



---

## Strengthening the integral and sustainable management of biodiversity and forests by indigenous peoples and local communities in fragile ecosystems of the dry forests of the Bolivia Chaco

### Basic Information

**GEF ID**

10393

**Countries**

Bolivia

**Project Title**

Strengthening the integral and sustainable management of biodiversity and forests by indigenous peoples and local communities in fragile ecosystems of the dry forests of the Bolivia Chaco

**GEF Agency(ies)**

FAO

**Agency ID**

FAO: 667102

**GEF Focal Area(s)**

Multi Focal Area

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

## PIF

### Part I – Project Informatics

#### Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019: :

Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

### Co-financing

**3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?**

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019:

There is no sub-set of the co-financing that meets the definition of Investment Mobilized. Please explain.

**November 5, 2019:**

Thank you for the clarification and adjustments. Cleared.

## Agency Response

The "investment mobilized" was included in Table C under three types of investments (municipal annual budgets, annual municipalities purchases, and purchase by private sector), from the third year of the project. In order to facilitate these investments mobilized, the following changes were included in Table A: (i) in the component 1, the allocation of funds in the municipal annual budgets as part of the indicator on participatory processes of integral territorial management established, strengthened or approved to support decision-making on ISMBF, in each of the seven municipalities included in the project; and (ii) in the component 2, the establishment of Communal Economic Organizations (OECOMs, according to its name in Spanish) for commercialization of the produce from the ISMBF implemented by indigenous peoples and local communities, under project outputs (as 2.1.4), and the addition of its corresponding indicator of the establishment of seven OECOMs.

## GEF Resource Availability

**4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

### Agency Response

## The STAR allocation?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, the budget required for the proposed project is \$4 million and total budget available is \$17.82 million (no STAR resources have been utilized so far). cleared.

### Agency Response

## The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

October 23, 2019:

Yes, the budget uses \$1.5 million from the LD focal area (out of \$3.19 million available) and \$2.5 million from the BD focal area (out of \$12.57 million available). cleared.

**Agency Response****The LDCF under the principle of equitable access****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Not Applicable.

**Agency Response****The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Not Applicable.

**Agency Response****Focal area set-aside?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Not Applicable.

**Agency Response**

**Impact Program Incentive?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Not Applicable.

**Agency Response**

**Project Preparation Grant**

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

October 22, 2019:

The PPG requested is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

## Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

## Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

## Part II – Project Justification

## 1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**October 24, 2019:**

- The described barrier doesn't include the lack of capacity to prevent and control forest fires. As it is a common practice which most likely will continue even with improved SLM, shouldn't the project consider this barrier too? Please explain.
- The expansion of agriculture is mainly explained by poor agriculture practices. Isn't there other drivers, such as economic/regulatory, that the proposal should also consider to maximize the chance of success of the project?

**November 5, 2019:**

Thank you for the complements. Cleared.

### Agency Response

Under section 1a.1 it was included Barrier 4 "Insufficient capacity to prevent and control forest fires" was included.

Under 1a.1 "Land degradation in forests and agricultural systems, and its drivers in the project intervention areas" it was added the economic and regulatory drivers of expansion of agriculture over forests in the Chaco region, which complement the technical (management) causes previously indicated. These three drivers have briefly referred also in the section 1a.1 "Deforestation and land-use change".

## 2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**October 24, 2019:**



There is no mention of on-going projects funded through the international cooperation. Nevertheless, some development partners such as the World Bank, FAO, the Nordic Development Fund... support the agriculture and forestry sectors in Bolivia including on innovation with the INIAF and institutional capacity. Isn't there such projects that the proposal could articulate with and benefit from?

**November 6, 2019:**

Thank you for the clarification. We thus understand that at concept stage there isn't any other significant project identified that can be associated with this proposal. We request the project developers to further explore during the PPG phase possible articulation with actions supported by development partners such as the World Bank, IFAD, GIZ, JICA (which begins discussion on value chains in 2019) and others. Cleared.

**Agency Response** It was included: (i) National Maize Program and National Chilli Program (implemented by INIAF), (ii) National Registry of Agricultural Varieties (implemented by INIAF), and the "Conservation and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity to improve human nutrition in five macro-regions" Project (implemented by the Ministry of Environment and Water together with FAO).

**3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**October 24, 2019:**

All the components are supported by Technical Assistance with many actions related to capacity building, training, workshops..., and there is no Investments. It is unclear without investments how the project will have concrete results on the ground, such as the establishment of ISMBF design and management practices, nurseries and communal enterprises for the processing of biodiversity products, forests and agrobiodiversity. Please explain.

**November 5, 2019:**

Thank you for the adjustments. Nevertheless, they are not reflected in Table B. Please adjust also the table B.

**November 7, 2019:**

Thank you for the adjustment in the table B. Cleared.

## Agency Response

November 7, 2019

Noted. Component 2 is supported by Investments; this has been reflected in the latest version of the PIF document as well as in the GEF portal submission.

The indication of Component 2 as “technical assistance” was an involuntary error during uploading the PIF. Yet, component 2 on “Implementation of the ISMBF for SFM and SLM at the landscape level in the Chaco region, to advance towards LDN” was adjusted to make explicit that this is the core investment component that will secure the ecological and social functions of ISMBF, as well as its economic sustainability and the scaling up and out of the project. These adjustments are reflected in Table B and in section 1a.3 “The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project”. In the latter, the explanatory text of Outcome 2.1 was updated. With the indicated changes, the component 2 starts with the technical implementation of ISMBF (now output 2.1.1, before 2.1.4) and involves the establishment of OECOMs (as project output 2.1.4) as the adding-value and commercial body of the ISMBF implemented by indigenous peoples. Therefore, the establishment of OECOMs will contribute to secure the economic sustainability of the ISMBF to be implemented. Additionally, the technical and investment activities were streamlined under this component by moving to the component 1 the project outcome on development of community plans for ISMBF (now output 1.1.3, before 2.1.3) and a new corresponding indicator was added (at least 15 communal action plans developed and implemented in a participatory manner, for ISMBF, one in each community included in the project). Additionally, it was moved to the component 3 the project outcome of monitoring environmental functions resulting from ISMBF for SFM, SLM and LDN (now output 3.1.2, before 2.1.5). The wording of component 2 was adjusted according to the changes indicated above, making explicit that any capacity building in under this component is “technical” (see current project outputs 2.1.2 and 2.1.3).

## 4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

### Agency Response

#### 5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

### Agency Response

#### 6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

##### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

- With respect to the new investment provided only by the GEF grant, the targeted areas of protected areas and landscapes under improved practices appear relatively high. Please explain.

- The proposals says that the environmental degradation processes affect more than 5,800,000 ha, which represents 6 percent of the project intervention area. Could the project intervention area be so big? Please explain.

November 6, 2019:

- Thank you for the adjustment. The description indeed mentions: Sub indicator 4.1: 100,000 hectares of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (area 1: Sub-Andean strip and Chaco plains, 60,000 ha under SFM; 39,000 ha under agroforestry and silvopastoral systems management; 1,000 ha under agriculture focused on agroecological systems); Sub indicator 4.3: 6,000 hectares under sustainable land management in production landscapes and Sub Indicator 4.3: 2,000 ha with strengthened environmental functions, including CO2 mitigation. Nevertheless, the changes are not reflected in the Core Indicator table of the PIF. The total area under improved management of 350,000 ha is not the sum of the different sub indicators. In addition, please correct and complete accordingly.

- Well noted, thank you.

**November 7, 2019:**

Thank you for the adjustment. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

**November 7, 2019**

Duly noted. The amounts concerning Core Indicator 4 have been corrected in the Core Indicator Worksheet (Annex B uploaded under the "Documents" section.

The targeted area under protected areas and landscapes under improved practices was updated by reducing the total area to 100,000 hectares distributed as follows: 60,000 ha under SFM; 39,000 ha under agroforestry and silvopastoral systems management; and 1,000 ha under agriculture focused on agroecological systems. These changes were included in Table B, section 1a.3 "The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project", and section 1a.6 "Global environmental benefits". The targeted area is considered feasible provided that the project includes an output of developing a co-management model for protected areas based on the ISMBF approach, and in the area of intervention exists 3,497,712 ha of national protected areas and 300,563 ha of sub-national protected areas in the GAIOC of Charagua Iyambae. Hence, just a portion of them will be targeted.

Concerning 5,800,000 ha representing the 6 percent of the project intervention area, it was an involuntary mistake, which was corrected with the following text: "These processes affect more than 5,800,000 ha, being 6 percent of it located in the project intervention area."

## **7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****October 24, 2019:**

The proposal says the ISMBF project approach has the potential to be scaled up and out from the family farm to the communal, basin and regional levels in terms of improved agro-ecological production systems. Considering the important needs for capacity building and training that are not covered today, as demonstrated by the proposal, it is unclear how such potential to scaled up can be achieved. Please explain.

**November 6, 2019:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

Under the section 1a.7 "Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up/out", the scales of impact was streamlined to farm, communal and basin area (excluding regional scales). In this section, it was also explicit that scaling up and out the project and its approach and results include working with local governments, mainly municipalities and indigenous peoples captaincies and communities; including and prioritizing women and youth along with the whole project; establishing OECOMs and their economic dynamics to reach local and national markets; and channeling the support of national and sub-national programs.

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion****October 22, 2019:**

Yes, cleared.

**Agency Response**

## Stakeholders

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**October 22, 2019:**

There is no clear indicative information on how the private sector will be engaged in the project preparation. Please clarify accordingly.

**November 6, 2019:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### Agency Response

In section 1b.2 "Stakeholders" it was added information on how the private sector will be engaged through individual and associated private producers, and markets. More details are provided under 1b.4 Private sector engagement.

## Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

**October 22, 2019:**

Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

## Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

## Agency Response

## Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019:

The proposal says that climate change is another cause of decreasing biodiversity and rising soil degradation but it isn't explicitly considered as a risk. Please take into account this risk too and clarify if it is related to the mentioned "extreme weather conditions".

**November 6:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency Response** In section 1b.5 "Risks", under "Extreme weather conditions negatively affect ecosystems" a clarification was added indicating that the project will manage it by establishing the initial ISMBF in less weather vulnerable sub-areas.

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined?  
Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**October 22, 2019:**

- The stakeholder table informs that FAO, as Implementing Agency, will support in the M&E of project implementation, which is part of component 3 and as such, correspond to executing functions. Please, in the "Coordination" section, list explicitly all the functions FAO plans to undertake in this project and indicate which functions would be financed by Agency fees and which one would be financed by PMC or the project budget.
- There is no mention of the GEF-7 SFM Dryland Impact Program. Please explore possible linkages with this Program that could be beneficial for both the proposed project and the Program.
- The project developers are invited to explore possible synergies with the recently approved GEF AVACLIM project (GEF ID#9993) which is a global project implemented by FAO and promoting agro-ecology.
- Please also consider if the GEF project "SFM Sustainable Forest Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco American Ecosystem" is relevant too.

**November 6, 2019:**

- Thank you for the clarification indicating the implementing agency will not undertake any executing function.
- The other comments regarding the possible articulation with other GEF investments don't appear to be addressed. Please address them.



**November 8, 2019:**

In the coordination section, it is said that the Project Management Unit will be “financed with GEF resources”. Actually the PMU should be covered by Project Management Cost which include not only GEF resources, but also co-financing resources (see paragraph 5 – Annex 8 from the GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy). Please clarify and amend the text accordingly.

**November 8, 2019:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency Response****November 8, 2019**

Addressed in the body of the PIF. PMU will indeed be co-financed substantially as PMC budget is never enough to ensure minimum standards for appropriate project coordination.

**November 7, 2019**

Point taken, we have included the coordination with the AVACLIM and Drylands Programs in section 6 of the PIF.

Please note that we have not included coordination activities with the GEF project "SFM Sustainable Forest Management in the Transboundary Gran Chaco American Ecosystem" since it ended in 2013. Nonetheless, we expect to take lessons learned from this project.

As described in section 6. Coordination, the VMA (viceministerio de medio ambiente...) will be the executing entity and FAO will act as implementing agency.

The sentence "Support in the M&E of *project implementation*" in the Stakeholders section has been changed for "*Support project implementation and supervision as an implementing agency as established in the Project and Program Cycle Policy*".

## Consistency with National Priorities

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

## Knowledge Management

**Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project's/program's overall impact and sustainability?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 23, 2019:

Yes, the knowledge management is included in the component 3 and coordination is planned with other relevant projects/programs. cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

October 22, 2019:

Yes, cleared.

#### Agency Response

#### Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not Applicable

Agency Response

**EFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**October 24, 2019:**

Thank you for this relevant and timely proposal. Some comments above need to be addressed. The PIF isn't yet recommended for technical clearance.

**November 6, 2019:**

Thank you for the clarification and adjustments provided. Nevertheless some last comments still need to be considered. Please address these comments.

**November 8, 2019:**

Not yet. Please address the remaining comment.

**November 8, 2019:**

Yes, the PIF is now recommended for technical clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

**Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.**

## Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

## /iew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	10/24/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/8/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		