



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

GEF ID:	4859		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Consolidation of National System of Conservation Units (SNUC) and Enhanced Flora and Fauna Protection		
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; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$32,621,820
Co-financing:	\$128,200,000	Total Project Cost:	\$160,821,820
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	June 01, 2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ian Gray	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.	
	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.	
	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.	

*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)
	<p>5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 The project is consistent with the agency's country strategy. Brazil is one of IDBs founding member countries.</p> <p>The PIF has no electronic signature from the Agency Coordinator, please include this.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Revised version includes signature. Cleared.</p>	
Resource Availability	<p>6. 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>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.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the focal area allocation? 	<p>March 16, 2012 Yes amounts sought are within the FA allocations.</p> <p>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.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		

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 SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> focal area set-aside? 	<p>April 05, 2012 Cleared. Current requests for SFM/REDD funding for Brazil are below the \$10 million ceiling.</p>	
Project Consistency	<p>7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?</p>	<p>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</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Table A has been revised. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?</p>	<p>March 16, 2012 Yes objectives identified: BD-1, BD-2, CCM-5 and SFM-1</p>	
	<p>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?</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Please articulate the consistency with the Second National Communication of the FCCC.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 Additional information on consistency with second National Communication</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		provided. Cleared.	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	<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>	
Project Design	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>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>	
	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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<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 additional carbon benefits that are not already being created. Please clearly explain.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 At CEO endorsement, please provide more clarity in activities for Component 3.</p>	
	<p>14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?</p>	<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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>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>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<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>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</p> <p>Financing planning for 14 priority PAs National and sub-national landuse planning that incorporates BD and ecosystem services</p> <p>Rehabilitation of 20,000 ha of forest and non-forest land</p> <p>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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>and briefly documented.</p> <p>April 05, 2012 a) Thank you very much for the very clear and well-documented calculations. Cleared. b) Additional details added to the text. Further analysis will be expected at the time of CEO Endorsement. Cleared.</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 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. b) The development of the PA network has the potential to restrict livelihood opportunities, please explain how the project is addressing potential impacts. c) Please provide more detail on what is envisaged in "sustainable resource use by local communities" in Component 2. 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 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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>analysis during PPG is acknowledged and expected at time of CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>b) Additional details provided. Cleared.</p> <p>c) Language modified in the text. Cleared.</p> <p>d) General role of CCM is better described. Cleared at PIF.</p> <p>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 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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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. c) Addressed. d) Adequate at PIF stage.</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</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		CEO Endorsement.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>March 16, 2012 Please provide some additional detail on 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?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	<p>March 16, 2012 PMC stands at 4.7%</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>	
	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> <p>April 05, 2012 Co-finance is now at 1:3.93.</p>	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	<p>March 16, 2012 There is no IADB co-finance contribution at present. The early stage</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>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>	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convention Secretariat? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies? 		
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>	

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