



# REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit [TheGEF.org](http://TheGEF.org)

## PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Sustainable Forest Lands Management and Conservation under an Eco-social Approach			
Country(ies):	Venezuela	GEF Project ID:	5410
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	623206
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Popular Power for Eco-socialism and Water	Submission Date:	
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-focal	Project Duration (Months)	60
Name of Parent Program (if applicable):		Agency Fee (\$):	783,685
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>		

### A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK

Focal Area Objectives	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
<b>CCM-5:</b> Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry	GEFTF	2,194,982	7,700,000
<b>BD-2:</b> Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors	GEFTF	3,400,115	10,464,000
<b>LD-2:</b> Forest Landscapes: Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in drylands, including sustaining livelihoods of forest dependent people	GEFTF	297,271	920,500
<b>SFM/REDD+-1:</b> Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services	GEFTF	1,428,571	4,402,000
<b>SFM/REDD+-2:</b> Strengthen the enabling environment to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhance carbon sinks from LULUCF activities.	GEFTF	535,552	713,500
Sub-Total		7,856,491	24,200,000
Project management cost	GEFTF	392,825	1,530,000
<b>Total project costs</b>		8,249,316	25,730,000

### B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

**Project Objective:** To mainstream biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and climate change mitigation in the forestry sector to achieve Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) through innovation in information management, incentive schemes, participative governance, empowerment of the local communities dependent on forests, and multiple mechanisms for restoration of areas under degradation processes in key representative forest ecosystem in Venezuela.

Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Cofinancing (\$)
1. Integrated National Forest Information System (SINIB)	TA	<b>Outcome 1.1:</b> <i>Improved capacity for national forest monitoring and evaluation within the framework of the</i>	<b>Output 1.1.1:</b> <i>Information system integrating data on carbon stocks and flows, biodiversity, physical-natural-sociocultural and economic environment, status</i>	GEFTF	2,203,668	3,940,000

		<p><i>National Forest Inventory (NFI).  <b>Target:</b> 4,465,909 ha of forest ecosystems monitored and evaluated through protocols facilitating collection and analysis of high quality data, including generation of biodiversity thematic maps, assessment of GHG flows and stocks, identification of carbon hotspots and development of national MRV standards.</i></p> <p><b>Outcome 1.2:</b>  <i>Knowledge and valuation of forest related biodiversity and carbon hotspots integrated in an improved forest management at local forest management unit scale as a strategy to mainstream measures</i></p>	<p><i>and characterization of forest ecosystems and providing high quality information for decision-making.</i></p> <p><b>Output 1.1.2:</b> <i>Protocols for updating and processing geo-spatial information for sustainable forest management (planning, monitoring, control and research) and multi-temporal analysis of forest cover at national level.</i></p> <p><b>Output 1.1.3:</b> <i>Protocol for field level information gathering on forest and socio-cultural-economic conditions of forest-dependent communities and indigenous peoples</i></p> <p><b>Output 1.1.4:</b> <i>Study of GEI and carbon stocks and fluxes in three types of forests, carbon hotspots identified, and national MRV standards established for the GEI benefits from reduction of deforestation and forest degradation (REDD)</i></p> <p><b>Output 1.1.5:</b> <i>Thematic maps of biodiversity with information on distribution of plants species, their abundance, frequency, dominance, and fito-geographical relationships</i></p> <p><b>Output 1.1.6:</b> <i>Participatory mechanism for monitoring of the forest coverage and status, and related GHG flows in deforested and degraded forests</i></p> <p><b>Output 1.2.1:</b> <i>Lists of forest flora and fauna species (endemic, threatened, exotics) of the IFR associated to carbon hotspots in Unit V.</i></p> <p><b>Output 1.2.2:</b> <i>Guidelines for the study and definition of zoning of management units taking into consideration the state and needs of</i></p>			
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

		<p>for forest biodiversity conservation in forest management plans.</p> <p><b>Target:</b> The Forest Land Use and Management Plan of Unit V of the Imataca Forest Reserve (IFR) mainstreams data and information on forest coverage, land use changes, deforestation, degraded areas, carbon stocks and measures for conservation of forest biodiversity covering an area of 167,230 ha.</p>	<p>biodiversity, carbon hotspots and forest ecosystem conservation based on information generated by the SINIB.</p> <p><b>Output 1.2.3:</b> Database of biodiversity goods, products, and services of forest ecosystems (including the forest reserves), and considering wood and non-wood products and their multiple use by local communities.</p>			
2. Building of capacities and innovative tools for SFM	TA	<p><b>Outcome 2.1:</b> Community stakeholders and national and local governments involved in sustainable forest management through new participatory management tools, covering at least 167.320 ha of forests of the IFR Unit V.</p> <p><b>Targets:</b> a) Stabilized populations of algarrobo (<i>Hymenaea courbaril</i>), yellow trumpet tree (<i>Handroanthus serratifolius</i>, <i>H. impetiginosus</i>), zapatero (<i>Peltogyne floribunda</i>) and mureillo (<i>Erismia uncinatum</i>) within Unit V monitored through:</p> <p>i) study on autoecology; ii) abundance and iii) diametric distribution of species</p> <p>b) Direct avoided emissions: 1,136,759 tCO<sub>2eq</sub> in 5 years in 25,000 ha (227,351 tCO<sub>2eq</sub>/year for 5,000 ha/year)</p> <p>c) Indirect avoided emissions: 18,188,149 tCO<sub>2eq</sub> in 5 years</p>	<p><b>Output 2.1.1:</b> Program to strengthen technical-legal human resources to promote and sustain innovations in SFM utilizing the information generated by the SINIB.</p> <p><b>Output 2.1.2:</b> Forest Operational Plans based on the information generated by the SINIB for forest planning and management with an ecosystem and sustainable livelihood approach developed with local governments and community organizations</p> <p><b>Output 2.1.3:</b> Pilot scheme for forest co-management with communes or other types of social organizations.</p>	GEFTF	1,036,101	5,723,862

		<p>(3,637,629 CO<sub>2</sub>eq /year in 80,000 ha)</p> <p><b>Outcome 2.2:</b> <i>Development and initial implementation of a National Program for environmental and social sustainability standards for production of wood and non-wood products.</i> <b>Target:</b> One (1) National Program for environmental and social sustainability standards for production of wood and non-wood forest products designed and implemented in Unit V covering 15.000 ha.</p> <p><b>Outcome 2.3:</b> <i>Inter-sectoral dialogue on SFM strengthened.</i> <b>Target:</b> One (1) inter-institutional coordination and consultation platform for forest governance in Venezuela operating and effectively fulfilling its functions as per its work plan, and promoting the use of the SINIB</p>	<p><b>Output 2.2.1:</b> <i>Criteria and indicators for environmental and social sustainability of SFM on the basis of information generated by the SINIB</i></p> <p><b>Output 2.2.2:</b> <i>Participatory monitoring mechanism of forests managed under environmental and social standards for multiple use of forests in balance with the provision of forest ecosystem goods and services.</i></p> <p><b>Output 2.3.1:</b> <i>Training program of human talent and dialogues exchanging local knowledge related to the utilization of information generated by the SINIB for improved forest planning and management and SFM practices.</i></p> <p><b>Output 2.3.2:</b> <i>Inter-institutional coordination agreements for forest management governance in Venezuela and adjustment of the SINIB.</i></p>			
3. Forest restoration, conservation, and SFM/SLM in areas affected by degradation processes	INV	<p><b>Outcome 3.1:</b> <i>Technical and institutional capacities for restoration of forest and forestlands applying SFM/SLM practices strengthened.</i> <b>Targets:</b> a) National manuals for restoration of tropical humid forests and forestlands elaborated, validated and disseminated. b) At least 200 representatives of government institutions, NGO, grassroots organizations and communities trained in SFM/SLM (at least</p>	<p><b>Output 3.1.1:</b> <i>General standards and indicators for prioritizing areas for forest restoration applying information generated by SINIB.</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.1.2:</b> <i>Strategy for restoration, rehabilitation and recovery of forest cover in the IFR based on an eco-social approach.</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.1.3:</b> <i>National network of community providers of forest seeds established.</i></p>	GEFTF	4,178,748	13,283,900

		<p>40% are women)</p> <p><b>Outcome 3.2:</b> <i>Restoration and regeneration 1,440 ha of forests through SFM/SLM strategies under an ecosystem approach prioritizing the multi-functionality of forests.</i></p> <p><b>Target:</b> a) Populations of algarrobo (<i>Hymenaea courbaril</i>), yellow trumpet tree (<i>Handroanthus serratifolius</i>, <i>H. impetiginosus</i>), zapatero (<i>Peltogyne floribunda</i>) and mureillo (<i>Erismia uncinatum</i>) stabilized through reforestation, analogue forestry and agroforestry and monitored through structure, floristic and soil composition b) 512,985 tCO<sub>2eq</sub> sequestered in 1,440 ha through: i) reforestation (748 ha): 262,348 Ton/ha CO<sub>2eq</sub> ii) analog forestry (342 ha): 122,976 Ton/ha CO<sub>2eq</sub> and iii) agroforestry (350 ha): 127,660 Ton/ha CO<sub>2eq</sub> c) Land degradation processes reduced in 1,440 ha through reforestation, analogue forestry and agroforestry: 50% reduction in the degraded surface area (420 ha) compared to the baseline</p>	<p><b>Output 3.2.1:</b> <i>Model for forest restoration through SFM/SLM on-the-ground tested with the participation of local governments and communities.</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.2.2:</b> <i>Experiences and lessons learned on commercializing wood and non-wood products systemized so they can be used to sustain SFM/SLM best practices</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.2.3:</b> <i>Value chain and market analysis of the main forest products demanded and affecting the forest and recommendations for market adjustments and the design of commercialization strategies for reducing the pressures on forests.</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.2.4:</b> <i>Community commercialization plans for wood and non-wood forest products in accordance with the principle of multiple uses.</i></p> <p><b>Output 3.2.5:</b> <i>Financing schemes to promote adoption of SFM/SLM, support commercialization of non-wood products, and implementation of the National sustainability standards program for SFM established under outcome 2.2.</i></p>			
4. M&E and information dissemination	TA	<p><b>Outcome 4.1:</b> <i>Project implementation based on results-based management and facilitating the application of lessons learned and good practices in future operations.</i></p>	<p><b>Output 4.1.1:</b> <i>Project M&amp;E system operational, providing constant information on project progress in achieving outcomes and outputs</i></p> <p><b>Output 4.1.2:</b> <i>Midterm and final evaluations</i></p>		437,974	1,252,238

		<b>Target:</b> Project outcomes achieved and demonstrating sustainability	<b>Output 4.1.3:</b> <i>Project best practices and lessons learned published</i>  <b>Output 4.1.4:</b> <i>Webpage for information sharing and exchange of experiences</i>			
Subtotal						7,856,491      24,200,000
Project management Cost (PMC) <sup>1</sup>				GEFTF		392,825      1,530,000
<b>Total project costs</b>						<b>8,249,316      25,730,000</b>

**C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED COFINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)**

Please include letters confirming cofinancing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Co-financing	Co-financing Amount (\$)
National government	Ministry of Popular Power for Eco-socialism and Water (MPPEA)	In-kind	3,000,000
National government	National Forest Company (ENF)	In-kind	10,000,000
National government	National Reforestation Company (CONARE)	In-kind	8,000,000
National government	Tree Mission	In-kind	3,000,000
National government	Latin American Forestry Foundation (IFLA)	In-kind	1,500,000
GEF Agency	FAO	Grant	200,000
GEF Agency	FAO	In-kind	30,000
<b>Total Co-financing</b>			<b>25,730,000</b>

**D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY<sup>1</sup>**

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Funds	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	Grant Amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) <sup>2</sup>	Total (\$) c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	Climate Change	Venezuela	2,304,731	218,949	2,523,680
FAO	GEFTF	Biodiversity	Venezuela	3,570,121	339,161	3,909,282
FAO	GEFTF	Land Degradation	Venezuela	312,135	29,653	341,788
FAO	GEFTF	SFM/REDD+	Venezuela	2,062,329	195,921	2,258,250
<b>Total Grant Resources</b>				<b>8,249,316</b>	<b>783,684</b>	<b>9,033,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

<sup>2</sup> Indicate fees related to this project.

**F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:**

<sup>1</sup> PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

<b>Component</b>	<b>Grant Amount (\$)</b>	<b>Cofinancing (\$)</b>	<b>Project Total (\$)</b>
International Consultants	173,500	0	173,500
National/Local Consultants	2,036,200	0	2,036,200

**G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? No**

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected reflows to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

**PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

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

**A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e.**

**NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.**

No major changes from PIF. Since PIF approval the new Forest Law was passed in 2013 replacing the Forest Management Law of 2008 (the latter one mentioned in the PIF). The new law was passed to adapt the previous one to the national priorities and guidelines set forth in the Plan of the Nation 2013-2019. The project is consistent with this law and it constitutes an important project baseline, since the project will contribute to the development of instruments and mechanisms to help implement the law within the framework of the country’s new sustainable forest management paradigm through the generation of information, experiences and lessons from the eco-social<sup>2</sup> perspective.

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

The proposed project is a multifocal project that seeks social recognition of the multifunctional value that forests provide, not only in terms of wood and non-wood products, but also in terms of ecosystem services (forest carbon sequestration, biodiversity conservation, regulation of the water cycle and water quality, soil conservation). It is therefore consistent with the following GEF strategic objectives: CCM-5: *Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry*; BD-2: *Mainstream Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into Production Landscapes, Seascapes and Sectors*; LD-2: *Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in drylands, including sustaining livelihoods of forest dependent people*; SFM/REDD+-1: *Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services* and SFM/REDD+-2): *Strengthen the enabling environment to reduce GHG emissions from deforestation and forest degradation and enhance carbon sinks from LULUCF activities*.

In relation to CCM-5 Component 1 will strengthen the capacity to generate accurate and reliable information for decision-making regarding land use planning and forestry management. The improved information will facilitate the increase in carbon benefits and provide enough precision in data to create national MRV standards for GHG reduction from projects reducing deforestation and forest degradation. Furthermore, the complemented NFI will provide improved data for the GHG inventory. Component 2 will strengthen the human operational and technical capacities to be able to implement forest planning and management instruments and SFM practices incrementing the carbon and other GHG benefits from forest ecosystems. To sustain the adoption of good practices of LULUCF and SFM, by adding value to forest products from forests under SFM, criteria and indicators for national SFM sustainability standards will be defined, including criteria and indicators in line with national standards for REDD and MRV (developed under

---

<sup>2</sup> The eco-social approach is a humanistic, comprehensive and participatory approach that recognizes the strategic role of forests in contributing to adaptation and mitigation of climate change, biodiversity conservation, food security, sustainable development and poverty eradication, and forest conservation through sustainable management and rehabilitation of forestlands.

component 1). Component 3 will invest in restoration and rehabilitation of forests, increasing carbon sequestration and avoiding forestry GHG emissions.

Under BD-2, Component 1 will improve the knowledge and valuation of biodiversity associated with forest ecosystems to sustain the integration of its conservation and sustainable use in SFM at management unit level. For this end the component will provide technical assistance for: the recollection of information and elaboration of lists and thematic maps of forest species and related flora and fauna (endemic, threatened, exotic) in pilot management units with the participation of local communities; preparation of guidelines for the study and definition of zoning in management units according to the state and needs of conservation of biodiversity and forest ecosystems; the establishment of a database of goods, services and products from biodiversity and forest ecosystems (including forest reserves) and their multiple use by local communities. Component 2 will strengthen the human operational and technical capacities to be able to implement forest planning and management instruments and SFM practices increasing the benefits of habitat for globally important species in forest ecosystems. To sustain the adoption of good SFM practices by adding value to forest products from forests under SFM, criteria and indicators for national SFM sustainability standards will be defined including criteria and indicators for conservation of biodiversity and forest eco-systemic services under pressure. Component 3 will invest in restoration and rehabilitation of forests with native species. This investment will increase the habitat for forest flora and fauna, which are currently under pressure due to deforestation and forest degradation processes. This will result in stabilizing or increasing populations of critically threatened species.

Within LD-2, Component 1 will undertake forest ecosystem monitoring in arid/semi-arid forests of the country using the protocols and methodologies that mainstream GEBs. Component 2 of the proposed project will strengthen human operational and technical capacities to be able to implement forest planning and management instruments and SFM practices increasing the benefits of conservation of soil resources, rehabilitation of degraded lands, and a sustainable flow of forest ecosystem services.

Under SFM/REDD+ 1 and 2, Component 1 will strengthen the capacity to generate more accurate and reliable information for decision-making in land use planning and forest management. The improved information will facilitate the increase in carbon benefits and provide enough precision in data to create national MRV standards for GHG reduction benefits from projects reducing deforestation and forest degradation. Component 2 will strengthen the human operational and technical capacities to be able to implement forest planning and management instruments and SFM practices increasing the benefits of forest ecosystems (carbon stocks and other greenhouse gases, habitat for global important species, conservation of soil and water, and rehabilitation of degraded lands). To sustain the adoption of good LULUCF and SFM practices by adding value to forest products from forests under SFM, criteria and indicators for national SFM sustainability standards will be defined including criteria and indicators relevant for multiple benefits of CCM, BD and LD, as mentioned above, showing a reduced pressure on forest resources and generation of sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services. Component 3 will invest in restoration and rehabilitation of forests affected by land degradation, deforestation and forest degradation. This investment will reverse the degradation processes and increase the forest ecosystem services. Moreover, the management of degraded forests will reduce pressure on primary forests and is therefore expected to reduce deforestation and land degradation, and increase carbon sequestration during tree growth.

### ***Project contribution to Aichi Targets***

The project will contribute to the following Aichi Biodiversity Targets: **Target 2:** By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems; **Target 3:** By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio economic conditions. **Target 7:** By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity; **Target 14** - By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable; **Target 15:** By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification; **Target 19:** By 2020,

knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.

### **A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:**

No changes from PIF.

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

Information on the baseline programs and projects has been updated and expanded based on the assessments undertaken during the full project preparation. In addition, the analysis of the barriers that currently prevent mainstreaming of biodiversity conservation, sustainable forest and land management and climate change mitigation in the forestry sector to achieve sustainable forest management and global environmental benefits has been further developed. Please see the FAO-GEF Project Document section 1.1.1 a) *Baseline projects and investments for the next 3-5 years addressing the identified GEB threats and causes in forest ecosystems* and 1.1.1 b) *Remaining barriers to address threats on global environmental benefits generated by forest ecosystems*.

### **A. 5. Incremental /Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:**

The project will help to mainstream biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management, and climate change mitigation in the forestry sector to achieve Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) through innovation in information management, incentive schemes, participative governance, empowerment of the local communities dependent on forests, and multiple mechanisms for restoration of areas under degradation processes in key representative forest ecosystem in Venezuela.

Through the GEF's incremental support the availability and access to information on the status of forest ecosystems and associated ecosystem services (biodiversity, carbon stocks and soil conservation) and capacities will be strengthened for the implementation of a new sustainable forest management model with an ecosystem, landscape, integrated, participatory and multiple-use approach, to achieve sustained yields of the various products, goods and services offered by forest ecosystems, thereby improving the livelihoods of forest-dependent communities and/or communities located in the area of influence of forest ecosystems.

The GEF incremental financing for Component 1 will be directed toward developing and implementing the National Integrated Forest Information System (SINIB) through technical assistance for: (i) developing new geo-spatial and multi-temporal analysis protocols for monitoring and forest management, and strengthening the data collection, processing and analysis processes; (ii) preparing protocols for socio-economic and cultural information gathering; (iii) studies on GHG emissions, and forest carbon stocks and fluxes; (iv) defining national MRV standards; (v) elaborating biodiversity maps and listings of forest species and associated flora and fauna (endemic, threatened, exotic); (vi) multi-temporal analysis of vegetation cover; (vii) elaborating guidelines for the study and definition of zoning criteria for forestry management units in the IFR; and (viii) establishment of a database of goods and products from biodiversity and forest ecosystems, and their multiple use.

The incremental resources in Component 2 will address the strengthening of technical and operational capacities of institutions and communities through technical assistance to: (i) develop and implement a capacity-building program for SFM, using the information generated by the SINIB; (ii) prepare and implement with a high community participation forest operational plans based on the information generated by the SINIB under an ecosystem approach; (iii) design and pilot a forest co-management scheme with community involvement; and (iv) design and pilot a SFM environmental and social sustainability standards program and a participatory monitoring mechanism of the standards.

In Component 3 the incremental resources will address forest restoration, conservation and SFM / SLM and will be used to: (i) define standards and indicators to prioritize relevant areas for forest rehabilitation and restoration; (ii) prepare

good community practices guidelines for forest seeds management and seed trees identification with emphasis on native species; (iii) establishment of a National Network of Community Suppliers of Forest Seeds; (iv) development of a strategy for restoration and recovery of the forest cover with an eco-social approach; (v) systematization of experiences and lessons learned in commercialization of wood and non-wood products; (vi) market analysis for main forest products; (vii) formulation of community plans for commercialization of wood and non-wood forest products; and (viii) establishment of investment fund to promote SFM / SLM, support to commercialization of non-wood products and financing of SFM sustainability standards.

For further details including baseline financing see FAO Project Document Section 1.1.1 c)

### ***Changes in the results framework compared to the PIF***

The objective, components and outputs of the project remain largely unchanged and are described in detail in the FAO-GEF Project Document (Section 2). There are some minor adjustments described below:

**Component 1:** Under Outcome 1.1 a new output has been added to reflect the development of the Integrated National Forest Information System (SINIB). Outputs 1.1.1 (protocol for updating geo-spatial information) and 1.1.3 (protocol for multi-temporal analysis) have been merged into a single output given that the same activities and budget are needed to develop and implement both protocols. Output 1.1.7 (protocol for information flow and exchange) is now part of the new SINIB development output.

**Component 2:** Under Outcome 2.1, the wording of Output 2.1.3 (pilot scheme to transfer forest management responsibilities) has been adjusted to pilot co-management scheme.

Outcome 2.2 has been adjusted. The national certification program has been replaced by a national environmental and social sustainability standards program given that the Forest Law foresees the development of such standards as the basis for a certification program, but the standards currently do not exist. This outcome will help develop the standards and acquire experience through piloting the standards hence setting the bases for a future certification program. The wording of Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.4 has been adjusted accordingly to reflect the standards instead of certification. Output 2.2.3 (incentives scheme) has been removed since Output 3.2.5 (financial schemes) will be in charge of developing the financial incentives for the SFM standards. Output 2.2.5 has been removed since it repeats the outcome and the activities have been included in other Outputs.

Outcome 2.3: Output 2.3.2 (platform for inter-institutional coordination) is now the outcome indicator. The output has been replaced by a new one to reflect the inter-institutional agreements needed as a previous step to establishing the coordination platform.

**Component 3:** Outcome 3.1: Output 3.1.2 (national coordinating mechanism for restoration) has been removed since this role will be exercised by the inter-institutional coordination platform above.

Outputs 3.1.3 (good community practices for forest seeds) and 3.1.4 (national network of community seed providers) have been merged. The output now refers to the establishment of the national network of seed providers. Elaboration of the guide for good community practices has been included as an activity under the network.

Outcome 3.1.5 (national policy and strategy for restoration) has been adjusted to a restoration strategy for the Imataca Forest Reserve given that the Forest Law passed in 2013 contains stipulations and guidance on restoration. A specific restoration strategy for the reserve will serve to generate experiences and lessons in restoration that will be replicable to the remaining forest reserves in the country (covering over 16 million hectares).

Outcome 3.2: based on cost assessments during the project preparation phase the 3,000 hectares target for restoration has been modified to 1,440 hectares. This area will be achieved with GEF financing and the GEF financing in turn will serve to leverage co-financing to achieve the additional 1,560 hectares to complete the target.

The table below summarizes the new numbering of Outputs as a result of the above-mentioned changes:

<b>PIF</b>	<b>CEO Endorsement</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1.1.1</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.1.3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1.1.2</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1.1.2</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Output 1.1.3</li> </ul>

• Outputs 1.1.4 to 1.1.6	• Outputs 1.1.4 to 1.1.6
• Output 1.1.7	
• Outputs 1.2.1 to 1.2.3	• Output 1.2.1 to 1.2.3
• Outputs 2.1.1 to 2.1.3	• Outputs 2.1.1 to 2.1.3
• Output 2.2.1	• Output 2.2.1
• Output 2.2.3	
• Output 2.2.4	• Output 2.2.2
• Outputs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2	• Outputs 2.3.1 and 2.3.2
• Output 3.1.1	• Output 3.1.1
• Output 3.1.2	•
• Outputs 3.1.3 and 3.1.4	• Output 3.1.3
• Output 3.1.5	• Output 3.1.2
• Outputs 3.2.1 to 3.2.5	• Outputs 3.2.1 to 3.2.5

Please refer to Sections 2.2 *Project Objectives*, 2.3 *Expected Project Outcomes* and 2.4 *Project Components and Outputs* of the FAO-GEF Project Document for a detailed description. Please refer to Section 2.5 *Global Environmental Benefits* of the Project Document for a full description of GEBs. The Project Results Framework in Annex A includes GEB indicators and targets at outcome level.

As a consequence of the more detailed development of the project interventions and cost assessments there has also been some changes in the resources distribution between the PIF and CEO endorsement stages. Please refer to the Results Budget in Appendix 3 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details.

**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:**

The risks identified in the PIF remain. The mitigation measures have been further assessed and described. Please refer to section 3 and Appendix 4 “Risk Matrix” of the FAO Project Document for the full risk assessment and mitigation measures.

**A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives**

No changes from PIF. FAO, MPPEA and other participating institutions will collaborate with the GEF implementing agencies of other GEF-supported programs and projects to identify and facilitate synergies, as well as with other agencies that support projects financed by other donors. Collaboration will be undertaken through: (i) informal communications; and (ii) exchange of information. In order to guarantee an effective coordination and collaboration between different initiatives, specific coordination responsibilities have been assigned to the Project Management Unit and included in the terms of reference of the Project Technical Coordinator, which results shall be explicitly reflected in the Project Progress Reports (PPRs).

**B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:**

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

**B.1.1 Project implementation and management arrangements**

The project will be managed through a Project Steering Committee and a Project Management Unit. This management structure will ensure the participation of key stakeholders during project planning, implementation and M&E.

The **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** will be comprised by the: Forests General Directorate (DGB), through the National Project Director (NDP) designated on behalf of the MPEEA, who will chair the PSC; the MPPEA’s Office for International Cooperation and Management, CONARE, ENF, IFLA, Tree Mission, representatives of the beneficiaries

(2) designated in Popular Power Assembly, the Ministry of Popular Power for Planning and Knowledge and FAO. Additionally, the following institutions may be invited to attend the PSC meetings as necessary: Ministry of Popular Power for Finance (MPPF); Directorate General for Environmental Planning (DGPOA); Biological Diversity National Office (ONDB); Simon Bolivar Geographical Institute of Venezuela (IGVSB); Botanical Institute of Venezuela Foundation (FIBV); Ministry of Popular Power for Defense (MD); Ministry of Popular Power for Foreign Affairs and other national institutions relevant to the project.

PSC responsibilities will include: (i) guidance and orientation to the NDP and PT, as may be needed, on specific actions for project implementation, as well as ensuring political viability, advice, inter-institutional coordination, consultation and planning to support project implementation; (ii) promote integration of the project in the Forest Policy of Venezuela to ensure its sustainability; (iii) overall oversight of project progress and achievement of planned results as per the project document; (iv) facilitate cooperation between the project participating partners and project support at the local level; (v) advise the NPD on other on-going and planned activities facilitating collaboration between the Project and other programs, projects and initiatives; (vi) facilitate that co-financing is provided in a timely and effective manner; and (vii) review and approve the six-monthly Project Progress Reports and the AWP/B.

The **Project Management Unit (PMU)** will be in charge of: i) coordinating and closely supervising the implementation of project activities; ii) day-to-day project management; iii) coordinating with related initiatives; iv) ensuring collaboration between the participating national, state and local institutions and organizations; v) follow-up on project progress and ensure the timely delivery of inputs and outputs; vi) implementing and managing the project M&E plan; vi) organizing annual project workshops and meetings to monitor project progress and preparing the Annual Work Plans and Budgets (AWP/B); vii) preparing the Project Progress Reports (PPRs) together with the AWP/B; and viii) supporting the preparation of Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), mid-term and final evaluations.

### B.1.2 Stakeholder involvement plan

The stakeholder mapping carried out during project preparation is presented in the table below, including their roles and participation in project implementation.

Stakeholder	Interest/role in project
Ministry of Popular Power for Eco-socialism and Water (MPPEA)	Executes the forest policy through instruments of Environmental and territorial planning. It gives directions to the forest resources conservation policy in Venezuela. The MPPA governs the management and conservation of forest ecosystems, recognizing the multiple uses and functions of forests and its value as an important part of the national economy. Lead Execution Agency and co-funder of components 1, 2 and 3 and project management costs.
National Forest Company (ENF)	MPPEA ascribed entity; It aims at sustainable production of forest goods and services through the planning of the national forest heritage. Strategic partner. Will accompany the process of community involvement in the planning and SFM. Co-funder of components 1, 2, 3 and 4 and project management costs.
Tree Mission	MPPEA ascribed entity. Supports the implementation of forest policy of MPPA through instruments Environmental Planning, Territorial Planning, Environmental and Socio Cultural Impact Assessment, Environmental Education. Works in empowering and incorporating rural and urban communities in forest restoration. Co-funder of components 3 and 4.
Latin American Forestry Institute (IFLA)	Will support in terms of research and academic consultancy. Strategic partner and co-funder of components 3 and 4.
National Reforestation Company (CONARE)	MPPEA ascribed entity. Expertise in and responsible for forest recovery and restoration. Strategic partner and co-funder of component 3.
Bolivarian Agency for Spatial	Responsible for the Venezuelan satellite (Miranda) that can provide high

activities (ABAE)	resolution satellite images for forest ecosystem monitoring under Component 1
Communes / communities	Project beneficiaries. Will be involved in the implementation of activities under Components 1 and 2

The project will promote stakeholder participation at both institutional and community levels. At the institutional level, it will promote the creation of multi-stakeholder spaces for intersectoral dialogue on SFM / SLM. This includes the establishment of a platform for inter-institutional coordination and consultation for the governance of forest management in Venezuela and adjustment of the SINIB to ensure that the information needs and requirements at different levels (regional and local) are taken into account. This platform will comprise key stakeholders of the forestry sector, including for example the MPPEA and its affiliated entities, other ministries, local governments, universities and social organizations.

At the community level, the project will use a number of tools to promote buy-in and participation, namely: a) contacts with leaders or authorities of the local communities and indigenous peoples, b) sharing of information on the project (objectives, planned activities, progress and results); c) community meetings; d) participatory assessments; e) consultation and validation workshops; f) training; and g) participatory evaluations. These will help engage the communities in activities such as: a) identifying priority areas for SFM intervention; b) participatory monitoring of forest ecosystems; c) participatory monitoring of SFM sustainability standards; d) incorporating labor in SFM activities; e) development of social production enterprises for production and commercialization of wood and non-wood products; f) forest restoration through agroforestry, reforestation and analog forestry, g) community involvement in surveillance and control, through setting up monitoring brigades to work jointly with state institutions in protecting the IFR.

**B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):**

The population within the Imataca Forest Reserve (IFR) comprises 38,199 people including indigenous peoples, miners, small farmers and lumberers; with 44.3% being indigenous population, 25.4% non-indigenous population and 30.3 % lacking census data on their ethnicity. The existing indigenous peoples belong to the Warao, Kariña, Pemon, Akawaio, Arawaco, Sanema and other smaller ethnic groups. Mining is the main land use followed by forestry and agriculture. Members of the Kariña ethnic group (251 women and 285 men) live in several communities in Unit V (the project’s priority site for field interventions). The economy of these Kariña communities is based on shifting agriculture, hunting and fishing for subsistence, the exchange of agricultural products and in a few cases their sale. Some members participate in mining activities.

The project will seek to deliver socio-economic benefits to both indigenous and non-indigenous communities in the IFR through several approaches. One of these approaches will be to raise awareness and promote the benefits of sustainable forest use compared to the impacts of mining, especially the highly dangerous consequences of pollution from the indiscriminate use of mercury and deforestation and its consequences on soil, water and other resources. This will help to create a positive attitude in the communities toward adopting the alternatives proposed by the project. The other approach will be promoting economic alternatives to replace the current activities (e.g. illegal mining and logging) that generate attractive incomes and improve the livelihoods of the communities. These will include: a) development of forest operational plans with 5 communities for sustainable management and harvesting of wood products that will allow the legal harvesting and sale of wood; b) promoting within the framework of the forest operational plans, community enterprises for production of wood and non-wood products, seeking to add value to production and obtaining better prices; c) piloting with 10 communities in the IFR a local network of community seed providers that will produce good quality seeds enabling the legal sale of seeds for reforestation and agroforestry purposes; d) developing community plans for commercialization of wood and non-wood products; e) establishing agroforestry systems to diversify agricultural production that will help improve food security and may in the medium and long term generate surpluses for sale. In addition, the project will generate environmental and social standards for sustainable forest management that will set the basis for a future forest products certification program that will help integrate the

communities into markets that demand certified products and thereby receiving better prices for producing sustainable forest products.

The project will promote gender equity. It will develop a socio-economic-cultural protocol to evaluate the role of men and women in the management of forest resources according to their age and social condition. The analysis of the data will provide information related to the use of resources and the description of the users; needs for hand labor; roles, responsibilities and vulnerabilities related to climate change and its consequences, with emphasis on vulnerability and adaptation options, that will help identify gender-oriented options that can be proposed by the project. Furthermore, the project will foster the timely participation of women in all project activities such as: a) creating income opportunities (e.g. through improved agroforestry systems with diversified production, marketing of non-wood products, and planning and implementation of SFM); b) promoting the participation of women in training activities as well as designing specific training for women according to their interests and demands in the context of SFM (with at least 30% participation of women in community trainings); c) participation in field monitoring with specific activities designed for women (at least 30% female participation); d) a special line for women within the investment fund to be designed under the project to support commercialization of non-wood products. Data will be disaggregated by gender to facilitate monitoring of differentiated impacts by the project.

The project will promote stakeholder participation through tools such as: a) contacts with leaders or authorities of the local communities and indigenous peoples, b) sharing of information on the project (objectives, planned activities, progress and results); c) community meetings; d) participatory assessments; e) consultation and validation workshops; f) training; and g) participatory evaluations. These will help engage the communities in activities such as: a) identifying priority areas for SFM intervention; b) participatory monitoring of forest ecosystems; c) participatory monitoring of SFM sustainability standards; d) incorporating labor in SFM activities; e) development of social production enterprises for production and commercialization of wood and non-wood products; f) forest restoration through agroforestry, reforestation and analog forestry, g) community involvement in surveillance and control, through setting up monitoring brigades to work jointly with state institutions in protecting the IFR.

Moreover, the project will take into account the ethno-cultural characteristics of the communities in the IFR, including the role of the family in production and income generation, socio-economic differences between men and women and the differences in knowledge related to the use of the environment by each. In the case of indigenous groups the incorporation of women in project interventions will depend on the customs and traditions of each group, taking care not to promote actions that could generate resistance to the participation of community members. The project will respect traditional values and livelihoods to avoid influencing ethno- cultural changes.

In the long term around 250,000 people from rural areas who have a direct relation or live within forest reserves would benefit from replication of the experiences and lessons learned to other forest reserves in the country.

### **B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:**

The project's components will collectively address the threats to the GEBs provided by the forest ecosystems of the IFR by removing the identified barriers and for which the following cost-effective strategies and methodologies have been selected and will be implemented within the framework of the Project:

- Development of institutional arrangements to optimize coordination, collaboration, support and participation of institutional and community stakeholders involved in forest ecosystem monitoring and SFM / SLM.
- Development of a set of cost-effective protocols for data collection and analysis, and construction of forest ecosystem monitoring indicators, as well as innovative tools to implement in practice the new vision on forest land use planning and SFM based on an eco-social approach.
- Harmonization of existing data models and information systems through establishing an integrated information management system that includes user-friendly tools (e.g. web-mapping) and products (e.g. thematic maps) that will improve information and facilitate its access and use by different user groups.

- Capacity development of managerial and technical government personnel to improve and/or update their knowledge in participatory tools for forest management as well as innovative SFM / SLM tools.
- Training and awareness raising of community stakeholders to promote an attitudinal shift toward sustainable management of forests, soil and water, and adoption of appropriate technologies.
- Stakeholder participation (government institutions and community organizations) in all stages of Project implementation will ensure that the decision-making mechanisms and implementation of activities is aligned with the project's objectives and development priorities.
- Promotion of appropriate technologies for forest and land restoration (reforestation, analog forestry, agroforestry) will generate lessons and experiences on generation of GEBs (habitats for forest biodiversity, carbon stocks and soil and water conservation) that will be replicable to other areas of the IFR and at national level.
- The development of an investment fund for SFM / SLM practices, commercialization of non-wood products and implementation of environmental and social SFM standards will ensure long term financing for conservation, restoration and application of SFM / SLM in forests and soils under degradation processes.
- Systematization of experiences and lessons learned will contribute to a cost-effective replication of project results at national level.

### **C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M & E PLAN:**

Monitoring and evaluation activities will follow FAO and GEF monitoring and evaluation policies and guidelines. The table below summarizes the project Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. For further details please see the FAO Project Document, sections 4.5 and 4.6.

<b>Type of M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Time-frame</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Inception Workshop	Project Technical Coordinator (PTC), FAOVE (supported by LTO, BH, and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit)	Within two months of project start up	USD 40,000
Project Inception Report	PTC and FAOVE, cleared by LTO, BH, and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after the workshop	-
Field-based impact monitoring	PTC, project partners, local organizations	Continually	USD 235,400 (3% of PTC time; 20% of M&E Assistant time, cost of annual workshops for monitoring and follow-up)
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	PTC and FAO (FAOVE, LTO and FAO GEF Coordination Unit)	Annual or as required	FAO visits will be financed through GEF agency fee. Project coordination visits will be financed by the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports (PPR)	PTC with inputs by project partners and other participating institutions	Six-monthly	USD 18,600 (2% of PTC time, 10% of M&E Assistant time)
Project Implementation Review report (PIR)	FAO (LTO and FAOVE) supported by the PTC. PIRs cleared and submitted by the FAO GEF Coordination Unit to the GEF Secretariat	Annual	Financed through GEF agency fee
Co-financing Reports	PTC with inputs from other co-financiers	Annual	USD 13,800 (1% of PTC time, 8% of M&E Assistant time)

<b>Type of M&amp;E Activity</b>	<b>Responsible Parties</b>	<b>Time-frame</b>	<b>Budget</b>
Technical reports	PTC, and FAO (LTO, FAOVE)	As appropriate	
Mid-term Evaluation	External Consultant, FAO Office for Evaluation in consultation with the project team including the GCU and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000 for independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Final evaluation	External Consultant, FAO independent Evaluation Office in consultation with the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000 for external, independent consultants and associated costs. In addition the agency fee will pay for expenditures of FAO staff time and travel
Terminal Report	PTC, FAO (FAOVE, LTO, TSCR Report Unit, FAO-GEF Coordination Unit)	At least two months before the end date of the GCP Agreement	
<b>Total Budget</b>			<b>USD 412,800</b>

**PART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)**

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
Lic. Lissett Hernández	Directora General Dirección General de la Oficina de Gestión y Cooperación Internacional	MINISTERIO DEL PODER POPULAR PARA EL AMBIENTE	04/04/2013

**B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION**

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation Department FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla (00153) Rome, Italy <a href="mailto:TCI-Director@fao.org">TCI-Director@fao.org</a>		05/22/2015	Jorge Meza Principal Forestry Officer	(56-2) 2923- 2181	Jorge.Meza@fao.org
Jeffrey Griffin Senior Coordinator FAO GEF Coordination Unit Investment Centre Division				+39 0657055680	Jeffrey.Griffin@fao.org

**ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK** (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please see Appendix 1 of the FAO-GEF Project Document

**ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS** (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

**Responses to Council comments:**

Council Comments	Responses
<p>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PIF does not refer to the current reform of the national forest law in Venezuela. The baseline does not make reference to potential synergies with regional capacity building programs implemented by OTCA such as “Proyecto Monitoreo en la Amazonía Regional” and the project “Fortalecimiento institucional de los países miembros de la OTCA en manejo integral y sustentable de los bosques para una gestión forestal ecológicamente responsable y conservación de la biodiversidad en la Amazonía”.</li> </ul>	<p>Germany’s comments have been taken into account in the FAO-GEF Project Document. Sections 1.1.1.a) on institutional and policy framework, 1.1.1.a) on projects and investments include information on the Forest Law passed in 2013 and the Forest Policy for development. The Forest Law is an important baseline and the interventions have been designed to support the implementation of the law through different instruments and mechanisms contained in the law that currently do not exist.</p> <p>The Project “Deforestation Monitoring, Forest Land Use Changes in the Pan-amazon Forest” (Proyecto Monitoreo en la Amazonía Regional) has been included in the baseline analysis (please see Section 1.1.1.a) on projects and investments). The project provides capacity building to the Forests General Directorate of the Ministry of Eco-socialism and the Forests General Directorate.</p> <p>In terms of synergies this project will provide information on forest ecosystems (including the intervention area) that will be incorporated in the Integrated Forest Information System to be developed by the GEF project, and which will be useful for the development of SFM and SLM.</p> <p>In regards to the second project mentioned in the comments, the Forests General Directorate has stated that the project idea was presented to the Authorities of the member countries but no decision was taken; therefore it has not been included in the baseline analysis.</p>

**Responses to GEFSEC comments**

Review Criteria	Questions	GEFSEC comments	Responses
Project Design	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	By CEO endorsement it is requested that the process and type of engagement with local stakeholders in forest (carbon) monitoring be elaborated. The details on the selected subsidy and support programmes are also expected during the	The project will develop a participatory mechanism for monitoring of the forest cover and status of forest communities and indigenous people (Section 1.1.6). This will entail developing a participatory monitoring, a training program for community monitoring, and piloting of the monitoring mechanism in an area of 3,000 ha of forests. The key strategy for community buy-in and involvement will be to ensure the benefits of sustainable forest use compensate the impacts of mining, especially the highly visible consequences of pollution from the indiscriminate use of mercury and deforestation and its consequences on soil, water and other resources. Training will cover a number of themes related to information gathering

		endorsement stage.	biodiversity, carbon and socio-economic aspects. Participation of both men and women will be encouraged (30% participation of women is estimated) and assignment of tasks will take into account their respective knowledge and use of forest resources. Please refer to Section 2.4 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for further details on the monitoring mechanism. Development of the monitoring mechanism will be undertaken with the National Forest Company in charge of managing forest units in the Imataca Forest Reserve (IFR) and will incorporate the mechanism, experiences and lessons in its operations.
	8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	By CEO endorsement, please identify deforestation rate, forest types at the target locations, species to be used for agroforestry, and use the location specific information to estimate CO2 sequestered	<p><i>Deforestation rates and forest types:</i> A description of the IFR is included in Section 1.1 b) of the FAO-GEF Project Document, including deforestation rates. Furthermore, Appendix 7 includes a vegetation map of the IFR with forest types.</p> <p><i>Species to be used for agroforestry:</i> a list has been included in the description of Output 3.2.1 under Section 2.4 of the FAO-GEF Project Document.</p> <p><i>Location specific information to estimate CO2 sequestered:</i> The project will monitor carbon sequestration benefits through the Simplified Agroforestry Methodology. Monitoring will include the establishment of 36 permanent plots of 0.1 ha, measurement and re-measurement of the plots. Please refer to Section 2.4 of the FAO-GEF Project Document (Output 3.2.1) for more details.</p>
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	By CEO endorsement please ensure: Details of how the project will deal with the indigenous communities in the reserve is provided.	<p>The project will promote the participation of stakeholders through tools such as: a) contacts with leaders or authorities of the local communities and indigenous peoples, b) sharing of information on the project (objectives, planned activities, progress and results); c) community meetings; d) participatory assessments; e) consultation and validation workshops; f) training; and g) participatory evaluations.</p> <p>It will at all levels take into account the ethno-cultural characteristics of the communities in the IFR, including the role of the family in production and income generation, socio-economic differences between men and women and the differences in knowledge related to the use of the environment by each. In the case of indigenous groups the incorporation of women in project interventions will depend on the customs and traditions of each group, taking care not to promote actions that could generate resistance to the participation of community members. The project will respect traditional values and livelihoods to avoid influencing ethno- cultural changes. During PY1 the project will undertake consultations with the communities and indigenous peoples following the</p>

			<p>procedures established in the regulations in force.</p> <p>Please see Section 2.1 for overall participation aspects and Section 2.4 for participation aspects at the level of specific outputs.</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 resilience)</p>	<p>By CEO Endorsement please provide clear description of how the project implementation arrangements will be constructed to maximize the potential for ensuring progress of the project and includes adequate provision for monitoring project implementation and means for addressing issues arising.</p>	<p>The project management structure will comprise a Project Steering Committee (PSC) and a Project Management Unit (PMU). The PSC will be responsible for overall project management and monitoring and will include the main government institutions involved in project implementation. These include the Ministry of Eco-socialism and Water, the National Forest Company, the National Reforestation Company, Tree Mission and the Latin American Forestry Foundation. These are key institutions with mandates in forest conservation and management, reforestation and restoration within the framework of the Forest Law and the Forest Policy. They are also the project co-financiers. Additionally, a number of other institutions will be invited to PSC meetings to ensure a smooth coordination at government level. In addition the PSC will include representatives of the beneficiaries to ensure that the needs and demands of these stakeholders, and local development priorities are taken into account in project management.</p> <p>The PMU will be in charge of day-to-day management and implementation of project activities, as well as monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E), stakeholder coordination and participation. The PMU will set up a project M&amp;E system on the basis of FAO-GEF M&amp;E policies and procedures, the Results Framework, the M&amp;E plan, the Annual Workplans and Budgets, and the Risk Analysis Matrix. Within the framework of the M&amp;E, the PMU will be in charge of collecting data in sufficient detail to track specific outputs and outcomes, and flag project risks early on. Output target indicators will be monitored on a six-monthly basis, and outcome target indicators will be monitored on an annual basis, if possible, or as part of the mid-term and final evaluations. For further details please refer to the FAO-GEF Project Document, Section 4.2 on implementation arrangements.</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>Full details of how the project will coordinate with other activities are expected at CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>The project will coordinate with the GEF projects: i) “Social Integral Development and its Interrelation with Climate Change in Watersheds in Lara and Falcon States” (#3963); and ii) Strengthening the Financial Sustainability and Operational Effectiveness of the Venezuelan National Parks System” (#3609). Coordination will be undertaken through: (i) informal communications, and (ii) exchange of information. In order to guarantee an effective coordination and collaboration between different initiatives, specific coordination responsibilities have been assigned to the</p>

			Project Management Unit and included in the terms of reference of the Project Technical Coordinator, which results shall be explicitly reflected in the Project Progress Reports (PPRs). Please refer to Section 4 on implementation arrangements of the FAO-GEF Project Document.
--	--	--	--

### Responses to STAP comments

STAP Comment	Response
1. While there is frequent mention of sustainable forest management, the proposal is not clear what this means in practice and how it will be facilitated. STAP recommends for FAO to detail this aspect further in the proposal.	<p>Since approval of the PIF, a new Forest Law was passed in 2013. This law defines sustainable forest management as the set of actions and measures to ensure the sustainability of forest ecosystems and their components, giving prominence to the protection of forests, conservation of water resources and biodiversity, as well as to the recovery and increase of the forest cover in the national territory, and the promotion of forest plantations of multiple use, and agroforestry systems, among other aspects (Article 7; <a href="http://www.asambleanacional.gov.ve/uploads/leyes/2013-07-16/doc_05a8cc1ae88b826671216473c5bfec0ab28da895.pdf">http://www.asambleanacional.gov.ve/uploads/leyes/2013-07-16/doc_05a8cc1ae88b826671216473c5bfec0ab28da895.pdf</a>)</p> <p>The project is consistent with this law and has taken into account this definition in the identification of interventions. Please refer to Section 2 of the FAO-GEF project document for a detailed description of the project strategy and proposed activities in line with the above definition.</p>
2. Furthermore, STAP recommends detailing to what extent fuel wood harvesting is a driver of deforestation and forest degradation. STAP believes this may be an important factor to consider, as well as thinking about alternative fuel wood sources. Additionally, it would be useful to detail further how the indicator on quantity of fuel wood will be assessed.	As per information provided by the National Forest Company, which is in charge of managing forestry operations in the Imataca Forest Reserve and works with the communities in the area, the use of fuel wood is low and not sufficiently significant to be considered a driver of deforestation and degradation. Most of the population in the area of influence of the Reserve is urban and uses other heating sources (e.g. gas)
3. STAP appreciates the comprehensive description of the incremental reasoning and the global environmental benefits. This includes providing initial values for carbon sequestration from sustainable forest management and sustainable land management activities. Similarly, STAP welcomes the various references made to defining more precisely the baselines for the global environmental benefits (forest biodiversity and carbon sequestration) during the development of the proposal. In this regard, STAP encourages FAO to specify the indicators that will be used to estimate and monitor each global environmental benefit, as well as the methodologies used.	The comment has been duly taken into account. Please refer to the Results Framework in Appendix 1 of the FAO-GEF Project Document, which includes the GEB baselines and indicators.
4. In component 2, STAP suggests for the project developers to rely on the following STAP advisory document for the development of a certified sustainable forest management scheme. The document presents the evidence base on environmental and socioeconomic	The project will no longer develop a forest certification scheme as proposed in the PIF. The Forest Law (2013) in its Article 112 stipulates that the Ministry of Popular Power responsible for the environment may certify the production of wood and non-wood products from native forests or

STAP Comment	Response
<p>impacts of sustainable certification of forest products (among others), and defines implications for the GEF – such as defining the proposal so that it is explicitly designed to evaluate the environmental impacts of the attempt to certify sustainable forest products. The document is titled "Environmental Certification and the Global Environment Facility, A STAP Advisory Document. September 2010. www.stapgef.org</p>	<p>forest plantations that comply with environmental standards set forth by the relevant body. However there are currently no standards that may serve as the basis for such certification. The project will therefore support the Ministry in developing and piloting national environmental and social sustainability standards for SFM, to generate experiences and lessons that may serve as the basis for a future certification program. Development of the standards will involve designing criteria and indicators for the standards as well as a participatory monitoring mechanism. Please refer to Section 2.4 of the FAO-GEF Project Document and the Results Framework for further details (Outputs 2.2.1 and 2.2.2).</p>
<p>5. It is unlikely that the root to shoot ratio is higher in tropical forests than in drier forest types. It would be preferable to use the same reference for each forest type, especially where one forest type will replace the other. For example, STAP suggests using "Mokany" for all forest types.</p>	<p>The National Forest Company and the Amazon Forest Inventory Network (RAINFOR) have installed four permanent plots in the Imataca Forest Reserve (project intervention area) to measure and estimate aboveground biomass, following the RAINFOR protocols (<a href="http://www.rainfor.org/en/manuals">http://www.rainfor.org/en/manuals</a>). Estimation of the carbon benefits included in the FAO-GEF Project Document is based on the results of this work. The RAINFOR protocols will be used during project implementation to measure and monitor the carbon benefits during the project’s lifetime.</p>
<p>6. STAP recommends paying close attention to the units when referring to forest carbon stocks and avoided emissions. For instance, STAP believes the figures are tC rather than CO2 in some instances. Furthermore, the restoration (which are actually in tC not CO2e) must relate to sequestration over the long term. Therefore, STAP recommends defining the time-frame of the calculations and providing a figure over the life of the project.</p>	<p>The comment has been duly taken into account. The carbon benefits have been estimated for the project’s lifetime. Please refer to Appendix 9 of the FAO-GEF Project Document for details on the estimated figures.</p>

**ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS<sup>3</sup>**

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

NA

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

<b>PPG Grant Approved at PIF: US\$ 200,000</b>			
<b><i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i></b>	<b><i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i></b>		
	<b><i>Budgeted Amount</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Spent To Date</i></b>	<b><i>Amount Committed</i></b>
Professional salaries	11,321.00		11,321.00
Local consultants	94,500.00	7,311.80	84,525.00
International consultants	22,000.00	3,600.00	14,400.00
Travel	20,500.00	9,468.55	6,503.23
Workshops	51,679.00	62,870.42	
<b>Total</b>	<b><u>200,000.00</u></b>	<b><u>83,250.77</u></b>	<b><u>116,749.23</u></b>

<sup>3</sup> If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

**ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used)**

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

**NA**