

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

Review PIF 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

9/28/2020

Review completed by PM

10/30/2020

Program Manager

Mark Zimsky

Focal Area

Biodiversity

Project Type

FSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

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

9/30/2020

No.

The project should not be aligned with BD 1-5 as Inclusive Conservation is a specialized project.

As currently presented and in relation to the core indicators identified, the project is best aligned with BD 1-1 and BD 2-7.

Please revise this as part of the overall project revisions required and ensure that it reflects all revisions undertaken in the PIF.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required

28 Oct 2020

Point taken. The project is aligned with BD-1-1 and BD-2-7 and this is reflected in the revised PIF throughout the document.

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

9/30/2020

First, please revise the project objective. A project objective should focus on a discrete and measurable objective.

The current objective is stated as: "Promote and improve participatory management of natural resources and their associated productive chains as a means of sustainable economic development, as well as to conserve biodiversity and maintain carbon stocks, avoiding greenhouse gas emissions."

An objective should not include the means to the end but just the end. What is the objective of the project that is directly relevant to the GEF's mandate? Please remember that a project objective should state the intended physical, financial, institutional, social, environmental, or other development **results** to which a project is expected to contribute. Thus, in this case your objective should be something along these lines: **To conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and maintain carbon stocks in the targeted Amazonian wetlands.** Everything else is means to the end, but they do not belong in the project objective. Please revise accordingly.

Second, table B needs to be revised. The outcomes are mainly outputs. Based on the project strategy, the project hypothesizes that the development of these biodiversity-based enterprises and the use of improved technologies etc. will result in some measurable outcome for biodiversity in the targeted wetlands and this is overlooked in Table B entirely. Capacity built for these enterprises are the means to biodiversity outcomes that should be measured and appear in table B. Please revise and these outcomes and the indicators should be reflecting your core indicator targets as well including: 3,808,581.49 ha of direct coverage in Amazonian wetlands; direct impact over protection and management in 18,556,830.52 ha of Amazonia; and Incorporation of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into policy and planning frameworks. It is not clear from table B how the project can achieve these ambitious targets given the project's own threat description.

Finally, in para 56 the document states: "The project has the main goal of supporting local people and their community organizations, involving public and private stakeholders responsible for normatives and directives, fiscalization and licencing of quotas for biodiversity." Thus, please clarify how this fits in with the way FAO is presenting the project objective.

The project would benefit from developing a theory of change and a preliminary supporting logframe just to help the project team think through the project strategy more clearly.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required

28 Oct 2020

Point taken. The project has been revised starting from the Theory of Change. The objective has been revised, table B has been revised.

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

9/30/2020

Yes, for the most part. However, the "Investment Mobilized" that was identified coming from Mamirauá Sustainable Development Institute is dependent on the successful negotiation of a contract. Please clarify when this contract negotiation will be over. If this contract does not materialize will the institute continue to operate and if it will continue to operate, please explain how the cofinance will be replaced. Finally, is the \$7.2 million amount part of the entry for MSTI for 9.6 million?

Finally, a contribution from the private sector lists the entity as an NGO (Mamirauá Sustainable Development Institute). This should be the private sector source of the infrastructure contribution and an NGO is not considered a private sector entity. Please revise.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required

28 Oct 2020

Point taken. Please see revised co-Financing.

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

9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
28 Oct 2020

No response required

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/30/2020

NA

Agency Response
28 Oct 2020

No response required

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/30/2020

NA

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

NA

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

NA

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

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

9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

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

9/30/2020

The main global environmental benefits to be achieved as a result of the project are: (a) conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Amazon wetlands, in 3,808,581.49 ha of direct coverage; (b) direct impact over protection and management in 18,556,830.52 ha of Amazonia; and (c) Incorporation of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into policy and planning frameworks.

Please complete the core indicators section in the portal placing these hectares under the relevant core indicators as not all of these hectares can be found in the portal totaling to these figures above.

If some of these hectares are in protected areas, then the METT should be used to measure management effectiveness improvements and this should be reflected in Table B.

And all of these indicators should find their way into Table B above, as outcomes of the various interventions in all of the wetlands.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required

28 Oct 2020

Point taken. Core Indicators and the METT have been reflected in the in the logframe

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

9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

Part 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

9/30/2020

The project does not provide a comprehensive threat description of the targeted wetlands for the intervention, thus, it presents a solution to an undefined problem. The project presents evidence from other similar initiatives by the lead project executing agency where this approach has been successful, but the project area covers a wide array of protected areas and reserves across a large swath of the Amazon, all under different pressures and the project document does not discuss these nor provide any kind of theory of change as to why the proposed project response (however successful it has been in other circumstances) will result in achieving the project objectives.

Based on the literature and threat profiles of Amazon wetlands, the proposed project intervention strategy appears to be only part of a set of responses that would be required. For example, there is no mention of the impacts of unmanaged fisheries, extractive industries and infrastructure on these wetlands and how the proposed intervention fits within this context.

Please revise this section and include a comprehensive threat description of the Amazonian wetlands that are the target of the proposed intervention.

10/29/2020

Thank you for the revisions. With regards to the exploitation of the caiman, please certify that sustainable management of this species will follow all national and international laws and regulations, given that this very visible species was once in critical condition due to overhunting. Please also clarify whether FAO has evaluated the reputational risk of targeting such a visible species.

10/30/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

Yes, the management of caiman will follow all national and international laws and regulations. We understand the risks associated with targeting visible species and will work with Mamirauá and our Office of Climate and Biodiversity to ensure adequate safeguards are put in place and reputational risks are minimized. This will be explored in more detail during the preparation process.

Nonetheless, in the case of Brazil, the legislation for the management of the Caiman species in the state of Amazonas and the federal legislation in Brazil are based on research developed by the Mamirauá Institute. Likewise, to minimize the risks of over-exploitation and illegal hunting, the Mamirauá, the only institution in Brazil that supports the management of this species, together with the local and national governments, has developed a series of tools and protocols that are strictly followed: (i) the established number of animals to be slaughtered is determined after the population survey of the area; (ii) Mamirauá technicians forward the slaughter request to IBAMA identifying the number of animals and size; (iii) a serial number is identified for each slaughtered animal, and can only be sold with that number; (iv) Mamirauá has an online tracking system available on the institution's website with the registration of each animal.

28 Oct 2020

The project justification has been thoroughly revised, including the threats, barriers and project intervention strategy.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

No. The baseline description is of the actual lead project executing agency and its experience in executing its strategy in Sustainable Development Reserves. Please revise and provide a baseline description of the project areas where the project will intervene, the management status of the wetlands and reserves, what is currently being done in each and how much is being invested. The baseline should also reflect the more comprehensive threat analysis of the targeted wetlands.

10/29/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required.

28 Oct 2020

The baseline description has been updated.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

Since the project has not provided a proper baseline analysis of the project areas, the alternative scenario is not adequate or sufficient and it lacks the context needed to understand whether the alternative is an adequate response.

This is an instance of where an approach is presented as an alternative scenario. The approach being proposed has been developed by the lead executing agency and is basically a technical assistance package for enterprise development based on use of biodiversity.

Absent a proper threat analysis of the geographic areas where the project will work, the baseline investments in these areas, it is impossible to properly evaluate the project as the context is lacking.

Please revise the proposal as noted above and then develop an alternative scenario that reflects the threat analysis, the baseline, and refine the project intervention strategy accordingly.

Please include in the revision a well-articulated Theory of Change that shows a coherent and logical causal model that includes explicit mention of the assumptions that underpin the causal pathways as this is an essential element to understanding the project hypothesis.

Please strengthen the written description of the alternative scenario by paying special attention to describing the causal pathways of the expected outcomes and the underlying assumptions of the causal pathways. Documenting these assumptions now will enable a better PPG design process and eventual evaluation of the project intervention strategy at mid-term for course correction if needed and at final evaluation when lessons can be extracted. Clear identification of assumptions may also uncover other intervention options available to the project.

Once you have more clearly identified these causal pathways please provide a more robust justification that these pathways are sufficient to achieve the project objective, given the assumptions upon which they are based.

10/29/2020

Please include the critical assumptions in the theory of change.

10/30/2020

Thank you. Please insert these in the PIF submission in the portal as it is not showing up in the portal. Thank you.

10/30/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020 - part 2

The text below has been included in the portal

30 Oct 2020

Point taken. The following Key Assumptions have been included:

Key Assumptions for the Theory of Change
<p>Stakeholders from different levels and across many sectors cooperate in the capacity building programs, and in the design of community-based management protocols. Government stakeholders participate to ensure that management protocols are in line with national regulations. Mechanisms to resolve conflicts are put in place (Component 1)</p>
<p>Socio economic analysis is representative targeting the selected regions, protected areas, production systems and value chains (Component 1).</p>
<p>Stakeholders, including local communities, are willing to participate actively in the capacity building programs and commit to the development of the management plans. Local communities apply lessons learned in their practices and management of natural resources (Component 1 and 2)</p>
<p>Monitoring System effectively informs management protocols (Component 1).</p>
<p>Communities get the required knowledge for managing the technological improvements for value chains and management protocols: knowledge remains with local communities (Component 2).</p>
<p>Communication strategy targets key stakeholders and delivers key messages across multiple sectors about best practices and lessons learned from the project. The messages are up-scaled by stakeholders to other communities and regions (Component 3).</p>

Key Assumptions for the Theory of Change
<p>Stakeholders from different levels and across many sectors cooperate in the capacity building programs, and in the design of community-based management protocols. Government stakeholders participate to ensure that management protocols are in line with national regulations. Mechanisms to resolve conflicts are put in place (Component 1)</p>
<p>Socio economic analysis is representative targeting the selected regions, protected areas, production systems and value chains (Component 1).</p>
<p>Stakeholders, including local communities, are willing to participate actively in the capacity building programs and commit to the development of the management plans. Local communities apply lessons learned in their practices and management of natural resources (Component 1 and 2)</p>
<p>Monitoring System effectively informs management protocols (Component 1).</p>
<p>Communities get the required knowledge for managing the technological improvements for value chains and management protocols: knowledge remains with local communities (Component 2).</p>
<p>Communication strategy targets key stakeholders and delivers key messages across multiple sectors about best practices and lessons learned from the project. The messages are up-scaled by stakeholders to other communities and regions (Component 3).</p>

28 Oct 2020

Point taken. The project Theory of Change has been developed with national stakeholders and the alternative scenario has been revised.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

No, see notes above. Please revise once the project intervention strategy is refined and better clarified. It appears to be aligned with BD 1-1 and BD 2-7, but it is not entirely clear from the presentation thus far.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required.

28 Oct 2020

Project is aligned with BD1-1 and BD2-7. Justification of the alignment is provided.

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

9/30/2020

No. The incremental cost reasoning is not sufficiently articulated and needs revised once the entire project document is revised as requested above. As currently presented, it presents justification for the GEF increment that emphasizes local economic development and barely references the global environmental benefits that such a project intervention strategy would generate, hence justifying the overall investment.

The project team, as it reflects on the totality of the comments, may wish to narrow the geographical scope to a targeted set of wetlands where a comprehensive threat assessment could be done and where this strategy has the highest likelihood of success as a sustainable threat reduction strategy and hence justify the incremental cost reasoning.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required.

28 Oct 2020

The incremental cost reasoning was revised.

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

9/30/2020

The main global environmental benefits to be achieved as a result of the project are: (a) conservation and sustainable use of globally significant biodiversity in Amazon wetlands, in 3,808,581.49 ha of direct coverage; (b) direct impact over protection and management in 18,556,830.52 ha of Amazonia; and (c) Incorporation of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into policy and planning frameworks.

The project design does not clearly indicate how the project intervention strategy will achieve this large of an impact and why this strategy is the most optimal to address the threats to the targeted wetlands in the Amazon.

Based on the literature and threat profiles of Amazon wetlands, the proposed project intervention strategy appears to be only part of a set of responses that would be required. For example, there is no mention of the impacts of unmanaged fisheries, extractive industries and infrastructure on these wetlands and how the proposed intervention fits within this context.

10/29/2020

Please clarify how the interventions in the 32 PAs translate into the core indicator numbers.

10/30/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 October 2020

The following text has been added as an explanation in the box below the Core Indicators:

Core indicators were calculated as follows:

Core Indicator 1: Terrestrial protected areas under improved management effectiveness: The project will support the development and implementation of community-based resource management plans/protocols for forestry, caiman, fisheries, tourism and crab management in the protected areas listed below. The estimated area under improvement is calculated for each protected area. In total, the project is expected to improve management (measured with the METT score) in 935,606 ha of terrestrial protected areas.

#	ID	Ecosystem	Management Activities	Area under improved management for conservation
TERRESTRIAL PROTECTED AREAS				
1	Reserva de Desenvolvimento Sustentável Piagaçu-Purus	Varzea	Forestry; Caiman	504.083,50
3	Reserva Extrativista do Rio Unini	Varzea	Fisheries	424.842,40
5	Terra Indígena Jaquiri	Varzea	Tourism	1.000,00
15	Reserva Extrativista de São João da Ponta	Mangrove	Crab management	340,94
16	Reserva Extrativista Mãe Grande de Curuçá	Mangrove	Crab management	5.061,60
17	Reserva Extrativista Chocoaré- Mato Grosso	Mangrove	Crab management	278,32
Sub-total				935.606,76

Core Indicator 2: Marine Protected Areas under improved management effectiveness: The project will support the development and implementation of community-based resource management plans for the sustainable use of crabs in the nine Marine Extractive Reserves (MER) listed in the table below. The estimated area under improvement is calculated for each protected area. In total, the project is expected to improve management (measured with the METT score) in nearly 37,169 ha of MERs.

#	ID	Ecosystem	Management Activities	Area under improved management for conservation
MARINE PROTECTED AREAS				
18	Reserva Extrativista Marinha de Soure	Mangrove	Crab management	4.732,61
19	Reserva Extrativista Marinha Mocapajuba	Mangrove	Crab management	2.311,17
20	Reserva Extrativista Marinha Cuinarana	Mangrove	Crab management	1.126,82
21	Reserva Extrativista Marinha Mestre Lucindo	Mangrove	Crab management	3.485,16
22	Reserva Extrativista Marinha do Maracanã	Mangrove	Crab management	4.013,83
23	Reserva Extrativista Marinha de Tracuateua	Mangrove	Crab management	3.666,36
24	Reserva Extrativista Marinha de Caeté-Taperaçu	Mangrove	Crab management	5.681,23
25	Reserva Extrativista Marinha de Araí-Peroba	Mangrove	Crab management	1.581,04
26	Reserva Extrativista Marinha de Gurupi-Piriá	Mangrove	Crab management	10.571,47
Sub-total				37.169,69

Core Indicator 3: Area of landscapes under improved management to benefit biodiversity (hectares, qualitative assessment, non-certified): The project will support the development and implementation of community-based resource management plans for the sustainable use of fisheries in three lake complexes, namely the Complexo de Lagos Jurupari Grande, the Complexo de Lagos do Paraná do Jacaré (Cativara) and the Complexo de Seringa (Joacaca). The estimated area under improvement management is calculated for each landscape and listed in the table below. In total, the project is expected to improve management in nearly 33,242

ha of productive landscapes. The project is also expected to apply agroforestry practices in the Região de Tefe, but the target impact area will be calculated during the preparation phase.

#	ID	Ecosystem	Management Activities	Area under improved management for conservation
LANDSCAPES UNDER IMPROVED PRACTICES (excluding protected areas)				
27	Complexo de Lagos Jurupari Grande	Varzea	Fisheries	12.501,74
28	Complexo de Lagos do Paraná do Jacaré (Capivara)	Varzea	Fisheries	16.284,54
29	Complexo de Seringa (Joacaca)	Varzea	Fisheries	4.455,72
32	Região de Tefe	Varzea	Agroforestry	NA
Sub-total				33.242,00

28 Oct 2020

The project GEBs have been revised. The project is targeting narrowing interventions to 21 of the 32 targeted protected areas and productive landscapes, though it will provide capacity building to the remaining 11 PAs and landscapes.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

There is nothing uniquely innovative about this project as it seeks support to implement a strategy where the proposed lead agency has demonstrated proof of concept. The project would have post-project financial support if there are successful contract negotiations. The GEF support is actually helping scale the proof of concept but in theory this could lead to more scaling with support from the Government.

10/29/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required.

28 Oct 2020

The following text has been added:

In this context, the project is innovative in a number of actions. First, it brings technical capacity to areas of Amazonia where it is lacking and promotes gender equality in biodiversity management processes. Second, the project will be innovative in terms of the use of technologies and applications for production, access to markets and monitoring of natural resources. Third, the project will be innovative in the use of state of the art monitoring system. Finally, the promotion of alliances to catalyze innovations in technology, policies, financing and business models for the more sustainable development of productive activities is another innovative aspect of the project

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

9/30/2020

Can you please explain the map better with a key? For example, is each reserve identified in the map going to be a place where the project intervenes? Please provide a table that lists all of the reserves and the interventions that will take place at that location as part of the PIF submission.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required.

28 Oct 2020

A list of PA/Landscapes the types of interventions has been included in the PIF under component 2 and Annex D

Type of management plan	Terrestrial Protected Areas	Marine Protected Areas	Productive Landscapes
Forestry management plans	RDS Pigacu-Purus FN do Amapa FE do Amapa		CL Jurupari Grande CL do Parana do Jacare C de Seringa
Caiman management plans	RDS Pigacu-Purus		
Fisheries management plan	RE do Rio Unini		
Crab management plan	RE do Sao Joao da Ponta RE do Mae Grande de Curuca RE Chocoare-Mato Grosso	REM de Soure REM Mocapajuba REM Cuinarana REM Mestre Lucindo REM do Maracanã REM de Tracuateua REM de Caeté-Taperaçu REM de Araí-Peroba REM de Gurupi-Piriá	
Agroforestry mgmnt plan			Regiao de Tefe
Sustainable tourism	TI Jaquiri		

Notes: RDS: Reserva de Desenvolvimento Sustentável; RE: Reserva Extrativista; FN: Floresta Nacional; FE: Floresta Estadual; REM: Reserva Extrativista Marinha; CL: Complexo de Lagos; C: Complexo

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

9/30/2020

Please provide a description of the stakeholder consultations that have taken place to date.

10/30/2020

Please insert the text about stakeholder consultations in the PIF in the portal as it is not showing up as presented here. Thank you.

10/30/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020 - part 2

The following text was text below has been included in the portal:

During project identification (late August, September and October) and given the restrictions brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic, Mamiraua consulted electronically with representatives from state (Amazonas and Pará), municipal (such as Tefé municipality), and local governments where the target areas are located to inquire about their interest and potential role in the proposed project. In addition academic institutions (i.e. Federal Universities of Pará) were consulted about their interest in supporting this initiative. Both government and academic institutions indicated their willingness to cooperate with the project and their interest to be part of the project design. Similarly, using Mamiraua's network of offices and partners, leaders of local communities in the states of Amazonas and Para were informed about the potential project. Their response was positive and they highlighted the need for capacity building and technical support. During project preparation, a detailed stakeholder engagement and participation plan will be developed and social and economic assessments will be carried out for targeted communities.

30 Oct 2020

No response required.

28 Oct 2020

Stakeholder consultations were carried out both via electronic means and using Mamiraua's presence in the field. Local institutions in the targeted 21 PA/Landscapes were consulted between August and October 2020 about their interest and priorities regarding this potential project.

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

9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

Yes. Please provide a clearer and more comprehensive articulation of the role of the private sector in the value chain as briefly referenced in paragraph 75.

10/29/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

No response required.

28 Oct 2020

The role of private sector in the value chain is provided.

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

10/29/2020

Yes and adequate risk mitigation measures identified.

Please describe how COVID-19 will be addressed in the project from a risk management standpoint including associated impacts of COVID-19 and how these risks will be mitigated particularly within the context of delivering GEBs. This should cover the design and implementation stages of the project.

10/30/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

Additional text has been added to the Risks section regarding COVID-19

28 Oct 2020

No response required

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

9/30/2020

Yes, adequate descriptions provided. Cleared.

10/29/2020

Since submission of the project, it has become clear that this proposed project has not had any discussions with the ASL Program nor the World Bank which is the lead agency of that program and the Brazil child project.

We subsequently discovered that a large number of protected areas in the FAO project are already receiving support from ASL:

Reserva de Desenvolvimento Sustentável Piagaçu-Purus

Reserva Extrativista do Rio Unini

Reserva Extrativista Mãe Grande de Curuçá

Reserva Extrativista Marinha Cuinarana

Reserva Extrativista Marinha Mestre Lucindo

Reserva Extrativista Marinha do Maracanã

Reserva Extrativista Chocoaré- Mato Grosso

Please communicate with the WB to:

1. map a way forward and truly identify what the complementarity might be between the FAO project and the ongoing investments in these protected areas;
2. identify coordination mechanisms to ensure that there is no overlap at an activity level and that what the FAO project is proposing complements and supports the ASL vision; and
3. further identify how lessons learned from the investment might be relevant to other Amazonian stakeholders and how the lesson learned from FAO GEF support could be replicated in the ASL with the support of the FAO project.

Revise the PIF accordingly after these discussions are held and resubmit.

11/2/2020

Executing partners' section in Portal misses the "Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovations" – the participation of the Ministry is also missed in the narrative in Section 6. Coordination - please revise accordingly.

11/2/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

30 Oct 2020

The following text has been added to this section:

The proposed Project is aligned with both phases of the Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program, namely ASL-I (currently under implementation) and ASL-II (currently under preparation). While there is overlap in some of the targeted protected areas, the project will work with the World Bank and its ASL partners to ensure both projects are truly complementary and prevent that GEF resources are spent twice on the same activities.

In order to identify the complementarities between both projects, the FAO will create a **working group** during project preparation that will include key actors from ASL I and II. This group will include the World Bank (as Implementing Agency for ASL) and other executing agencies for ASL (FUNBIO, CI-Brazil) and will provide advice to the Project Design Team as it carries out baseline and socioeconomic assessments, and defines project interventions in consultation with local communities. The goal of the working group is to ensure that project activities do not overlap in geographical areas targeted by both the ASL and the proposed program.

During project implementation, the proposed project will establish a **Consultative Committee** which will include Mamiraua as project executing agency for the proposed project and state level governments, local stakeholders, and executing partners for the ASL programme to make sure that Annual Work Plans and budgets are coordinated and complementary. For instance, if the ASL Project will support fisheries agreements in a particular site, the proposed project can support investments in processing or any other value chain improvement, or vice versa. This committee will provide a space for executing agencies for both programmes to coordinate efforts on the ground—in other words, Mamiraua will have an opportunity to work closely with CI-Brazil and FUNBIO on topics such as the development of PA management plans and CI-Brazil on the development of productive value chains and align efforts and resources. In addition, the project will invite the World Bank and other central government stakeholders in the ASL program to participate in a **Strategic Advisory Committee** when it is operational to ensure high-level coordination.

Finally, the World Bank has invited Mamiraua to participate in the Knowledge Management platform established within the ASL programme (FAO is already participating as Implementing Agency for the Peru ASL Child project). This platform provides a space to exchange lessons learned and best practices from FAO GEF support that can be replicated across the ASL. This could include, for instance, Mamiraua's work on community monitoring or citizen science. Mamiraua has offered its installations to support knowledge sharing (i.e. short courses, protocol design) for partners and stakeholders in the ASL.

28 Oct 2020

No response required

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

9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

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

9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion
9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
28 Oct 2020

No response required

Part 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
9/30/2020

Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response
28 Oct 2020

No response required

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/30/2020

NA.

Agency Response

28 Oct 2020

No response required

GEFSEC 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

9/30/2020

No. Please review all comments raised above and revise the project design accordingly.

10/29/2020

No. Please review all comments and resubmit with the appropriate revisions.

10/30/2020

All issues have been addressed. However, due to a portal issue, two items have not shown up in the PIF in the portal that have been identified above: 1) critical assumptions for the ToC; 2) short description of the stakeholder consultations done to date. Please insert these into the portal in the PIF.

11/1/2020

Executing partners' section in Portal misses the "Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovations" – the participation of the Ministry is also missed in the narrative in Section 6. Coordination - please revise accordingly.

11/2/2020

All issues have been addressed. PIF is recommended 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

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	9/30/2020	10/28/2020

	PIF Review	Agency Response
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/29/2020	10/30/2020
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/30/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/2/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

The objective of the project is to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and maintain carbon stocks in varzea floodplain forests and mangroves wetlands of Amazonia. The project will strengthen the enabling environment to enhance the effectiveness of natural resource management in the target sites. This includes developing and implementing resource management protocols for the target species (i.e. resource management and exploitation plans (fisheries, caiman, mangrove crab, forestry, and community-based tourism) and biodiversity monitoring tools to inform management decisions. The project will generate the following global environmental benefits: (i) improved management of 972,776 hectares in 17 terrestrial protected areas, (ii) improved management of 33,242 hectares of production landscapes important for biodiversity covering 3 lake complexes (Jurupari Grande, Parana do Jacare, and Seringa) and the Tefe region.