



Caatinga Protected Areas Program - ARCA

Review PPG Request and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11509

Countries

Brazil

Project Name

Caatinga Protected Areas Program - ARCA

Agencies

WWF-US

Date received by PM

3/5/2024

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

GBFF

GEF-8 Project Preparation Grant request Review Sheet

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

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

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

a) Cleared.

b) Please shift all financing and agency fees from "non grant" to "GEF project financing / grant" in the General Project Information table.

Please explain the contribution of the project to KMGBF target 1 or please remove the tag on Target 1, which is not necessary and does not seem justified based on the content of the PPG request.

3/12/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

3/11/2024

GEF Agency Response:

b) thank you for this correction, the PPG Request now requests "Grant" funding only.

Target 1 has now been removed.

II. Indicative Project Overview

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?

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

a) Cleared.

b) Please confirm that all surveys under output 2.3.1 would be linked to a policy or management decisions, e.g. PA expansion, to be taken as part of the project.

Please clarify in the log-frame and project description the difference between outputs 3.1.1 and 3.1.2, which both include training to IPLCs.

3/12/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

3/11/2024

GEF Agency Response:

b) Output 2.3.1 encompasses biodiversity surveys to support PA expansion, identification of new PAs, and potential corridors. Outcome 2.3 and output 2.3.1 have been removed, and output 2.3.1 is now included under output 1.1.2.

Output 3.1.1. refers to training with IP&LC and also government training.

Output 3.1.2. refers to a strategy to provide direct support to IP&LCs via calls for proposals, in which IP&LC groups submit proposals to receive funding through sub grants from FUNBIO, to fund capacities and operational support/TA for IP&LC groups governance, PA management and natural resource management in areas in and around the PAs. The language in 3.1.2 has been reworded to clarify this, and the trainings have been removed from 3.1.2

c) Are the components adequately funded?

d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional (only for Multi-trust Funds PPGs with BD from the GEF Trust Fund)?

e) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for projects of more than \$2 million or 10% for projects of less than \$2 million? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

III. Project Rationale

a. Does the project adequately describe the: (i) current situation/baseline conditions within the project geographic area or project thematic area; (ii) problem(s) that the project will address; (iii) goal and objectives of the project; and (iv) justification for the project intervention; and (v) expected results including the Global Environmental Benefits and an estimate of the project's contributions to the relevant biodiversity core indicators.

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

IV. Project Description

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 project components and activities identified in the theory of change adequately described.

c) Is a list of stakeholders that will be involved in the project and their roles in the design and implementation of the project provided?

d) Are the Specific Action Area(s) that the project is aligned with identified and an explanation provided on and how the project will support the achievement of the specific Action Area objective(s).

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

Please justify in the PPG request the apparent low cost-efficiency of the project given the Country context (1 million ha impacted for \$9 million of GBFF grant funding) and the proposed balance between support to existing PAs (900,000 ha) and expansion (100,000 ha).

3/12/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

3/11/2024

GEF Agency Response:

Thank you for this comment. It should be noted that the size of the individual protected areas in Caatinga are not as large as those in the Amazon. The average federal + state PA size for the Caatinga is 89.460ha, whereas in contrast, the 120 ARPA-supported PAs in the Amazon average 517.783ha. Nonetheless a number of the management functions still have a set cost, including development of/updates to management plans, staff training, supporting PA Councils and convening their meetings. Secondly, the baseline of existing PA management activity and expenditure in Caatinga is lower than the Amazon, so the gaps and needs are greater. As such, it is true that the work in Caatinga does not provide as high cost efficiency; but it is delivering key global biodiversity benefits, including protection of critically endangered bird species and a number of endemic species.

For expansion, at the estimated 100,000 ha, this figure is based on a recently conducted workshop by ICMBio (late January 2024) that mapped all existing PA creation and expansion demands for the biome, at varying stages of progress. Based on this mapping exercise, priority areas for potential new PA establishment in Caatinga were also identified, and these results are still being systematized and evaluated by ICMBio.

V. Does the proposal adequately describe how the project meets the following criteria:

a) Potential to generate global environmental benefits (GEBs) (include a description of the GEBs the project will generate per the GEF-8 Core Indicators for biodiversity);

b) Alignment with the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans and/or National Biodiversity Finance Plans or similar instruments to identify national and/or regional priorities;

c) The level of policy coherence and coordination across multiple ministries, agencies, the private sector, and civil society that the project aims to support;

**d) Whether the project will mobilize the resources of the private sector and philanthropies';
and**

e) Whether and how the project will engage with and provide support to IPLCs.

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

VI. Project results indicators

Is the table correctly populated and consistent with the Project Description?

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

Core indicators 6: Please, at this PPG request stage, be conservative and remove the target on indirect GHG mitigation, unless there is a compelling justification and associated methodology.

Core indicator 11: Please explain the very low target reported here (2,800 people) and confirm that a significantly larger number of people would benefit from the project.

3/12/2024

Cleared.

•Please make sure that all climate co-benefits derived from the project are captured in the CEO endorsement request document. This includes all climate mitigation co-benefits, for which a target should be defined under core indicator 6, and corresponding assumptions and methodology provided as part of the CEO endorsement request package (Please see guidelines provided in https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results_Framework_Guidelines_2022_06_30.pdf).

Agency's Comments

3/11/2024

GEF Agency Response:

The target for Indicator 6 has been removed, to be conservative.

Direct Beneficiaries was conservatively estimated at this stage, and will increase when the target PAs are identified, and actions in Sustainable Use PAs in particular will engage IP&LC directly.

VII. Project Financing Tables

a) Are all the tables correctly populated?

b) Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines (only for projects with GEF TF components)?

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

Please clarify to what amount of resources is going to support action by IPLCs. Component 3, which seems the most targeted towards IPLCs has only 0.7 mio of budget and not all of component 3 is to support actions BY IPLCs.

Please confirm that the entire \$1.4 million of GBFF funding reported as ?amount to support action by IPLCs [for] biodiversity? corresponds to project activities supporting action by IPLCs and does not encompass project activities that will benefit IPLCs without supporting their actions.

Please clarify in the PPG request to what the \$1.4 million corresponds, with cross reference to anticipated outcome / outputs.

Whether the project as a whole or certain project activities support action by IPLCs could entail a number of circumstances including but not limited to: IPLCs directly receive resources through the GEF agency for execution of project components/activities; IPLCs lead the design and management of some project activities but do not manage financial resources; the project provides in-kind support to actions by IPLCs for biodiversity, etc.

Please proportionally allocate the PPG fee between Action Area 1 and 2 (at 9.00 % each) instead of charging it all to Action Area 1 as currently is in Portal (i.e. 9.00% of US\$82,977 is US\$7,467 while 9.00% of US\$17,023 is US\$1,533):

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country/ Regional/ Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	Grant / Non-Grant	PPG (\$)	Agency Fee(\$)	Total PPG Funding(\$)
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 1	Non-Grant	82,977.00	9,000.00	91,977.00
WWF-US	GBFF	Brazil	Biodiversity	GBFF Action Area 2	Non-Grant	17,023.00		17,023.00
Total PPG Amount (\$)						100,000.00	9,000.00	109,000.00

3/12/2024

Cleared.

Please remember to include any cofinancing that might be part of the project budget at the time of CEO endorsement. Cofinancing is encouraged but not required.

Agency's Comments

3/11/2024

GEF Agency Response:

The original \$1.45M total to support IP&LC action came from:

(a) a sub-total of \$750,000 to support the operations of PA Management Councils (output 1.2.1), which are comprised of IP&LC representatives as well as government and NGOs, based on budget to provide support to each Council for 10 PAs for a 5 year period;

(b) \$180,000 allocated for hiring a consultant to engage IP&LCs representatives, and facilitate their participation in PA Councils meeting and decision making while improving their capacity through training and other TA for the 10 Councils (output 1.2.1); and (c) 80% of component 3 is allocated to support IP&LC for training in PA management and NR use/management (Output 3.1.1) and sub-grants, based on call for proposals and technical assistance to develop the proposals, directly to IP&LC groups to do PA management operations (Output 3.1.2). This is equivalent to \$520,000 (from 3.1.1 and 3.1.2).

In this revision, we now show funding to support action by IP&LC as 80% of Component 3, for 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 (training and subgrants with IP&LC groups) at \$520,000.

The PPG fee has been updated to reflect the distribution of 9% for Action Area 1 and 2.

VIII. Project Endorsement

- a) Has the project been endorsed by the country's(ies) OFP and has the OFP at the time of PPG request submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?**
- b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**
- c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

Cleared.

Agency's Comments

IX. GEFSEC Decision

- a. Is the PPG recommended for technical clearance?**
- b. Additional comments to be considered by the Agency during project preparation**

Secretariat's Comments

3/6/2024

No, please make the necessary revisions and resubmit as soon as possible.

3/12/2024

Yes, PPG is recommended for technical clearance.

- Please make sure that all climate co-benefits derived from the project are captured in the CEO endorsement request document. This includes all climate mitigation co-benefits, for which a target should be defined under core indicator 6, and corresponding assumptions and methodology provided as part of the CEO endorsement request package (Please see guidelines provided in https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2022-09/Results_Framework_Guidelines_2022_06_30.pdf).

-

•Please remember to include any cofinancing that might be part of the project budget at the time of CEO endorsement. Cofinancing is encouraged but not required.

Agency's Comments

3/11/2024

GEF Agency Response:

Thank you for your feedback. Please see the updated version of the PPG Request.

Review Dates

	PPG Request Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/6/2024	3/11/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/12/2024	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		