



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

GEF ID:	5324		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Reversing Desertification Process in Susceptible Areas of Brazil: Sustainable Agroforestry Practices and Biodiversity Conservation (REDESER)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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):	LD-2; LD-3; BD-2; SFM/REDD+-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$3,930,155
Co-financing:	\$15,766,666	Total Project Cost:	\$19,696,821
PIF Approval:	September 12, 2013	Council Approval/Expected:	November 07, 2013
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ulrich Apel	Agency Contact Person:	Marcello Broggio,

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	March 12, 2013 CBD signed 1992, CCD ratified 1997, FCCC entered into force 1994.	04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	March 12, 2013 Letter from R Martins Vieira dated August 31, 2012 available.	04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	March 12, 2013 Brazil's allocation remaining to be programmed stand at: BD \$7,132,760 LD \$1,819,420	04/06/2016 UA: Yes. As approved at PIF stage.

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>The figures within the PIF are within the remaining funds for BD and fully utilize LD funds.</p> <p>Brazil has two MFA projects in GEF-5 which have accessed the SFM/REDD+ incentive (4834 and 4859). In total, project grant and agency fees for these two projects have reached the \$10 million maximum allowable sum a country can draw from the incentive mechanism. It is therefore not possible to access further SFM/REDD+ funds.</p> <p>Please amend the Indicative Grant Amount in Tables A and B so that the amounts requested from SFM/REDD+ are zero. Co-finance can still remain for these elements. PMC and Agency Fees would also need recalculating.</p> <p>04/12/13 Cleared</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> <li>• focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Strategic Alignment</b></p>	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>For BD projects: Has the project</i></p>	<p>March 12, 2013</p> <p>1. Please identify which Aichi Targets the project will work towards and the indicators which will be used to track progress.</p> <p>2. Please reorganize Table A so each</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA: Yes.</p> <p>For Aichi targets, refer to PAD pages 41: targets 5, 7, 14, 18 will be addressed.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<p><i>explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).</i></p>	<p>Expected FA Outcome is on an individual row and has separate Indicative Grant Amount and Indicative Co-finance figures.</p> <p>July 10, 2013 Cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	<p>March 12, 2013 Generally yes, the Caatinga and Cerrado are both identified in the October 2010 4th National Report as effected by deforestation and unsustainable land uses. The SAPI is also identified as a national strategy for promoting Integrated Production in Agriculture, with the objectives of promoting sustainable development and improving the competitiveness of Brazilian agribusiness. The report also identifies that although environmental themes are already included in some production sectors, the importance of biodiversity conservation remains to be mainstreamed into processes and actions of all sectors.</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA: Yes. Fully consistent.</p>
<p>Project Design</p>	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>March 12, 2013 General information is provided, however: 1. A little more clarity on the drivers of deforestation and land degradation would be useful in order to be clear what the project is aiming to address. B1 provides some overall deforestation rates for Cerrado and Caatinga but does not really explain the processes work and relate to the project. 2. There has been considerable investment in Cerrado and Caatinga please provide a little more rationale of</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA: Yes.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>how this fits into the overall strategies for each. The section "Baseline Projects" should more definitely identify the baseline activities related to the project.</p> <p>July 10, 2013 Addressed.</p>	
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>April 12, 2013 Components 1 and 2 are based around identifying and assessing best practice but some more explanation of how this would then be used and particularly how on-the-ground management is changed is necessary. Component 1 please explain into which government programs the INRM is being integrated. Component 3 Information on seed collection is welcomed but clearer description of what is planned in terms of restoration at the landscape level would be useful.</p> <p>July 10, 2013 Addressed.</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA: Yes. Component 3 has been re-designed as a Forest and Landscape Restoration component with a direct target of 30,000 ha forests restored and avoided deforestation on 600,000 ha.</p>
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>April 12, 2013 GEBs are not adequately identified. While it is accepted that at PIF stage not all information is available there needs to be some estimate of the GEBs generated by the project included. The section on GEBs needs to be developed with incremental reasoning; some are available in Table B but these need to cover all and the reasoning provided. Please remember to include an estimate of carbon benefits.</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA: Yes. Refer to SFM tracking tool.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>July 10, 2013            Additional information provided. Carbon benefit estimates are appreciated, but more detailed estimates will be expected as a result of PPG activities. Cleared.</p>	
	<p>9. Is there a clear description of:            a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b>, 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>04/06/2016 UA:            Yes. Refer to PAD, chapter 5.1</p>
	<p>10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?</p>	<p>April 12, 2013            Information on socioeconomic benefits is limited to a series of general statements that the project will be beneficial but no explanation is given of how, for example, Component 1 will promote employment and income generation as claimed.</p> <p>July 10, 2013            Additional information added to text. Cleared.</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA:            Yes.</p> <p>The project does not involve IP directly.</p>
	<p>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)</p>	<p>March 12, 2013            The risks that are identified in B.4 are adequate for PIF stage but there is no account taken of climate resilience, please include.</p> <p>July 10, 2013            Sufficient detail for PIF stage added. Fuller coverage will be expected at CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA:            Yes.</p>
	<p>12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?</p>	<p>March 12, 2013            Please provide some additional detail on how the project is designed to fit in with existing strategies in these two biomes,</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA:            Yes. But response to Japan's related council comment is lacking.</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>capitalizing on potential synergy and avoiding duplication or overlap with the various existing project and programs. Please explain how this is part of the strategic approach rather than a piecemeal addition.</p> <p>July 10, 2013 The preliminary nature of coordination discussions is appreciated. Fuller coverage is required by time of CEO Endorsement and will be expected as part of PPG activities.</p>	<p>04/28/2016 UA: Response provided in Annex 2 of the project document.</p> <p>Cleared</p>
	<p>13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> <li>• Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>	<p>March 12, 2013</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please explain the level of innovation of this project.</li> <li>2. Sustainability is based on the uptake of improved management practices but as identified in Q12 the rationale for this being driven by improving livelihoods is not clearly developed.</li> <li>3. Potential for scaling up is not clearly described, particularly when the magnitude of the project impact is not clearly identified.</li> </ol> <p>July 10, 2013 Issues addressed.</p>	<p>04/06/2016 UA: Yes. Refer to comments at PIF stage, which have been addressed.</p>
	<p>14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?</p>		<p>04/06/2016 UA: Yes. Minor changes have been justified.</p>
	<p>15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative</p>		<p>04/06/2016 UA: Please resend the detailed budget table - the hyperlink in the PAD did not work.</p> <p>04/28/2016 UA:</p>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Budget table is adequate.  Cleared
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	March 11, 2013 Funding and co-finance appear in line with expected outcomes, however please re-visit in light of Brazil already having reached the maximum SFM/REDD+ incentive.  July 10, 2013 Addressed.	04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	March 11, 2013 FAO is supporting the project with \$40,000, equal to 2% of co-finance. This is low and would need to be increased. National government co-finance is identified as \$15.56 million from the Ministry of Environment. Please identify whether this is in-kind or cash in Table C.  July 10, 2013 FAO contribution increased five-fold. Co-finance figures amended. Cleared.	04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	March 11, 2013 Yes, PMC is at 5%.	04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the PPG fund?	July 10, 2013 PPG request in line with norm.	04/06/2016 UA: Yes. Has been provided.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	March 11, 2013 There is no NGL.	n/a
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		04/06/2016 UA: Yes.
	• Convention Secretariat?		none received
	• The Council?		No. Responses to Council members Japan and Germany are missing. Please provide within the response matrix annexed to the CEO endorsement request so that if the documents are web-posted, Council members can check the responses.
	• Other GEF Agencies?		none received
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	March 12, 2013 Not at this stage. Please address issues above.  July 10, 2013 All issues addressed. This project has been technically cleared and may be included in a future work program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	<b>26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		04/06/2016 UA: No. Please address comments.  04/26/2016 UA: Yes. Program managers recommends CEO endorsement.
	First review*	March 12, 2013	April 06, 2016
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)	July 10, 2013	April 28, 2016
	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.**