



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	9271		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	National Strategy for Conservation of Threatened Species (PROSPECIES)		
GEF Agency:	Funbio	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2 Program 3; BD-2 Program 4; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$300,000	Project Grant:	\$13,435,000
Co-financing:	\$50,942,867	Total Project Cost:	\$64,677,867
PIF Approval:	March 15, 2016	Council Approval/Expected:	April 19, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Fabio Leite

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	08/18/2015 The project seeks alignment with BD-2 Program 3 Preventing the Extinction of Known Threatened Species. This program focuses on addressing poaching, hunting and illegal trade of endangered species. However the proposal as presented does not focus on this but the reduction in threats to endangered species in general. Hence the proposal is not compatible with BD-2 Program	

¹ For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>3. Additionally the broad approach to address a wide suite of endangered species does not fit well with the BD Strategy which is much more specifically focused. The proposal would therefore need very significant revision through narrowing focus onto species threatened through poaching, hunting and illegal trade or by reorienting the project to develop sufficient alignment with the BD Strategy. The subsequent review comments should be considered with this in mind.</p> <p>Additionally the support of Aichi Targets is not adequately articulated nor are SMART indicators identified.</p> <p>2/29/2016</p> <p>Revision adequately addresses the project contribution to the Aichi Targets; however, it does not address how the project is aligned with the GEF biodiversity programs and results frameworks. Please revise accordingly.</p> <p>3/8/2016</p> <p>Adequate revision. At time of CEO endorsement, please provide a more explicit description of project design</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		alignment with GEF biodiversity programs.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	<p>08/18/2015 The PIF identifies public plans, policies and instruments. Some additional information on how these are implemented on the ground would allow clearer understanding of how the proposal is consistent with these.</p> <p>2/29/2016 Please explicitly clarify the project's consistency with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).</p> <p>3/8/2016 Adequate revision. At time of CEO endorsement, please provide a more explicit description of project design alignment with the Brazil NBSAP.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>08/18/2015 With over 3,000 red list species there will be a range of root causes of species decline and loss, however the drivers of this are not appropriately addressed. Additional information is needed to specify what the drivers are and how the project would address these.</p>	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Additional detail on how the project aims to achieve market or sector transformation would be useful in particular given the proposed involvement of the private sector as a means to scale the approach.</p> <p>2/29/2016</p> <p>Adequate.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>08/18/2015</p> <p>Consideration of the incremental reasoning is difficult given the very limited baseline information which should be enhanced. Information presented is largely GEF-related, considerably more detail on ongoing GoB and other initiatives are needed to allow incremental reasoning to be assessed. How for example does this link with ongoing major efforts in protected areas, addressing forest loss and improvement in the management of productive landscapes. This should be revisited fully when resubmitted.</p> <p>2/29/2016</p> <p>The baseline description should be rewritten. The baseline is not what GEF has invested previously in Brazil in similar thematic areas that the project is addressing, but rather the baseline should be a description of the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>ongoing work in these thematic areas by the Government of Brazil and other stakeholders, besides GEF investments, and what will be the ongoing investment in these thematic areas in the absence of the GEF investment/project. Please revise accordingly as only with a revised baseline section can the incremental reasoning argument be understood.</p> <p>Under the section 1.1 the problem is well described, however, please move the text that describes the project response to the Alternative Scenario section.</p> <p>In addition, the problem description and the section on the baseline (sections 1.1 and 1.2) need to more clearly and comprehensively explain the barriers and root causes that the project components are designed to address vis a vis biodiversity mainstreaming with a species focus, IAS management, and poaching.</p> <p>In the alternative scenario, please make the suggested changes noted in question 5 below regarding the component structure to all the component descriptions in section 1.3.</p> <p>Regarding Figure 1, please provide a</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>larger color map and describe how the proposed sites will fulfill the IUCN KBA Standard as this is the criteria now used by GEF. Please see GEF-6 Biodiversity Strategy.</p> <p>Please clarify why the proposed private sector grant is unknown in terms of whether it is cash or in-kind while at the same time the PIF provides such an exact dollar figure.</p> <p>Please note that under 1.3, first paragraph, regarding Component One, GEF will not support actions for mitigating impacts of private sector actors as this is part of corporate social responsibility, rather we would support the development of actions and policies to AVOID threatened species loss. Please clarify this nuance throughout the text and make the corrections in text and in project design accordingly.</p> <p>3/8/2016</p> <p>Adequate revision.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>08/18/2015</p> <p>Overall the four components require further detail to fully explain the underlying theory of change. It is not clear how the components in combination would result in the</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>amelioration of pressures on threatened species. Component 1 there is some disconnect between the text and project framework. Component 2 how will the project make links from the CAR which is general in nature to the species specific requirements. Ex-situ approaches would require justification on a species by species basis and then would be very exceptional. Component 3 makes the link between species conservation and the private sector please provide additional detail of how the project would make this connection, how would the private sector be a source of additional finance for species conservation.</p> <p>2/29/2016</p> <p>While the revised submission is vastly improved over the previous submission, further refinement and revision is required.</p> <p>First, outcome 3.1 and output 3.1 should be its own component as it is a cross-cutting component supporting all the other project components. Alternatively, it could be a sub-outcome of Component One and folded into Component One. It does</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>not make sense that it is included with the IAS actions.</p> <p>Second, the outcome 3.2 and output 3.2 should be their own component on IAS management.</p> <p>Under the risks section please discuss the risks of development actors not adhering to the advice and policies on avoiding impacts on species caused by their activities. Please also describe how the project will mitigate this risk.</p> <p>3/8/2016</p> <p>Adequate revision.</p>	
	<p>6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>08/15/2015</p> <p>Coverage of stakeholders is very limited please provide details of what the range of stakeholders would be and means to include them in project preparation and implementation and their potential roles.</p> <p>Please provide additional detail of potential impacts on indigenous groups, natural resource dependents and local communities, including additional consideration of gender issues. The species in question or the habitats in which they are found may well be important for local communities. Changes to their</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>management and/or uses may have profound effects on local communities.</p> <p>2/29/2016</p> <p>While this section is slightly better, the issues raised in the review of 8/15/2015. Please improve this section of the PIF, following the request made on 8/15/2015.</p> <p>3/8/2016</p> <p>Adequate revision.</p>	
<p>Availability of Resources</p>	<p>7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	<p>08/18/2015</p> <p>Please address the following errors highlighted by the system:</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - Fee in Finance Breakdown record(s) exceed(s) 9% (limit for this project or PFD)</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ</p> <p>2/29/2016</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Yes.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	08/15/2015 The request for \$14,435,000 is within the STAR BD FA allocation remaining as of 08/5/2015. 2/29/2016 The request is within the STAR BD FA allocation remaining.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	08/15/2015 Not at this stage. Please address the points raised above. 2/29/2016 No. Please address all issues above. Please also note that on the first page of the PIF, every time you submit a new version of the PIF, you must enter a new submission date. When referring to GEF projects, please use full names of projects, not acronyms. 3/8/2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Adequate revisions have been provided. The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	August 18, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 29, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 08, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	July 5, 2017 No significant changes in design.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	July 5, 2017 Based on what is presented in the GEF CEO endorsement request, the project structure and design is appropriate. Please note, however, that FUNBIO forgot to include the FUNBIO project document in the attachments that	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>were included in the three emails sent to GEFSEC, thus, this analysis is incomplete.</p> <p>Please submit the FUNBIO project document when the other revisions are submitted.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>Based on what is presented in the GEF CEO endorsement request, the financing appears adequate and the design cost-effective.</p> <p>Please note, however, that the FUNBIO project document was not included in the attachments that were attached to the three emails sent to GEFSEC, thus, this analysis is incomplete.</p> <p>Please submit the FUNBIO project document when revising the documents.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks,	<p>July 5, 2017</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Project risks adequately identified and mitigation measures satisfactory.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>Cofinancing letters presented; however, all of them are in Portuguese and the currency used is the Brazilian real. We are unable to read the letters. (Please note for future projects, it would be helpful; although not required, to include an English translation.) In lieu of translating the letters, please produce a summary table that lists the cofinancers, the amount in Brazilian real in cash and in-kind resources provided by each cofinancer, the conversion rate used to arrive at the US\$ amount of each contribution, and then a column that presents the US\$ value of that contribution. As currently presented it is not possible to assess whether the amounts in the letters are consistent with the amounts in Table C.</p> <p>Please ensure in Table C that each source of cofinancing is selected as being from Government, CSO, private sector, etc as appropriate and as supported by a cofinance letter. In the current Table C, some contributors are</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		not listed. Please use one row for each cofinance letter and for each source of cofinancing. July 19, 2017 Cleared.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	July 5, 2017 Yes.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	July 5, 2017 NA	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	July 5, 2017 Yes.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	July 5, 2017 Based on what is presented in the GEF CEO endorsement request, the M&E is appropriate. Please note, however, that the FUNBIO project document was not included in the attachments that were attached to the three emails sent to GEFSEC, thus, this analysis is incomplete. Please submit the FUNBIO project document when revising the documents.	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please also clarify why IUCN, and not FUNBIO, is the agency listed as being responsible for financial reports in the M&E plan in the GEF CEO endorsement request. This does not make sense.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
Agency Responses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>Please present a table, as is the custom, of comments from GEFSEC that were to be addressed by CEO endorsement, and discuss how they were addressed and where they were addressed in the final project design and project document.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Adequate responses provided.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>Please present a table, as is the</p>	

³ If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>custom, of comments from STAP that were to be addressed by CEO endorsement, and discuss how they were addressed and where they were addressed in the final project design and project document.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Adequate responses provided.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>Please present a table, as is the custom, of comments from GEF Council members Germany and the USA that were to be addressed by CEO endorsement, and discuss how they were addressed and where they were addressed in the final project design and project document.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Adequate responses provided.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat 	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>NA</p>	
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	<p>July 5, 2017</p> <p>Not at this time. Please address all issues above.</p> <p>Please also submit the FUNBIO project document.</p>	

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please note that in Table A of the GEF CEO endorsement request, the figure for the total project cost is incorrect. The numbers in Table A total 13,435,270 for total project cost, but the budget in the rest of the document is 13,435,000. Please correct.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
Review Date	Review	July 05, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	July 19, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		