

# Empowering Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) to manage biodiversity data and information as a strategy to conserve their territories, safeguard traditional knowledge, and promote integrated biodiversity management

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11269

**Countries**

Brazil

**Project Name**

Empowering Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities (IPLCs) to manage biodiversity data and information as a strategy to conserve their territories, safeguard traditional knowledge, and promote integrated biodiversity management

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

4/12/2023

**Review completed by PM**

4/28/2023

**Program Manager**

Sarah Wyatt

**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

4/25/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/25/2023

No, the summary will need to be revised based on the comments provided.

Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

The summary has been edited, based on the changes made in response to the comments provided.

### **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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/25/2023

a) Yes.

b) No, the project will need to reexamine the outcomes and outputs of this project.

- Virus surveillance is not eligible for GEF funding. Please remove these activities or explicitly state that they will be undertaken with other funding.

- The project lacks on-the-ground results for the activities that are being proposed. While there is important work proposed on knowledge, there needs to be an explanation of how that will result in GEBs.

- The project needs to include on-the-ground results for the conservation of globally important biodiversity that goes beyond monitoring. While monitoring is important, it needs to be accompanied by action or it is just the cataloguing of loss. Information is

necessary but not sufficient for good management. The connection to action is missing and needs to be included.

- Sustainable use is important but it is unclear how sustainable use connects back to conservation.

#### Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

The project outcomes and outputs, and overall rationale (section A) and description (Section B), have been extensively revised, in order that:

- Activities relating to zoonoses and virus surveillance are excluded;
- A link is established between biodiversity data and knowledge, and conservation actions.
- The relevance of sustainable use for conservation is clearer.

Revisions and additions have been made throughout the PIF and are particularly centred on the outputs of Component 2, which focus on creating IPLCs capacities for biodiversity conservation and the sustainable use of key species, and on better explaining the overall conservation rationale and approach. New texts added allude to the conservation outcomes and global environmental benefits expected from the project.

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

#### Secretariat's Comments

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/25/2023

No, please request integrate gender equality considerations in Components 2 and 3 of the project as these are relevant from a gender perspective and women's empowerment. This can be done in the description of the components and any indicators. Also, outputs and outcomes in M&E component in the Indicative Project Overview Table are missed.

#### Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

Gender considerations have been more thoroughly integrated across all three Components and can be noted within revised outputs (including a specific output in Component 1 dedicated to women's biodiversity-related activities) and in the Components' narrative.

An outcome and three outputs for the M&E component have now been added to the Indicative Project Overview Table.

**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

4/25/2023

Yes.

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

5/17/2023

Yes. Please continue to work on the issues below during PPG.

4/25/2023

No, while indigenous rights and inclusion are undoubtedly important the document does not make the connection to results for biodiversity conservation. It could also be reframing the understanding of the challenge in that it's not only about rights and knowledge but also their implementation.

Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

Better emphasis is made throughout the text on the relation between biodiversity information and territorial management decisions and conservation planning, on the part of IPLCs. The project's rationale and Theory of Change has been finetuned (from the project barriers through to the change pathways and final outcomes) to make a better case

for biodiversity information management by IPLCs as a means to promote conservation, protect livelihoods and facilitate territorial governance.

#### **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**

5/17/2023

Yes. Please continue the focus making the connection between the activities and GEBs during PPG.

4/27/2023

No, while most of these have been addressed, likely building on the changes for the text noted above, please talk about why this the best (or at least a very good) strategy to address biodiversity protection and other GEBs.

It may be helpful to understand any previous successes of the SiBBR and conservation results to understand how expanding this work will have conservation benefits.

#### **Agency's Comments**

5/16/2023

The strategic importance of the SiBBR is now better explained, and key successes are named within Section A (Project Rationale). The project's overall approach to conservation (rationale and description) is better explained, as well as the role that information management plays. Specific results relating to species conservation and territorial management have been added, showing how biodiversity data and traditional knowledge will contribute to results on the ground.

### **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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/27/2023

No, while we appreciate the style of ToC that was used for this project, there is a missing question of the GEBs that will result and how the project will achieve them. The "intermediate states to impact/GEBs" cannot simply rest on a sustainability strategy. A sustainability strategy is how to ensure that the institutions and impacts of a project keep going after the project closes. However, it does not speak to how a project has impact and how it gets there.

Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

Changes have been made to the ToC to match the revised rationale and fuller project description and follow the results pathways more consistently from outputs to impact (GEBs).

#### **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

4/25/2023

Yes.

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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/25/2023

No.

a) Please engage with the Fundacao Osvaldo Cruz as part of this project.

b) Yes.

c) Yes, however the project needs to be more clear especially in the outcome language that these activities are done with FPIC and full support of the communities. It may be helpful to work with a good editor to make sure that this nuance is covered.

## Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

a) The possibility of engaging with the Fundacao Osvaldo Cruz is now mentioned in Section D (Stakeholder Engagement).

c) A paragraph has been added to this effect in Section D (Stakeholder Engagement), emphasising that the project is responsive to the needs and priorities of IPLCs, as established within their Environmental and Territorial Management Plans, and Conservation Unit Management Plans. The fact that many project activities will be IPLC-driven and shaped by the communities themselves should have been made clearer following the revisions to the project outputs and outcomes, and a full description of the proposed project strategy.

**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

4/27/2023

Yes, it is very logical that specific sites have not been chosen yet, and it is common for GEF projects at PIF to not have specific sites selected yet. In particular, when engaging with IPLCs it is important to have the communities themselves make decisions about their engagement. What has mostly been done but it would be good to be more clear on is the criteria and process that will be used to select where the project will be working.



Thank you for providing the hectare estimate, which given the above, we understand is a best estimate at this time.

Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

The criteria and process that will be used to select where the project will be working is described in Annex C (Project Location).

**5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat's Comments 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

4/27/2023

Yes, this is sufficient for now but the risks and mitigation measures will need to be significantly elaborated upon during PPG.

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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/27/2023

No, please address the following -

- a) Please include this information.
- b) Please include this information
- c) How the project will relate to and influence relevant national policies.

#### Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

Revisions and edits made throughout the PIF, and especially in Sections B (Project Description) and C (Alignments), now provide a clearer picture of how the project will be fully integrated with existing institutional frameworks (instruments, plans, programmes, policies, etc), durable, innovative and will contribute to an improved alignment of national policies.

#### **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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/27/2023

No, as mentioned above some of activities are not eligible for GEF support. In addition, please include tagging this project for engagement with the Nagoya Protocol.

#### Agency's Comments

Ineligible activities (zoonoses/virus surveillance) have been removed from the Project. Tagging for engagement with the Nagoya Protocol is now included.

**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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/27/2023

No, please include information on how this project relates to Brazil's NBSAP.

#### Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

Reference to Brazil's NBSAP and how this project responds to this policy instrument is now included in Section C. (Alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities).

**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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/27/2023

No, please include this.

#### Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

Reference to the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the Targets to which this project is relevant are now included in Section C (Alignment with GEF-8 programming strategies and country/regional priorities).

### **7 D. Policy Requirements**

#### **7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?**

#### Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023

Yes.

#### Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**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

4/25/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments  
SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments  
SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments  
Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments 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  
4/25/2023

Yes.

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  
4/25/2023

Yes.

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

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/25/2023

No, the LoE was signed by an OPF (Andre Luiz Campos de Andrade) who was not the official OFP by the time of PIF submission (April 12<sup>th</sup>). Ms. Livia Farias Ferreira de Oliveira is the official OFP ? her tenure?s started six days before. A new LoE is required.

Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

A new LoE has been obtained from the new GEF OFP (Ms. Livia Farias Ferreira de Oliveira) and is included.

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

Secretariat's Comments

4/25/2023

Yes.

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

4/25/2023

Yes.

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 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

4/25/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**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

4/25/2023

Yes.

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

4/25/2023

Yes.

Agency's Comments

**Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet**

**8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?**

Secretariat's Comments

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/25/2023

No, please include ABS/Nagoya.

Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

ABS/Nagoya has now been tagged.

**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 NA

Agency's Comments

**9 GEFSEC Decision**

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

Secretariat's Comments

5/17/2023

Yes.

4/25/2023

No, this project will require significant adjustments. We welcome a conversation with project proponents.

Agency's Comments

5/16/2023

UNEP is grateful for the comments received and for conversations held with a view to improve the project's framing and alignment with GEF requirements.

**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**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>4/27/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/17/2023</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

