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:	**$45,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$58,435,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	**April 01, 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
		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. Additionally the support of Aichi Targets is not adequately articulated nor are SMART indicators identified. 2/29/2016 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. 3/8/2016 Adequate revision. At time of CEO endorsement, please provide a more explicit description of project design	

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?	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. 2/29/2016 Please explicitly clarify the project's consistency with the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP). 3/8/2016 Adequate revision. At time of CEO endorsement, please provide a more explicit description of project design alignment with the Brazil NBSAP.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	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.	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		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. 2/29/2016 Adequate.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	08/18/2015 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. 2/29/2016 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	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		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. 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. 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. 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.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Regarding Figure 1, please provide a 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. 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. 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. 3/8/2016 Adequate revision.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	08/18/2015 Overall the four components require further detail to fully explain the underlying theory of change. It is not clear how the components in	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		combination would result in the 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. 2/29/2016 While the revised submission is vastly improved over the previous submission, further refinement and revision is required. 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	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		folded into Component One. It does not make sense that it is included with the IAS actions. Second, the outcome 3.2 and output 3.2 should be their own component on IAS management. 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. 3/8/2016 Adequate revision.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	08/15/2015 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. 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	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		communities. Changes to their management and/or uses may have profound effects on local communities. 2/29/2016 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. 3/8/2016 Adequate revision.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	08/18/2015 Please address the following errors highlighted by the system: ERROR in PIF - Fee in Finance Breakdown record(s) exceed(s) 9% (limit for this project or PFD) ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants differ ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		2/29/2016 Yes.	
	• 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.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• 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.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		3/8/2016 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?		
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		

[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
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		