



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

GEF ID:	9449		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Sustainable, Accessible and Innovative Use of Biodiversity Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Promising Phytotherapeutic Value Chains in Brazil		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	5792 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-3 Program 8; BD-4 Program 9;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$213,303	Project Grant:	\$5,722,770
Co-financing:	\$24,300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$30,022,770
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 03, 2016
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Helen Negret,

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	March 18, 2016  Yes linked to BD strategy and programs 8 and 9.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	March 18, 2016  No.  Please be more expansive in paragraph 70 on how the project helps implement the NBSAP and the ABS	

<sup>1</sup> 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>law.</p> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 18, 2018</p> <p>Yes, fully described and elaborated. Project is innovative in design and has significant potential for expanding its impact through its focus on ILCs and through the LPA Program, Brazil's most important and comprehensive local development program.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 18, 2018</p> <p>Sound design and elaborate and detailed description of baseline allows for an easy to understand and well presented logic that underpins GEF's role and the incremental reasoning justifying the investment.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes for the most part. However, please clarify why the project explicitly states that it will apply the ABS tracking tool for capacity development by UNDP, but does not mention the GEF ABS tracking tool which was designed to measure progress in implementation of ABS.</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Given that part of the rationale of the project within the PIF is to help with implementation of the ABS law, we would think using the GEF tool to assess progress would also be a critical part of the projects attempt to measure progress over time.</p> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revision provided.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>All adequately covered at the PIF stage. By the time of CEO endorsement, please ensure that all of these areas are given comprehensive treatment due to the nature of the project.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>NA</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>NA</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>NA</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>March 18, 2016</p> <p>No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.</p> <p>Please correct these date errors and resubmit:</p> <p>ERROR in PIF - FASF and Project Objective Cofin Amounts by Trust Funds Differ.</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 - The sum of the cofinance as given per source differs from FASF's total cofinance.</p> <p>March 28, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions have been provided of all outstanding issues.</p> <p>The PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 18, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 28, 2016	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.