area tracking tools) are used by most focal areas on an annual basis as well.

Periodic Monitoring through site visits:

21. UNDP CO and the UNDP RCU will conduct visits to project sites based on the agreed schedule in the project's Inception Report/Annual Work Plan to assess first hand project progress. Other members of the Project Board may also join these visits. A Field Visit Report/BTOR will be prepared by the CO and UNDP RCU and will be circulated no less than one month after the visit to the project team and Project Board members.

Mid-term of project cycle:

22. The project will undergo an independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (insert date). The Mid-Term Evaluation will determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and will identify course correction if needed. It will focus on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; will highlight issues requiring decisions and actions; and will present initial lessons learned about project design, implementation and management. Findings of this review will be incorporated as recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term. The organization, terms of reference and timing of the mid-term evaluation will be decided after consultation between the parties to the project document. The Terms of Reference for this Mid-term evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF. The management response and the evaluation will be uploaded to UNDP corporate systems, in particular the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the mid-term evaluation cycle.

End of Project:

23. An independent Final Evaluation will take place three months prior to the final Project Board meeting and will be undertaken in accordance with UNDP and GEF guidance. The final evaluation will focus on the delivery of the project's results as initially planned (and as corrected after the mid-term evaluation, if any such correction took place). The final evaluation will look at impact and sustainability of results, including the contribution to capacity development and the achievement of global environmental benefits/goals. The Terms of Reference for this evaluation will be prepared by the UNDP CO based on guidance from the Regional Coordinating Unit and UNDP-GEF.

24. The Terminal Evaluation should also provide recommendations for follow-up activities and requires a management response which should be uploaded to PIMS and to the UNDP Evaluation Office Evaluation Resource Center (ERC). The relevant GEF Focal Area Tracking Tools will also be completed during the final evaluation.

25. During the last three months, the project team will prepare the Project Terminal Report. This comprehensive report will summarize the results achieved (objectives, outcomes, outputs), lessons learned, problems met and areas where results may not have been achieved. It will also lay out recommendations for any further steps that may need to be taken to ensure sustainability and replicability of the project's results.

Learning and knowledge sharing:

26. Results from the project will be disseminated within and beyond the project intervention zone through existing information sharing networks and forums. The project will identify and participate, as relevant and appropriate, in scientific, policy-based and/or any other networks, which may be of benefit to project implementation though lessons learned. The project will identify, analyze, and share lessons learned that might be beneficial in the design and implementation of similar future projects. Finally, there will be a two-way flow of information between this project and other projects of a similar focus.

PART III: ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT AND GEF AGENCY

A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT: (Please attach the Operational Focal Point endorsement letter(s) with this template).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE *(MM/dd/yyyy)*
Ms. Analiza Rebuelta- Teh	GEF OFP	Department of Environment and Natural Resources	13/08/2013

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF criteria for project identification and preparation.					
Agency Coordinator, Agency name	**Signature**	**Date (MM/dd/yyyy)**	**Project Contact Person**	**Telephone**	**Email Address**
Adriana Dinu, UNDP-GEF Executive Coordinator.		December 23, 2015	Jose Vicente Troya, Regional Technical Advisor, Biodiversity	+507-302-4636	Jose.troya@undp.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

SECTION II: STRATEGIC RESULTS FRAMEWORK AND GEF INCREMENT

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks and assumptions
Objective: Forest ecosystems of Amazonia are managed by indigenous and local communities (TIOCs) to generate multiple environmental and local benefits that motivate the continued participation of local communities in their protection.	**O1.** Area of forest in the target TIOCs[2] subject to sustainable management, including: - Limitation of the extraction of fauna and NTFPs to ecologically sustainable levels; - Thinning and enrichment planting to promote the regeneration of target species and/or the pollinators on which they depend; - Respect of ecologically sensitive zones (for example where ecologically important species are under processes of recovery)	All of the forest (1,147,643ha) is subject to varying levels and types of extraction (Brazil nut principally in the 933,463ha of high forest).	- 700,000 ha (61% of the total forest area in the target TIOCs) managed in accordance with PGIBTs, and where as a consequence: - Extraction of products is within ecologically sustainable limits; - Timber is sustainably harvested; - NTFPs are actively managed (e.g. through thinning, assisted regeneration) - Measures are being actively taken to protect plant species of importance as alternative food sources for pollinators **and/or** - Conservation zones are established to protect ecologically sensitive areas or those under processes of recovery. - This will create conditions that will allow the avoided deforestation of 6,948ha of forest (and the consequent avoided emission of 2,560,894tC) in the 10 years following the project (see explanation in Table below)	TIOC monitoring systems (to be established and/or strengthened with Project support)	**Assumptions:** Climate change stresses do not exceed coping ranges of ecosystem management and livelihood support strategies. Market prices for ecosystem products remain favourable for their profitability. External (social or economic) pressures do not undermine social capital, ecosystem governance or the relative attractiveness of sustainable ecosystem management as opposed to deforestation
	O2. Numbers of people in the 4 target TIOCs who have increased their levels of income due to their participation in the sustainable management of forests	Average family income in the target TIOCs is US$6,347, of which US$3,999 (63%) is from forest- and tree-based products	- 2,000 people have increased their income by at least 10%, as a result of adding value to forest products, gaining access to improved prices and diversifying forest-based sources of income	Questionnaires and/or focus groups	

[2] The total area of the 4 target TIOCs is 1,626,536ha, including 67 communities

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks and assumptions
	and life systems, without affecting the diversity and sustainability of their livelihoods.				
	O3. Area of non-forest land in the TIOCs and adjacent areas subject to sustainable management practices	The target TIOCs contain 4619ha of anthropic (rainfed cropping) land and 420,932ha, all of which is subject to unsustainable management in the form of periodic fires that pose a threat to adjoining forests	160ha (80 families) of cropping areas, and 500ha of savannah, with improved fire management due to establishment of Farmer Field Schools	M&E systems of partners providing technical assistance directly to producers	
	O4. Area of other TIOCs covered by planning instruments and regulations that support SFM, as a measure of the indirect (replication) effect of the project	Dispersed initiatives of planning in a number of TIOCs	1,600,000ha elsewhere in the Bolivian Amazon	Interviews with representatives of other TIOCs, review of instruments	
	O5. Abundance and occupancy of Brazil nut disperser species	Baseline values to be determined at project start	Values remain stable	Field surveys (transects) with direct sightings and records of tracks, carried out by community-based technicians	
	O6. Population status of pollinator species	Baseline values to be determined at project start	Values remain stable	Methodologies to be validated ay project start	
	O7. Numbers of animals hunted (by species) per unit of effort, as a measure of the population status of fauna populations	Baseline values to be determined at project start	Values remain stable	Interviews with community members	
	O8. Trends in indicators of ecosystem status, as defined through knowledge dialogue	- Indicators and baseline values to be determined at project start through	Values remain stable	To be determined	

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks and assumptions
	between scientists and community members.	knowledge dialogue between scientists and community members.			
	O9. Numbers of boxes of Brazil nuts harvested per unit of effort	Average daily harvest of Brazil nut per person (kg): - Father 57.5 - Mother 34.5 - Older son 34.5 - Older daughter 11.5 - Younger son 5.75	Daily per capita harvest quantities remain at least stable	Interviews with community members	
Outcome 1: Enabling environment at national and regional levels in support of integrated and sustainable management of forests and life systems in Original Indigenous Peasant Territories (TIOCs)	**1.1.** Degree of development, harmonization and application of principles and procedures for territorial planning at regional, landscape and TIOC levels, to optimize the delivery of environmental and social benefits	Plans provide for the concept of life systems in general terms, but do not specifically incorporate harmonized principles and procedures for the application of the concept	Considerations of sustainable management of life systems incorporated and harmonized in principles and procedures for the development of the following instruments for application in the Amazon region: - Municipal Development Plans - Municipal Territorial Land Use Plans (PMOT) - General Plans for the Integrated Management of Lands and Forests (PGIBT)	Review of instruments, interviews with responsible institutions	**Assumptions:** Receptiveness of key institutions to conceptual inputs and inter-institutional coordination
	1.2. Numbers of actors participating actively in consultative platforms at the regional level in support of multi-stakeholder decision-making regarding forest management and life systems (e.g. locations and nature of institutional investments in social, productive and/or infrastructural development, provisions of environmental regulations)	No formal consultative mechanism meeting on a regular basis, with a landscape/inter-departmental vision	Bi-departmental platform covering the entirety of the two target departments, involving: - Departmental Governments - Municipal Governments - CIRABO/CIPOAP - Private sector - APMT and other relevant entities of central Government - NGOs - Universities and technical schools	Interviews with stakeholders	
	1.3. Numbers of institutions participating in monitoring	No systematic and harmonized monitoring of parameters of	The following institutions participate in monitoring: - ABT	Interviews with institutional representatives	

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks and assumptions
	systems/applying indicators of the condition of the natural resources of relevance to the model of forest management promoted by the Project.	relevance to overall ecosystem health and sustainability	- APMT - Departmental and municipal Governments		
	1.4. Degree to which specific provision is made in budgetary instruments to support SFM in TIOCs	The *Plan Quinquenal* assigns budget that will assist producers in managing their forests sustainably (the USD39,787,500 Government cofinancing for the project), but this does not specifically provide for research, capacity development, planning and enforcement in the context of SFM in TIOCs.	Specific budget allocations defined within the framework of the *Plan Quinquenal* to support SFM (research, capacity development, planning and enforcement) in TIOCs	Interviews with institutional representatives	
Outcome 2: Integrated management of natural resources in TIOCs	**2.1.** Area covered by General Plans for the Integrated Management of Lands and Forests (PGIBT) providing for the sustainable management of forests and life systems for NTFPs and/or timber.	There are no PGIBTs at present in the target TIOCs, but there are 9 General Forest Management Plans covering a total of 249,187.63ha (around 22% of the total forest area)	All four target TIOCs are covered entirely by PGIBTs (1,626,536ha)	Inspection of plans	**Assumptions**: Continued receptiveness among local communities and their organisations to sustainable options for the management of life systems
	2.2. Area covered by effective provisions (norms and human/logistical resources) for the inspection and control of the target forests and life systems, based on traditional mechanisms for oversight and control, in coordination with central authorities	At present traditional controls are largely effective, but lack an integrated vision, are not adequately based on information on resource and threat status, and do not provide for adaptation to evolving threats in the future	1,147,643ha (total area of dryland, flooded and varsea forest in the target TIOCs)	Field inspections, surveys and focus groups	
	2.3. Area of the target forests	Information on the status	100% of the area of the target	Field inspections,	

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks and assumptions
	where local stakeholders are applying local level holistic monitoring of forests and life systems, including baseline values and analysis of environmental, social and productive elements of forests and life systems, and their interactions; resilience and regenerative capacities environmental functions and services (linked to external sources of information)	of resources is based on one-off studies, but no permanent, structured or institutionalized system of monitoring exists capable of guiding future management in response to evolving conditions.	TIOCs (with varying intensities and approaches of monitoring according to land use and vegetation type)	surveys and focus groups	
	2.4. Numbers of communities with plans developed and implemented for the use and commercialisation of products, contributing to the sustainable management of the target forests	No business development plans currently in operation.	50 communities (50% of the total in the 4 target TIOCs)	Interviews with community representatives and members	
	2.5. Number of families with access to sustainable sources of finance that allow the development of their businesses based on the use and sale of products, contributing to the sustainable management of the target life systems	19 projects have been supported by Fondo Indígena to date.	300 (25% of the families in the 50 communities with plans for use and commercialization (see Indicator 2.4)).	Interviews and focus groups with families in target TIOCs	
	2.6. Increases in the prices received for selected forest products by community members, due to improvements in their capacities to add value and market, relative to control communities	Current prices: - Brazil nut: US$25/kg - Paiche: US$2.0-2.5/kg in local communities, US$2.5-3.0 in Riberalta.	- Brazil nut: 15% above prices received by control communities - Paiche: 100% above prices received by control communities	Interviews with producers in target and control communities	
	2.7. Number of Government	To be determined by	Actors with increased awareness of	Knowledge,	

Vertical logic	Indicator	Baseline value	Target value	Means of verification	Risks and assumptions
	and community-based actors with increased awareness of the concepts and determining factors of sustainable management of forests and associated life systems	KAP survey at Project start	strategic aspects, required to ensure the existence of a favourable environment of policies and investments: - Ministries of Environment and Rural Development, APMT, and ABT at national level Actors with increased awareness of technical aspects, to ensure the provision of concrete support and coherence of plans and investments at local level: - Municipal and departmental governments, local communities	Attitude and Practice (KAP) surveys	
	2.8. Number of Government and community-based actors regularly dialoguing and coordinating their actions in relation to SFM	To be determined at project start	Ministries of Environment and Rural Development, APMT, ABT, and regional and municipal governments report frequent constructive dialogue and coordination in relation to the sustainable management of forests and life systems	Interviews and focus groups with local and institutional actors	

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS

STAP Review

Comments	Response
STAP would propose that additional thought in particular be given to Component 2. This component as presented seems to be focused only on addressing the second barrier presented (local communities are unable to obtain significant and sustainable revenues from standing forests). Although important, this barrier is only one element of this Component as it is presented. Perhaps elements of this Component could be shifted to Component 1. The project context is described well and the threats and principal barriers are identified clearly. However, as mentioned above, the relationship between the barriers (especially number 2) and the structure of the Components could be revisited and strengthened.	The apparently poor correspondence between Barrier 2 and Component 2 was due to the inadequate wording of the former in the PIF. The wording of Barrier 2 has now been significantly expanded (and its title modified) to make it clearer that the application of sustainable forest management by local communities is not only hampered by inability of local communities to earn income, as this is not their sole motivation for protecting their forests. Rather, as suggested by the corresponding outcomes under Component 2, they appreciate the value of the forest "life system", but their ability to manage it sustainably and protect it effectively is hampered by factors such as inadequate awareness of specific aspects of ecosystem function, and the failure of traditional and other existing governance and planning frameworks adequately to reflect the nature of ecological processes and the landscape-wide nature of threats, or to adapt to changing conditions. Please see revised barrier analysis in Project Document paragraphs 99-107.
Currently there is a lack of clarity in the Outcomes and Outputs, as some are mixed with indicators and suggested targets. It is understood that indicators will be either developed or further refined during the PPG stage.	The indicators have been reviewed and in a number of cases modified, and a number of additional indicators introduced, as explained in Section A5 above.
While the project is certainly innovative in its approach, no explicit mention of this is made. Perhaps this is tacitly assumed.	As explained in paragraph 120 of the Project Document, the project will be innovative inasmuch as it will recognize that the sustainability of the forest's ability to generate multiple livelihood benefits depends on the maintenance of its biological integrity and ecological functioning, without which it risks undergoing progressive specialization, simplification and degradation (as discussed by Freese, 1997) and eventual transformation into isolated trees dispersed within pastures, with little potential for successful regeneration (the "living dead" , *sensu* Janzen 2001). This model coincides closely with the concept of "life systems" that is central to environmental policies and legislation in Bolivia (see Box 4).
The project's scaling-up potential is likewise not addressed at this stage.	As explained in paragraph 197 on cost-effectiveness, the model of forest management that is proposed here is directly replicable to other sites in the north of Bolivia where Brazil nut is native, as well as elsewhere in its native range (see Map 1), and to other sites nationwide and beyond containing other species that lend themselves to such forms of sustainable extractive management.
The reasoning behind the sustainability of the expected results is	Paragraph 198 on sustainability provides further detail to that which

Comments	Response
adequate at this stage but will require further specifics moving ahead.	was presented in the PIF, explaining how the project's support to forest/life system management (as detailed under the respective outputs) will ensure the integration of environmental and productive sustainability, how the project's approach to participation and ownership by local stakeholders will ensure social sustainability, and how financial sustainability will be ensured by focusing on economically viable productive options identified with the participation of local stakeholders, and by developing capacities for financial management among the target institutions at local level.
The key stakeholders are presented in a comprehensive list however there is little indication of potential roles or unique contributions.	Details of the specific roles and contributions of each key stakeholder are provided in Table 20 of the Project Document.
Likewise, the nature of the coordinating mechanism to be employed should be articulated	As now explained in Part III (Implementation Arrangements), it is proposed to establish (in addition to the national Project Board) a Bi-Departmental Coordination Platform bringing together key stakeholders at regional and local levels in order to facilitate coordination and consensus-based decision-making of relevance to the management of forests and associated life systems. This Platform would also serve during the project's lifetime as Regional Advisory Board.
Regarding the project's coordination with other projects and initiatives, only one project is mentioned (GEF/UNDP project on strengthening certification). Community forest management has been a hallmark of the GEF biodiversity and SFM programs for many years, much of which was led by the Agency concerned in this initiative in the Latin American region. It would be useful even at this stage to indicate how the project will be drawing on this knowledge base and lessons learned. Clearly there is a very large body of experience related to the proposed project that should be considered	Text has been included (Project Document paragraph 134) to explain that the Implementing Agency UNDP also has wide experience with projects in support of sustainable forest management elsewhere in Latin America. Important lessons will be drawn from the project "Transforming management of biodiversity rich community production forests through building national capacities for forest certification" (PIMS 4015) in Mexico, on building national and international markets for timber products from sustainably managed forests, thus garnering economic benefits and incentives to reward sustainable forest management and biodiversity conservation, while enhancing the capacity of forestry stakeholders to participate in this market. The GEF Small Grants Programmes, implemented by UNDP in different countries in the region (especially Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru) have also generated extensive and valuable experiences with sustainable forest management that will be applicable to the project.
Furthermore, STAP wishes to emphasize that the project proponents should ensure that this project contributes to the broader knowledge base for successful community-based SFM and how this supports not only the delivery of GEBs but local benefits as well and including contributions to boarder initiatives such as REDD+. STAP wishes to draw the proponents' attention to a paper on this subject the Panel presented in 2010: The Evidence Base for Community Forest Management as a Mechanism for Supplying Global Environmental	Paragraph 137 and Table 10 explain how the project takes into account the findings of the 2010 STAP paper. Output 1.2d focuses on the promoting access to best practice and technical and conceptual knowledge, on SFM and related issues, among relevant stakeholders, including the systematization of best practices learned previously from other initiatives, and the systematization and dissemination of the results of this project.

Comments	Response
Benefits and Improving Local Welfare (http://www.stapgef.org/the-evidence-base-for-community-forest-management-as-a-mechanism-forsupplying-global-environmental-benefits-and-improving-local-welfare/).	

GEFSec review

Question	Reviewer's comment	Response
Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).	The project is well aligned with the FA strategies for BD and LD as well as SFM. The contribution to the Aichi is articulated and indicators are identified although it is expected further refinement of these through the PPG stage to CEO Endorsement.	The indicators originally presented in the PIF have been rationalized and refined, as explained in detail in Section A5 of the CEO Endorsement Request.
8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	GEBs will accrue through the improved management of forested and non-forested area. Incremental reasoning is generally appropriate additional refinement and detail will be expected through PPG at CEO Endorsement. Forest carbon calculations are sufficient for PIF stage additional refinement will be expected at CEO Endorsement.	The following targets have been defined for global environmental benefits: - O1… conditions created that will allow the avoided deforestation of 6,948ha of forest (and the consequent avoided emission of 2,560,894tC) in the 10 years following the project - O5. Abundance and occupancy of Brazil nut disperser species remain stable - O6. Population status of pollinator species remain stable - O7. Numbers of animals hunted (by species) per unit of effort, as a measure of the population status of fauna populations - O8. Trends in indicators of ecosystem status, as defined through knowledge dialogue between scientists and community members. The basis for the projections of avoided deforestation is presented in Table 23 of the Project Document.

Comments from German Council Member

Comments	Response
The project concentrates on non-timber forest products (NTFP). The silvioculture elements concentrate exclusively on keeping a healthy nut tree population. In order to reduce income and production uncertainty (fluctuation in prices, production, etc.), the promotion of other forest uses, such as timber and other NTFP should be added to the planned activities in sustainable agriculture and agroforestry practices in non-forest areas ((42) - output 2.3 ,iv)).	It has been made clear in the Project Document (e.g. Project Rationale, paragraphs 118-120) that the central approach of the project avoids focusing exclusively on one species or forest product, but rather to promote the conservation of the forest and its constituent biodiversity and ecological functioning in an integrated manner, including multiple species that are or may be valued by local people for extractive use, as well as species that are not directly valued in this way but that provide

	ecosystem services (e.g. as alternative food sources for pollinator species). Examples of the range of species with potential for "direct use" are given in Box 10.
The "Plan de Gestión Integral de Bosques y Tierras (PGIBT)" is a new instrument of the Bolivian Authority for Surveillance and Social Control of Forests and Lands (Autoridad de Bosque y Tierra - ABT). It seems this is not considered in the proposal. We request that instruments to ensure the viability and sustainability of forest-related production systems (see p. 30) should only be developed taking the PGIBT into account and in coordination with the ABT.	The PGIBT model is now referred to in the section of the Project Document on "Policy and Legal Framework" (paragraph 36); the area of forest under PGIBT is used as a key impact indicator of the project (the target being that 700,000 ha (61% of the total forest area in the target TIOCs) is managed in accordance with PGIBTs. In section A5 of the CEO Endorsement, this is explained on the grounds that PGIBTs are a newly-introduced instrument with potential to be applied to both extractive and non-extractive management, and on both forest and non-forest areas.

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

None: PPG studies confirmed the target sites and strategies proposed in the PIF.

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: $136,987			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GEF Amount ($)***		
	Budget Approved	***Amount Spent to Date***	***Amount Committed***
1. Technical review	52,593.96	42,164.90	10,429.06
2. Institutional agreements and commitments, monitoring and evaluation	13,878.61	6,948.41	6,930.20
3. Financial planning and cofinancing	16,500.00	8,250.00	8,250.00
4. Process of generation of consensus and validation	37,514.40	33,543.23	3,971.17
5. Consolidation of final document	16,500.00	8,250.00	8,250.00
TOTAL	**136,986.97**	**99,156.54**	37,830.43