



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

GEF ID:	5755		
Country/Region:	Bolivia		
Project Title:	Sustainable Management of Forest Ecosystems in Amazonia by Indigenous and Local Communities to Generate Multiple Environmental and Social Benefits		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4743 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; BD-2; LD-3; LD-3; SFM/REDD+-1; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,987	Project Grant:	\$6,208,848
Co-financing:	\$26,375,246	Total Project Cost:	\$32,721,081
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	May 01, 2014
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	Agency Contact Person:	Jose Vicente Troya

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 ?	March 13, 2014 CBD party since 1994, CCD ratified in 1996.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 13, 2014 Yes a letter from OFP R Salatierra dated March 05, 2014 is available.	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the STAR allocation? 	March 13, 2014 As at March 13, 2014 all focal areas were still within budget for Bolivia and with sufficient resources to cover the request within this project. The SFM request is	

*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.

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		within the allowed ratio.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	March 13, 2014 Requested amounts are within the FA remaining amounts.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 		
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework and strategic objectives ? <i>For BD projects: 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).</i>	March 13, 2014 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.	
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	March 13, 2014 The project is consistent with strategic policies and reforms to land tenure and governance that are taking place across Bolivia. The project is well aligned with implementation framework of the plurinational authority of the Mother Earth and the Joint Mitigation Mechanism.	
	6. Is (are) the baseline project(s) , including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and	March 13, 2014 The baseline of structural reform in the forest sector is generally well described.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?		
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the project framework (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	<p>March 13, 2014</p> <p>The project is generally well designed.</p> <p>1. The project is designed around the devolution of SFM control to indigenous groups. This necessarily requires the role of authorities to change simultaneously. Please describe capacity building efforts for forest administration to be able to support the indigenous groups assuming their new role.</p> <p>2. Poor Brazil nut husbandry, hunting, illegal logging and fire are identified as threats. Improved forest management as described will address the first but there is little detail on the other three. Are these included? Where threats such as illegal logging by 3rd parties exist how does this new model deal with them; is it a responsibility of the locals or the administration?</p> <p>3. Does Component 2.2 include development of Plan de Gestion Integral de los Bosques y Tierra?</p> <p>4. Component 2.3 on community-based production entities. This appears to be the driver for long term sustainability as it will encourage sustainable use of the forest resources, however this is the least developed section in the PIF. Support items i to iv are very generic and need some specificity for example how is business capacity improved, will the project provide direct financial assistance to local indigenous groups or merely seek it from other parties, will opportunities for product processing be included to</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>improve product marketability, where well developed market chains are already in existence what are the barriers to accessing these at the moment by these groups?</p> <p>March 24, 2014 Additional information provided. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 13, 2014 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.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>		
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>March 13, 2014 Yes, local communities and indigenous peoples are involved as direct beneficiaries. CSOs identified for participation.</p>	
	<p>11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate</p>	<p>March 13, 2014 Key risks and mitigation measures are identified. Sufficient for PIF stage.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	resilience)		
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	<p>March 13, 2014 The description is limited to one project. Please consider and include further links to other initiatives with 3rd parties.</p> <p>March 24, 2014 Additional information included. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>13. Comment on the project's innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. • Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience. • Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention. 	<p>March 13, 2014 Innovation lies within the movement of long term management control to indigenous groups. Although this is seen in other regions this is a major change in forest governance and management. As reforms continue the concept can easily be replicated in other indigenous peoples areas. Sustainability is largely dependent on the communities being able to access the benefit of increased management control and opportunities for livelihoods.</p>	
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	March 13, 2014 Amounts seem appropriate overall.	
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	March 13, 2014 Co-finance stands at 1:4.24 and co-finance is 100% grant format. UNDP is supporting the project with a grant of \$387,746 or 1.4% of total co-finance.	
	18. Is the funding level for project management cost appropriate?	March 13, 2014 PMC is 5.2%. Please re-calculate the PMC using the sub-total rather than the total project cost as mentioned in footnote 4 on the template. March 24, 2014 PMC is now under 5%. Cleared.	
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	March 13, 2014 PPG request is within the allowed limits.	
	20. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	March 13, 2014 There is no non-grant instrument.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	indicators, as applicable?		
	22. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	March 13, 2014 Not at this stage please address issues noted above. March 24, 2014 Yes, issues addressed.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	1. Aichi indicators clarified. 2. Results of PPG investigations of community based production entities support options. 3. Enhanced forest carbon calculations.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
	First review*	March 13, 2014	
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 2014	
	Additional review (as necessary)		

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