

Strengthening participatory natural resource management processes for sustainable economic development, conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of carbon stocks in Amazon Wetlands.

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10706

Countries

Brazil

Project Name

Strengthening participatory natural resource management processes for sustainable economic development, conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of carbon stocks in Amazon Wetlands.

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

3/10/2022

Review completed by PM

4/22/2022

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Project description summary

2. Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Co-financing

4. Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

4/21/2022

The co-financing from Mamiraua Institute for Sustainable Development can't be categorized as Public Investment. As per the co-financing letter, it looks like the co-financing will materialize in scholarships and research grants. Therefore, please change from 'Public Investment' to 'Grant'.

In addition the amounts from the Ministry have been provided are in local currency (reais), we would kindly request the agency confirm the exchange rate used.

4/22/2022

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

Noted. Mamiraua co-financing has been changed to Grant.

Exchange rate at the time of submission was 5.08 Brazilian Reais per USD, as follows:

Co-financier	Type	Reais	USD	Exchange rate
MCTI	In-kind	65,508,000	12,895,276	5.08
MCTI	Public Investment	80,000,000	15,748,031	5.08
IDSM	Grant	13,011,680	2,561,354	5.08

01 April 2022

No response required

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Core indicators

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E?
Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Please clarify why there is not a METT score for the Piagacu-Purus which totals 504,083 hectares.

Please clarify why the total number of hectares of protected areas under improved management presented in para 126 is not equal to the number presented in the core indicator entries in the portal.

Given the nature of the project interventions, we believe that Core Indicator 6 should be tracked. Please explain why an assessment was not provided.

4/13/2022

Thank you for the additions and clarifications. Cleared.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

No response required

06 April 2022

- Apologies for the oversight. The METT score has been added.
- Apologies for the oversight. The number has been corrected. Please note that there was an error in the numbering of paragraphs, so this paragraph is now number 314 (section 1a-6. Global Env Benefits)
- Noted. Preliminary calculations have been made and 1.8 million tCO₂eq have been added to the Core Indicators. Please note that these calculations will be revised during implementation. The EX-ACT worksheet has been uploaded to the portal. The following explanation has been included below the Core Indicator Table.

Greenhouse gas emissions were calculated using EX-ACT tool and assume that (i) at least 5% of the land targeted for forest management activities within protected areas, (ii) production landscapes in the 3 lake complexes and the Tefe region will reduce biomass losses by 5% during the 20 year accounting phase.

Finally, the following text has been added to section 1a-6 (GEBs).

? The project will implement forest management and agroforestry activities that will result in the capture or avoidance of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Preliminary estimates indicate that the project could mitigate around 1.8 million tons of CO₂-eq. (please refer to EX-ACT calculation uploaded into the portal). These numbers will be revised once target sites and field activities have been selected to provide more precise estimates.

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

The incremental costs table is blank. Please complete.

4/13/2022

Cleared.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

No response required

8 April 2022

Noted. The table is now complete

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Stakeholders

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase?
Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the
implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of
engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender
differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so,
does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators
and expected results?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Private Sector Engagement

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier
and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed Knowledge Management Approach for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Please ensure that the targets from Core Indicator 1 are reflected in the results framework, as well as all the other core indicators (in reference to the project proponents to consider Core Indicator 6 as an addition to the Core Indicators).

4/13/2022

Cleared.

GEF Core Indicators should be explicitly mentioned in the Results Framework in Annex A. Please request agency to include the following core indicators in the results framework in the annex A:

- Core Indicator 1.2: 510,764 ha of Terrestrial Protected Areas under improved management
- Core Indicator 2.2: 37,169 ha of Marine Protected Areas under improved management
- Core Indicator 4: 33,242 ha of landscapes under improved practices
- Core Indicator 6: 1,801,599 tons of CO₂e (direct) Greenhouse Gas Emissions Mitigated

Agency Response

21 April 2022

Noted. Apologies for the oversight. Core Indicators are now in the log frame in Annex A.

01 April 2022

Noted.

The first indicator for Outcome 1 has been rephrased to read as follows:

Increase in METT score for each terrestrial (Core Indicator 1.2) and marine protected (Core Indicator 2.2) area under improved management for conservation and sustainable use

In order to maintain the format of the results framework in the portal, the target increase for each protected area has been included as an additional table after the Results Framework (see below)

Detailed increased in METT Score for Outcome 1 (Core Indicators 1 and 2)

Protected Area	METT at CEO Endorsement	Target METT at project end	Percent increase
Terrestrial Protected Areas (Core Indicator 1.2)			
RESEX Chocoare MT	45	56	20%
RDS_Piaga?u_Purus	58	72	19%
RESEX_Mae_Grande_Curuca	39	52	25%
RESEX_Sao_Joao_da_Ponta	38	51	25%
TI Jaquiri	37	49	24%

Marine Protected Areas (Core Indicator 2.2)			
RESEX Mr Mestre Lucindo	40	53	25%
RESEX_MAR_Arai_Peroba	33	46	28%
RESEX_MAR_Caete-Tapera?u	46	60	23%
RESEX_MAR_Gurupi_Piri?	40	53	25%
RESEX_MAR_Soure	53	63	16%
RESEX_MAR_Tracuateua	48	59	19%
RESEX_Maracana	46	59	22%
RESEX_Marinha_Cuinarana	40	53	25%
RESEX_Marinha_Mocapajuba	39	52	25%

In addition, Core Indicator 6 has been included under Outcome 2 in the results framework.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

Please respond to the STAP comments, in particular, this observation:

"The success of this project will likely hinge on whether or not local people will benefit more from biodiversity-friendly value chains than illegal extraction, as is currently the case. This is listed as a moderate risk and the mitigation measure of "mapping bottlenecks" to develop a mitigation plan" does not provide much reassurance. This reaffirms the need for a more detailed ToC that better incorporates and directly addresses these types of risks.

Agency Response

21 April 2022

No response required

8 April 2022

Noted. STAP comments have been included in the table in Annex B "Response to Project Reviews". The table has also been uploaded in the portal.

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

01 April 2022

No response required

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request
3/22/2022

NA.

Agency Response
01 April 2022

No response required

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/22/2022

No. Please revise and respond to the comments above and resubmit.

Please remove random underlining and highlighting in the document in the portal.

Please clarify the executing arrangement in the portal entry. The Ministry is listed as the EA but CSO has been clicked in the portal.

Finally, in the text of the presentation of components two and three, there is text that says "these need to be harmonized with the results framework". This appears to be internal FAO communication. Please delete.

4/21/2022

No. Please revise the cofinancing entry as indicated above and resubmit.

4/22/2022

Yes. CEO endorsement is recommended.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/22/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/13/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/21/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/22/2022	

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

The project objective is to strengthen participatory natural resource management processes for sustainable economic development, conservation of biodiversity and maintenance of carbon stocks in Amazon Wetlands. Varzea and mangrove ecosystems are among the most imperiled of Amazonia. These globally significant wetlands are fragile and once altered difficult to recover. Under the existing scenario, varzea and mangrove ecosystems are threatened by unsustainable resource use, including logging and wildlife exploitation, and climate change.

The project has three components:

Component 1: The project will support the design and implementation of a capacity building program for community leaders. Mamirau? Institute will implement a series of capacity building workshops to assist IPLCs to improve management and organizational skills required to support conservation programming. Effort will address capacity barriers that currently inhibit communities from developing and implementing management protocols for over-exploited resources and opportunities to engage in pro-conservation development practices. Sectors to be addressed through improved community-based management protocols include agroforestry, forestry, non-timber products, pirarucu, caiman, mangrove crab, and community-based tourism. Biodiversity monitoring improvements will help inform decision-making and conservation target achievement.

Component 2: The project will support community-based organizations to implement resource and activity specific management plans. Technological solutions will incentivize conservation of wetlands ecosystems by targeting and improving conservation of specific resources, e.g., forest management, caiman, pirarucu, and crabs. At the same time, support for alternative sources of value added revenue sources will be explored such as community-based tourism and manioc flour production.

Component 3: The project will facilitate the building of knowledge management, financing, monitoring, and governance. This will fill existing gaps related to informed decision-making and improve policy coherence through the effective capture and promotion of project emplaced success. Critically, the project under this component will ensure that sustainable financing is in place to carry forward and maintain project investments.

The project will substantially contribute to the conservation of Varzea and mangrove ecosystems and associated globally significant biodiversity. The project will benefit over 5,975 beneficiaries including 3,985 men and 1,990 women. Approximately 415,706 hectares of terrestrial protected areas 11,136 hectares of marine protected areas

will be under improved management. More than 33,242 hectares of productive landscapes beyond protected areas will be under improved management.

The project has put in place thoughtful COVID-19 risk mitigation plans that are adaptive and that should be able to support effective implementation.