



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4859		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Management Strategies to enhance Caatinga, Pampa and Pantanal Biodiversity – GEF Terrestre		
GEF Agency:	IADB	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; CCM-5; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$32,621,820
Co-financing:	\$159,154,672	Total Project Cost:	\$191,776,492
PIF Approval:	April 12, 2012	Council Approval/Expected:	June 07, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Annette Killmer

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	March 16, 2012 CBD signed 1992, CCD ratified 1997, FCCC entered into force 1994.	July 8, 2016 Cleared
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	March 16, 2012 Letter from Rodrigo Vieira dated March 01, 2012.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	March 16, 2012 IADB already well established in Brazil. CC, BD and SFM all noted in country strategy for Brazil.	8 July, 2016 The co-financing announced at PIF stage by the agency (\$15 million) doesn't appear in the project document. Please explain. April 20, 2017 Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	March 16, 2012 There is no non-grant instrument.	NA
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	March 16, 2012 The project is consistent with the agency's country strategy. Brazil is one of IDBs founding member countries. The PIF has no electronic signature from the Agency Coordinator, please include this. April 05, 2012 Revised version includes signature. Cleared.	July 8, 2016 Cleared
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	March 16, 2012 As of March 16, 2012 STAR allocations remaining were: BD \$46.04 million, CC \$51.76 million, LD \$6.09 million. Other pending projects have not been deducted from these amounts.	July 8, 2016 Cleared
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	March 16, 2012 Yes amounts sought are within the FA allocations. The SFM Incentive has a maximum limit of \$30 million qualifying FA funding, which with the 1:3 ratio means there is a \$10 million ceiling for country requests for SFM funds. Please reduce the total request for GEF-5 SFM funds for Brazil to be within the \$10 million limit.	July 16, 2016 The total request for GEF-5 SFM funds is within the authorized limit. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		July 8, 2016 NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		July 8, 2016 NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		July 8, 2016 NA
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	April 05, 2012 Cleared. Current requests for SFM/REDD funding for Brazil are below the \$10 million ceiling.	July 8, 2016 Cleared
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	March 16, 2012 Yes, aligned with FA results framework. In Table A, please use the exact numerical codes and text for the outputs and outcomes as listed in the framework document at http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/3624 April 05, 2012 Table A has been revised. Cleared.	July 8, 2016 Cleared
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	March 16, 2012 Yes objectives identified: BD-1, BD-2, CCM-5 and SFM-1	July 8, 2016 Cleared
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	March 16, 2012 4th National Report to CBD identifies the 3 biomes for action -- Pampa and Pantanal in particular are well below percentage coverage in PAs (26% and 22% respectively vs 10% target). Fire control target of 25% reduction of incidences in the three biomes. Please articulate the consistency with the Second National Communication of	July 8, 2016 The CEO endorsement request only refers to CBD. Please consider also the last developments of the country's strategy since PIF approval on forests and climate change issues, in particular taking into account the INDC and the last National Communication to UNFCCC. April 20, 2017

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the FCCC.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Additional information on consistency with second National Communication provided. Cleared.</p>	Cleared
	<p>10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 Capacity development in conservation management and fire management in PAs.</p> <p>It is not clear if there is any capacity development for climate change mitigation. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Thank you for the clarification. By CEO endorsement, please clarify how will these capacities developed contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes. Cleared.</p>	<p>July 8, 2016 It remains unclear how will the capacities developed for climate change mitigation will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes. Please provide clear information on that matter.</p> <p>April 20, 2017 Cleared</p>
Project Design	<p>11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 SNUC set up in 2000. PA system is being implemented but has acknowledged issues with technical capacity and financial resourcing.</p> <p>It is unclear how the CCM objective ties into the baseline project. Please explain. The PA system is already being implemented and carbon benefits must be additional to a baseline.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Adequate at PIF stage. Cleared.</p>	<p>July 8, 2016 The Brazilian Native Vegetation Protection Law is briefly described showing its important role in the targeted areas. Nevertheless, the baseline information on forest issues, in particular on deforestation and forest fire prevention, control and enforcement, as well as restoration, forest communities and commercial opportunities, needs to be further developed.</p> <p>In addition, no baseline assessment is provided of the situation of the protected areas regarding sustainable finance (one</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>element of the project) or the policy and regulatory frameworks that the project intends to address. Please provide this analysis under the baseline section.</p> <p>Please revise the baseline section focusing on these particular thematic issues and describing the status quo for each of them as only then can the GEF increment be understood in terms of its complementarity to the baseline.</p> <p>April 20, 2017 The baseline situation regarding forest fire prevention and fire fighting, forest restoration and forest management still remains unclear. Please see the GEF comments made in July 2016 and respond accordingly.</p> <p>July 19, 2017 Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.</p>
	<p>12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?</p>		<p>July 8, 2016 The cost effectiveness of the project is mainly explained by the combination of three approaches: the creation and consolidation of protected areas, the restoration of degraded landscapes associated with connectivity development and the species-oriented approach.</p> <p>Please include additional information on how the approaches to support sustainable management of production landscapes are cost-effective.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>April 20, 2017 Thank you for the interesting information provided. Based on a study, the proposal states the project is cost effective by providing financial results of the project. Nevertheless, there is no information regarding the alternative scenarios considered in the study and the cost effectiveness of the proposed approach remains unclear. To demonstrate the cost effectiveness, please complete accordingly informing briefly about the other alternative approaches that have been considered and appear to be less cost effective.</p> <p>July 19, 2017 Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.</p>
	<p>13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 The project seeks to develop a significant area of PAs in the three biomes which are under-represented against national plans for protection, in addition the plans to restore corridor and connective land uses and improve forest management are a coherent approach to addressing connectivity issues that are outside of the scope of the SNUC.</p> <p>It is unclear what the CCM activities are and unclear how the CCM funding will create addition carbon benefits that are not already being created. Please clearly explain.</p> <p>April 05, 2012</p>	<p>July 8, 2016 The incremental reasoning is still unclear, especially for the components 2 and 3 and this is due to the fact the baseline analysis for these elements of the project investment are not well-developed. Please clarify.</p> <p>Please provide a more detailed and clear explanation on how the CCM and SFM proposed activities will create additional environmental benefits.</p> <p>April 20, 2017 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		At CEO endorsement, please provide more clarity in activities for Component 3.	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>a) Financing plans for the 24 PAs are identified in Table A but this is not reflected in Table B or the text. Please clarify the PA finance plans and how this is being achieved.</p> <p>b) Please explain the business plans for 4 selected sites. If these are PES systems please describe how these are to be developed and how STAP guidance on PES is being incorporated. PES also seems to be a part of Component 3 and similar details should be provided.</p> <p>c) Please explain a little how Component 4 and Component 2.1 differ and do not duplicate effort; both appear to address management effectiveness.</p> <p>d) Please explain how Component 5 differs from community-related activities in Components 2 and 3</p> <p>e) The outputs and outcomes in Table B related to CCM objectives are not readily apparent. Please show clear activities targeted at CCM objectives. In Table A, 20000 hectares are listed with the CCM objective but that does not show up in Table B.</p> <p>f) The project objective in Table B seems quite lengthy and yet still does not clearly indicate this is a climate mitigation project, intentional targeting climate mitigation benefits. Please clarify.</p>	<p>July 8, 2016</p> <p>It is not clear where the project will be working in terms of the protected areas that are the focus of component one and two. The tracking tool is also not clear in this regard as a number of METTs are provided but these protected areas are not listed clearly in the GEF CEO endorsement. In addition, it is not clear for what protected areas the finance plans will be developed. This is also not clarified in the tracking tools which provide no baseline information on the financial status of the protected areas where financial plans will be developed. Please revise all of this and list the names of the existing protected areas that the GEF investment in Component Two will be focused. There should be a METT presented for each of these areas and their total area should be presented in the project framework.</p> <p>In addition, please include the names of the protected areas where the project aims to improve financial sustainability, and the target for reducing the finance gap.</p> <p>With regards to the work on protected areas management and finance, there is a confusion between Table A which</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>g) Note that biodiversity monitoring system is to be funded by BD funding not CCM funding. If this project is proposing a carbon monitoring system, then be clear how it is coordinated with existing carbon inventory systems or matches with existing methodologies, as appropriate.</p> <p>April 05, 2012</p> <p>a) Cleared</p> <p>b) Ecosystem services elements concentrated into Component 2 and additional information presented . Cleared.</p> <p>c) Additional information presented. Cleared.</p> <p>d) Sufficient information provided for PIF stage, fuller details are expected at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>e) By CEO endorsement, please ensure activities related to CCM-5 objectives are clear.</p> <p>f) Thank you for the addition. Cleared.</p> <p>g) Monitoring in Component 4 now funded only by BD. Cleared.</p>	<p>notes 24 sustainable finance plans will be produced and Table B which lists five. Please clarify.</p> <p>In addition, nowhere in the document is a financial analysis provided of the funding gap of the protected areas. Please note that the GEF focus is on reducing the funding gap under BD 1.2 thus there should be an indicator that has a target for how much the funding gap will be reduced. Please revise.</p> <p>In Table A we see that 3 policies will be changed under BD-2, but we do not see what these policies are in Table B. Please revise and clarify.</p> <p>Please provide more details on the activities funded by the CCM-5 and SFM windows. These activities remain too vague, the targeted areas do not appear in the component description. Please be more specific and complete.</p> <p>April, 20 2017</p> <p>Thank you for clarification on the protected areas issues. Cleared.</p> <p>Regarding the CCM/SFM comment (last paragraph). The response from the Agency states: "The additional information regarding the activities is included in the Result Matrix (Annex II of the POD)", but this has not been provided. Please provide this document</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>to clarify the outputs.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification. Nevertheless, with regards to the use of CCM and SFM resources, the activities planned need to be further explained. As this component is the main component providing GHG benefits, it is particularly important to clarify concretely how the \$31 million will be used to achieve the expected results over a such extended area (1 million ha + 5,000 of degraded landscape). Please explain in component 3 and for each biome what is the state of the land before the intervention and the activities planned to implement the restoration and make it sustainable (cancelling the drivers of the degradation).</p> <p>August 4, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification and the added text in the project document. Cleared.</p>
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>Outputs identified as: 24 new PAs covering 1,000,000 ha in unprotected ecosystems and protecting 25 RTES Financing planning for 14 priority PAs National and sub-national landuse planning that incorporates BD and ecosystem services Rehabilitation of 20,000 ha of forest and</p>	<p>July 8, 2016</p> <p>Regarding the carbon calculation, please provide the expected results in the same unit (tCO₂), after the duration of the project and after 15 years. In the project document, please briefly explain these results (including fire management) for both mitigation sources: carbon stock enhancement and emissions avoided.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>non-forest land SFM practiced in 5,000 ha of forest</p> <p>SFM/REDD+ projects should show carbon benefits not only from the CCM funding but also the SFM/REDD+ funding.</p> <p>a) Please provide an estimate of the carbon benefit likely to accrue from the project, in comparison to a baseline (carbon accrual expected without the project). Using Tier 1 estimates are acceptable at this stage, but more precise and measured estimates are expected during project implementation. Include concise documentation as to the source of the carbon factors.</p> <p>b) Note that fire management may or may not create carbon benefits. The effects should be carefully considered and briefly documented.</p> <p>April 05, 2012</p> <p>a) Thank you very much for the very clear and well-documented calculations. Cleared.</p> <p>b) Additional details added to the text. Further analysis will be expected at the time of CEO Endorsement. Cleared.</p>	<p>In the carbon calculation sheet the duration of the project is from 2014 to 2017. Nevertheless the project duration is 5 years and, if beginning in 2014, should ends in 2018 and the CO2 mitigation result coming from emissions avoided should be much better according to the sheet (10 times more). Please explain and adjust if it is a mistake.</p> <p>April 20, 2017</p> <p>The carbon benefits are still unclear. The project document informs about MtC and MtCO2 which are not reflected the same way in the TT. Are the 15.76 MtC as in the project document or 15.76 MtCO2 as in the TT? Where is this figure in the carbon calculation excel sheet? Are the 9.18 Mt CO2 emissions from conversion BAU as documented in the project document or emissions avoided as in the TT? Are the 239663.27 tCO2 as in the TT or tC as in the carbon calculation excel sheet?</p> <p>Please revise accordingly all the figures, use only tCO2 in the project document, ensure the coherence between the different documents so that the carbon benefits, in terms of CO2, after the project duration and 10 years after the project duration remain clear and correspond to figures in the carbon calculation excel sheet.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>The same unit is now used in the different documents, thank you. Nevertheless, there are still these remaining issues that need to be addressed:</p> <p>1- In the calculation sheet, under the project scenario at the end of the project, the "Stock Gains from PAs and Mgmt (tCO2)" and the "Emissions Prevented by PAs (tCO2)" are inverted. The calculated numbers don't correspond to type of GHG benefits (stock gains versus emissions prevented). This inversion of numbers appears also in the CEO endorsement request in paragraph 26. Please ensure in all documents that the type of GHG benefits reported correspond to the calculated numbers.</p> <p>2- In the calculation sheet, under the project scenario and 10 years after the project, the "Stock Gains from PAs and Mgmt (tCO2)" is 2,396,633 tCO2 which is different from the number reported in the CEO endorsement request (2,16 Mt CO2). Please note also that the cel D59 is different from the cel W68. Please check the calculation and ensure to use the right number in the "Carbon Benefit Model Summary" of the calculation sheet and in the project document.</p> <p>August 4, 2017</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Thank you for the explanation and corrections. Cleared. We acknowledge the GHG calculation based on local data which provides more accurate results. Nevertheless, the baseline data used for the calculation of the GHG benefits seem very high, which leads to a very high final result, notably for the carbon sequestration. It is requested to the Agency to revise all the baseline numbers used for the calculation at the beginning of the project and, if new numbers are found, to correct accordingly the project targets in terms of carbon benefits. Please inform the GEF Secretariat about the results of this revision.</p>
	<p>16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012</p> <p>a) Activities addressing local land users management practices are included in Components 2, 3 and 5, however the socio-economic benefits are not clear and need to be described.</p> <p>b) The development of the PA network has the potential to restrict livelihood opportunities, please explain how the project is addressing potential impacts.</p> <p>c) Please provide more detail on what is envisaged in "sustainable resource use by local communities" in Component 2.</p> <p>d) If climate change mitigation is truly an objective in this project, its role in section B.3. needs to be clearly described.</p> <p>e) For part b) of this question, please</p>	<p>July 8, 2016</p> <p>Yes, this is clearly described.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>briefly describe that if there are incremental synergistic benefits from combining focal area objectives in this proposal, what are the resulting synergies that are being captured?</p> <p>April 05, 2012 a) Sufficient detail provided for PIF stage. The planned undertaking of analysis during PPG is acknowledged and expected at time of CEO Endorsement. b) Additional details provided. Cleared. c) Language modified in the text. Cleared. d) General role of CCM is better described. Cleared at PIF. e) At CEO endorsement, please provide more details. Adequate at PIF.</p>	
	<p>17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 Stakeholders identified are largely governmental and organized. How are CSO and local community stakeholders (as these will be important in affecting changes in management) being included in project design and execution? Also as the private sector is identified as a major contributor of co-finance some additional information on their inclusion would be necessary. Are any of the stakeholders focused on climate mitigation activities? Please briefly describe.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Sufficient information provided for PIF stage. Fuller details of participation by</p>	<p>July 8, 2016 The participation of the private sector still needs to be further explained, in particular for the Private Natural Heritage Reserve Association. Please provide more information accordingly.</p> <p>April 21, 2017 Cleared</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>the public and private sector will be expected by CEO Endorsement.</p>	
	<p>18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 The basic risks are identified and would be expected to be further developed by time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>a) At this stage some additional thoughts on how local land users and communities are going to be included at all stages of the project is necessary given their role in ground level management.</p> <p>b) Also given the importance of the private sector to co-finance it would be useful to address the risk of their non-participation.</p> <p>c) Please address the risk of increased GHG emissions from possible leakage outside of project boundaries and how that risk is being mitigated.</p> <p>d) If fire is a concern, please address the risk of fire disturbance in restored forests.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 a / b) Sufficient information provided for PIF stage. Fuller details will be expected by CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>c) Addressed.</p> <p>d) Adequate at PIF stage.</p>	<p>July 8, 2016</p> <p>To mitigate the risk of local communities resistance, the project proposes financed compensation for cases where there would be a restriction in use of land or other natural resources. How this risk is expected to be faced and the project results maintained after the end of the project? Please clarify.</p> <p>The risk of fire disturbance in restored forests is not specifically addressed as expected at CEO endorsement stage. Please address accordingly.</p> <p>The potential impact of climate change has not been adequately addressed and the mitigation measures are not well developed. For example, how is CC being factored into both PA management plans and the siting and creation of new protected areas. Please revise.</p> <p>April 21, 2017</p> <p>As a response to the risk of local community resistance, it is explained that in those cases where the declaration of new or expanded protected areas results in access or land use restriction, the Project will act in strict conformity with the IDB's resettlement policy.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>Please briefly specify the relevant elements of this policy.</p> <p>Cleared for the other comments about forest fires and taking into account climate change.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification on declaration or expansion of PAs. Cleared.</p>
	<p>19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 There are a number of relevant on-going and potential projects, and key ones are mentioned in the PIF, however please provide some detail on how coordination with this wide range (both technically and geographically) is going to be achieved. Please include coordination with other mitigation projects.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Additional information provided and is sufficient for PIF stage. Fuller details of coordination efforts will be expected at CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>July 8, 2016</p> <p>The proposal provides a limited number of other related initiatives, essentially national and GEF financed initiatives. Please provide a more complete overview of the other related initiatives and explain how they coordinate with the project proposal and what mechanisms will be put in place to ensure coordination.</p> <p>In addition, we note that currently in Brazil there are a number of existing and future GEF projects dealing with implementing the CAR thus, we want to know how the Government is coordinating across these various GEF investments.</p> <p>April 25, 2017</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<p>20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 Please provide some additional detail on</p>	<p>July 8, 2016 Cleared.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>project execution, in particular given the widely distributed nature of the project.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Execution arrangements with ICMBio and JBRJ have been expanded. Cleared.</p>	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		July 8, 2016 Cleared.
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		July 8, 2016 NA
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>March 16, 2012 PMC stands at 4.7%</p>	<p>July 8, 2016 PMC stands at 11,1% while the threshold is at 5% of the GEF grant for grants above \$2 million. Please reduce the PMC in the authorized limit.</p> <p>April 20, 2017 The PMC amount which exceed the 5% threshold for GEF grants about US\$2 million has been agreed to by the GEF agency and Brazil. Cleared.</p>
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	<p>March 16, 2012 Please provide a breakdown of FA funding for the Components.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Breakdown included. Cleared.</p>	July 8, 2016 Cleared
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	<p>March 16, 2012 Co-finance is 1:2.8, which is low for this type of project. Please identify additional co-finance sources.</p>	July 8, 2016 Co-finance is 1:4,9. Cleared

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>April 05, 2012 Co-finance is now at 1:3.93.</p>	
	<p>26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 There is no IADB co-finance contribution at present. The early stage of preparation of a loan for the SISNAMA is mentioned but this is not anticipated until 2013. Please explain the comparative advantage of IADB as implementing agency for this project and what role they will play in the absence of co-financing.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 IADB contribution has been included and now stands at \$15 million (loan).</p>	<p>July 8, 2016 It is not apparent from the documentation what happened to the \$15 million IADB loan as cofinance. Please clarify.</p> <p>April 20, 2017 Cleared</p>
<p>Project Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?</p>		<p>July 8, 2016 The tracking tools for the BDFA are not completed correctly nor are they aligned at all with the project results frameworks and the various targets. This is referenced above as well.</p> <p>The project aims to improve financial sustainability of some protected areas, therefore, for these specific protected areas the financial sustainability scorecard should be completed.</p> <p>The project proposes to change policies in and regulatory frameworks in production sectors (3), therefore the tracking tool for BD-2 must be completed for the relevant sectors.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>The Tracking Tools for SFM and CCM do not fully correspond the project documents and the carbon calculation sheet. For instance, the area of forest restoration is 0ha and the area covered by forest management plans is 5,000 ha in the SFM-TT, while they are respectively 5,000ha and 20,000ha in the CEO endorsement request. The carbon benefits form avoided deforestation do not correspond to the carbon calculation sheet... Please revise the Tracking Tools accordingly to ensure that they correspond exactly to the project documents which should be fully documented.</p> <p>April 21, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for including the sustainable finance scorecards.</p> <p>Please provide the METTs for the protected areas in components one and two that have been identified as the target protected areas in components one and two.</p> <p>In addition, as was noted in the July 2016 comments above, please provide the tracking tool for BD-2 activities which must be completed to track the results of BD-2 investments which total US\$ 7,494,614, per Table A.</p> <p>Regarding the SFM and CCM elements, the SFM TT is nearly the same as the</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>previous one and doesn't show the requested information. Please note also that the figure 5,472,360 appears to be dollars in the project document (cost of restoration) and hectares in the SFM TT. Furthermore, a new version of the CCM TT is not provided with this new resubmission. Please adjust accordingly and provide TTs that are consistent with all the documents.</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the new TTs provided. Nevertheless, the following points still need to be addressed:</p> <p>1- In the SFM TT we don't understand where the results attributed to the 25,000 ha come from and the sum of the GHG benefits is much less as the total GHG benefits as reported in the calculation table and the project document (10,388,273 Mt CO2 instead of around 60 million tCO2). In addition, the 1 million ha doesn't appear and outcomes (current situation and planned target) are not informed (except raw 93 and 94). Please explain the calculation of the GHG benefits for the 25,000 ha, adjust the SFM TT so that it corresponds to the calculation sheet and the project document and complete the information regarding the outcomes;</p> <p>2- In the CC TT, the same comment applies as the one regarding the GHG</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>benefits of the 25,000 ha in the SFM TT: we don't understand where the GHG benefits come from and the sum of the GHG benefits is much less as the total GHG benefits as reported in the calculation table and the project document. Please explain the calculation of the GHG benefits for the 25,000 ha and adjust the CC TT so that it corresponds to the other documents provided.</p> <p>August 4, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the corrections. Cleared.</p>
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		<p>July 8, 2016 Cleared</p>
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		<p>8 July, 2016</p> <p>- The project states that the "activities will be based... on the identification of main threats and conservation opportunities". The STAP comments regarding the threats needs to be more clearly addressed.</p> <p>- The baseline situation for land use still needs to be presented as requested by STAP and as also referenced above.</p> <p>- Response on mitigation measures vis a vis climate change are not adequate. Please revise as noted above.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>April 25, 2017</p> <p>This comment does not appear clearly addressed as it also relates with others that are not fully addressed (such as the baseline situation for forest land use as informed in Box 11). Please ensure this comment is fully addressed and indicate where each element of this comment is addressed in the project document and show clearly the added or modified text in the project document (by highlighting this text).</p> <p>July 19, 2019</p> <p>The response doesn't indicate where each element of this comment is addressed in the project document. Please do so.</p> <p>August 4, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? 		<p>8 July, 2016</p> <p>The response provided is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>The suggested stronger focus on incentives and benefits for the local population and communities to achieve strong community support doesn't appear clearly in the proposal and need to be better explained. Most of the activities of the component 5 do not address specifically this aspect.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>In addition, the German council member asked that synergies with the BIZ project be explored during the design phase of the project. The project has been under design for more than two years, yet the response by IADB is that a dialogue will be undertaken during implementation. Please clarify why this discussion has not already taken place and arrangements for collaboration identified.</p> <p>April 25, 2017</p> <p>Component 5 description doesn't show improvement regarding activities focusing on incentives and benefits for the local population and communities. Furthermore, synergies with the ongoing project on Biodiversity monitoring / REDD+ of the German Development Cooperation are not explained in section B.1.</p> <p>This comment therefore is not clearly addressed. Please clarify and specify where they are addressed in the project document and showing clearly the added or modified text (by highlighting this text).</p> <p>July 19, 2017</p> <p>Cleared.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other GEF Agencies? 		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>March 16, 2012 Not at this stage, please address comments above. As indicated, much more clarity is needed to convincingly show that CCM funding is used for CCM objectives in this project.</p> <p>9 Apr 2012 The PIF is technically cleared. We recommend approval.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	9 Apr 2012: By CEO endorsement, please ensure questions 10, 13, 14d&e; 15b, 16a&e; 17, 18a, and 19 have been addressed.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		<p>July 12, 2016</p> <p>No. The documents provided have considerable gaps, inconsistencies, and an overall lack of clarity and thus significant revisions are required. Please address all the issues listed above and resubmit a revised version along with a table that describes how each issue has been addressed.</p> <p>Please note that Table D is missing but must be included in the CEO endorsement submission.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>April 25, 2017</p> <p>Not yet. We noted that the table D has been included, thank you. Nevertheless, several comments previously presented have not been adequately addressed. Please review accordingly and resubmit. The GEF Secretariat is available to discuss carbon calculations and assist with this issue.</p> <p>In addition, please correct these clerical errors:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Finance Breakdown and Focal Area Strategy Framework (FASF) GEF Project Grants differ 2) Finance Breakdown and FASF GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ 3) Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview GEF Project Grants / Fees differ 4) Finance Breakdown and Project Framework GEF Project Grants differ 5) Finance Breakdown and Project Framework GEF Project Grants per Trust Fund differ <p>July 20, 2017</p> <p>No. Please address all issues above and resubmit.</p> <p>August 4, 2017</p> <p>Thank you for addressing the remaining issues. Yes, the CEO endorsement is</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			now recommended.
Review Date (s)	First review*	March 16, 2012	July 12, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)	April 09, 2012	April 27, 2017
	Additional review (as necessary)		July 19, 2017
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.