



REQUEST FOR CEO ENDORSEMENT

PROJECT TYPE: Full-sized Project

TYPE OF TRUST FUND: GEF Trust Fund

For more information about GEF, visit TheGEF.org

PART I: PROJECT INFORMATION

Project Title: Reversing Desertification Process in Susceptible Areas of Brazil: Sustainable Agroforestry Practices and Biodiversity Conservation (REDESER)			
Country(ies):	Brazil	GEF Project ID: ¹	5324
GEF Agency(ies):	FAO	GEF Agency Project ID:	616970
Other Executing Partner(s):	Ministry of Environment (MMA), Secretariat of Extractivism and Sustainable Rural Development (SEDR), Department to Combat Desertification and Land Degradation (DCD)	Submission Date: Resubmission Date:	14 January 2016 26 April 2016
GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi-Focal	Project Duration (Months)	48
Name of Parent Program (if applicable): ➤ For SFM/REDD+ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ➤ For SGP <input type="checkbox"/>		Agency Fee (\$):	373,365

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK²

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
LD-2	Outcome 2.2: Improved forest management in drylands Outcome 2.3: Sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands	Output 2.2 Types of innovative SFM practices introduced at field level Output 2.3 Suitable SFM interventions to increase/maintain natural forest cover in dryland production landscapes	GEFTF	1,601,301	5,900,265
LD-3	Outcome 3.2: Integrated landscape	Output 3.2 INRM tools and methodologies	GEFTF	779,823	3,443,044

¹ Project ID number will be assigned by GEFSEC.

² Refer to the [Focal Area/LDCF/SCCF Results Framework](#) when completing Table A.

Focal Area Objectives	Expected FA Outcomes	Expected FA Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)
	management practices adopted by local communities	developed and tested			
BD-2	Outcome 2.1: Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation	Output 2.2. National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation.	GEFTF	705,556	2,031,984
SFM/REDD+-1	Outcome 1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests. <i>Indicator 1.2.2: Enhanced carbon sinks from reduced forest degradation.</i>	Output 1.2: Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management, separated by forest type	GEFTF	843,475	4,391,373
Total project costs				3,930,155	15,766,666

B. PROJECT FRAMEWORK

<p>Project Objective: To halt and reverse environmental degradation in areas susceptible to desertification (ASD), ensuring the flow of ecosystem services, promoting the integrated management of natural resources, generating global environmental benefits and contributing to poverty reduction.</p> <p>Development Objective: To increase and improve provision of goods and services from sustainable management and restoration of dryland forest and agroforestry production landscapes, contributing to poverty reduction.</p>						
Project Component	Grant Type	Expected Outcomes	Expected Outputs	Trust Fund	Grant Amount (\$)	Confirmed Co-financing (\$)
Component 1: Promoting Integrated Natural Resource Management (INRM) in Production Landscapes	INV	<p>Outcome 1.1: INRM has been mainstreamed, and scaled-up at landscape level</p> <p><i>Indicators:</i> <i>Smallholders with increased and diversified</i></p>	<p>Output 1.1.1: INRM best practices identified, evaluated and replicated at farm and landscape levels <i>(Target: 904,142 ha)</i></p>	GEFTF	937,747	2,660,000

		<p><i>production based on INRM (Baseline: negligible Target: 1,567 people)</i></p> <p><i>INRM adopted and mainstreamed into productive systems (Baseline: 0 Target: 904,142 hectares)</i></p> <p><i><u>Indicator LD-3 ii): Spatial coverage of INRM practices in wider landscapes (Baseline: 0; Target: 904.142 ha).</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Indicator LD-3 ii): Number of INRM tools and methodologies introduced (Target: 3 practices)³</u></i></p> <p><i><u>Indicator BD-2.1: areas where the project directly contributes to BD conservation or sustainable use of its components: 904,142 ha.</u></i></p>	<p>Output 1.1.2: Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) from INRM incorporated in government programs and projects and local agro-industries</p> <p><i><u>Indicator:</u></i> <i>Products purchased by PAA⁴/PNAE⁵ (Baseline: 10 products listed by PAA and PNAE at project sites. Target: +20% in purchases by PAA/PNAE by 2019)</i></p> <p>Output 1.1.3: Capacity for identification, evaluation and promotion of INRM systems strengthened at state-level departments, agencies and banks.</p> <p><i><u>Indicators:</u></i> <i>Guidelines developed for identification and evaluation of INRM systems (Baseline: 0; Target: 1 set of guidelines)</i></p> <p><i>Technical staff prepared to use</i></p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

³ List of practices, according to the LD Tracking Tool: Sustainable production of Non wood forests and agriculture products; Forest and Landscape restoration; and Sustainable management of natural resources

⁴ National Purchase Program, for its acronym in Portuguese

⁵ National Program of School Feeding, for its acronym in Portuguese

			<i>guidelines and to evaluate INRM at project intervention areas (Baseline: 0; Target: 100 technical staff)</i>			
Component 2: Promoting Multiple-Use Forest Management	TA	<p>Outcome 2.1: Forest areas under multi-purpose SFM have been increased</p> <p><i>Indicator LD-2 iii):</i> i) Number of hectares providing sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands (Baseline: 0; Target: 618,062ha. of forest areas. 85% of forest cover in project area)</p> <p><i>Indicator SFM/REDD+-1.2:</i> a) Area covered by forest management plans (Baseline:</p>	<p>Output 2.1.1: Innovative small- and large-scale SFM practices identified, evaluated and replicated in selected forest management and experimental areas (Target: +15,000 ha with SFM plans)</p> <p>Output 2.1.2: Support for the development of multiple-use SFM supply chains (Target: SFM plans for multiple use with NTFP at Araripe EPA⁷ and buffer areas of Sao Francisco MONAT⁸).</p>	GEFTF	1,199,309	5,543,334

⁷ In Brazil the APA (*Área de Proteção Ambiental*) or Environmental Protection Area (EPA) is an extensive natural area for protection and conservation of biotic attributes (fauna and flora), therein aesthetic or cultural, important for the quality of life of local people and for the protection of regional ecosystems. The main goal of EPAs is the conservation of natural processes and biodiversity, including guidance, the development and adaptation of diverse human activities to the environmental characteristics of the area. As protected areas with sustainable use category, the EPAs allow human occupation. These units are ordered to reconcile the human occupation of the area and the sustainable use of its natural resources. EPAs can be established in areas of public or private land by federal, state or municipalities, without the need for expropriation of private land. However, activities and practices developed in these are subject to specific rules. The conditions for conducting scientific research and public viewing areas in the public domain will be established by the unit's management agency, while in private property, it is up to the owner to establish the conditions for research and visits by the public, subject to the legal requirements and restrictions.

⁸ Natural Monuments (MONAT as per its acronym in Portuguese). In Brazil, MONAT is a category of strictly protected conservation area defined by the National Nature Conservation Units (SNUC). These units are created in order to preserve rare natural sites, natural or of great scenic beauty. The units of category MONAT may consist of particular areas, provided it is possible to match the unit's goals with the use of land and natural resources of the site by the owners. If there is incompatibility between the field goals and the private activities or not there is consent from the owner to the conditions proposed by the responsible unit of administration for the coexistence of Natural Monument with the use of the

		<p>1712 ha; Target: +15.000 ha)</p> <p>b) with conservation and enhancement of carbon in forest through SFM (target : 618, 062 ha corresponding to 2,058,146 t CO2eq (indirect impact) .</p> <p><u>Indicator LD-2 ii):</u> Total spatial coverage of SFM practices and technologies (Baseline: 1,712 ha; Target: 15,000 ha⁶)</p> <p><u>Indicator BD-2 iii):</u> Specific management practices that integrate BD: a) SFM plans (Baseline: 1,712 ha managed under SFM practices with management plans. Target: 15,000 ha under SFM plans).</p>	<p>Output 2.1.3: Guidelines developed for SFM practices and monitoring protocols at local level</p>			
<p>Component 3: Forest and Landscape Restoration (FLR)</p>	<p>INV</p>	<p>Outcome 3.1: Seed/ seedling production capacity improved to support restoration of</p>	<p>Output 3.1.1: Smallholders and public nurseries in ASD legalized with improved native seed and seedling production</p>	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>992,294</p>	<p>5,519,999</p>

property, the area should be expropriated, according to what provided by law. The open house is subject to conditions and restrictions set out in Unit Management Plan, the standards set by the agency responsible for its administration and those specified by regulation.

According to the National Register of Protected Areas, there were 23 units of this category in Brazil in 2012. Sao Francisco MONAT is one of them.

⁶ Under: 1) Best management practices /reduced Impact Logging; 2) Biodiversity conservation; 4) Management planning and multiscale land-use planning; 5) Participatory forestry, and 6) Sustained timber and NTFP production, as per the LD Tracking Tool, Indicator LD-2 iii).

	<p>degraded lands in ASD</p> <p><u>Indicator BD-2 iii):</u> Specific management practices that integrate BD: b) restoration with native species (Baseline: 0 restoration. Target: 30,000 ha under restoration with native species).</p> <p>Outcome 3.2: Forest connectivity sites have been defined, sustainably managed and restored</p> <p><u>Indicator SFM/REDD+-1.</u> Carbon stored in forest ecosystems and emissions avoided from deforestation and forest degradation from this project (Direct lifetime):</p> <p>a) Conservation & enhancement of carbon in forests (Target: +30,000 has of forest restored, +439,200 ton CO_{2eq} sequestered) (direct impact) and additional enhancement of carbon in forest through SFM (target : 618,062</p>	<p><u>Indicator:</u> Number of nurseries registered. Baseline: 90% of 165 forest nurseries without registration. Target: +20% of nurseries registered).</p> <p>Output 3.1.2: Seed collectors and nursery personnel trained and registered in National System of Seeds and Seedlings</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> Level of capacities of personnel working at nurseries. (Baseline: low capacities. Target: 1600 personnel with at least medium capacities, as per surveys distributed throughout the capacity development process).</p> <p>Output 3.1.3: Practical guidelines for FLR in ASD developed and adopted by stakeholders</p> <p>Output 3.2.1: Appropriate sites identified and restoration plans under implementation for restoration</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		<p>ha, 2,058,146 t CO₂ t CO₂eq (indirect impact) .</p> <p>b) <i>Avoided deforestation and forest degradation (Target: avoided emissions of 696,219 ton CO₂eq in 5,709 ha – (direct impact) and avoided emissions of 2,472,347 ton CO₂eq in 60,820ha (indirect impact)</i></p> <p><u>Indicator</u> <u>SFM/REDD+-1.2:</u> b) <i>Restoration/rehabilitation of degraded forests (Baseline: 0; Target: 30.000 ha)</i></p>	<p>and establishment of forest connectivity using cost-effective and adapted restoration techniques (assisted natural regeneration, enrichment and planting etc.)</p> <p><u>Indicator: Areas under restoration (Baseline: degraded forests area 104,169 ha.; Target: 30,000 ha with restoration plans under implementation)</u></p> <p>Output 3.2.2: Participatory projects for restoration of degraded lands and improvement of production landscapes and land-use practices</p> <p><u>Indicator:</u> <i>Number of local projects prepared for financing (Baseline: 0; Target: 8 projects in 15,000 ha. prepared and financing negotiated with the MMA and national banks).</i></p>			
--	--	---	---	--	--	--

<p>Component 4: Knowledge Management, Capacity Development and Awareness-Raising</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>Outcome 4.1: Improvement in capacity of key state and municipal institutions about LD and desertification</p> <p><i>Targets: 270 staff with improved capacities in 14 municipalities and 9 states A network established in ASD on knowledge-management</i></p> <p>Outcome 4.2: Policy-makers and farmer, private sector and education stakeholders have capacity to implement SFM, FLR, INRM and BD conservation</p> <p><i>Indicator: Availability of good-quality materials at local level. (Baseline: negligible; Target: materials for forest officers, nursery staff and seed collectors is produced and distributed in each project site).</i></p>	<p>Output 4.1.1: Strengthened learning and action networks facilitating field exchanges in ASD</p> <p>Output 4.2.1: Guidelines and briefs developed on best practices and lessons learned on SFM, FLR and INRM in ASD</p> <p>Output 4.2.2: ASD academic community engaged against LD and desertification</p> <p>Output 4.2.3: Increased awareness about SFM and FLR in ASD</p>	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>462,448</p>	<p>1,533,333</p>
<p>Component 5: Coordination with Other Activities, Monitoring and Evaluation</p>	<p>TA</p>	<p>Outcome 5.1: Synergy with complementary initiatives to promote sustainable management and restoration benefits</p> <p>Outcome 5.2:</p>	<p>Output 5.1.1: Effective collaboration with complementary initiatives</p>	<p>GEFTF</p>	<p>151,207</p>	<p>310,000</p>

		Project implemented with results-based management and application of findings/lessons learnt	<p>Output 5.2.1: Project M&E system operational providing information on progress in meeting project outcome and output targets</p> <p>5.2.2: Mid-term and final evaluation conducted, project best practices and lessons learned published and disseminated</p>			
			Subtotal		3,743,005	15,566,666
			Project management Cost (PMC) ⁹	GEFTF	187,150	200,000
			Total project costs		3,930,155	15,766,666

C. SOURCES OF CONFIRMED CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY SOURCE AND BY NAME (\$)

Please include letters confirming co-financing for the project with this form

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount (\$)
National Government	MMA – Ministry of Environment	Grant	1,866,667
National Government	SFB – Brazilian Forest Service	Grant	2,666,667
National Government	MDA – Ministry of Agrarian Development	Grant	3,360,000
National Government	INSA – National Semi-Arid Institute	Grant	1,333,333
State Government	SEMARH – Alagoas Secretariat of Environment and Water Resources	Grant	533,333
State Government	SEAFDS – Paraíba Secretariat of Family Farming and Development of the Semi-Arid	Grant	1,066,667
State Government	SEIHRMACT – Paraíba Secretariat of Environment etc.	Grant	800,000
State Government	SEPLAN - Rio Grande do Norte Secretariat of Planning	Grant	1,066,666

⁹ PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project grant amount in Table D below.

Municipal Government	SEMA – Crato Secretariat of Environment	Grant	533,334
Civil Society	FUNETEC – Technological and Cultural Education Foundation	In kind	800,000
Civil Society	IABS – Brazilian Institute of Development and Sustainability	In kind	266,666
Civil Society	SEAPAC – Service for Support of Alternative Community Projects	In kind	160,000
Civil Society	CEPIS – Center for Sustainable Industrial Production	In kind	533,333
Civil Society	Araripe Foundation	In kind	160,000
Civil Society	APNE – Northeast Plants Association	In kind	160,000
Civil Society	AGENDHA – Advice and Management on Nature Studies, Human Development and Agroecology	In kind	160,000
Civil Society	ICRAF – World Agroforestry Center	Grant	100,000
GEF Agency	FAO – United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization	In kind	200,000
Total Co-financing			15,766,666

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY, FOCAL AREA AND COUNTRY¹

GEF Agency	Type of Trust Funds	Focal Area	Country Name/ Global	Grant Amount (\$) (a)	Agency Fee (\$) (b) ²	Total (\$) c=a+b
FAO	GEFTF	LD	Brazil	1,601,301	152,124	1,753,425
FAO	GEFTF	BD	Brazil	1,485,379	141,111	1,626,490
FAO	GEFTF	SFM	Brazil	843,475	80,130	923,605
Total Grant Resources				3,930,155	373,365	4,303,520

¹ In case of a single focal area, single country, single GEF Agency project, and single trust fund project, no need to provide information for this table. PMC amount from Table B should be included proportionately to the focal area amount in this table.

² Indicate fees related to this project.

F. CONSULTANTS WORKING FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMPONENTS:

Component	Grant Amount (\$)	Cofinancing (\$)	Project Total (\$)
International Consultants	30,000	0	30,000
National/Local Consultants	852,456	1,576,667	2,459,123

G. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A “NON-GRANT” INSTRUMENT? NO

(If non-grant instruments are used, provide in Annex D an indicative calendar of expected refloes to your Agency and to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund).

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN OF THE ORIGINAL PIF¹⁰

A.1 National strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, if applicable, i.e. NAPAS, NAPs, NBSAPs, national communications, TNAs, NCSA, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, Biennial Update Reports, etc.

The alignment of the project with the UNCCD, UNFCCC, and CBD is detailed in Subsection 1.1.5 b) of the FAO GEF Project Document. In summary:

UNCCD

In Brazil’s report on the fourth UNCCD reporting cycle, 2010-2011, there are priority commitments regarding family farming, agricultural food supply, the National Forestry Program, conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and genetic resources, integrated sustainable development of the Semi-Arid and the fight against desertification, among other commitments less directly relevant to the REDESER project. The priorities mentioned are addressed by all the project components (integrated natural resource management in production landscapes, multiple-use forest management, forest and landscape restoration and coordination, communication and awareness-raising). It should be noted that the institution which submitted the report in 2012 is the Directorate of the Department to Combat Desertification of the Secretariat of Extractivism and Sustainable Rural Development at the Ministry of Environment, the same that will be responsible for the REDESER project in the Government of Brazil.

CBD

The relevant geographical and thematic priorities in Brazil’s Fifth National Report to the Convention on Biological Diversity submitted by the Secretariat of Biodiversity and Forests of the Ministry of Environment in January of 2015 are: 1) Revised legislation, focusing on effectiveness of public policies; 2) Protected areas, including global designation and wetlands; 3) Restoration of vegetation cover, including restoration initiatives and action plans for deforestation reduction; 4) Sustainable forest management; 5) Integrated landscape management; 6) Conservation Action Plans; 7) Sustainability of agricultural production and use of native biodiversity, including native biodiversity and the National

¹⁰ For questions A.1 – A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF and if not specifically requested in the review sheet at PIFstage, then no need to respond, please enter “NA” after the respective question.

Agroecology and Organic Production Plan (PLANAPO). The REDESER project will include activities that contribute directly to points 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7. Specifically: 1) Outcome 1.1 includes improved licensing processes making use of technical guidance, while components 2, 3 and 4 also contribute to policy effectiveness ; 3) Restoration of vegetation cover is the objective of Component 3; 4) Sustainable forest management (SFM) is the objective of component 2; 5) Integrated landscape management is the objective of Component 1, on Integrated Natural Resource Management (IRNM); 7) Sustainability of agricultural production and use of native biodiversity is the objective of all components.

UNFCC

In the Second National Report to UNFCC in 2010, desertification is given specific attention as one of Brazil's five special circumstances. The priorities for mitigation are: 1) Sustainable development; 2) Mitigation as such; 3) Medium- and long-term planning; 4) Clean Development Mechanism. With regard to sustainable development, the REDESER project will help mitigation efforts through the reduction of deforestation. The priorities for adaptation foreseen in the report include specific activities in the semi-arid region, energy, water resources, forests and agriculture and livestock, all of which are related to REDESER components 1, 2, 3 and 4. The first Biennial Update Report of Brazil, in 2014, deals with Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV), REDD+ and measurement of emissions. The new inter-institutional arrangements at the federal level are indirectly relevant to the REDESER project. It should be noted that the National Semi-Arid Institute (INSA), which will be the decentralized base for the project, is part of the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI), which is responsible for climate reporting in Brazil.

A.2. GEF focal area and/or fund(s) strategies, eligibility criteria and priorities.

The REDESER project is consistent with the following GEF strategic objectives: BD-2, LD-2; LD-3, and SFM/REDD+-1.

Component 1 is aligned with the LD-3 objective, Outcome 3.2: *Integrated landscape management practices adopted by local communities*, Output 3.2 *INRM tools and methodologies developed and tested*. Component 1 will support the increase and diversification of smallholders' incomes through the application and dissemination of INRM in the territory of Caatinga. 1,567 rural people will be the direct beneficiaries. Component 1 will support the adoption and mainstreaming of INRM into productive systems in 904,142 hectares, increasing the spatial coverage of INRM practices in wider landscapes. INRM tools and methodologies will be introduced in the project intervention areas (i.e. 3 practices).

Component 1 will also contribute to the BD-2 objective, Outcome 2.1: *Increase in sustainably managed landscapes and seascapes that integrate biodiversity conservation*, Output 2.2. *National and sub-national land-use plans (number) that incorporate biodiversity and ecosystem services valuation by incorporating BD conservation or sustainable use of its components* in 904,142 ha of project direct intervention under INRM practices.

Component 2 is aligned with the LD-2 objective, Outcome 2.2: *Improved forest management in drylands*, Output 2.2 *Types of innovative SFM practices introduced at field level*. Component 2 will support the increase in the number of hectares providing sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands (Baseline: 0; Target: 618,062ha. of forest areas. 85% of forest cover in project area), and will increase the total spatial coverage of SFM practices and technologies (Baseline: 1,712 ha; Target: 15,000 ha).

Component 2 will also contribute to SFM/REDD+-1 Objective, Outcome 1.2: *Good management practices applied in existing forests*, Output 1.2: *Forest area (hectares) under sustainable management, separated by forest type*, by promoting the increase of areas covered by forest management plans (Baseline: 1712 ha; Target: +15.000 ha – see LD-2).

In addition, Component 2 will contribute to the BD-2 Objective, Outcome 2.1, and Output 2.2 by integrating biodiversity conservation criteria in specific management practices (Baseline: 1,712 ha managed under SFM practices with management plans. Target: 15,000 ha under SFM plans).

Component 3 will address the BD-2 Objective, Outcome 2.1, Output 2.2, by increasing the areas where specific management practices that integrate BD are implemented through restoration with native species (Baseline: 0 restoration. Target: 30,000 ha. under restoration with native species).

Component 3 will also contribute to the SFM/REDD+-1 Objective, Outcome 1.2, Output 1.2 by increasing the carbon stored in forest ecosystems and emissions avoided from deforestation and forest degradation from this project (Direct lifetime: a) Conservation & enhancement of carbon in forests (Target: +30,000 has of forest restored, +439,200 ton CO₂eq sequestered); and b) Avoided deforestation and forest degradation (Target: avoided emissions of 696,219ton CO₂eq in 5,709 ha). As well, Component 3 will support the restoration/ rehabilitation of degraded forests (Baseline: 0; Target: 30.000 ha).

Component 4 is cross-cutting and aligned with the BD, SFM/REDD+ and LD focal areas. It will support awareness-raising among national and local institutions, private sector, and local producers in Areas Susceptible to Desertification (ASD) on the importance of habitat preservation, sustainable forest management, and the management of natural resources from an integrated perspective. As well, Component 4 will promote the development of capacities of local government staff (in 14 municipalities of ASD), policy-makers, farmers, and education stakeholders on FLR, reducing, reversing and preventing desertification, SFM and BD conservation.

Component 5 is also cross-cutting and aligned with the BD, SFM/REDD+ and LD focal areas. It will promote synergy with complementary initiatives (such as the UNDP/GEF Project in Sergipe¹¹) to foster sustainable management and restoration benefits. In addition, Component 5 will support the Project M&E system that will generate lessons and valuable data that will be published and disseminated with the support of FAO in other dryland ecosystems in Brazil, in Latin America and the Caribbean, and in other ASD in the world.

Project contribution to Aichi Targets

In addition, the Project proposal and strategies contribute directly to reaching four of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets (5, 7, 14 and 18), as follows:

- By focusing on seed and nursery production and the recovery of degraded forests in ASD, also called “re-greening,” Component 3 contributes to safeguarding threatened biodiversity as foreseen in Target 5.
- Through Components 1 to 4, the project contributes to sustainable management on agricultural and forest land, as foreseen in Target 7.

¹¹ *Sustainable Land Use Management in the Semiarid Region of North-East Brazil (Sergipe)*, GEF ID 5276

- Likewise, the project contributes to provision of ecosystem services for vulnerable segments of the population as foreseen in Target 14.
- By supporting active involvement and empowerment of local communities and indigenous and traditional peoples, the project promotes traditional knowledge regarding sustainable use of NTFP, landraces and dissemination of agroforestry in line with Target 18.

Kindly refer to Subsection 1.1.5: *Links to national development goals, strategies, plans, policy and legislation, GEF and FAO's strategic objectives* of the FAO GEF Project Document for a detailed description.

A.3 The GEF Agency's comparative advantage:

In addition to the FAO's comparative advantages detailed in the PIF, the following advantages have been further described in Subsection 1.1.2 of the FAO GEF Project Document:

- As a world leader in designing and implementing technical programs to bolster natural resource management and combating desertification, FAO has wide experience in partnerships with government, donors, research organizations and networks and civil society and community organizations around the world. Building on its experience over the past 60 years, FAO catalyzes regional and international cooperation, including North-South, South-South and triangular cooperation, serving as a neutral forum.
- Sustainable natural resource management and sustainable forest management and restoration are FAO's greatest technical strengths. From working with farmers and producers in their fields to scientists in their laboratories to policy-makers and technical forestry officers in their ministries, FAO has a high level of awareness and understanding of the causes and drivers of deforestation and forest degradation and of the various options for the development of sustainable forest and ecosystem management strategies that reduce poverty through the generation of income and employment, that integrate biodiversity conservation into productive forest landscapes and that both mitigate climate change and provide key tools for rural communities to adapt to climate change.
- FAO has strong international programs for knowledge management in support of SFM and restoration in drylands, disseminated through capacity development projects and events, on-line platforms such as the SFM Tool Box, technical guidelines and forestry papers. All of these will provide critical support to the REDESER project and benefit from its contributions.
- Moreover, FAO leads or participates in the most active global and regional networks and platforms on Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought (DLDD) issues, including TerrAfrica, the World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT), the GEF-funded Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) and the Global Land Cover Network (GLCN), and the Great Green Wall for the Sahara and Sahel Initiative (GGWSSI).

- FAO's Forestry Department is combating desertification and land degradation through a comprehensive program focused on drylands forestry, agroforestry, climate change adaptation and mitigation, resource assessments, sustainable forest management and forest and landscape restoration. This has included the formulation of National Forest Programs (NFP) in countries that are heavily affected by desertification in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean and the Pacific.
- FAO's Forest Policy and Resources Division – FOA (formerly called Forest Assessment, Management and Conservation Division (FOM) has backstopped field projects in diverse habitats (drylands, islands and mountains) and assisted in improving the production and marketing of a wide range of ecosystem services and commodities, such as gums, resins and other NTFPs using a Market Analysis and Development approach across forest products value chains. It has provided technical oversight on interregional studies, guidelines and publications based on field experience and lessons learned through country-driven processes.
- Reducing rural poverty is central to FAO's mission and it has long experience in promoting sustainable rural livelihood solutions, particularly among smallholder and subsistence farmers. FAO understands how to make agriculture profitable for rural women and young people, specifically with respect to informal employment in agriculture.
- FAO's projects in this sector in Brazil during the last two decades are listed below. A wide range of delivery modalities for national, regional and inter-regional projects has been employed, ranging from fully FAO-funded Technical Cooperation Projects (TCP), projects granted by external donors (GEF, European Community and the National Forest Facility) and projects fully funded by the Brazilian Government. The portfolio of national projects reached a total value above USD 22 million. The portfolio includes the NFP Facility funds, totaling USD 300,000 between 2007 and 2010 to support the National Forestry Program.

A.4. The baseline project and the problem that it seeks to address

The baseline project and barriers that the project seeks to address have been further analyzed and detailed during the full project preparation. Please see the FAO-GEF Project Document section 1.1.1 *Baseline projects and investments for the next 3-5 years addressing the identified GEB threats (main co-financing sources of the project), and b) Remaining barriers to address threats on GEBs.*

A.5. Incremental/Additional cost reasoning: describe the incremental (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or additional (LDCF/SCCF) activities requested for GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF financing and the associated global environmental benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or associated adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF) to be delivered by the project:

In connection with *b) Remaining barriers to address threats on GEB* (FAO-GEF Project Document Subsection 1.1.1), the incremental reasoning has been further elaborated under Subsection 1.1.1 *c) Incremental reasoning (added value of the project in particular the GEF financing)*, as follows:

In order to remove the barriers analyzed under *Subsection 1.1.1 b)* and achieve global environmental benefits, GEF funds will be invested incrementally to the baseline initiatives detailed under *Subsection 1.1.1 a)* as described below:

Component 1: Promoting Integrated Natural Resources (INRM) in Production Landscapes.

In order to overcome barriers # 1, 3, 4 and 5, and indirectly barrier 2¹² (see subsection 1.1.1.b), Component 1 through GEF financing of USD 937,747 will support the promotion of INRM in production landscapes in project targeted areas. Federal government co-financing of USD 700,000 through MMA will support technical assistance, staff time, field activities, use of facilities. State government in-kind co-financing of USD 1,333,333 from Paraíba and Alagoas will support similar activities, as will municipal in-kind funding of USD 266,667 from Crato. Non-governmental in-kind financing of USD 160,000 from the Araripe Foundation and the same amount from APNE¹³ will support field activities. ICRAF¹⁴ will contribute with research and knowledge management-related activities for this Component with co-financing by USD 40,000.

Component 2: Promoting Multiple-use Forest Management

In order to overcome barriers # 1, 4, 5, and indirectly barrier 2¹⁵ (see subsection 1.1.1.b), Component 2 through GEF financing of USD 1,199,309 will support multiple-use forest management in project areas. Federal government co-financing of USD 1,333,333 through the Ministry of Agrarian Development (MDA), USD 566,667 through MMA and USD 2,556,667 through the Brazilian Forestry Service (SFB) will support technical assistance, staff time, field activities, use of facilities, travel. State in-kind financing of USD 266,667 from Paraíba will support field activities in Seridó, as will municipal in-kind funding of USD 266,667 from Crato. CEPIS will contribute with a in-kind co-financing of USD 533,333 and ICRAF¹⁶ will contribute with research and knowledge management-related activities for this Component with co-financing by USD 20,000.

Component 3: Forest and Landscape Restoration (FLR)

In order to overcome barriers # 1, 4, 6 and 7 (see subsection 1.1.1.b), Component 3 through GEF financing of USD 992,294 will support sustainable forest restoration. Government co-financing of USD 2,026,667 through MDA, USD 400,000 from MMA and USD 1,333,333 from INSA will support technical assistance, staff time, field activities, use of facilities, travel. State government in-kind co-financing of USD 1,066,666 from SEPLAN-RN and USD 533,333 from Paraíba will support field activities in Seridó. Non-governmental in-kind financing of USD 160,000 from AGENDHA will support field activities in Bahia.

¹² Barrier 2 is directly being addressed by the UNDP/GEF project *Sustainable Land Use Management in the Semiarid Region of Northeast Brazil (Sergipe)*, as anticipated in the FAO/GEF PIF submitted in 2013. This FAO/GEF project is coordinating actions with the UNDP/GEF project through the Directorate of Desertification (MMA) which is the main counterpart for both projects.

¹³ For its acronym in Portuguese, *Associação Plantas do Nordeste*, Plant Association of Northeast

¹⁴ World Agroforestry Centre

¹⁵ Barrier 2 is directly being addressed by the UNDP/GEF project *Sustainable Land Use Management in the Semiarid Region of Northeast Brazil (Sergipe)*, as anticipated in the FAO/GEF PIF submitted in 2013. This FAO/GEF project is coordinating actions with the UNDP/GEF project through the Directorate of Desertification (MMA) which is the main counterpart for both projects.

¹⁶ World Agroforestry Centre

Component 4: Knowledge Management, Capacity Development and Awareness-Raising

In order to overcome barriers # 1, 4 and 6 (see subsection 1.1.1.b), Component 4 through GEF financing of USD 462,448 will support coordination, capacity development, communication and awareness-raising. Paraíba state government in-kind co-financing of USD 266,667 will support technical assistance, staff time, field activities, use of facilities, travel. Non-governmental in-kind co-financing of USD 800,000 from FUNETEC, USD 266,666 from IABS and USD 160,000 from SEAPAC will support training and dissemination. ICRAF¹⁷ will contribute with research and knowledge management-related activities for this Component with co-financing by USD 40,000.

Component 5: Coordination with other activities, Monitoring and Evaluation

GEF financing of USD 151,207 will support project Monitoring and Evaluation and project coordination with complementary initiatives aiming at landscape-level benefits on land degradation and desertification. Government co-financing of USD 200,000 through the MMA and USD 110,000 through the Brazilian Forest Service will support technical assistance, staff time, field activities, use of facilities and travel for data collection, processing and dissemination and for coordination with other initiatives.

FAO will provide USD 200,000 (in-kind) to support the Project Management structure. See details in the Financial Plans, Section 4.3 of this Project Document.

In general terms, the added value of the REDESER project with GEF financing is the ability to mobilize significant co-financing resources, more than USD 15 million, from 17 different federal, state and municipal government institutions and non-governmental organizations and to involve numerous additional stakeholders in a mainstreaming initiative that until now has not received the interest and support it deserves, in spite of the severe environmental, economic and social impacts of land degradation and desertification, climate change and biodiversity loss.

The scenario without GEF resources would be timid and isolated initiatives, without integration and mainstreaming. To the contrary, the allocation of GEF resources will make it possible to implement concrete benefits, produce and disseminate new knowledge, capacity and awareness, reactivate implementation of policies such as SAPs and construct multi-sectoral dialog with all partners regarding ASD development issues. In Brazil, limited international cooperation can be used to leverage substantial additional resources and influence far-reaching policies and practices.

For further details on co-financing, please see the FAO GEF Project Document, Section 1.1.1 *c) Incremental reasoning* and the Financial Plan under Section 4.3. The complete description of the Project Components, Outcomes and Outputs is detailed under Subsections 2.3 and 2.4 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

¹⁷ World Agroforestry Centre

Changes in the results framework compared to the PIF

The Project Objective is the same as in the PIF except for some small changes in wording and order. The following Development Objective was added: “Increase and improve provision of goods and services from sustainable management and restoration of dryland forest and agroforestry production landscapes, contributing to poverty reduction”.

Some outcomes and outputs have been regrouped and/or reformulated for the following reasons: i) better management of implementation and measurement of achievements; ii) as the result of conclusions of analysis and assessments undertaken during the full project preparation; iii) greater clarity and consistency; iv) to include targets; v) in response to STAP recommendations¹⁸. The adjustments made are described as follows:

Component 1 remains largely unchanged. The original wording of Outcome 1.1 has been reformulated by focusing more at the landscape level and extending the project boundary. This FAO/GEF project will concentrate more on the field/landscape level to avoid duplication with the UNDP/GEF project “*Sustainable Land Use Management in the Semiarid Region of Northeast Brazil (Sergipe)*” (GEF ID 5276) that is focusing on the policy/program level and is aimed at strengthening the state environmental governance framework. Coordination will be led by the Department to Combat Desertification (DCD) of the Secretariat for Extraction and Sustainable Rural Development (SEDR) of the Ministry of Environment (MMA), which is the key counterpart for both projects. Synergy mechanisms will also be addressed under Component 5 of this FAO/GEF project.

As a result of field visits during full project preparation, it was decided not to include the Cerrado biome site in Piauí due to the difficulty of access and lack of local support for establishing a continuous corridor in a large area between the *Serra das Capivaras* and *Serra das Confusões* national parks. Four areas in five states have been selected: Rio Grande do Norte, Paraíba, Ceará, Alagoas and Bahia, where there is potential for the greatest impact. The areas are all in the Caatinga biome, although there are isolated patches of Cerrado in the Araripe area, outside the official biome. In addition, the project boundary has been re-defined in 904,142 ha. that represent the total surface of 14 municipalities. The project sites have been selected following the criteria of representativeness of the environmental problems in the Caatinga (see the description of baseline problems in Section 1.1 of the FAO GEF Project Document) and their replicability potential (see more under Section 5.6 of the Project Document), as well as the presence of ongoing baseline initiatives (see more in Subsection 1.1.1 of the Project Document).

The PIF outputs for Outcome 1.1 have been reformulated as follows:

- Output 1.1.1 does not follow the original geographical focus, but was revised on the basis of field visits and negotiation regarding co-financing.
- Output 1.1.2 makes specific reference to non-timber forest products (NTFPs).
- Output 1.1.3 refers mainly to capacity development rather than only to guidelines. Guidelines are a sub-output under 1.1.3. State-owned banks personnel have been included in the activities to improve their knowledge about INRM, which is really low. Banks are

¹⁸ See Annex B.

involved under Component 3 to provide financing for local sub-project of INRM in the project intervention area by Project Year (PY) 4 (see output 3.2.2).

Component 2 the same as in the PIF. Outcome 2.1 has been slightly re-worded to include multi-purpose SFM.

The geographical focus of Outcome 2.1 has been changed as explained above, without including the Cerrado biome, but only Cerrado areas in the Araripe region.

The PIF Output 2.1.2 has been changed from a very specific focus on inclusion of the Cerrado biome in one federal program to “Support for development of multiple-use SFM supply chains.”

Output 2.1.3, on guidelines, now refers to the farm level rather than the local level.

Component 3: The name of the component was changed from “Sustainable Forest Restoration” to “Forest and Landscape Restoration,” which is the category abbreviated as “FLR”

Outcome 3.1, about seed and seedling production capacity, is essentially the same.

Output 3.1.1 now refers to legalization of nurseries rather than strengthening of forest seed seeds and seedling. This is a pre-requirement for establishing networks and the business-as-usual scenario analysis has demonstrated that 90% of 165 nurseries is still unregistered in the project intervention area. For this reason the focus of the output has been revised.

Output 3.1.2 is essentially the same, although the targets have been expanded.

Output 3.1.3, about development and adoption of practical guidelines for FLR in ASD, has been added to what was in the original PIF.

Outcome 3.2 refers to “sustainable forest connectivity” with better specification of total area rather than 10 “sustainably managed forest corridors established between protected areas” (5 corridors Caatinga, 5 corridors in Cerrado).”

Output 3.2.1 now refers to connectivity using cost-effective and adapted restoration technique (assisted natural regeneration, enrichment and planting etc.), not just to corridors.

Outputs 3.2.2 and 3.2.3 have been combined into one, with more realistic targets.

Component 4: “Knowledge Management” has been included in the component title.

Outcome 4.1, about improvement in capacity of state and municipal agencies, is essentially the same.

Output 4.1.1 now refers to strengthened learning and action networks facilitating field exchanges in ASD rather than training of staff at the state and municipal levels.

Outcome 4.2 is essentially the same, but includes information about lessons learned.

Output 4.2.1, on guidelines and briefs, now includes FLR, in addition to SFM and INRM.

Output 4.2.2, on engagement of the academic community, refers to ASD rather than states and the wording includes research centers, not being limited to higher education institutes.

Output 4.2.3, on awareness-raising, now includes SFM, in addition to restoration.

Component 5: The component is now called “Coordination with Other Activities, Monitoring and Evaluation” instead of “Project Coordination, Monitoring and Evaluation” to stress the need for synergy with complementary initiatives.

Outcome 5.1 remains unchanged.

Output 5.1.1, on collaboration with complementary initiatives, is for the Caatinga biome, without the Cerrado biome.

Outcome 5.2, on project implementation, is the same as in the PIF.

Output 5.2.1, on project monitoring, is exactly the same.

Output 5.2.2. on mid-term and final evaluations, is the same as in the PIF.

A.6 Risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and measures that address these risks:

Risk and mitigation actions are detailed in the *Risk Matrix* in Appendix 4 of the Project Document. Risk management is also discussed in Section 3.2 of the Project Document.

In summary, the Project Document additionally recognizes the following risks:

- 1) Climate change: Accelerated destruction of agricultural activities and production in the most vulnerable areas of the Caatinga as a result of increased frequency of droughts and drastic reduction in rainfall. Disappearance of natural water sources and drying up of large surface water sources such as reservoirs and dams result in the loss of staple crops, death of livestock, increased wood extraction as a last resort for cash, increased migration to urban areas and closure of school activities (high).
- 2) Biodiversity: Fragmentation of forests and pollution of water resources by pesticides results in significant biodiversity loss, causing damage to production processes in ASD. Disappearance of bees seriously affects pollination, the production of honey and extra income for farmers, extractive and traditional peoples in the Caatinga, increasing levels of food and nutritional insecurity. There can also be loss of bird fauna due to deforestation (medium).
- 3) Support from public and governments: Public funding is subject to budget cuts and the government resources available are not sufficient to carry out actions agreed upon between the project and government agencies in the ASD (medium).
- 4) Pressures from agribusiness: Increased land degradation and loss of biodiversity due to clearing of forests in vulnerable transition areas (high).

The risk from climate change increased since the PIF because of the severity and duration of the drought, the worst in many years. The additional risks regarding biodiversity have to do with recognition of its ecosystem functions. There is now increased risk of reduced support from the public and government allocations due to economic crisis and fiscal adjustment. Budget cuts also affect rural development programs and uptake of new policies and strategies by state governments.

A.7. Coordination with other relevant GEF financed initiatives

The project will adopt a strategic integrated approach together with an ongoing project of the Department to Combat Desertification (DCD) of the Secretariat of Extractivism and Sustainable Rural Development (SEDR) of the Ministry of Environment (MMA) and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation in Agriculture (IICA), as well as three other GEF projects through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), seeking synergy and complementarity and taking due care to avoid duplication:

- 1) The GEF-UNDP Small Grants Program (SGP), known in Brazil as the *Programa de Pequenos Projetos Ecosociais* (PPP-ECOS), in operation since 1995, is one of the possible channels of replication within the Caatinga, the Cerrado and adjacent parts of the Amazon. With sufficient funding, it could issue specific calls for proposals regarding desertification, biodiversity conservation and reduction of carbon emissions. If possible, these calls could be supported with resources from international donors, foundations, private sector, banks and development instruments of federal and state governments.
- 2) The UNDP/GEF Project “*Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation and Sustainable Use into NTFP and AFS production practices in Multiple-Use Forest Landscapes of High Conservation Value,*” (GEF ID 4659) through the Genetic Resources and Biotechnology Center (CENARGEN) of the Brazilian Agricultural and Livestock Research Company (EMBRAPA), approved in 2015, will generate detailed biological and economic data in three biomes (Caatinga, Cerrado and Amazon), without spatial overlap with the REDESER project, but with valuable technical information on sustainable use of biodiversity.
- 3) The UNDP/GEF Project “*Sustainable Land Use Management in the Semiarid Region of Northeast Brazil (Sergipe)*” (GEF ID 5276) which is led by the Ministry of Environment, has been designed by the same project team in coordination with the present proposal. The project aims at strengthening the governance framework strengthened to avoid, reduce and revert land degradation in the State of Sergipe, and to strengthen extension services, support the availability of best practice models and financing to increasing SLM adoption in Sergipe and reduce land degradation, especially in the Alto Sertão region in the western part of the state.

B. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NOT ADDRESSED AT PIF STAGE:

B.1 Describe how the stakeholders will be engaged in project implementation.

The project includes diverse community-based organizations and local communities (see Sub-section 1.1.3 of the Project Document for a full list of stakeholders). Project interventions will be agreed and socialized through stakeholder consultations.

Additionally, participation will be fostered in formal and informal spaces through: i) timely and transparent access to information on project implementation; ii) project messages adapted to the different target audiences; iii) use of existing spaces for dialogue (councils, thematic roundtables) and/or establishment of specific spaces for consultation with the beneficiaries and civil society; iv) timing for training and meetings adapted to producers’ timings; v) training, meetings and workshops; vi) establishing an enabling environment for horizontal dialogue among all the participants; vii) project incentives provided to small farmers, settlers, men, women, youth and elderly, among others; and viii) project activities that promote the self-development of the beneficiaries and the sustainability of project results.

Moreover, the rural population will participate in project implementation through: i) the development and implementation of sustainable alternatives for land use and forest management and restoration; ii) participatory monitoring of economic and environmental factors in production systems; iii) implementation of demonstration projects; and iv) systematization of experiences. The specificities of the communities will be taken into account in all project interventions, creating opportunities for income and sustainable

livelihoods that are concomitant with their realities as well as delivering socio-economic benefits and generating GEBs.

Active participation of a wide range of stakeholders will be promoted through several mechanisms. This is described under Subsection 1.1.3 of the Project Document.

The project management structure will ensure the participation of key stakeholders during project planning, implementation and M&E through its decision-making structures:

- The **Project Steering Committee (PSC)** will take decisions on the overall project management and will be in charge of ensuring the project's strategic approach for the operational tasks. The PSC includes the representative of FAO, the MMA, the Secretariat of International Affairs (SEAIN) of the Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management (MP), the Brazilian Cooperation Agency (ABC) of the Ministry of External Relations (MRE) and their respective alternate members. The PSC will meet at least twice a year and its responsibilities will include: (i) overall oversight of project progress and achievement of planned results as per the project document; (ii) take decisions in relation to the practical organization, coordination and implementation of the project; (iii) facilitate cooperation among those involved in execution and project participating partners and project support at the local level; (iv) advise the National Project Director (NPD) on other on-going and planned activities facilitating collaboration between the project and other programs, projects and initiatives; (v) seeing to it that co-financing is provided in a timely and effective manner; and (vi) review and approve the six-monthly Project Progress Reports (PPRs) and the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWP/B).
- The **Project Management Committee (PMC)** will be responsible for: (i) guiding project implementation as per the AWP/B; (ii) timely achievement of project outcomes and outputs; (iii) effective and efficient use of resources allocated as per the project document; (iv) planning project activities, giving guidance and advice to the NPD; (v) provide technical advice to the Project Steering Committee; (vi) advise the NPD on other on-going and planned activities facilitating collaboration between the project and other programs, projects and initiatives. The PMC may also be involved in technical evaluation of project progress and outputs, and development of an agreed adjustment plan in project execution approach, if needed. The PMC will comprise the Director of DCD/SEDR/MMA or his/her delegate, the FAO Project Task Manager (PTM) and the FAO Lead Technical Officer (LTO). Further membership of the PMC will be defined at the Project Inception workshop in a participatory manner and other project partners will be invited accordingly. The PMC will meet on a bi-monthly basis, as minimum.
- The **Project Advisory Board (PAB)**, including representatives of MMA, ABC and FAO, will have the objectives of: (i) facilitating coordination among project partners; (ii) supporting the Project Management Committee with technical recommendations and guidance regarding project activities; and (iii) socializing and providing timely information on implementation of co-financed activities.
- FAO, and MMA and other participants will collaborate with the GEF implementing agencies of other GEF-supported programs and projects to identify and facilitate synergies, as well as with other agencies that support projects financed by other donors. Collaboration will be undertaken through: (i) informal communications; and (ii) exchange of information. In order to guarantee an effective coordination and collaboration among different initiatives, specific coordination responsibilities have been assigned to the Project Management Committee.

The full implementation arrangements are described in Section 4.2 of the FAO GEF Project Document.

B.2 Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels, including consideration of gender dimensions, and how these will support the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund/NPIF) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF):

The main drivers of biodiversity loss and land degradation in the ASD are unsustainable agriculture and livestock production combined with poverty. Therefore, the long-term solution to the problem consists in making adjustments in the productive sector by mainstreaming principles of economic and environmental sustainability in the productive systems, the development of value chains based on sustainable production, sustainable forest management and the promotion of non-timber forest products (NTFPs) as new sources of revenue, as well as the incorporation of incentives for conservation of biodiversity and food security.

Through these actions, rural communities will access opportunities for income, thereby reducing rural poverty without harming the natural resources and contributing to attaining global environmental benefits. The project will incorporate 904,142 ha under INRM, adapted to the local context and 45,000 ha under sustainable forest management, thereby generating incomes from sustainable agricultural production and sustainable use of biodiversity. The project will support the financial sustainability of environment-friendly production alternatives through the strengthening and articulation of the financial and non-financial incentive mechanisms, which will contribute to up-scaling of good practices to greater numbers of rural producers and communities after project termination, especially through influence on the actions of state and municipal agencies and other decision-makers regarding policy design and implementation.

The project mainstreams gender issues throughout its whole cycle. Participation of women and their organizations will contribute to their successful empowerment as social stakeholders. The project will promote timely participation of women beneficiaries in all project activities, such as: i) generation of income opportunities for female heads of households; ii) promotion of participation of women in training, meetings and technical assistance under the project; iii) mainstreaming a cross-cutting gender approach for INRM; iv) timely dissemination of lessons learned to female beneficiaries; vii) promotion of participation of women in planning and decision making at provincial, municipal, community and family levels.

B.3. Explain how cost-effectiveness is reflected in the project design:

During full project preparation diverse strategies and methodologies were analyzed with a view in their cost/effectiveness and suitability for the provincial context. The project will build upon existing baseline activities, capacities and infrastructure in the ASD. In order to reduce soil, water and forest degradation, the following strategies and methodologies have been selected for project implementation:

1. Capacity development will improve inter-institutional and intersectoral coordination, which in turn will avoid duplication of efforts and reduce project implementation costs.
2. Decision-making mechanisms and project activities will be aligned with local development priorities, and other on-going initiatives. Stakeholder participation is key for these purposes.

3. SLM will be promoted to raise awareness on the best land uses in the ASD context.
4. Training and awareness-raising of individual producers and communities will be supported to achieve a shift in attitude that favors the sustainable management of soils, water and forests and implementation of appropriate technologies.
5. Fostering sustainable land and forest management adapted to the local context (e.g. farm planning, conservation and management of soils, water and forests, use of NTFPs and foraging for livestock production).
6. Strengthening of sustainable seed collection and tree nurseries for production of tree seedlings that will be used in reforestation and ecological restoration.
7. Promotion of financial and non-financial incentive mechanisms to stimulate the adoption of sustainable production systems that also conserve forest areas in farms and community lands.
8. Fostering a value chain approach that links production to markets, generating alternative incomes and livelihoods for project beneficiaries.
9. Systematization of experiences and lessons learned will contribute to a cost-effective replication of project results throughout the ASD and other regions and countries.

The proposed strategies are cost-efficient: they will allow small-scale producers to maintain their production levels and yields with a low level of use of external technologies, thereby reducing production costs. This, coupled with a strategy of accessing markets, will provide access to better prices and improve family incomes, hence reducing pressures over forests and biodiversity in ASD.

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M&E PLAN:

The following table summarizes the budgeted M&E table, described in greater detail in the FAO Project Document Sections 4.5 and 4.6.

Type of M&E Activity	Responsible Parties	Time-frame	Budget
Inception Workshop	Project Technical Coordinator (PTC), FAO (PTM supported by LTO, Budget Holder (BH) and FAO GEF Coordination Unit)	Within two months of project start up	USD 6,500
Project Inception Report	PTC, Expert M&E and FAO PTM, cleared by LTO, BH, and FAO GEF Coordination Unit	Immediately after the workshop	-
Field-based impact monitoring	PTC, institutions and organizations participating in the project	Continually	USD 14,285 (project coordination time, technical workshops for identification of indicators, M&E workshops)
Supervision visits and rating of progress in PPRs and PIRs	PTC and FAO (PTM, LTO, FAO GEF Coordination Unit may participate in the visits if needed.)	Annual or as required	FAO visits will be financed through GEF agency fee and project coordination visits will be financed by the project travel budget
Project Progress Reports (PPR)	PTC with inputs by MMA, MDA, FAO and other participating partners	Six-monthly	USD 4,945
Project Implementation Review (PIR)	Drafted by the PTM, with the supervision of the LTO and BH. Approved and submitted to GEF by the FAO-GEF Coordination Unit	Annual	Financed through GEF agency fee
Co-financing Reports	PTC with inputs from other co-financiers	Annual	USD 1,649
Technical reports	PTC, and FAO (LTO, PTM)	As appropriate	
Mid-term Evaluation	External consultants and FAO Office for Evaluation in consultation with the project team and other partners	At mid-point of project implementation	USD 40,000 for external consultants

Final evaluation	External consultants and FAO Evaluation Office in consultation with the project team including the FAO GEF Coordination Unit, and other partners	At the end of project implementation	USD 40,000 for external consultants
Terminal Report	PTC and FAO (PTM, LTO, FAO GEF Coordination Unit, TSCR report unit)	Two months before the end date of the project	USD 17,412
Total Budget			USD 124,791

ART III: APPROVAL/ENDORSEMENT BY GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) AND GEF AGENCY(IES)

- A. RECORD OF ENDORSEMENT OF GEF OPERATIONAL FOCAL POINT(S) ON BEHALF OF THE GOVERNMENT(S):** (Please attach the [Operational Focal Point endorsement letter\(s\)](#) with this form. For SGP, use this [OFP endorsement letter](#)).

NAME	POSITION	MINISTRY	DATE (MM/dd/yyyy)
R. Martins Vieira	General Coordinator for External Financing, GEF Focal point	Ministry of Planning, Budget and Management	31 August 2012

B. GEF AGENCY(IES) CERTIFICATION

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF policies and procedures and meets the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF criteria for CEO endorsement/approval of project.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (Month, day, year)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Gustavo Merino Director, Investment Centre Division Technical Cooperation and Programme Management FAO Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153, Rome, Italy		26 April 2016	Marcello Broggio, Project Task Manager, FAO Brazil & Nora Berrahmouni, Forestry Officer (Drylands)/ FOA, Forestry Department, FAO		Marcello.Broggio@fao.org Nora.Berrahmouni@fao.org

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Kindly see page 103, Appendix 1 of the FAO-GEF Project Document

ANNEX B: RESPONSES TO PROJECT REVIEWS (from GEF Secretariat and GEF Agencies, and Responses to Comments from Council at work program inclusion and the Convention Secretariat and STAP at PIF).

Responses to GEFSEC Comments:

Review Criteria	Questions	GEFSEC comments	Responses
Project Design	8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?	Carbon benefit estimates are appreciated, but more detailed estimates will be expected as a result of PPG activities.	Carbon benefits are detailed in Section 2.5 of the Project Document and in Table B of this CEO ER (see above). In addition, kindly see the SFM/REDD+ tracking tool.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	Sufficient detail for PIF stage added. Fuller coverage will be expected at CEO Endorsement	The project risks and related mitigation actions have been carefully elaborated under Appendix 4 <i>Risk Matrix</i> of the Project Document.
	12. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related	The preliminary nature of coordination discussions is appreciated. Fuller coverage is required by time of CEO	The main project partner, the Department to Combat Desertification and Land Degradation (DCD) of the Ministry of Environment, is coordinating actions

	initiatives in the country or in the region?	Endorsement and will be expected as part of PPG activities.	between the present project, the UNDP/GEF project in Sergipe, the EMBRAPA/GEF project, and the IICA project, among other national initiatives related to ASD and the Caatinga biome. Kindly see a detail of the coordination mechanisms under Section 2.1 of the Project Document and section A.7 of this CEO ER.
--	--	---	---

Responses to STAP comments

STAP Comment	Response
STAP suggests that the proposal could have been further strengthened by describing more fully the components, so that it could have been more apparent how the interventions support the project objective. Some of these details are in the project framework, and could complement the narrative description of the components	As suggested, the components, outcomes, outputs and activities are described in detail in the narrative of Sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the FAO GEF Project Document.
Additionally, an outline of the forest species being lost in the Caatinga and Cerrado appear not to be included in the proposal. Providing this information could further strengthen the claim of addressing biodiversity loss, and identifying ways to address forest restoration.	The list of threatened species of flora in the Caatinga according to the Ministry of Environment (MMA) is annexed in Appendix 8 of the FAO GEF Project Document. Kindly note that the Cerrado biome is not included anymore in the project intervention area for the reasons described under Section A.5 subtitle <i>Changes in the results framework compared to the PIF</i> of this CEO ER and under response to STAP #1 below.

<p>The proposal also does not define how forest restoration will lead to carbon sequestration and reduced carbon emissions. This aspect of component 3 requires further elaboration in the proposal.</p>	<p>Restoration of degraded areas (with a target of 30,000 ha), mainly forests and agroforestry systems to be selected during year one of the project. Priority will be given to those areas that will enable strengthening connectivity of fragmented areas. Through restoration the project will raise carbon storage by sequestration of 439,200 ton CO₂eq.</p> <p>Forest restoration will be conducted according to the FAO Global Guidelines for the restoration of degraded forests and landscapes in drylands which are focusing on the use of assisted natural regeneration and the planting and enrichment (when required) with native useful and multipurpose species (trees, shrubs and grasses) selected with local communities; as well as participatory, landscape and multisectoral planning. The project wil support the development of practical guidelines for restoration in the Caatinga and drylands of Brazil (adapting the above mentioned FAO global guidelines to the Brazilian context). In order to ensure high quality and sustainable supply of seeds and other reproductive materials of native species, capacity development and support will be provided through the project to the network of local tree nurseries. Moreover, seed collectors and nursery personnel will be trained and registered in National System of Seeds and Seedlings (SNSM). Restoration will be looked at the whole market value chain from seed to end product. From one side supporting farmers to restore the land while producing and sustainably managing wood and non wood forest products and services generated to benefit further income and sustain their livelihoods</p>
<p>1. In the project description, it would be useful to provide further details about the Caatinga and Cerrado biomes to describe further the vegetation, and the agricultural activities (including livestock) influencing land use change. The following literature source provides a general characterization of the Caatinga and Cerrado biomes, which the project developers may wish to use. The authors of that study also argue that proximity and density of roads has influenced agricultural expansion in the Cerrado</p>	<p>1. The Cerrado biome, located mainly in Central Brazil, is no longer part of the geographical scope of the project. The site in the state of Piauí foreseen in the PIF was eliminated during the full project preparation, due to the difficulty of carrying out field operations in a remote location, establishing connectivity in a large area between two national parks and mustering support from local authorities and organizations. There are, however, some small patches of Cerrado vegetation within the Caatinga biome in the Araripe cluster of municipalities selected for direct project action.</p> <p>The Caatinga, meaning “white forest or vegetation” in the indigenous <i>Tupi</i> language, is a xeric shrubland and thorn forest consisting primarily of small, thorny trees that shed their leaves seasonally, taking on white coloration. Cacti,</p>

<p>biome. Perhaps roads also need to be considered a determining factor influencing the global environmental outcomes the proposal seeks to achieve. Suggested literature: Rada, N. <i>Assessing Brazil's Cerrado agricultural miracle</i>. Food Policy 38, 146-155. 2013.</p>	<p>thorny brush and grasses adapted to aridity make up the ground layer. When the rainy season arrives, annual plants grow, flower and fruit rapidly. The diversity of Caatinga vegetation has been classified by Andrade Lima (1981), cited in Sampaio and Rodal (2000), in terms of 12 types grouped in 6 units, as detailed in the Appendix 8 of the Project Document. As explained in the Project Document, the activities influencing land use change are primarily planting of crops and raising of livestock, including cattle, goats and sheep. There is also unsustainable harvesting of fuelwood, primarily for the red ceramic industry (bricks and tiles). Kindly consult Subsection 1.1.1 of the Project Document for a full description of the problems behind land use change.</p>
<p>2. Similarly, STAP recommends defining the socio-economic characteristics of the targeted regions. Doing so, will help design the interventions through an integrated approach that fully accounts for the ecosystem services and socioeconomic benefits of the targeted landscape and populations. Additionally, an integrated assessment could assist the project developers identify the trade-offs between the multiple land use options. This may help address the competing demands for forest uses described in the proposal.</p>	<p>2. The socioeconomic characteristics of the Areas Susceptible to Desertification (ASDs) in Brazil are described in Section 1.1 of the Project Document. The targeted regions have been carefully assessed, including land uses and socio-economic indicators as described in Section 2.1 of the Project Document. The specific socio-economic profile of each of the 14 project targeted municipalities is described in Appendix 10 of the Project Document. The project has a double objective of generating GEBs and reducing rural poverty, therefore the socio-economic benefits are a main part of the project design. Kindly see Appendix 11 of the project document for thorough description of the current and alternative livelihoods that the project is aimed to support, which is the result of a socio-economic analysis conducted during full project preparation. The competition among land uses and demands has been included in the analysis and will be further considered during PY1 by the Value Chain Specialist and the INRM Specialist to be hired by the project.</p>
<p>3. Once the targeted areas are defined, STAP recommends defining further the drivers of dry forest conversion in the targeted area (ecological and socio-economic). The drivers are likely to be site specific, and including this information may strengthen further the design and implementation of the project</p>	<p>3. The main driver of dry forest conversion in the Caatinga has been cattle raising, and livestock in general – including goats and few sheep. In addition, commercial crops (corn) and small-scale crops (rice, beans, and manioc squash), extraction of fire wood for the ceramic industry, plaster, and bakeries have been drivers of forest degradation in this ecosystem. In some areas of the Northeast, where water is available, there is also irrigated fruit production.</p>

<p>(integrated natural resource management practices and policies).</p>	<p>Population growth was high in the past, but fertility has now declined from very high levels, as high as 10 in some interior areas in 1970, to 2.47 for the Northeast as a whole in 2010 (IBGE), slightly above the replacement level (2.20 children per woman at the end of her reproductive age). There is also intense migration to urban centers in the Atlantic Forest along the coast in the Northeast and to other regions, both the North and the Southeast A full description of drivers and threats on GEBs is included in Section 1.1 <i>b) Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) status, threats and causes the project will address</i> of the Project Document. These drivers are addressed under Section 2 of the Project Document.</p>
<p>4. The project developers may wish to draw from the following paper that analyzes the extent of tropical forests in the Caatinga and Cerrado biomes “including forest fragmentation: Portillo-Quintero, C.A. et al. "Extent and conservation of tropical dry forests in the Americas", Biological Conservation 143, pp 144-155, 2010. The authors also encourage further assessments of dry forest cover to understand their conservation status and ways to strengthen it through protected areas and biological corridors. Perhaps the project developers can think of ways how the results can contribute to the scientific understanding of dry forests in the Caatinga and Cerrado biomes</p>	<p>4. Dry forest fragmentation is more serious in areas of extensive cattle ranching. Forest connectivity among remaining fragments is supposed to be improved through the enforcement of the new Forest Law, which requires 20% of Legal Reserve on all rural properties outside the Amazon. Legal reserves are not necessarily adjacent to farms but generally are located at the back ends of the properties. In addition, the Forest Law establishes that all hilltops, steep slopes and edges of rivers and streams in the Caatinga should be declared Areas of Permanent Preservation (APPs). Hilltops and steep slopes are spots that are not necessarily adjacent, while edges of rivers and streams are continuous and facilitate gene flows. Forest corridors are difficult to be implemented in a continuous way since land tenure/property is discontinued or fragmented among private stakeholders. The project will instead seek forest <i>connectivity</i> by establishing “stepping stones,” an approach developed by the Institute of Ecological Research (<i>Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas - IPÊ</i>) in the western part of the state of São Paulo. A full description of drivers and threats on GEBs, including forest degradation and fragmentation, is included in Section 1.1 <i>b) Global Environmental Benefits (GEB) status, threats and causes the project will address</i> of the Project Document. Drivers are also addressed under Section</p>

	<p>2 of the Project Document, in particular under the Project Strategy (section 2.1).</p> <p>Component 4 will support awareness-raising and knowledge management activities to contribute to the scientific understanding of the dry forests in the Caatinga in collaboration with the academia (see Outputs 4.1.1 and 4.2.2 on Table B of this CEO ER). A full description of Component 4 is detailed in Sections 2.3 and 2.4 of the Project Document.</p>
<p>5. STAP encourages FAO to define baseline indicators for each proposed global environmental benefit (biodiversity conservation and carbon sequestration). For example, the biodiversity indicators appear not to be included in the proposal. Thus, STAP recommends strengthening the baseline by defining the impact indicators, providing data, and describing the methodology that will be used to estimate and monitor the global environmental benefits.</p>	<p>5. Baseline and target indicators are detailed in Appendix 1 <i>Results Framework</i> of the Project Document. In addition, Section 2.5 of the Project Document explains in detail the assumptions and methodology behind carbon calculations. The Monitoring Plan is detailed in Section 4 of the Project Document and will be further systematized by month 6th of PY1 by an M&E Expert. The basis for the M&E system is set by the Project Results Framework. See also Table B of this CEO ER.</p>
<p>6. As mentioned above, STAP suggests elaborating further how carbon sequestration and reduced carbon emissions will be addressed through the interventions. Perhaps component 3 on forest restoration is intended to achieve this global environmental outcome. The project developers may wish to draw upon the following paper to characterize further the Cerrado and its potential for carbon storage from biomass – "Riberio, S.C. et al. "Above and belowground biomass in a Brazilian Cerrado. <i>Forest Ecology and Management</i> 262, pages 491-499,</p>	<p>6. Please note that the Cerrado biome is not included anymore in the project. The project is focusing on the Caatinga. As described in Section 2.5 of the Project Document, Component 2 and 3 will contribute both to reduction of carbon emissions from new clearing and unsustainable harvesting and use of fuelwood and to carbon sequestration SFM and FLR.</p> <p>The forest carbon density was calculated by using estimates provided by the FAO (FRA 2015 - Country report, Brazil) for Caatinga biome, which uses various references, with a conservative value of 33.3 t C/ha, including all carbon pools but soil (aboveground biomass, belowground biomass, litter and</p>

<p>2011. STAP also recommends using the UNEP/GEF Carbon Benefits methodology to estimate carbon stock changes. The CBP methodology can be accessed through this link “http://www.unep.org/ClimateChange/carbon-benefits/cbp_pim/”</p>	<p>deadwood), and an equivalent of 122.2 t CO_{2eq}/ha applying a factor Co_{2eq}/C of 3.66 (source IPCC, 2006).</p> <p>FAO FRA 2015 Country report for Brazil is available at: http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/6261857f-c0da-4f72-98fd-a18e9ca50509</p> <p>FRA 2015- Brazil report compiles the most reliable and updated sources of information on forest area losses and biomass estimates for Caatinga biome at publication date in 2015. It is expected that the estimates can be improved using results of the ongoing national forest inventory undertaken with support from GEF (<i>Strengthening National Policy and Knowledge Framework in Support of Sustainable Management of Brazil’s Forest Resources</i> project), when available.</p> <p>Deforestation data in the Caatinga biome from MMA/IBAMA-CSR was used to calculate the annual forest area loss in Caatinga. There is information for the periods 2002 to 2008 (annual forest losses of 0.33% of total area) and 2008 to 2009 (annual forest losses of 0.23% of total area). This implies a deforestation of 15,893 ha per year and 11,077 ha per year respectively during 2002-2008 and 2008-2009 in the area of indirect impact (66 municipalities) and 2,984 ha per year and 2,080 ha per year respectively in 2002-2008 and 2009-2010 in the area of the project direct impact (14 municipalities).</p> <p>The deforestation areas were detected by the Remote Sensing Center (CSR) of IBAMA for the period 2002 to 2008, as well as 2008 and 2009. The methodology applied to assess deforestation is available as described at http://www.mma.gov.br/estruturas/sbf_chm_rbbio/arquivos/relatrio_tcnico_caatinga_72.pdf (for the period 2002-2008) and http://www.mma.gov.br/estruturas/sbf_chm_rbbio/arquivos/relatorio_tecnico_caatinga_2008_2009_72.pdf (for the period 2008-2009).</p> <p>The decrease in forest area losses observed in 2008-2009 compared to 2002-2008 might not be sustainable so for the estimates beyond 2009, it was</p>
--	---

	<p>considered more appropriate to use an average annual forest area loss as estimate as follows: $(0.33*904,142*6+0.23*904.142)/7=2,855$ ha/year for the area of direct impact and $(0.33*4,816,060*6+0.23*4,816,060)/7=15,205$ ha/year for the area of indirect impact).</p>
<p>7. Furthermore, STAP recommends providing climate data “projections or trends for the targeted areas, and developing climate resilience interventions based on this data. The climate data could be obtained at the World Bank's Climate Change Knowledge Portal “http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/index.cfm?page=climate_data; which includes (for example) UNDP's climate change country profiles “http://www.geog.ox.ac.uk/research/climate/projects/undp-cp/ among other tools.</p>	<p>7. Climate projections in Brazil vary widely according to the models used. The Brazilian Panel on Climate Change (PBMC) carried out detailed analyses that are now being published by the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. The Brazilian Agricultural and Livestock Research Company (EMBRAPA) has also studied patterns of climate change that indicate a need for many crops to migrate to latitudes that are less affected by rising temperatures and reductions in rainfall. The Secretariat of Strategic Affairs (SAE), has just released a study about regional climate change for 2040 showing that higher temperatures and lower precipitation are foreseen for Northeast Brazil (http://www.sae.gov.br/imprensa/noticia/brasil-2040-cenarios-e-alternativas-de-adaptacao-a-mudanca-do-clima/)</p>
<p>8. In section A.2, STAP suggests defining the role each stakeholder will have in delivering a component, specifying their comparative advantage.</p>	<p>8. The main governmental and non-governmental stakeholders and their respective roles are described in Table 1.5 of the Project Document.</p>
<p>9. The proposal appears to indicate that previous efforts were not sustained when the projects ended (page 8). It is not clear, however, how this proposal will be different from previous efforts. Further details in this regard would be useful to add in the full proposal. Additionally, it would be useful to clarify further whether the incentive mechanisms (page 9) are new initiatives to be undertaken through this project?</p>	<p>9. Sustainability of the project results is discussed at length in Section 5 of the Project Document. This project will address barriers that were not addressed by previous projects, in particular at local level, and will coordinate efforts with other GEF-financed and government-financed projects through one main institutional actor: the Department to Combat Desertification and Land Degradation (DCD) of the Ministry of Environment. In this way, duplication will be avoided and the group of projects under implementation will allow for an integrated approach in the Caatinga regions by covering all key variables: governance, land uses, market linkages, local participation, gender and access to government programs. The incentive mechanisms are government-based programs that have not reached small-scale farmers in the Northeast of Brazil.</p>

10. STAP also is unclear whether the proposal intends to support alternative livelihoods. Further details on this aspect would be useful to understand further the proposed interventions	10. Yes. The project is going to support alternative livelihoods for small-scale farmers, in particular by facilitating the access of biodiversity-friendly products to the local market, agro-industries, and government purchase programs (see Table B of this CEO ER). The list of good practices and alternative livelihoods that will enhance poor rural people's incomes through the project activities is detailed under Appendix 11 of the Project Document. The project will be using the FAO Market Analysis and Development approach to address capacities of local farmers throughout the value chain of products (mainly non wood forest products) and so, ensuring sustainable livelihoods while sustaining forest goods and services (biodiversity, carbon stocks and restoration)

Responses to Council comments

Council comment	Response
<p>Comments by Germany</p> <p>Germany approves the following PIF in the work program but asks that the following comments are taken into account:</p>	
1. The project is formulated in a very general manner. Germany asks for a clear definition of the regions, where actions shall take place.	Point taken. The project intervention areas have been clearly defined in the FAO GEF Project Document (pages 48-50).
2. Furthermore, Germany suggests to coordinate with existing projects. Cooperation might be possible with regard to fire banned alternatives in agricultural management. For	The project strategy includes cooperation efforts with related initiatives. In addition, the project design is based on lessons learned drawn by the main project partners from initiatives that concluded in 2013-2015 (Kindly see

<p>instance, the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Protection and Nuclear Safety (BMU) targets the countries Piauí and Tocantins.</p>	<p>section A.7 of this CEO Endorsement Request, sections 1.1.4 and 4.1 of the FAO/GEF Project Document for more details). Regarding fires, the project will promote fire banned alternatives in order to support soil conservation in agricultural and agro-forestry systems, as well as in forest management. The project will work with IBAMA in forest management and restoration (nurseries) activities. IBAMA is a relevant federal partner that has led a successful project entitled PREVFOGO to develop capacities and disseminate information on fire banned tested alternatives in Brazil. Araripe is one of the project intervention areas and includes a small piece of Piauí State, but project targeted municipalities are not located in Piauí. The Project Coordination Unit will facilitate cooperation and knowledge-sharing with the German cooperation project in this field.</p>
<p>3. Further, to secure the sustainability of this approach it will be essential to define and include the respective states as stakeholders.</p>	<p>Yes. The respective states are key project stakeholders and co-financiers (except for Bahia). Kindly see Table C of this CEO Endorsement request and page 78 (Institutional arrangements) of the FAO/GEF Prodoc.</p>
<p>Comments by Japan</p> <p>Following project of JICA is being implemented in the same area such as and scope of activities of GEF Project. In order to avoid duplication of assistance then create synergy between projects, close coordination with JICA is highly recommended: JICA Project. Project Title: The Jalapao Region Ecological Corridor Project. Implementation Agency: Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da Biodiversidade— ICMBio. Duration: 3 years (2010 – 2013).</p>	<p>Point taken. The project design has considered the lessons learned from the JICA project. Furthermore, ICMBio is a key partner of the proposed FAO/GEF project (Kindly see pages 28 and 78 of the Project Document).</p>

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS¹⁹

A. DESCRIBE FINDINGS THAT MIGHT AFFECT THE PROJECT DESIGN OR ANY CONCERNS ON PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION, IF ANY:

NA

B. PROVIDE DETAILED FUNDING AMOUNT OF THE PPG ACTIVITIES FINANCING STATUS IN THE TABLE BELOW:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: 130,000			
<i>Project Preparation Activities Implemented</i>	<i>GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Amount (\$)</i>		
	<i>Budgeted Amount</i>	<i>Amount Spent To date</i>	<i>Amount Committed</i>
5011 Salaries Professional (Parent)	7,358	0	0
5012 Salaries General Service (Parent)	0	7,646	0
5013 Consultants (Parent)	70,214	52,953	8,827
5020 Locally Contracted Labor	0	0	0
5014 Contracts (Parent)	2,000	0	1,600
5021 Travel (Parent)	45,900	44,101	0
5023 Training (Parent)	4,528	3,920	0
5024 Expendable Procurement	0	0	0
5028 General Operating Expenses (Parent)	0	0	0
Total	130,000	108,620	10,427

¹⁹ If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue undertake the activities up to one year of project start. No later than one year from start of project implementation, Agencies should report this table to the GEF Secretariat on the completion of PPG activities and the amount spent for the activities.

ANNEX D: CALENDAR OF EXPECTED REFLOWS (if non-grant instrument is used) N/A

Provide a calendar of expected reflows to the GEF/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF Trust Fund or to your Agency (and/or revolving fund that will be set up)

NA