



## 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;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$136,987	Project Grant:	\$6,208,848
Co-financing:	\$26,393,386	Total Project Cost:	\$32,876,208
PIF Approval:	April 01, 2014	Council Approval/Expected:	May 27, 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 <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	March 13, 2014 CBD party since 1994, CCD ratified in 1996.	December 15, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	March 13, 2014 Yes a letter from OFP R Salatierra dated March 05, 2014 is available.	December 15, 2015 As at PIF stage.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	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	December 15, 2015 Overall proposed grant remains as at PIF stage.

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

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

FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		within the allowed ratio.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	March 13, 2014 Requested amounts are within the FA remaining amounts.	December 15, 2015 Individual FA amounts remain as at PIF stage.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><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></p>	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.	December 15, 2015 The project retains the FA alignment from PIF stage. Aichi targets have been further articulated.
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	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.	December 15, 2015 Additional details of legislation on autonomy and decentralization, Mother Earth and integral development as well as the 5-year development plan and the resource management frameworks are provided.
	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and</p>	March 13, 2014 The baseline of structural reform in the forest sector is generally well described.	December 15, 2015 Baselines for the four TIOCs are well presented including details of deforestation, ongoing Government and private sector initiatives along with

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	assumptions?		donor funded initiatives together with details of forest and NTFP production activities. Support for the 5-year plan 2015-20 is also included.
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (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</p>	<p>December 15, 2015</p> <p>The project maintains the general structure provided at PIF stage. The underlying principle of the project is to foster capacity within indigenous groups to improve their existing forms of devolved forest management to develop GEBs through strengthened SFM practices and enhance livelihoods through improved land use and agricultural practices. The underlying rationale is of conservation of GEBs through planned sustainable use.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>it from other parties, will opportunities for product processing be included to 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>December 15, 2015 GEBs are identified: improved management of 700k ha of globally important forest habitat; 1.6 million ha of landscapes covered by LMPs maintaining function of ecosystems and agro-ecosystems; avoided deforestation of 6,948 ha developing 2.5 million tCO2 over 10 years.</p>
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>December 15, 2015 The project aims to increase by 10% the income of 2000 people in the TIOCs. Gender is seen as a difficult issue given cultural norms but plans in place to ensure heightened attention. The socio-economic benefits are crucial to the longevity of the project through the protection-production nexus.</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>December 15, 2015 The project relies heavily on the full involvement of the groups within the TIOCs. Without their support the project would not be viable.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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 resilience)</p>	<p>March 13, 2014 Key risks and mitigation measures are identified. Sufficient for PIF stage.</p>	<p>December 15, 2015 Yes. Key risks and mitigation proposals are identified.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<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>December 15, 2015 Details of important initiatives included.</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<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>	<p>December 15, 2015 As at PIF stage the project's innovation is the development of long term management control to indigenous groups. Replication is easy, subject to continued reforms. Sustainability is remains dependent on the communities being able to access the benefit of increased management control and opportunities for livelihoods.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>December 15, 2015 Structure remains close to PIF, with changes adequately justified.</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project</p>		<p>December 15, 2015 Through the clustering of target sites, basing efforts on existing initiatives and involvement of local communities.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
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.	December 15, 2015 As at PIF stage.
	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.	December 15, 2015 Cofinance stands at \$26,375,246.  Please forward confirmation of cofinance of \$17.3 million from National Forest Fund (FONABOSQUE).  January 05, 2016 Cleared.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> 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.	December 15, 2015 PMC is at 4.9%.
	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.	December 15, 2015 PPG activity report is included.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	March 13, 2014 There is no non-grant instrument.	December 15, 2015 There is no NGI.
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		December 15, 2015 TTs for BD, LD and SFM available.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		December 15, 2015 M&E plan with budget available.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• STAP?</li> </ul>		December 15, 2015 STAP issues on components, outcomes, innovation, scaling up, sustainability, stakeholders and coordination have been addressed.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convention Secretariat?</li> <li>• The Council?</li> </ul>		December 15, 2015 Comments on other forest products, uses and services together with PGIBT and ABT have been taken into account.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other GEF Agencies?</li> </ul>		
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.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		December 15, 2015 Not at this stage. Please forward confirmation of cofinance.  January 05, 2016 The Program Manager recommends CEO Endorsement.
	First review*	March 13, 2014	December 15, 2015
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	March 24, 2014	January 05, 2016
	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.**