



Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program - Phase II

Basic Information

GEF ID

10198

Countries

Regional (Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, Peru, Suriname)

Project Title

Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program - Phase II

GEF Agency(ies)

World Bank, CI, FAO, IFAD, UNDP, UNIDO, CAF, WWF-US

Agency ID

World Bank: World Bank

GEF Focal Area(s)

Multi Focal Area

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

PIF

Part I – Project Informatic

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

April 10, 2019

Yes, the program is aligned with the SFM Impact Program and its focus on the sustainable management of forests. Cleared.

Agency Response Note taken. Thanks.

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

April 10, 2019

Yes, Table B provides a clear program framework of components and key outcomes to achieve the program objectives and to contribute to

five of the program core indicators. Cleared.

Agency Response Note taken. Thanks

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

April 10, 2019

The cofinancing package is presented, underpinned by the information in the associated child projects, with a brief explanation in the PFD of how cofinancing was identified supported by more in-depth explanations in the child projects. Please note the following requests:

- 1) In the case of Bolivia, the cofinancing ratio is quite low particularly with the involvement of an important regional development bank such as CAF. Please re-evaluate this cofinancing package and revise the cofinancing presentation for Bolivia.
- 2) In the case of Colombia, given the significant amount of resources being invested in the Colombian Amazon by many donors, we would expect a higher level of cofinancing for the GEF investments. Please re-evaluate this cofinancing package and revise the cofinancing presentation for Colombia.
- 3) In the case of Guyana, please re-evaluate the current cofinancing package carefully and assess whether the full complement of resources are being categorized correctly with regards to cofinancing for the GEF investment.

With regards to the master table of cofinancing sources for the program (Table C), please provide a breakdown of co-financing by entity. Each row must be an individual cofinancier, not grouped together.

Please ensure that when using "public investment" for co-financing that the sources are national and sub-national government authorities. For example, CTEA is , Table C includes one line where the source (CTEA) is listed as "Beneficiaries" and the type is "Public Investment". If the source is in fact a recipient country government authority, it should say "Government". If not, the type should not be "Public Investment".

For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

April 29, 2019

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

1. Bolivia has adjusted its estimated co-financing, increasing the ratio. This has been reflected in Table C of the PFD. The investment mobilized comes from public loans from CAF to the Bolivia's Government through the Mi Agua IV Program (\$9.1M) and a grant. In addition, donation funds from the government of Italy (\$0.6M) and estimated income from the SISCO SPAP (\$2.5M) were considered. In kind co-financing from the Government has also been estimated. Further details were included in the project's child project.
2. Colombia has adjusted its estimated co-financing to \$109 million, increasing the ratio. This has been reflected in Table C of the PFD and project document. As indicated in the earlier version of the child project, as part of negotiations between the government and international cooperation donors, investment mobilized will continue to be identified. As project preparation advances, coordination with other potential projects will be discussed in order to determine with more certainty commitments for co-financing.
3. The team has re-categorized some of the co-financing for Guyana as indicated in Table C.

On the request to increase the co-financing rate, the project team is aware that the current ratio is still low. Unfortunately, at this moment they are not able to provide better co-financing figures, but this is an ongoing effort and they are confident that an improved co-financing ratio will be obtained during project preparation phase

Following the recommendation, the co-financing table in the PFD includes further breakdown, as was submitted by the countries. The team has reviewed the categories of co-financing done by the country teams and now reflected in the PFD. For the example given for Ecuador's CTEA the category was amended as a recipient country government.

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

April 10, 2019

Yes, GEF financing and associated fee requests are in line with the GEF policies. Cleared.

Agency Response Noted. Thanks

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response Noted Thanks

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10 2019

April 10, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response Noted. Thanks

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

April 10, 2019

NA.

Agency Response**Impact Program Incentive?****Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

April 10, 2019

Yes for the IP SFM Amazon set aside. Cleared.

Agency Response Noted. Thanks

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

April 10, 2019

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response Noted. Thanks

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**

April 10, 2019

Overall Comments on the Core Indicator (CI) Reporting

1) In general, countries tend to report the entire area of the project intervention outside the protected area estate between these two indicators: core indicator 3 (restoration) and core indicator 4 (management practices).

Please ensure that for each child project there is a valid rationale to support the hectare estimates given the kinds of activities that will be implemented in these productive landscapes.

The exception to this observation was Suriname where the overall landscape outside PAs targeted was 5.38 million ha and the estimated results for this under core indicator 4 was 45,000 ha (<1% of the landscape).

2) **Please ensure that explicit assumptions are provided for the CO₂e estimates (core indicator 6, greenhouse gas emissions mitigated) and that each child project informs what methodology was used to arrive at the figures presented (Ex-ACT or other equivalently rigorous methodology).** This would help ensure there is equivalence between the different countries in terms of assumptions with the different parameters.

3) The child project for Suriname provided the most comprehensive and thorough presentation of how the proponents arrived at the core indicator figures, complete with justifications and rationale and we recommend that this be the standard by which all other child projects provide their data, particularly with regards to reporting on Core Indicators 3, 4, and 6.

Specific comments on the Core Indicator (CI) Reporting for Child Projects

Regional Child Project

1) Please clarify the added value projection of the Regional Child Project to the core indicator values. This was not clear in the core indicators table for this project nor in the accompanying footnote.

Bolivia

CI 1 = 6,201,317 ha. In the project description, the document mentions improving METT scores in 4 PAs, but under CI 1 (1.2) the document mentions 7 PAs with hectares for all counted. Please clarify.

CI 4 = 7,308,657. This represents the area of the 3 Ramsar sites where improved practices are to be promoted. Please clarify whether the improved practices are within the Ramsar Sites themselves, or external to the sites. In addition, if the Ramsar sites are protected areas these hectares should be reported under Core Indicator 1.

Please provide a rationale that supports the assumption that there will be 100% adoption of improved practices throughout the 7.3 m ha of Ramsar Sites.

CI 6. Please estimate CO2e for the project intervention and insert data.

CI 11. Please estimate project beneficiaries.

Brazil

CI 1 = 11,878,131 ha: Please clarify whether the Ramsar sites are included within PAs in Brazil totals?

CI 4 = 8,229,090 ha: We assume that this entire area is outside of protected areas (It was difficult to tell from the map)

CI 4.1 = 4,901,148.42 ha under improved practices to benefit biodiversity. Please provide a rationale that supports the assumption that there will be 100% adoption of improved practices throughout this entire area.

CI 4.4 = 3,027,941.58 ha of HCV forest loss avoided. Can you please clarify whether the area in question has been assessed against the HCVF criteria and/or what the plans are for the project to assess the forested area?

CI 11 = 1,000. The estimate of project beneficiaries seems very low; please confirm the total.

Colombia

CI 4 = 1,755,296 ha. Please provide a rationale that supports the assumption that there will be 100% adoption of improved practices throughout this entire area.

Ecuador

The document has the same hectares under two core indicators (CI 1 and CI 4) thus causing confusion and double counting. Please only include the hectares under one indicator. We would recommend taking out the hectares from C 4 and only placing the hectares under CI 1.

CI 6. Please estimate CO2e for the project intervention and insert data.

CI 11. Please estimate project beneficiaries.

Guyana

CI 4 = 400,000 ha. Please provide a rationale that supports the assumption that there will be 100% adoption of improved practices throughout this entire area.

CI 6. Please estimate CO2e for the project intervention and insert data. It is mentioned in the text but not in the core indicator tables.

CI 11. Please estimate project beneficiaries.

Peru

CI 6: 10,200,000 t CO2e. Thank you for providing information on the use of the Ex-ACT methodology and the screen shot. Please include text explaining the assumptions to arrive at this figure.

Suriname: No comments. Cleared.

Please review all child project indicator estimations and ensure that they are all properly reflected in the PFD summary table. We note that in the regional coordination project, one shared water ecosystem is listed as an indicator outcome, but it is not present in the PFD summary table. Please revise accordingly.

April 29, 2019

A comprehensive set of comments has been provided that addresses almost all of the issues raised.

However, a number of issues remain unresolved. Please address the following items:

- 1) For CI 1, The total is 32,083,872 based on summing child projects (including also minor change from response from Agency) – PFD shows 31,733,872. Please clarify.
- 2) For CI 11, the total from child projects is 25,753 – PFD shows 32,221. Please clarify.
- 3) Ecuador: The value that has presented for CO2e avoided is 15,930,461 tons. But it seems that this is the entire carbon stock – NOT emissions avoided which is what we are measuring here (unless they are suggesting the 35,000 ha is completely deforested without the project). We suggest that this child project use a projected deforestation rate over the time period and compare it with a counterfactual (without project) scenario. If Ecuador were to use Ex-ACT they could still use the Ecuadorian stock value as a Tier 2 input to the Ex-ACT tool under land-use change.

4) Guyana: The project will result in some GHG emissions avoided due to the investments being made to manage and conserve forests. As all child projects have done please report on indicator 6 using the ExACT methodology or other equivalent method.

May 5, 2019

Adequate revisions provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

Response May 4, 2019

1. The sum of the amounts included in each child project coincide with the total included in table E for Core Indicators. However, the amount was not updated in the table included in the PFD in page 44 for Ecuador and Bolivia. This has now been fixed. The team confirms that the total is 31,733,872, divided as follows: Bolivia 6,201,415

Brazil 11,878,131

Colombia 6,707,757

Ecuador 50,000

Guyana 800,000

Peru 4,386,369

Suriname 1,710,200

2. The team confirms that the total is: 32,221, divided by country as follows:

Bolivia 6,650

Brazil 1,000

Colombia 6,150

Ecuador 3,971

Guyana 700

Peru 11,000

Suriname 2,750

3. Ecuador adjusted its calculation for the carbon emissions. For the 4 years of project duration the estimated carbon avoided is 212,644 tonCO₂. This has been calculated using the official Ecuadorian methodology. During project preparation before submission for CEO endorsement, the country will be able to refine its calculations. This new amount has been incorporated in both the PFD and the child project document.

4. The target for CI 6 for Guyana Child Project is 471,500 tonCO₂. This calculation has been based on the carbon stock and deforestation rates for the area of intervention (data from the Guyana Forestry Commission). During project preparation, the country will be able to refine its calculations. This amount has been incorporated in both the PFD and the child project document.

Response April: General. Note taken.

1. As requested, several of the country child projects have adjusted for estimated targets with clarifications as per recommendation.

2. The countries that will track emissions mitigated (all except for Bolivia and Guyana) have indicated the methodology used to reach the estimates.

Green Gas Emissions mitigation estimates were done based on Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT) developed by FAO, except for Ecuador that follows the official Ecuadorian methodology (see note below)

3. Note taken.

Responses to Child projects:

Regional Child Project: The estimated core indicator values for the regional project include the sum of the values for each of the seven participating countries and additional estimated non-attributable outcomes (as per GEFSEC request), represented in core indicators.

Coordination and knowledge sharing actions are expected to generate an “influencing effect” that will reach additional areas beyond the target areas of each national project; e.g., public officials will have a strengthened capacity to promote conservation and sustainable productive activities in areas beyond those targeted by ASL. Partnerships with regional initiatives is expected to strengthen capacity for conservation and sustainable development in further areas. In addition, the project will support the countries in coordination and capacity building for freshwater management across borders, potentially leading to an expanded cooperative management in a watershed like the Putumayo. This could be an indirect outcome from the ASL.

During project preparation, a results framework will be prepared which will include indicators for outcomes that the project will achieve and are not included in the core indicators.

Bolivia has provided clarification of the indicators as per request and some estimates have been adjusted. These have been included in complete version of the child project document that has been updated and is reflected in the updated table in the PFD.

CI 1: Management effectiveness of the seven protected areas targeted by the project will be improved by the implementation of the Management Status and Effectiveness Tool (EGEM in Spanish). The EGEM implementation will strengthen and update the monitoring protocols, management effectiveness tools, PAs management plans, governance schemes and enhancing sustainable alternative livelihoods for communities inside and near protected areas. The cumulative area of the seven protected areas is 6,201,415.00 ha, broken down as follows: Área Natural de Manejo Integrado y Parque Nacional Madidi (1,895,750.00), Parque Nacional Noel Kempff Mercado (1,646,756.00), Reserva de la Biosfera Estación Biológica del Beni (135,000.00), Reserva Nacional Amazonica Manuripi (747,000.00), Territorio Indígena y Parque Nacional Isiboro Sécore (1,302,757.00), Territorio Indígena y Reserva de la Biosfera Pilón Lajas (400,000.00), Reserva de Vida Silvestre Bruno Racua (74,152.00).

CI 4: 7,124,915 ha

SubIndicador: 4.1: RAMSAR sites under national planning schemes are not considered PAs but are considered Strategic Ecosystems and part of the SPAP-ECOS program. The implementation of the integrated planning approach, under SPIE law, and the systematic monitoring of biodiversity in the three RAMSAR sites (total area: 6,941,173.00 ha) will help safeguard the associated globally significant biodiversity. Participatory planning processes and the training of community organizations to strengthen sustainable practices will reduce risks of degrading habitats. The three RAMSAR sites are: Rio Yata (2,813,229.00 ha.), Rio Matos (1,729,788.00ha.) and Rio Blanco (2,398,156.00 ha.)

Currently, the RAMSAR sites were created but there is the need to consolidate a management scheme that respect the different jurisdictions but aiming the common goal to conserve biodiversity and to strengthen sustainable practices.

The project aims to start from a RAMSAR sites with little management to a well-managed site based on coordinated schemes of improved practices focused on biodiversity conservation biodiversity, equaling in the practice to a PA.

SubIndicador 4.3: The integrated development plan for the CIPOAP indigenous territories (targeted territories sum 367,484.00 ha) will include the implementation of Sustainable Land and Water Management (SLWM) practices and the strengthening of sustainable agriculture practices in the five (Yaminahua, Tacana, Cavineño Machineri and Esse eja) indigenous territories of CIPOAP. Under the project at least 50% of the indigenous territory will implement SLWM practices (183,742.00 ha.)

CI 6: The Plurinational State of Bolivia defends and strengthens at the international sphere mechanisms for the development of sustainable production systems and the conservation of forests and biodiversity with approaches that are not based on markets (carbon credits, payment for environmental services, etc.), but rather in community management of local populations, indigenous people, campesinos and small producers; criticizing efforts that commercialize nature in the framework of the United Nations system. In that sense, Law 300 on the rights of Mother Earth stands out as a response to the joint mechanism of adaptation and mitigation as an integral process to face the effects and causes of climate change. Bolivian government did not adopt any methodology for calculated the Greenhouse gas emission mitigated.

The Paris Agreement in its article 5 .2. states:

2. Parties are encouraged to take action to implement and support, including through results-based payments, the existing framework as set out in related guidance and decisions already agreed under the Convention for: policy approaches and positive incentives for activities relating to reducing emissions from deforestation and forest degradation, and the role of conservation, sustainable management of forests

and enhancement of forest carbon stocks in developing countries; and alternative policy approaches, such as joint mitigation and adaptation approaches for the integral and sustainable management of forests, while reaffirming the importance of incentivizing, as appropriate, non-carbon benefits associated with such approaches.

In its article 6.8 states:

Parties recognize the importance of integrated, holistic and balanced non-market approaches being available to Parties to assist in the implementation of their nationally determined contributions, in the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication, in a coordinated and effective manner, including through, inter alia, mitigation, adaptation, finance, technology transfer and capacity-building, as appropriate.

These approaches shall aim to: (a) Promote mitigation and adaptation ambition; (b) Enhance public and private sector participation in the implementation of nationally determined contributions; and (c) Enable opportunities for coordination across instruments and relevant institutional arrangements.

A framework for non-market approaches to sustainable development is hereby defined to promote the non-market approaches referred to in paragraph 8 of this Article.

CI 11: The direct beneficiaries include the people residing in the seven protected areas (est. 3,500, of which 45% women) that will benefit from safeguarding the ecosystem services and biodiversity upon which they depend and from promotion of sustainable alternative livelihoods, and PAs staff (est. 80, of which 15% women).

The CIPOAP indigenous peoples have a total population of 7,900 approx. (48% women, 52% men) and the project direct beneficiaries in this landscape are estimated at 1,000 people.

The project direct beneficiaries at the RAMSAR sites are estimated at 2,000 people (40% women, 60% men).

The governmental institutional beneficiaries estimated at 70 (45% women, 55% men) are not only within the nature conservation and forest management sector, but also cut across many other sectors, including tourism, agriculture, rural development, freshwater management and mining.

Total number of beneficiaries in the project will be approximately 6,650 (2,899 women, 3,751 men)

Brazil

CI 1: The area mentioned above (11,878,131 ha) corresponds to the sum of the area of the 32 protected areas in the Central Amazon Biosphere Reserve. It should be noted that the area of the Central Amazonia Biosphere Reserve overlies the Baixo Rio Negro Mosaic, and the Ramsar Site of the Anavilhanas National Park, and overlaps in part with the Rio Negro Regional Ramsar Site.

CI 4: Yes. The area mentioned above (8,229,090 ha) corresponds to the area the Central Amazon Biosphere Reserve excluding the protected areas

CI 4.1: The area mentioned above (4,901,148.42 ha) corresponds to the area of the Central Amazon Biosphere Reserve excluding the protected areas and excluding the HCV areas.

Only in the preparation of the project document the exact area that will be under improved practices to benefit biodiversity will be known. The project will support the states governments in the implementation of the instruments defined in the Native Vegetation Protection Law (Forest Code): the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR); and the Environmental Recovery Programs (PRA). As long as these instruments are implemented they will help define the area for each management activity, as they define the areas that must be preserved or managed with sustainability criteria (Permanent Preservation Areas, Legal Reserves), as well as those that will have a lower level of protection, and will be under improved practices to benefit biodiversity.

CI 4.4: These areas were not defined through HCVF criteria, but by the Priority Areas and Actions for Conservation, Sustainable Use and Benefit Sharing of Biodiversity, which is a public policy instrument to support decision making in an objective and participatory manner in all Brazilian biomes, besides the coastal and marine zones. The area mentioned above (3,027,941.58 ha) correspond to the sum of the areas the polygons of the priority areas for conservation, sustainable use and benefit sharing in the Amazon, occurring in the Central Amazon Biosphere Reserve. The protected areas were excluded, since the exercise of defining priority areas already makes this exclusion.

The instrument was officially established by Decree No. 5,092, dated 05/21/2004 and was updated through ministerial directives directed by the National Commission on Biodiversity (Conabio). It uses the methodology of systematic conservation planning (PSC), recognized throughout the world. From 2012, it was incorporated by the Native Vegetation Protection Law (Forest Code) for the definition of priority areas for Environmental Reserve Quotas and requirements for the recovery of forest liabilities in the Amazon. For the second update of the Amazon priority areas, completed in 2018, about 170 people were involved, among researchers and managers of public agencies and NGOs, both in the environmental area and in sectors that use or impact biodiversity, as well as representatives of indigenous peoples and traditional communities. It is, therefore, a robust and central instrument in biodiversity policy in Brazil. We believe that this instrument (priority areas for conservation) contemplates the criteria and categories of conservation value foreseen by the HCVF methodology, and has therefore been chosen by the country to evaluate areas of high conservation value to be worked by the project.

CI 11: The calculation of beneficiaries is probably underestimated. This considers that the phase 2 will benefit 1/3 of the beneficiaries of phase 1. Were considered the beneficiaries who participate in the decision-making processes and some of direct beneficiaries' families of the protected areas that will be supported by the project. In the process of preparing the project document, we will better estimate the number of beneficiaries, considering the number of families who live or is beneficiaries of the creation and implementation of the sustainable use protected areas, and the beneficiaries of the areas under improved practices outside the protected areas.

For the estimation of Carbon emissions mitigated: The calculations were done using the FAO tool Ex-ACT 7.2 to maintain the same methodology used in ASL 1. Considering that the region of activity of this phase 2 has lower deforestation pressure, since it is an internal area in the state of Amazonas (Biosphere Reserve), we considered that the rate of deforestation in these areas would already be half of the average calculated by government (national institute of space researches – INPE) between 2004-2015 (0.21% as used in ASL phase 1). That is, we consider that the deforestation rate in the project area would be 0.105% per year.

We consider that in the first 3 years of the project this rate will continue and in the last 3 years this rate will be reduced by half (0.0525%), in the same logic used in the ASL1 project. For restoration we will consider the 1,200 hectares of new areas and we will assume that: i) the degradation will go from "moderate" to "low"; ii) we consider that without the project degradation would continue to be "moderate" because it is an area of the interior of the Amazon; iii) there will be no incidence of fire in the project area.

Colombia:

The indicator amount has been adjusted to: 1,016,724 has.

This corresponds to 866,724 ha of the Sustainable productive Landscapes for connectivity (including Integrated management districts DMI) that have been identified as target areas of intervention (detailed in the annex of the child project). Through environmental management plans, these hectares will develop productive and conservation activities. The project will develop sustainable land management practices following the plans, contributing to the harmonization of agricultural production as well as rural tenure and access to natural resources.

In addition, 150,000 hectares of forest landscapes that have previously developed Forest use Plans (with support from GEF6) will develop improved practices related to community management of timber and non-timber forest products.

Ecuador: The team adjusted the estimated values for the indicators considering the comments.

CI1 (1.1): The project will support the creation of two connectivity corridors in the two project landscapes (one corridor in the Putumayo – Aguarico with an estimated area of 15,000 ha, and a second corridor in the Palora-Pastaza landscape, with an estimated area of 35,000 ha). Through Component 1, the project will undertake the processes needed to declare these 50,000 ha under protected status, based on the newly established Environmental Code.

CI 4 (4.3): In the two target landscapes, the project will implement actions related to sustainable production practices in a total of 20,000 ha. The estimated areas have been calculated based on an analysis of the existing areas of the Socio Bosque Program. The areas were prioritized based on the criteria of complementing planned PROAmazonía interventions.

CI 6 (6.1): The calculation of GHG emissions avoided was done for an estimated 35,000 ha of native forest in the two proposed connectivity corridors. This forested area corresponds to a carbon stock of 15,930,461 tons of eq CO₂, according to the official Ecuadorian methodology. This methodology is based on the native forest coverage (Source: MAE, Map of coverage and land use of the year 2016) and the emission factors by forest type of the National Forest Evaluation.

CI11: The beneficiaries include the men and women residing in the two corridors that will directly benefit from the ecosystem services and biodiversity as a result of the conservation and sustainable production in these areas. The total direct beneficiaries in the corridors will be 3,653: 646 men and 503 women in the Putumayo-Aguarico Corridor, and 1,268 men and 1,236 women in the Palora-Pastaza Corridor. This

calculation is based on the latest census implemented by the National Institute for Statistics and Census (2010).

The project will provide trainings to 4 indigenous groups in the Putumayo-Aguarico Landscape and 3 indigenous groups in the Palora-Pastaza Landscape, specifically to Presidents and other territory leaders, with an estimate of at least 28 direct beneficiaries (21 men and 7 women, with an emphasis on increasing women participation).

With regards to direct beneficiaries from sustainable production activities, the project will work with producers affiliated with the Socio Bosque Program. The number of direct beneficiaries is based on the number of conservation agreements in the project geographies (37 conservation agreements, with an average of 5 community members per conservation agreement totals 185 beneficiaries: 111 men and 74 women). The work with 35 local governments at a provincial, municipal and parish level will involve the participation of representatives from the areas of environment, production, and planning (105 people total: 63 men and 42 women).

Guyana:

With regards to including a rationale for the Core Indicator's targets, see explanation below. This has been incorporated in the child project. The estimates are based on current knowledge of the project landscapes, and will be refined and improved during project preparation phase, when the team will be able to perform more in depth research, field work and public consultations.

CI 4: The project will develop a land use plan for Area B (covering the entire 400,000 ha) to secure landscape connectivity within the region. In this landscape, specific training, equipment, infrastructure, and monitoring activities will be supported through the project to bring an estimated area of 40,000 ha (10% of Area B) under improved management to benefit biodiversity. This figure will be updated during project preparation phase.

CI 6: With regards to the comment on "ensuring that explicit assumptions are provided for the CO2e estimates (core indicator 6, greenhouse gas emissions mitigated)", the project team was not planning to report on Core Indicator 6, since the project is not climate oriented, and it is not using funds from the Climate Change Focal Area.

CI 11: Number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender as co-benefit of GEF investment. The direct beneficiaries include the communities bordering Area A and Area B – who depend on the ecosystem services provided by the landscapes; government personnel who will benefit from project-supported trainings; government agency staff who will be empowered with stronger regulations/policy and training; and users of the productive landscape, including miners and loggers who will have access to trainings on best practice and sustainable use. An estimated 700 people will be direct beneficiaries of the project (approximately 40% women, since most loggers and miners in the area are men). The number of direct beneficiaries will be finalized during project development

Peru:

The Methodology for GHG accounting used for the project was the EX-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT). Assumptions for the calculations are the following:

The intervention area is in Satipo, Atalaya, and Loreto. According to the IPCC Climate Zones, this region qualifies for a tropical wet climate with Low Activity Clay Soils. The project is implemented over a total period of 5 years, i.e. from 2022 to 2026. The IPCC states, in its 2006 Guidelines for National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (Chapter 2) that, "the length of time that land remains in a conversion category after a change in land use [or management practice] is by default 20 years (the time period assumed for carbon stocks to come to equilibrium for

change in land use (or management practice) is by default 20 years (the time period assumed for carbon stocks to come to equilibrium for the purposes of calculating default coefficients in the 1996 IPCC Guidelines and retained for GPG-LULUCF and used here also, though other periods may be used at higher tiers according to national circumstances)". For the present project, the implementation phase is 5 years and the capitalization phase is 15 years, equaling the default 20 years of the IPCC.

Calculations were done based on these estimates: area of land restored: 7,900 ha; area of landscapes under improved practices (excluding PA): 15,000 ha; Area with avoided deforestation: 13,000 ha

Land Use Change (Deforestation): Based on the deforestation statistics for the years 2001-2017 provided by the Ministry of Environment of Perú (see Annex 1), the deforestation of tropical rain forests was projected in a business-as-usual (BAU) scenario for the years 2018-2022. The forests of Satipo, Atalaya and Loreto are projected to be deforested and converted into other lands. With the project, deforestation will be reduced by 10%.

Cropland (Annual Crops), grassland and forest management: While the project will define the specific territories in the PPG stage, the project aims to improve 15,000 ha of annual crops through improved agronomic practices (using improved varieties, extending crop rotation and/or increasing crop residues) and hectares of perennial crops.

Residues are also no longer burnt on the same area.

Currently, 12,000 ha of grasslands are moderately degraded with a soil C stock of 57.6 tC/ha. Without the project, the grasslands are expected to stay moderately degraded. With the project, the carbon stock of the grasslands will be slightly improved to 60 tC/ha (non-degraded).

Currently, hundreds of hectares are degraded. In the project scenario, less than 5% (7,900) will be recovered in an effort coordinated with the private and public sector. Hectares of tropical rain forests ha of tropical moist deciduous trees are moderately degraded with a biomass loss of 40%. Without the project, both forests are expected to stay moderately degraded. With the project, the biomass will be slightly increased so that the biomass loss is only 35% (low degradation). Furthermore, the carbon stocks of the tropical moist deciduous trees will be improved as follows:

- Above ground carbon stock of 141 tC/ha compared to 103.4 tC/ha
- Below ground carbon stock of 52.2 tC/ha compared to 24.8 tC/ha
- Litter carbon stock of 3.7 tC/ha compared to 3.65 tC/ha
- Soil carbon stock of 68 tC/ha compared to 60 tC/ha

Suriname: No comments. Note taken. Thanks

Child project indicators have been reviewed based on country level inputs and amendments as a result of GEFSEC and PFD summary table

confirmed.

See comment above regarding the regional coordination project and its core indicators. Please note that the estimations for the core indicators in the coordination project include the results of each national child project plus the non-attributable indicators (such as the shared watershed). On the other hand, the core indicators summary table in the PFD adds the values for the core indicators measured as a result of the activities to be conducted by each country project. The core indicator values included for the Coordination project, as it was requested by the GEF SEC, include additional non-attributable estimates that may result from the coordination, knowledge sharing and partnerships developed by the project. This is the case for example of the shared ecosystem where the project will support some coordination/KM actions in Putumayo. However, this will not be a direct result of the project but an indirect effect. The PFD cannot combine indicators for activities that are attributable to the program and those that are not. As the team found in GEF guidelines, SMART indicators are those that among other criteria are "Achievable and Attributable". We have provided this explanation as a footnote for the PFD core indicator table so that the mismatch between the numbers is clarified.

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

April 10, 2019

Yes for the most part. Please look at Taxonomy table and consider ticking the following boxes as they appear appropriate for the program intervention:

- 1) Gender results areas: Access and control over natural resources, participation and leadership, capacity development
- 2) Mainstreaming: forestry
- 3) Chemicals and waste: artisanal and small-scale gold mining.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response As recommended, Annex C of the PFD has been revised.

art 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

April 10, 2019

The document presents a thorough and well-referenced description of the problem, including a synthetic analysis of the root causes and drivers of degradation in the Amazon Basin, and identifies barriers that the program will address through the various investments. The summary problem statement demonstrates a holistic understanding of the inter-relatedness of these drivers and provides the justification for an integrated approach to address them.

In order to strengthen this presentation, please include a map at the start of this section that depicts the current state of deforestation and environmental degradation in the Amazon including land use classifications (production, protected areas, etc.). Please ensure that the narrative clearly explains what is happening to the Amazon, and what the program will do to counter the suite of pressures on the Amazon and keep the system's integrity intact.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

A map that shows the deforestation in the Amazon has been incorporated in the PFD (see Map 1, page 12).

It may be clarified that the program will not be able to deal directly with the suite of pressures in the Amazon. However, as suggested by STAP the team had included a column in the table summarising the barriers that explain how the program aims to address each barrier.

Table 1 (page 24-28 of the PFD) elaborates on the ASL Program to address the main barriers of deforestation in the Amazon.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

An in-depth and comprehensive explanation of the thematic, temporal and spatial baseline at national and regional level is presented which is also supported by the child project descriptions. Cleared.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please ensure that the baseline projects, as well as the amount of the baseline investments, are elaborated fully for each child project.

Agency Response

Noted for consideration at the CEO endorsement stage. The lead agency will advise countries to include amounts for baseline investments during project preparation. Thank you.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

Yes, the PFD provides an overarching theory of change that frames the overall program investment strategy, including key assumptions, and a clear description of project components, expected outcomes and supporting activities are fully elaborated.

For components one, two and three, please add a table and/or summary synthesis of the outcomes per child project under the alternative scenario.

For component four, please include a diagram that outlines the coordination structure of this component and demonstrates how this will help secure Pan-Amazonian coordination and collaboration.

Please more clearly explain, both in the PFD and in the specific Regional Child Project, how this investment will serve as a platform and collaborate with other existing Amazon-wide platforms to help catalyze collaborative management across the Amazon in addition to providing a means for South-South targeted technical assistance amongst the participating countries. It must serve both objectives in mutually supportive and synergistic way.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response

A table has been added after each component description to summarize the outcomes for each component.

Table 2 (for Component 1) in page 44.

Table 3 (for Component 2) in page 46

Table 4 (for Component 3) in page 47

Table 5 (for Component 4) in page 50-51

A diagram illustrating coordination arrangements (Figure 6, page 65) has been added in Part II Section 6 Coordination

The PFD (paragraphs 122 and 131) and the coordination child project the ASL Knowledge and Coordination platform now explains how it will link with other important initiatives in the region that deal with similar issues. Cooperation and building synergies will be a main focus of the coordination project. The PFD also includes a diagram (Figure 7, page 71) to indicate the flow of knowledge that is expected to happen between other Amazon platforms and from/to the child projects with the regional project as the facilitator and catalyst.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

Yes, the program is aligned with the SFM Impact Program and its focus on the sustainable management of forests, as well as the underpinning focal area strategies and in particular biodiversity (BD 1-1, BD 2-7, land degradation (LD 2-2, LD 3-4), climate change (mitigation-CC-M- 2-7), and, indirectly, to chemicals and waste (CW 1-1). Cleared.

Agency Response

Note taken. Thanks

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**

April 10, 2019

Both at the program level and within the child projects, incremental cost reasoning is adequately framed and described justifying GEF investments to promote sustainable and connected protected and productive landscapes that will generate global environmental benefits within the participating countries and across the Amazon biome. Cleared.

By the time of CEO endorsement, and as the child projects are finalized, please refine and expand the incremental reasoning with the additional information that will be made available through the project design process.

Agency Response

Note taken. Thanks

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

April 10, 2019

Please see previous comments on the core indicators and address them completely.

The program's integrated strategy of effective management of formal protected areas, more sustainable management of productive landscapes through policy frameworks that provide the right incentives to improve management practices, and capacity building at all levels provides the substantive basis to conclude that the program's expected contributions to five of the core indicators is certainly achievable. Cleared.

Agency Response Comments on core indicators have been addressed. See earlier response on specific child projects.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

Yes.

The program is innovative given in that a suite of investments will be coordinated regionally across seven Amazonian countries to respond to key root causes of deforestation in the region, harmonize sectoral government policies that impact the region, and work across countries with similar approaches. Interventions will not simply focus on specific sites only but rather on mechanisms and enabling conditions to build productive and protected landscapes in the Amazon region.

The long term sustainability of the ASL2 Program will be assured through enhanced collaboration of the countries to improve the policy, regulatory and legal frameworks guiding development in the Amazon region. The results of this collaboration, be it in research, monitoring, assessments, and other areas, has the potential to disseminate lessons and successful practices thus helping strengthen individual country interventions on the ground. This knowledge sharing will occur through the regional platform of the Program (component 4) which will build upon and expand the efforts launched under ASL1. Ecological sustainability will be achieved through the combined efforts of improving

protected area coverage and management effectiveness while strengthening connectivity between these and their surrounding productive landscapes to strengthen ecosystem integrity and climate resilience. The sustainability of these efforts will be promoted through the emergence of a sustainable, forest- and freshwater-friendly value chains that the project will help establish.

Scaling up different innovations and tested solutions will take place regularly throughout the implementation of the child projects and the program as a whole. Once an approach has been tested in one of the program's sites, replicating a successful program (methodology and organizational mode) from one site or country and repeating it elsewhere will be another manner of scaling up solutions.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revision. Cleared.

Agency Response

Thanks. Note taken.

The PFD now includes updated information information in Section 7: sustainability, innovation and scaling up

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

April 10, 2019

Yes. By the time of CEO endorsement please ensure that each of the child project's geo-reference is clearly presented both for targeted protected areas and productive landscapes.

Agency Response Response May 4,2019: A map that shows the areas of intervention for the ASL1 has been included in Annex A. .

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

April 10, 2019

Both at the program level and within the child projects indicative information on stakeholder engagement to date is provided and the proposed future means at program level (building on ASL1 experience and established mechanisms) and child project level if adequately elaborated at this point. Cleared.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please ensure that each child project takes into consideration the approved [Policy on Stakeholder Engagement](#) as well as the corresponding [Guidelines](#).

Agency Response Note taken. Thanks.

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

April 10, 2019

The PFD articulates the gender context in the Amazon writ large and identifies how the ASL program, at both the program and child project levels, will seek to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women with regards to voice and decision-making vis a vis natural resources management in the Amazon.

Please provide more details on the following in the PFD section on gender:

1) How gender (including indigenous women issues) will be addressed in the specific program components, e.g. what are some key considerations on gender related to the proposed activity areas such as strengthening protected area management; increasing participatory governance and planning; increasing capacity for and participation in sustainable value chains; and enhancing technical support and financial incentives for adoption of SLWM.

2) Please clarify if there are any specific plans to consider gender in the capacity building and regional coordination component of the program as the program coordination component could play an important function to promote a coherent gender responsive approach for the program. The program could, for example, consider to more proactively address gender issues in specific activities as well as developing a program level gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation process.

3) While the PFD recognizes the role of women, as primary users and stewards of many natural resources, in environmental protection, as well as in productive systems in sustainable agriculture and forestry, it falls short in terms of providing a high-level program rationale for incorporating an inclusive and gender responsive approach. The statements on gender are rather general and it would, again, be good if it could better connect these statements to the actual program objective, components and activities.

4) In terms of the proposed country project preparation activities, it mentions that assessment of social impacts and benefits will incorporate a gender-sensitive lens. It would be helpful for the PFD to provide a more directive framework to guide this and more clearly spell out the need for child project level to:

1) conduct analyses that identifies any project relevant gender differences, differentiated impact and gaps as well as opportunities to empower women relevant to the program objectives; identification of concrete activities linked to program propositions to strengthen the access to and control of land, water, and other productive assets and biological resources for women; increase the participation and leadership in decision-making processes of women; and ensure economic benefits coming from the sustainable use of forest resources are shared fairly between men and women.

During the PPG phase, please consider developing a program level ASL-II gender action plan to provide a coherent strategy to address common gender issues in the implementation and monitoring across the child projects.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revision. Cleared.

Agency Response

The section on gender has been revised to include more detailed information on the important issue of gender inequality, an issue which has received relatively little attention in the Amazon. The Program will consider how women and men are being treated in relevant topics for the program, identifying the gaps and opportunities that they each specifically face and will seek to address these issues. Examples to illustrate how gender could be addressed in each component of the program have been added to the PFD (Para. 162, Part II Section 3)

During the PPG phase, discussion will be carried out with the countries on how to strengthen the integration of gender issues into child project design and to explore the need to develop a program level ASL-II gender action plan.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 10, 2019

An extensive strategy for engaging the private sector is included and the theory of change relies on the role that the private sector can play by reducing unintended negative impacts caused by private sector activities as well as the potential role that the private sector can play in delivering positive environmental benefits. Cleared.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please ensure that the role of the private sector is fully articulated with regards to the forestry value chains referenced in the PFD.

Agency Response Note taken. Thanks.

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

April 10, 2019

Risks are clearly identified and assessed fairly with reasonable mitigation strategies proposed. Please include mention of how the program proposes to assess and manage potential leakage.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please ensure that each child project elaborates a risk management strategy.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response In the risks section (Para. 175, Part II Section 5), potential leakage has been added and a management strategy is described.

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

April 10, 2019

Yes, coordination is outlined. Please provide a schematic that outlines the coordination structure for project implementation.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revisions. Cleared.

Agency Response Figure 6 (Page 65) has been added that illustrates the program implementation and coordination arrangements.

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

April 10, 2019

The PFD and child projects are all in alignment with agreed national strategies (NBSAPs, NDCs, etc). Cleared.

Agency Response Note taken. Thanks.

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

April 10, 2019

In para 104, it is mentioned that “It (ASL -II) reflects lessons learned from other program and the current thinking of many organizations”. But there is no explanation of what these lessons are. Specific lessons are spelled out in Para 40 which mentions “lessons learned from the Brazilian experience...” and para 80 which mentions PROFOR. Please provide a summary table or explanation in the KM section of what key lessons inform the design of ASL-II, perhaps organized by component, that demonstrates KM under the existing program.

Para 181 describes how a community of practice will be developed. The Program Steering Committee will play a key role in coordinating knowledge and learning across the partnership and “each implementing agency will work through this committee to share lessons and coordinate reporting”, but it is not entirely clear how other partners, especially at the country level, will be involved. It would be helpful to include here proposed roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders vis a vis KM.

Given the vast array of partners and stakeholders, it would be beneficial to include a graphic that reflects initial thoughts on how knowledge could flow among various partners, stakeholders, counterparts, etc. including the agencies and the GEF itself. By the time of CEO endorsement, this could be further developed.

By the time of CEO endorsement, please include plans for a more strategic approach to communications that connects communication of information and knowledge to supporting capacity building, stakeholder engagement, advocacy and policy change.

By the time of CEO endorsement for the child projects, please provide more details regarding KM actions/arrangements/deliverables proposed at the child project level.

April 29, 2019

Adequate revision. Cleared.

Agency Response

Lessons learned from ASL1 and other projects in the Amazon which have informed program/child project design has been added (Para.110). Please note, however, that since ASL1 child projects only started implementation in the last quarter of 2018, lessons are only now beginning to emerge and have yet to be systematized (end of 2019).

The sections on coordination and knowledge management were revised according to the comments received and clarifying the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders.

Figure 7 (Page 71) has been added in the PFD to depict how knowledge flows among partners and stakeholders. This will be further developed during the preparation of the coordination project in consultation with countries and agencies.

Noted for consideration at the CEO endorsement stage.

Noted for consideration at the CEO endorsement stage.

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

April 10, 2019

Yes, all endorsement letters have been presented, except for Brazil. Please submit the LOE for Brazil.

April 29, 2019

Brazil LOE is still outstanding, please provide as soon as possible.

May 5, 2019

The Brazil LOE has been submitted. Cleared.

Agency Response

The Brazil LoE is now available and submitted with the package.

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

May 6, 2019

Please correct the Program Commitment Deadline and modify it to 12/14/2020 and resubmit for technical clearance.

May 6, 2019

Revision is cleared. PFD is recommended by PM 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

/view Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/19/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/29/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/5/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/6/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		