

Biodiversity Wildlife Territories

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11268

Countries

Brazil

Project Name

Biodiversity Wildlife Territories

Agencies

Funbio

Date received by PM

4/14/2023

Review completed by PM

5/17/2023

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

We suggest that the title be changed to reflect the actual project which is focused on creating new PAs and improving PA management and implementing species specific action plans within protected areas. Wildlife Territories is not an accurate description of what the project is focused on supporting. Please revise.

5/17/2023

"Wildlife Territories" is neither a term of art, nor is it a technically accepted term in natural resources management and biodiversity conservation in English, thus you may wish to consider going forward how you refer to this project in English going forward. I am not sure if the title in Portuguese would be best translated this way given that there really is no English phrasing like this.

We will not hold the project for this issue, thus, will clear it with this name.

Agency's Comments

A discussion was held over the name of the project, but this name got traction within ICMBio, and we would like to keep it, and since PAs are part of the territories, we think it is not so farfetched.

We will take this into account and revise the name during the PPG.

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, for the most part except for Component 3.2 "Development of regional conservation agreements" which we suggest be deleted as it does not fit within the overall focus of the project or its theory of change nor does it satisfy the incremental reasoning criteria. Please use the money allocated in 3.2 for other project components that are geared towards conservation action in the project areas.

5/17/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments Original 3.2 was replaced by Knowledge and dissemination with adjustments in the budget.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Please delete activity 3.2 on regional conservation agreements.

Please strengthen Component 3 with regards to knowledge management and learning and please include the communications strategy/plan for the project in this component. Elements that should be included in Component three to strengthen this component include, per expectations at PIF stage:

1. an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept
2. plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations
3. processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
4. tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites
5. knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate)
6. a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability
7. plans for strategic communications and outreach

Please be sure to reflect the additional actions above, such as plans for communications and outreach etc., in the project's budget.

5/17/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments Component 3 has been strengthened with a knowledge management better explained and a communication plan. ToC was revised to reflect these changes.

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Please include information about cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects.

Please strengthen Component 3 with regards to knowledge management and learning and please include the communications strategy/plan for the project in this component. Elements that should be included in Component three to strengthen this component include, per expectations at PIF stage:

1. an overview of existing lessons and best practice that inform the project concept

2. plans to learn from relevant projects, programs, initiatives & evaluations
3. processes to capture, assess and document info, lessons, best practice & expertise generated during implementation
4. tools and methods for knowledge exchange, learning & collaboration, including knowledge platforms and websites
5. knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders (at community, national and international levels as appropriate)
6. a discussion on how knowledge and learning will contribute to overall project impact and sustainability
7. plans for strategic communications and outreach

Please be sure to reflect the additional actions above, such as plans for communications and outreach etc., in the project's budget.

5/17/2023

As noted above, please include information about cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects. This could include potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing, if relevant.

5/17/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Component 3 has been strengthened with a knowledge management better explained and a communication plan. ToC was revised to reflect these changes.

Included information on cooperation. Potential co-location will be explored further during the PPG phase.

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Please provide an estimate using an appropriate methodology for CI 6 given the extensive work the project will do on terrestrial ecosystems.

5/17/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments Carbon sequestration and mitigation estimates were included.
5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA.

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

- a) Are climate risks and other main risks relevant to the project described and addressed within the project concept design?**
- b) Are the key risks that might affect the project preparation and implementation phases identified and adequately rated?**
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.7 Qualitative assessment

- a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?**
- b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?**

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, for the most part.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Please identify which targets of
the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and

how it contributes to the identified targets.

5/17/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments Kunming-Montreal targets identified and included in the text.

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

The project is the direct result of a substantial process of consultations, largely funded by the Pro-Species project, including Brazilian civil society organizations involved in species conservation. Therefore, please provide additional information on who was consulted.

Please also provide additional information on the activities and efforts that will be undertaken during the PPG phase to develop a Stakeholder Engagement Plan before CEO endorsement.

5/17/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

A list of institutions engaged in PANs was included as appendix I.

The project will develop a stakeholder engagement plan before CEO endorsement

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

The LoE was signed by an OPF (Andre Luiz Campos de Andrade) who was not the official OFP Ms. Livia Farias Ferreira de Oliveira by the time of PIF submission (April 12th). Ms. Ferrerira de Oliveira tenure's started six days before. A new LoE is required.

The executing partner in LoE (Ministry of Environment and Climate Change) is different than in Portal (Undefined, but it was classified as CSO) ? this can either amended with the new LoE or by modifying the executing Partner in Portal accordingly.

5/17/2023

- The new LoE is signed by the current OFP. However, as noted before, with the previous LoE, it identifies the executing partner (Ministry of Environment and Climate Change). However, in Portal it is shown as ?undefined?. Please correct so that the executing partner in Portal (with the type, which would be ?Government?) matches the executing partner in LoE.

Agency's Comments New LoE uploaded and project executor corrected

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

No. The map simply shows where endangered species are but is not specific about the project area. Please clarify and provide more specifics as to the project locations.

5/17/2023

Cleared.

Agency's Comments ICMBIO produced a map with the priority areas for biodiversity conservation (not considering the Amazon region) using updated data from the last endangered species red list. The areas are larger than the ones that will be subject of project focus, which will be defined during the PPG and will take into account the areas where new protected areas will be created and other initiatives to avoid overlaps and to coordinate.

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

Yes, cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) 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 to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

4/21/2023

No, a number of issues have been raised above that require revision of the PIF. Please revise and resubmit.

5/17/2023

No, two issues that were previously raised have not yet been addressed. Please revise and submit by 5/18/2023.

5/17/2023

PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

PIF Revised.

Two last issues resolved.

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/
Approval**

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/21/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/17/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/18/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		