GEF-6 REQUEST FOR PROJECT ENDORSEMENT/APPROVAL

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: Realising the biodiversity conservation potential of private lands in Brazil			
Country(ies):	Brazil	GEF Project ID:[1]	9413
GEF Agency(ies):	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	01402
Other Executing Partner(s):	MMA, IIS, PUC-Rio (CSRio), FBDS	Resubmission Date:	January 26, 2018
GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity, Land Degradation, Sustainable Forest Management	Project Duration (Months)	60
Integrated Approach Pilot	IAP-Cities ☐ IAP-Commodities ☐ IAP-Food Security ☐	Corporate Program: SGP ☐	
Name of Parent Program	[if applicable]	Agency Fee ($)	850,575

A. FOCAL AREA STRATEGY FRAMEWORK AND OTHER PROGRAM STRATEGIES[2]

Focal Area Objectives/Programs	Focal Area Outcomes	Trust Fund	(in $)	
			GEF Project Financing	Co-financing
BD-4 Program 9	Outcomes 9.1 and 9.2	GEFTF	4,527,983	17,158,895
LD-2 Program 3	Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2	GEFTF	724,941	3,958,500
LD-3 Program 4	Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2	GEFTF	724,942	3,958,500
SFM-1	Outcomes 1 and 2	GEFTF	1,398,426	4,408,511
SFM-2	Outcome 3	GEFTF	1,577,133	4,408,511
	Total project costs		**8,953,425**	**33,892,917**

B. PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY

Project Objective: Scale up sustainable landscape management and contribute to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision in private areas in Brazil

Project Components/ Programs	Financing Type[3]	Project Outcomes	Project Outputs	Trust Fund	(in $)	
					GEF Project Financing	Confirmed Co-financing
1. Pilot implementation	TA	1.1. Increased vegetative cover, reduced degree of fragmentation in production landscapes and increased habitat	1.1.1. Programme for implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de	GEFTF	1,446,153	4,310,284

[1] Project ID number remains the same as the assigned PIF number.
[2] When completing Table A, refer to the excerpts on GEF 6 Results Frameworks for GETF, LDCF and SCCF and CBIT programming directions.
[3] Financing type can be either investment or technical assistance.

		availability for 'Golden Lion Tamarin' in the Atlantic Forest pilot area of the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro) [BD 4 Outcome 9.1; SFM 2 Outcome 3; LD 2 Outcome 2.1; LD 3 Outcome 3.1, 3.2]	Janeiro)			
	TA	1.2. Reduced conversion rates and degree of fragmentation of current area of native vegetation cover in production landscapes and improved conservation actions for key endangered species populations in the Cerrado pilot area of the Pouso Alto APA (KBA are in the State of Goiás) [BD 4 Outcome 9.1; LD 2 Outcome 2.2; LD 3 Outcome 3.2; SFM 1 Outcome 1; SFM 2 Outcome 3]	1.2.1 - Programme for implementation of conservation actions of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan in private areas	GEFTF	1,355,837	15,310,781
	TA	1.3. Biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM, SFM and recovery of native vegetation in private areas in the two pilot areas enhanced by the development of direct and indirect incentives schemes [LD 2 Outcomes 2.1, 2.3; LD 3 Outcomes 3.1 and 3.2; SFM 1 Outcome 2]	1.3.1 - Incentive package for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas in the two pilot areas	GEFTF	1,867,855	2,901,745

2. Agreement with Forestry sector companies	TA	2.1 Biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM and SFM in areas of highest conservation value managed by Forestry sector companies enhanced through an agreement for the implementation of improved conservation and restoration guidelines [BD 4 Outcome 9.2; LD 2 Outcome 2.1, 2.2]	2.1.1. Programme for the identification of areas of high value for conservation and for biodiversity monitoring, SLM, and SFM 2.1.2. Spatial database related to the prioritization for restoration in forestry sector companies' areas	GEFTF	1,239,696	4,599,577
3. Improvement of public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas	TA	3.1. Biodiversity conservation and ecosystems services provision mainstreamed into national regulatory framework to support SLM, SFM and restoration in private areas [BD 4 Outcome 9.2; LD 2 Outcome 2.1; SFM 1 Outcome 2; SFM 1 Outcome 3]	3.1.1 - Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas	GEFTF	1,353,687	3,398,274
	TA	3.2. Conservation value of private areas mainstreamed into public policies and tools [BD 4 Outcome 9.2; SFM 1 Outcome 1; SFM 1 Outcome 2]	3.2.1 - Public policies incorporating spatial databases with conservation value of private areas 3.2.2 - Capacity building and dissemination programme for mainstreaming conservation value	GEFTF	1,263,844	3,291,332
Subtotal					8,527,072	33,811,993
Project Management Cost (PMC)[4]				GEFTF	426,353	80,924
Total project costs					**8,953,425**	**33,892,917**

[4] For GEF Project Financing up to $2 million, PMC could be up to10% of the subtotal; above $2 million, PMC could be up to 5% of the subtotal. PMC should be charged proportionately to focal areas based on focal area project financing amount in Table D below.

C. CONFIRMED SOURCES OF CO-FINANCING FOR THE PROJECT BY NAME AND BY TYPE

Please include evidence for co-financing for the project with this form.

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Cofinancing	Amount ($)
CSO	International Institute for Sustainability	Grant	1,254,720
Recipient Government	SECIMA/GO	In kind	13,901,439
Recipient Government	Ministry of Environment - Brazilian Forest Service	Grant	16,900,000
Recipient Government	Ministry of Environment - Secretariat of Biodiversity	In kind	1,836,758
Total Co-financing			33,892,917

D. TRUST FUND RESOURCES REQUESTED BY AGENCY(IES), COUNTRY(IES), FOCAL AREA AND THE PROGRAMMING OF FUNDS

GEF Agency	Trust Fund	Country Name/Global	Focal Area	Programming of Funds	(in $)		
					GEF Project Financing (a)	Agency Fee [a] (b)[2]	Total (c)=a+b
UNEP	GEFTF	Brazil	Biodiversity		4,527,982	430,158	4,958,140
UNEP	GEFTF	Brazil	Land Degradation		1,449,883	137,739	1,587,622
UNEP	GEFTF	Brazil	SFM	SFM	2,975,560	282,678	3,258,238
Total Grant Resources					8,953,425	850,575	9,804,000

a) Refer to the Fee Policy for GEF Partner Agencies

E. PROJECT'S TARGET CONTRIBUTIONS TO GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS[5]

Provide the expected project targets as appropriate.

Corporate Results	Replenishment Targets	Project Targets
1. Maintain globally significant biodiversity and the ecosystem goods and services that it provides to society	Improved management of landscapes and seascapes covering 300 million hectares	*795,216 hectares*
2. Sustainable land management in production systems (agriculture, rangelands, and forest landscapes)	120 million hectares under sustainable land management	*216,057 hectares*
3. Promotion of collective management of transboundary water systems and implementation of the full range of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and investments contributing to sustainable use and maintenance of ecosystem services	Water-food-ecosystems security and conjunctive management of surface and groundwater in at least 10 freshwater basins;	*Number of freshwater basins*
	20% of globally over-exploited fisheries (by volume) moved to more sustainable levels	*Percent of fisheries, by volume*
4. Support to transformational shifts towards a low-emission and resilient development path	750 million tons of CO_{2e} mitigated (include both direct and indirect)	*28 million* metric tons
5. Increase in phase-out, disposal and reduction of releases of POPs, ODS, mercury and other chemicals of global concern	Disposal of 80,000 tons of POPs (PCB, obsolete pesticides)	*metric tons*
	Reduction of 1000 tons of Mercury	*metric tons*
	Phase-out of 303.44 tons of ODP (HCFC)	*ODP tons*
6. Enhance capacity of countries to implement MEAs (multilateral environmental agreements) and mainstream into national and sub-national policy, planning financial and legal frameworks	Development and sectoral planning frameworks integrate measurable targets drawn from the MEAs in at least 10 countries	*Number of Countries: 1*
	Functional environmental information systems are established to support decision-making in at least 10 countries	*Number of Countries: 1*

F. DOES THE PROJECT INCLUDE A "NON-GRANT" INSTRUMENT? NO.

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

PART II: PROJECT JUSTIFICATION

A. DESCRIBE ANY CHANGES IN ALIGNMENT WITH THE PROJECT DESIGN WITH THE ORIGINAL PIF[6]

[5] Update the applicable indicators provided at PIF stage. Progress in programming against these targets for the projects per the *Corporate Results Framework* in the *GEF-6 Programming Directions*, will be aggregated and reported during mid-term and at the conclusion of the replenishment period.

[6] For questions A.1 –A.7 in Part II, if there are no changes since PIF , no need to respond, please enter "NA" after the respective question.

A.1. *Project Description*. Elaborate on:

1) the global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed;

N/A

2) the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects,

N/A

3) the proposed alternative scenario, GEF focal area[7] strategies, with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project,

N/A

4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, CBIT and co-financing;

N/A

5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF);

N/A

and

6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up.

N/A

Table 1: Main changes between the PIF and the CEO Endorsement stages

At PIF	At CEO Endorsement	Explanation for the change
GOAL		
-	Enhance biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision, increase connectivity and native vegetation cover, reduce environmental degradation in private areas, improve endangered species conservation, and mitigate climate change.	The project goal is linked to the project's conservation target and represent the desired status of the conservation target over the long-term – it is the formal statement of the ultimate impacts we hope to achieve. It was included in the PRODOC as a consequence of the adoption of Open Standards for the delineation of the project context.
OBJECTIVE		
Scaling up sustainable landscape management and improving biodiversity	Scale up sustainable landscape management and contribute to biodiversity conservation and	No substantial changes made; re-wording only. The mainstreaming of conservation value will not only affect set-aside areas (PPAs and LRs) but

[7] For biodiversity projects, in addition to explaining the project's consistency with the biodiversity focal area strategy, objectives and programs, please also describe which Aichi Target(s) the project will directly contribute to achieving.

conservation and ecosystem services provision in Brazilian private set-aside areas	ecosystem services provision in private areas in Brazil	also the wider landscape including native vegetation exceeding legal requirements and farming areas on private lands.
COMPONENTS		
1. General Coordination, Guidelines and Federal regulations for Private Set-Aside Areas (PSAA) established by the Brazilian Forest Code – Law 12.651/12	1. Pilot implementation	The main change between the PIF and the PRODOC was that, following STAP's advice, the project flipped its logic to a bottom-up approach by using field level implementation of the two pilot projects to drive the proposed national scale tools and policies. This is reflected at the reordering of the components and at a higher budget, number of activities, and outputs at pilot level. The PRODOC now has the following three components: i) Pilot implementation (at the local level), ii) Agreement with Forestry sector companies (at the regional level), and iii) Improvement of public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas (at the national level). In the PRODOC, the Pilot Implementation Component is presented in first place. In the PIF, it was in Component 2. This change was made to highlight: i) our bottom-up approach, as suggested by STAP, since many of the lessons learned will be incorporated at the national level; and ii) that the Pilot implementation (in two different areas) and the Agreement with Forestry sector companies are two different things. The area covered by the agreement (new Component 2) is not a third pilot area. In the PRODOC, the Component 3 is related to improvement of public capabilities with a major focus in the federal level. Finally, given the project review, General Coordination (part of the PIF's Component 1) was dispersed across all Components and does not need to be considered now as a specific Component.
2. Pilot implementation and Forestry Sectorial Agreement	2. Agreement with Forestry sector companies	As explained above, since the agreement with forestry companies is not a pilot, we placed this subject in a specific Component. Besides, due to an unexpected change in government and political instability in the country, which caused the domestic GDP to drop (while the International Monetary Fund predicted global growth), credit and public funding to be restricted, unemployment

		to increase, and nearly all sectors of the economy to contract, we reworded the component from a "sector agreement" to a "agreement with forestry sector companies". This implies that such agreement might not be held with the entire forestry sector (represented by the Brazilian Tree Industry) but with specific forestry companies. Despite that, the forestry companies that are being engaged to sign the agreement are the largest ones in Brazil and manage more than a half of the native vegetation managed by the sector.
3. Improving management capabilities and incentives for scaling up biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services, SLM and SFM in PSAA	3. Improvement of public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas	The main change in this Component was the exclusion of an explicit incentive aspect. Following the flipping of the project logic to a bottom-up approach, the direct and indirect incentives will be stimulated especially within the pilot areas. During the PPG we noticed a great demand for increased local incentives, and thus, we included the development of direct and indirect incentives schemes as a new and separate outcome of the Component 1 - Pilot implementation. This outcome includes a dissemination and lessons learned element that can lead to up-scaling and replication of these incentives to a national level. The new Component 3 addresses the national level interventions: i) improvement of federal level regulations, and ii) incorporation of conservation value of private areas into federal decision-making tools.
OUTCOMES		
1.1. Improved institutional coordination on biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision of PSAA	Outcome removed.	Given the change in the project logic, improvement of institutional coordination was spread accross all Components, so it lost its need to be approached in a specific outcome.
1.2. Sustainable Landscape Management (SLM) Guidelines for PSAA applied in 5 Brazilian biomes	1.1. Increased vegetative cover, reduced degree of fragmentation in production landscapes and increased habitat availability for 'Golden Lion Tamarin' in the Atlantic Forest pilot area of the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro) 1.2. Reduced deforestation rates and degree of fragmentation of current area of native vegetation cover in production landscapes and improved conservation actions	According to PIF (p. 14), the guidelines had two main parts. The first part would provide a fast and simple protocol for biodiversity monitoring, and the second part would support the management of PSAAs, registered in the SiCAR, according to their conservation value and landscape context (e.g. importance for connectivity, ecological corridors and buffer zones). These guidelines were expected to include spatial strategies for conserving or restoring LR and productive areas (agriculture and pasture land) in a landscape approach; support the identification of ecosystem services and the establishment of protected areas; and clarify types of sustainable native vegetation management appropriate for LRs. However, as pointed out by STAP, these guidelines were

	for key endangered species populations in the Cerrado pilot area of the Pouso Alto APA (KBA are in the State of Goiás) 2.1 Biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM and SFM in areas of highest conservation value managed by Forestry sector companies enhanced through an agreement for the implementation of improved conservation and restoration guidelines 3.1. Biodiversity conservation and ecosystems services provision mainstreamed into national regulatory framework to support SLM, SFM and restoration in private areas	poorly defined in the PIF, and their design needed to be carefully thought through and articulated in terms of stakeholder buy in and sequencing. Since part of these guidelines - the improvement of biodiversity monitoring and restoration protocols and the adoption of spatial strategies for LR and PPA restoration - was expected to be implemented by forestry companies through the sectorial agreement (as roughly stated in PIF's "Figure" 5), we relocated this subject to the PRODOC's Outcome 2.1. By the way, we removed the word "Guidelines", because there are already guidelines being implemented in the forestry companies. However, these guidelines can be improved in the aspects of biodiversity monitoring and native vegetation restoration. In addition to that, as a consequence of the adoption of a bottom-up approach, PRODOC's Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2 (through the Outputs 1.1.1 and 1.2.1, respectively) incorporated the second part of the PIF's Outcome 1.2 (abovementioned; refer to PRODOC's Sub-Section 3.3 and Appendix 5 for more details). PIF's Outcome 1.2 also has a link with PRODOC's Outcome 3.1 since the first aim of the latter is to clarify procedures related to sustainable management of native vegetation in LRs in at least five biomes, one of the goals of the former (refer to PRODOC's Sub-Section 3.3). Finally, the processes abovementioned – specially the ones related to PRODOC's Outcomes 1.1, 1.2, and 2.1 – will be developed hand-in-hand with the landholders they are intended to affect. In the context of the PRODOC's Outcome 3.1, public agents, civil society, rural landowners (from the pilot areas) will be engaged.
1.3. Biodiversity conservation and Ecosystems services provision mainstreamed into national regulatory framework to support SLM, Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) and restoration in PSAA	3.1. Biodiversity conservation and ecosystems services provision mainstreamed into national regulatory framework to support SLM, SFM and restoration in private areas	Except for the observation regarding the link with PIF's Outcome 1.2 (abovementioned), no changes were made; re-wording only.
2.1. Increased application of best practices for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM and SFM by the small, medium and large landowners (both	1.1. Increased vegetative cover, reduced degree of fragmentation in production landscapes and increased habitat availability for 'Golden Lion Tamarin' in the Atlantic Forest pilot area of the São	In the PRODOC, we merged actions related to best practices for SFM and SLM and native vegetation recovery into one outcome as the implementation of both will result in improved biodiversity and ecosystem services provision. It will occur in São João APA only (one of the two Pilot areas), thus we highlighted it by removing

women and men) and the forestry sector in PSAA	João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro)	the word "Forestry sector" (now contemplated in a separate component).
2.2. Increased Intact vegetative cover, reduced degree of fragmentation in production landscapes and increased "Golden Lion Tamarin" population in the Atlantic Forest pilot area of the São João Basin APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro)		There is no substantial change at this outcome, apart from re-wording mainly to make the outcome clear. As explained in the previous comment, we merged actions related to best practices for SFM and SLM and native vegetation recovery into one outcome. The goal is to increase native vegetation (but not "intact" one as it will be a secondary after recovery), reduce degree of fragmentation in production landscapes and increase habitat availability for "Golden Lion Tamarin" population in the Atlantic Forest pilot area of the São João Basin APA. The main change is that the project will increase habitat availability (which accounts for amount and configuration of native vegetation within a landscape, and species dispersal ability) for and not population of Golden Lion Tamarin itself as it is not expected to occur within 5 years project. In addition to that, in local workshops in the APA members of environmental organizations told us that the Golden Lion Tamarin do not need to increase population size, but its habitat availability as the individuals are restricted to small fractions of the landscape that do not support more individuals.
2.3. Maintenance of current area of Intact vegetative cover, reduced degree of fragmentation in production landscapes and increased "Pali Palã" grass and "Aroeira" populations in the *Cerrado* pilot area of the Environmental Protected Area of Pouso Alto APA (KBA area in the State of Goiás)	1.2. Reduced conversion rates and degree of fragmentation of current area of native vegetation cover in production landscapes and improved conservation actions for key endangered species populations in the Cerrado pilot area of the Pouso Alto APA (KBA are in the State of Goiás)	There is no substantial change at this outcome, except for re-wording mainly to make the outcome clear. 1) During the PPG, we had the opportunity to develop workshops in this pilot area and it was clear that the implementation of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan is the most important intervention to reduce conversion rates and degree of fragmentation of current area of native vegetative cover and improve conservation actions for key endangered species population. Thus, the new outcome states clearly the result we aim to achieve at this pilot area in order to achieve the project objective. 2) The expression "Maintenance of current area of Intact vegetative cover" in the PIF Outcome was incompatible with the description provided in the PIF text itself, and also in the Annex 1 of the PIF ("Annex 1 – Mitigation potential estimate"),

		where we detailed the business as usual conversion rates and the reduction in conversion expected due to the project intervention (50% reduction). The new text "Reduced conversion rates…" makes it clearer what was promised in the PIF text and Annex I and is now included in the project document. 3) Also, in the PIF we suggested to increase "Pali Palã" grass and "Aroeira" populations – two threatened species – but, in fact, we aim to avoid loss of as many key endangered species as possible because of our proposed strategies. These species will be monitored through the monitoring plan co-developed with key research institutions. In addition this monitoring plan will be the basis of a new endangered species national Action Plans to be co-developed with the 'National Strategy for Conservation of Threatened Species – PROSPECIES' (GEF Project ID9271) (Page 43 of the Prodoc).
3.1. Natural capital in PSAA is better managed by the creation of a national management system	3.2. Conservation value of private areas mainstreamed into public policies and tools	There is no substantial change at this outcome; re-wording mainly to make the outcome clear. Nowadays SiCAR is the main system developed that has the potential to contribute to biodiversity conservation in private areas. During the PPG we developed a draft technical cooperation agreement with the Brazilian Forest Service/MMA (which host the SICAR), to be signed after the project approval. The information on conservation value of private areas developed during this project will be included into this system. In other words, as a large-scale (baseline) investment has been made in a system focused on identifying and regulating native vegetation cover in private lands, which has matured and gained acceptance during the PPG development, we opted to drive our efforts at improving biodiversity conservation capability to this system (via developing missing knowledge and tools). In this way, the project would contribute even more in improving this system rather than creating a new - and potentially non-official - one. In addition, to avoid the use of different terms, we chose the use of conservation value of private areas instead of natural capital in PSAA. Conservation value means the importance of exuberance of living organisms (individual and species), communities, ecosystems, their ecological complexities and provision of ecosystem services. Finally, the project also aims to incorporate the conservation value of private lands within public policies.

3.2. Biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM and SFM in PSAA are enhanced by the development of direct (tradable environmental certificates – CRA) and indirect incentive schemes	1.3. Biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM, SFM and recovery of native vegetation in private areas in the two pilot areas enhanced by the development of direct and indirect incentives schemes	No changes; re-wording only. As already explained, the incentives will be stimulated especially within the two Pilot areas. Thus, we preferred to include it in the Component 1 (Pilot implementation) as a new and separate outcome than maintaining it in Component 3, which is related to actions at the national level. In fact, no change was made except for the re-wording of the outcome to clarify its statement - for example, the project will also support incentives for native vegetation recovery. We only removed the tradable environmental certificates (CRA) from the outcome text because we will deal with other forms of incentives too, rather than only CRA.
OUTPUTS		
1.1.1. Governance and coordination strategy for stakeholders (companies, NGOs, Academy, Regional/Local Governments, and landowners) on biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM and SFM of PSAA 1.2.1. Biome specific SLM Guidelines for landscape stakeholders focused on strengthening biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision and SFM of PSAA (registered in the Environmental Rural Registry System – SiCAR) 1.2.3. Federal regulation improved for better biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services management in PSAA to support SLM, SFM and restoration 2.1.1. SLM Guidelines for PSAA implemented in Atlantic Forest pilot area of the São João Basin APA	1.1.1. Programme for implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro) 1.2.1 - Programme for implementation of conservation actions of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan in private areas 1.3.1 - Incentive package for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas in the two pilot areas 2.1.1. Programme for the identification of areas of high value for conservation and for biodiversity monitoring, SLM, and SFM 2.1.2. Spatial database related to the prioritization for restoration in forestry sector companies' areas 3.1.1 - Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas 3.2.1 - Public policies incorporating spatial databases with conservation value of private areas	The main change between PIF and PRODOC in terms of outputs is that, following STAP´s advice, the project has flipped its logic to focus on the implementation of conservation, restoration, and good management practices on the ground rather than taking regulation and central monitoring as the starting point. The development of the Theory of Change clarified the necessary steps to achieve each outcome. Considering so, we have refined the outputs (each of them has sub-outputs; refer to Appendix 5 of PRODOC) and activities, which are now being part of an impact pathway to effectively achieve the outcomes and, consequently, the objective and the goal.

(KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro) aimed at improving the habitat quality for 6 threatened species and SFM for the Legal Reserves areas 2.1.2. SLM Guidelines for PSAA implemented in Cerrado pilot area of the Environmental Protected Area of Pouso Alto APA (KBA area in the State of Goiás) aimed at improving the habitat quality for 45 threatened species and SFM for the Legal Reserves areas 2.1.3. SLM Guidelines for PSAA training package (workshops, online training tool) for stakeholders (forest companies, landowners, government agents) in up to 9 states 2.1.4. A sectorial agreement with the forestry sector, containing SLM Guidelines for PSAA and targets to be implemented (in 5 biomes – 7 States; i.e. potential upscaling to 5M ha of PSAA) by the IBA (Brazilian Tree Industry Association) 3.1.1. Natural Asset Management System (NAMS), a national PSAA management system based on three nested components: i) improving PSAA conservation, ii) natural capital measuring, and iii) biodiversity and ecosystem services management	3.2.2 - Capacity building and dissemination programme for mainstreaming conservation value	

3.2.1. Incentive package created and focused on negotiation of CRA for biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services provision, SLM and SFM in PSAA		

4) incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing

Incremental cost reasoning has been changed since the project logic has been flipped to a bottom-up approach, using field level implementation of the pilot projects to define and drive demand for other requirements, rather than taking regulation and central monitoring as the starting point (as suggested by the STAP).

In the São João APA (Atlantic Forest's pilot area), very limited effort is expected in terms of compliance with the LPVN through restoration efforts. Even these limited efforts are likely to have no spatial intelligence which prevents them from being translated into integrated sustainable land management at property and landscape levels. By creating the enabling conditions for a cost-effective restoration and developing SLM plans (including detailed restoration plans) that are legally binding, the project will achieve substantial additionality in relation to the baseline. In the Pouso Alto APA (Cerrado's pilot area), the management plan implementation is hampered by key barriers, including a low-level of buy-in from private landowners. By using best practices of stakeholders' engagement to conduct activities of biodiversity conservation in private areas inside this APA, the project will contribute to the improvement, acceptance, and effective implementation of the APA's management plan. Taken together, those pilots-scale efforts, through their lessons learned, will boost the incremental performance at national levels.

The forestry sector owns 5 million hectares of areas covered by native vegetation (in addition to 7 million hectares of production areas, mainly exotic eucalyptus). These areas are not actively managed, but neither are they actively conserved. Companies conduct some biodiversity monitoring in some regions, but there is a lack of coordination among forestry companies that compromises biodiversity data systematization in their lands and integration of such data to public policies and national targets. Crucially, there is no spatial intelligence to their conservation or restoration efforts. The project role in synthesising their current monitoring data, co-developing improved protocols and management guidelines, and identifying their areas of highest conservation value will greatly improve the targeting of their efforts and resulting conservation outcomes. It will also allow the national government to incorporate these areas into national reports in the scope of CBD. This incremental contribution will also serve as a blueprint for the integration of conservation efforts from other sectors to the ones from public institutions.

National efforts towards developing a system to implement regulations of private land-use have already reached hundreds of millions of USD (refer to Appendix 12 of PRODOC). Furthermore, restoration efforts are estimated to cost tens of billions of USD. But these efforts do not have specific focus on biodiversity conservation. Some of the top-down conservation regulations are hampering sustainable native vegetation management on the ground (refer to sub-section 2.3.2 of PRODOC), so the conservation potential of private lands is not appropriately addressed. The incremental efforts provided by this project (e.g. fostering knowledge on SFM techniques and refining regulations related to SFM in LRs), arising from pilots' lessons and experience, will change this baseline into a situation where biodiversity conservation is appropriately integrated into private land-use governance. As private lands cover 53% of the remaining natural vegetation in Brazil, the incremental impact of this transition will be substantial.

5) global environmental benefits (GEFTF) and/or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)

The project is expected to generate several Global Environmental Benefits. More details were added in the PRODOC when compared to the PIF, as follows:

Biodiversity focal area: had no changes from the PIF state. Although we do not foresee significant changes in populations of threatened species during the lifetime of the project, we aim to **increase habitat availability for threatened species**. In addition, the main indicators are related to the enabling conditions that will be established for positive changes - increased area of production landscapes that integrate conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity into management and sector policies and regulatory frameworks incorporate biodiversity considerations - to occur, *e.g.* area covered by legally binding forest recovery plans; number of incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas developed/improved; number of endangered species with improved monitoring; area occupied by the companies that signed the agreement for improving and implementing protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM; number of spatial databases on conservation value of private areas mainstreamed into public policies; number of national policies incorporating spatial databases on conservation value of private areas.

Land Degradation focal area: improved provision of agro-ecosystem and forest ecosystem goods and services (e.g. water quality through recovery of native vegetation), increased carbon sequestration in production landscapes,

conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in productive landscapes. Again, the improvement of these benefits will not be monitored directly by this project, because they will take longer than the project's lifetime to be detected, but the project interventions will set enabling conditions for them to occur. These conditions will be monitored through indicators that are associated with establishment of support mechanisms for forest landscape management and restoration, improvement of forest management and/or restoration, and supporting local communities to adopt integrated landscape management practices, such as: area under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans, area under refined and implemented management plan that supports SLM and SFM at Pouso Alto APA, area occupied by the companies that signed the agreement for improving and implementing protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM, percentage of partner forestry companies' areas under restoration that consider the spatial prioritisation developed by the project, and number of engaged stakeholders (both women and men) to point bottlenecks and solutions regarding sustainable native vegetation management in LRs.

Sustainable Forest Management focal area: are reduction in forest loss and forest degradation and maintenance of the range of environmental services and products derived from forests. These GEBs will come from the adoption at pilot areas of planning approaches and incentive mechanisms that avoid loss of high conservation value forests (monitored through the indicators area under refined and implemented management plan that supports SLM and number of incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas developed/improved) and the application of good management practices by private sector actors that increase area of sustainably managed native vegetation (monitored through the indicators area under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans and area occupied by the companies that signed the agreement for improving and implementing protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM).

6) innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up

As suggested by STAP, the project is now built in a manner that combines activities of bottom up with top down approach focused on improving public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private set aside areas that comprise 88 million hectares in Brazil in the five analysed biomes. In that respect, the project will mainstream biodiversity conservation and the provision of ecosystems services into national regulatory frameworks to support sustainable land and native vegetation management. This will anchor the project's transformational impact within the public institutions with legal competence on the matters and these activities will be carried out with the active participation of these institutions. At the national level, the project will also contribute to mainstreaming conservation value of private areas in governmental management tools and public policies, whose effects will continue beyond the duration of the project. In this matter, the project is innovative as it aims to develop the third pillar for biodiversity conservation in private areas, supporting the compliance with the most important environmental law for native vegetation conservation in Brazil - LPVN.

There are several ways to assure the sustainability of project impacts. The first is the contribution of strong co-financing partners that was developed during the PPG (the Brazilian Forest Service and the Secretariat of Biodiversity of MMA, the International Institute for Sustainability, and the Executive Superintendence of the Environment and Water Resources of the State of Goiás). These institutions are committed to share their financial and human resources with concerted efforts towards the common objective that is to maintain activities strengthening the national system of private areas. Regarding the financial sustainability of the project, it will also likely trigger complementary resources to assist consolidating results and defining future activities. Through alliances with major stakeholders and a wide range of other relevant institutions including top universities and research institutions in Brazil, NGOs, extension organizations, and private sector the project ensures continuation beyond its duration. Improvement of the national protected areas system is ensured beyond the project as national authorities such as MMA, have the mandate to include the results of the project into public reports to maintain the project objective beyond its duration. Furthermore, other project partners such as United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment) will contribute by promoting the implementation of the environmental aspect of sustainable development within the United Nations system. Also, IUCN, which acts to spread conservation efforts globally, will foster international dissemination of project results and its visibility. *Crucially, the five spatial databases of conservation value in private lands will, through the associated program of engagement and training of key stakeholders, ensure the mainstreaming of this crucial information into public policies related to conservation, SFM and SLM in the decades to come.* Lessons learned will be disseminated both nationally and internationally. Project's sustainability will also be possible due to its interdisciplinary bottom-up participatory

approach. Large-scale restoration is a challenge, not only at national but also at global scale. Brazil has a target to recover native vegetation over 12 million hectares, and successful regional examples are vital to demonstrate the feasibility of expansion of native vegetation recovery. Circulation of successful case studies is also crucial to show how to reconcile native vegetation recovery with increased farming productivity. Demonstration Units (DUs) will provide cases of success that are paramount to a participatory bottom up vision of sustainability. Lessons learned from DUs will be systematized and widely disseminated via online platforms as well as other means depending on target audience. Systematized lessons learned from the pilot will also support national policies, so the project becomes holistic.

With respect to replicability of the project, on one hand it is at national scale and on the other hand has a bottom up approach. The project has been designed from the outset to develop tools, regulations and incentives to mainstream the conservation value in private lands in Brazil, which corresponds to 53% of Brazil's remaining natural vegetation. The potential for replication of the pilots and the forestry sector agreements are, therefore, substantial and can be measured in tens of millions of hectares. This replication potential is catalysed by the development and mainstreaming of these national scale tools, regulation and incentives which will foster systemic enabling conditions for the pilot activities of conservation in private areas to be replicated. Project replicability will be based on systematization of the outcomes of the project, dissemination of the lessons learned of the implementation of DUs as well as of the facilitation of credit access and incentives for native vegetation conservation, and implementation of monitoring protocols with the forestry sector. This will provide potential for scaling up ''know-how'' exchange with other countries with rich biodiversity in private areas. The integration of private areas in the national conservation system as performed by the project will serve as a model for countries elsewhere. At national level, this project will contribute to replication of good agricultural practices, improved restoration models, and prioritization models for restoration in key areas for biodiversity while sparing land with best agricultural potential for agriculture. Implementation will be jointly coordinated by Farmers' Associations, NGOs and local authorities. We expect 'snow ball effect' in the area of DUs implementation, as observed previously with similar projects (e.g. Latawiec et al., 2017). As DUs are in the biodiversity hotspot, the likelihood to replicate in areas that are key biodiversity and ecosystem services provision is high. The sectorial agreement, the regulation detailing methods for sustainable native vegetation management in LRs, the spatial prioritization model for restoration of native vegetation, the spatial database with conservation value, and the incentives package developed will serve to base a national system that will manage the 88 million hectares of PPAs and LRs in the five biogeographic regions that focus of this project. Such system can also provide inputs for the management of private areas in the Amazon. The implementation will be fostered by private sector, NGOs and Farmers' Associations in the five respective regions. The project aims at systemic change at many levels which translates to high potential for replication, and serves as basis for a paradigm shift in accounting for biodiversity and ecosystem services in private lands and a new national system that will create and promote 'third pillar of conservation'. Dissemination of all these activities and outcomes will be vital for stakeholders elsewhere that are taking part in similar processes and are yet to develop their third pillar of biodiversity conservation. Because the project is built in a holistic manner wherein participatory approach of DUs is linked to overall national scale policy initiatives where regulatory frameworks and strategic planning play their fundamental and long-term role, the project can serve as a model not only for projects of similar scope but also for other GEF projects in other parts of the world. On the account of the novel integration systems for biodiversity conservation proposed here, there is a potential for replicability in other regions of the world and for increasing biodiversity conservation globally.

A.2. Child Project? If this is a child project under a program, describe how the components contribute to the overall program impact.
N/A.

A.3. *Stakeholders*. Identify key stakeholders and elaborate on how the key stakeholders engagement is incorporated in the preparation and implementation of the project. Do they include civil society organizations (yes ☒ /no☐)? and indigenous peoples (yes ☐ /no☒)? [8]

[8] *As per the GEF-6 Corporate Results Framework in the GEF Programming Directions and GEF-6 Gender Core Indicators in the Gender Equality Action Plan, provide information on these specific indicators on stakeholders (including civil society organization and indigenous peoples) and gender.*

For the complete Stakeholder assessment, mapping and participation details please refer to Sub-Section 2.5 and Section 5 of the project document.

The Project was developed through a participatory process involving a broad group of stakeholders related to biodiversity conservation, sustainable management of native vegetation, and environmental degradation in private areas acting in several scopes and scales. The chart below identifies the key stakeholders mapped during the preparation of the project and details about their role/actions and their participation and interest in the project (Table 3).

Table 1. Key stakeholders, sector, role, and project participation/functions.

Stakeholder, Sector and Role	Participation in the Project
Ministry of the Environment (MMA) Public sector. The MMA is the federal body that, among other subjects in its agenda, deals with the environment. It rules the environmental public policies on conservation and restoration of biodiversity, protected areas and plans and actions for endangered species.	One of the executing agencies of the project. I) Department of Ecosystems: Will assist in the general coordination of the project, in the improvement of the procedure to approve sustainable forest management in areas of existing and recovering RL (e.g. bottleneck diagnosis, identification of possible solutions, formulation of the regulation proposal and advocacy), in the development of incentives to value biodiversity/native forests in private areas, and in the sectoral agreement with the forestry sector companies. It will participate in every component of the project. II) Department of Endangered Species: Develops the PRODOC for the GEF 'National Strategy for Conservation of Threatened Species' (PROSPECIES; GEF Project ID 9271). In this GEF project, there will be an activity to reduce hunting through awareness raising for local landowners. This activity is synergic with our project and will be potentially developed in at least one of the two pilot areas (APA Pouso Alto or São João River Basin/Mico Leão Dourado). Potential additionality to component 1. III) Department of protected areas: Develops the PRODOC for the GEF 'Consolidation of National System of Conservation Units and Enhanced Flora and Fauna Protection' (TERRESTRE; GEF Project ID 4859).
International Institute for Sustainability (IIS) Private sector. Non-profit, non-governmental institution that assists with decision-making of governmental and non-governmental organizations on landscape sustainable use.	One of the executing agencies of the project. Will coordinate the technical execution and implementation of the entire project with the MMA, UN Environment and other project partners. Will participate in every component of the project.
Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro - PUC-Rio Center for Synthesis in Science Rio Conservation and Sustainability Science Centre (CSRio) Private sector. Academic and scientific institution in sustainability and conservation science.	One of the partners to execute the project. Will provide technical support to every component of the project.
The Brazilian Foundation for Sustainable Development (FBDS) Private sector. Non-profit, non-governmental institution that thinks and structures projects and partnerships in	One of the partners executing the project. Will assist in the establishment of a sectoral agreement with the forest sector, summarizing biodiversity data made available by the companies in this sector, the co-development of protocols for native species recovery within the areas leased by forest companies.

the subject of sustainable development.	It will participate in the component 2 of the project.
United Nations Environment Programme (UN Environment) UN agency with the mandate to keep the environment under review and advice countries on environmental policy based on sound science.	UN Environment is the GEF Implementing Agency that will provide technical assistance during the full project cycle. As such it supports project development and supervision of implementation including Monitoring & Evaluation and ensuring fiduciary standards. It will participate in every component of the project.
Brazilian Forest Service (SFB) Public sector. Linked to the MMA, it promotes knowledge, sustainable use and expansion of native cover (particularly forests), making this agenda strategic for the country's economy. The SFB manages the SiCAR, supports the implementation of the CAR and of the Environmental Regularization Programs (PRAs) in the states, and manages the issuing of the Environmental Reserve Certificates.	Federal governmental Institution They are responsible for the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) and its online System (SiCAR), in addition to acting in the forest management area. Therefore, it will be a vital partner to the project. They will provide training to those hired by the project to validate the CAR and initiate the Environmental Regularization Programs with the landowners at the São João APA. They will create a module within SiCAR where a spatial database on biodiversity value in private areas will be added. They will assist in the stakeholders training on the use of this spatial database in SiCAR. Furthermore, they will also assist to expedite/improve the procedure to approve sustainable forest management in areas of existing or recovering LR (e.g. bottleneck diagnosis, identification of possible solutions, formulation of the regulation proposal and advocacy). They will potentially assist in the development/implementation of mechanisms to value biodiversity/native forests in private areas. For example, using spatial database on biodiversity value in private areas to negotiate the CRAs. It will participate in the components 1 and 3 of the project.
Consulting Board of São João APA Public sector. Created by the Order (No. 87 from 12/07/05), it consists of 39 members from federal, state and municipal bodies and governmental entities, and by the civil society. It aims to contribute to the arrangement and implementation of actions destined to achieve the goals of protected area. Currently, it does not act much, for these activities are being held by the Mosaic of the Mico Leão Dourado.	Will provide support for the development of activities in the pilot area of APA of São João River Basin/Mico Leão Dourado, which are: implementation of practices of integrated landscape management, promoting the development of restoration and developing incentives to appreciate native forests/biodiversity in private areas. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Mosaic of São João River/Mico Leão Dourado Public sector. It is included in an action by the Federal government to strengthen the mosaics of protected areas (a series of protected areas that are close or overlapped). The law (Order of the MMA No. 418/2010) recognizes the Mosaic and its management structure. Currently, it acts as the Board of the São João APA. The Mosaic is in 75% of the APA and consists of 19 governmental and non-governmental institutions and the civil society.	Council to strengthen Mosaics of protected areas (in this specific case, in the region of São João APA). Will support the development of activities in the pilot area of São João APA, such as: practices implementation of integrated landscape management, promoting restoration and developing incentives to appreciate native forests/biodiversity in private areas. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Non-governmental Organization Mico Leão Dourado	Working since 1992 in São João APA, this NGO is extremely engaged with rural landowners and institutions active in the APA region. In

Private sector. Non-profit, non-governmental institution that promotes conservation, mainly of the Golden Lion Tamarin (endemic and endangered species in the Atlantic Forest).	addition, it monitors a symbolic endemic and threatened species in the region – the Golden Lion Tamarin. Therefore, the NGO will be a partner of the project in implementing integrated management practices of property and landscape, in addition to monitoring the Golden Lion Tamarin in the pilot area of São João APA. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Rio de Janeiro State Environmental Institute (INEA) Public sector. Governmental State institution that aims to protect, conserve and recover the environmental heritage of the State of Rio de Janeiro through an agenda of sustainable development.	This institution assists, among other things to: i) the restoration planning of small properties with native seedlings, ii) real-time monitoring of land use changes (*Projeto Olho Verde*), and iii) the creation of RPPNs. INEA will be a partner in the project aiding with the activities development in São João APA, particularly with the validation of the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) in the APA, and subsidies to develop restoration. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Secretary of Agriculture and Livestock of Rio de Janeiro State- Rio Rural Programme Public sector. This program of the state of Rio de Janeiro aims at funding the sustainable Rural development in micro-watersheds in the state of Rio de Janeiro.	The Rio Rural Programme has already a GEF project with the goal to improve biodiversity protection and increase sustainability of productive areas in private properties in some parts of the state of Rio de Janeiro (mainly the northeast of the state). Since their goal is aligned to the present project, Rio Rural will assist with the negotiation with EMATER (see below) regarding technical assistance and training courses to implement SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery in São João APA. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Technical Assistance and Rural Extension – EMATER Public sector. It is responsible for technical assistance and rural extension in the State of Rio de Janeiro.	It employs the extension agents who will act in the pilot area of São João APA. Hence, the company will approve, in the annual work plan of extension agents, the participation in the training programs to implement SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Environment Secretary of Silva Jardim Public sector. Municipal institution that aims at protecting, conserving and recovering the environmental heritage of the Municipality of Silva Jardim	This partner can offer political support to the implementation of the pilot in São João APA. It is interested in assisting projects that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable productive practices within the São João APA. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Rural Union of Silva Jardim and Casemiro de Abreu Private sector. Association of rural producers interested in improving their productivity and forming cooperatives.	Since the project will be developed in private areas, it is vital the participation of this association to implement the project in the pilot area of São João APA. The Union will be one of the main elements to connect the project with landowners in the region. It will participate in the component 1 of the project. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Small, medium-sized and large landowners Private sector. Private landowners with interests in the biogeographical regions encompassed by the project, but particularly from Pouso Alto and São João APAs.	These will benefit in two different levels. Nationally: Landowners will participate and benefit from lessons learned in the pilot areas (São João and Pouso Alto APAs), and from the improvement in the procedure for approval for a sustainable forest management in existing or recovering LR areas. Pilot Areas: The landowners will participate and benefit from technical assistance, awareness and training for SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery, in addition to a better knowledge on the biodiversity value in São João and Pouso Alto APAs. It will participate in the components 1 and 3 of the project.

Brazilian Tree Industry (IBÁ) Private sector. Association responsible for the institutional representation of planted forest production chains. Every company of the Forestry sector in Brazil is affiliated to this federation (e.g. Fibria, Klabin, Suzano, Eldorado, International Paper, etc.).	In this project, the Ibá will be a partner in the development of a sectorial agreement with the forestry sector, and will help to share the lessons learned about sustainable forest management. In addition, Iba affiliated companies will implement monitoring and sustainable management practices in their private areas. It will participate in the component 2 of the project.
Consulting board of the Pouso Alto APA Public sector. Created by the Decree (No. 5.419, from 05/07/01), it is formed by members from federal, state and municipal governmental bodies and entities and by the civil society. Its goal is to promote the sustainable development and preserve the flora, fauna, springs, geology and landscaping in the regions of Pouso Alto, located at Chapada dos Veadeiros.	After many years, it managed to create the Management Plan of Pouso Alto APA. However, it is not yet implemented. Thus, the board will assist the project's activities related to the implementation of the Management Plan of Pouso Alto APA and the creation of incentive packages to appreciate biodiversity/native vegetation. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Chapada dos Veadeiros National Park Public sector. Federal protected area managed by ICMBio.	It will assist with contacts to local landowners, associations and surrounding communities, since the Park is the main tourist attraction of Pouso Alto APA, it also acts directly in the implementation of the APA's Management Plan and collaborates with the local community (e.g. volunteers' training to work in the Park). It will further assist in the contact with organization of family agriculture products chains (e.g. Agroforestry Systems and extractive activities) and the strengthening of the networks of the Private Reserves of the Natural Heritage in the pilot area of Pouso Alto APA. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Secretary for the Environment, Water Resources, Infrastructure, Cities and Metropolitan Affairs (Secima / MARH) of the State of Goáis Public sector. State secretary responsible for environmental issues in Goiás.	A key project partner, that partner, which will offer technical and political support to the implementation of the pilot in Pouso Alto APA. It is interested in changing the criteria to receive the Ecological Sales Tax (ICMS-E), since it is not proportional to the protected areas within the municipality. In addition, it is interested in assisting projects that integrate biodiversity conservation and sustainable productive practices within Pouso Alto APA. Hence, the Secima/MARH will be a vital partner in the creation and strengthening of the Private Reserves of the Natural Heritage, and in the implementation of the management plan. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Municipal Governments of the Pouso Alto APA Public sector. Municipal management, including the agenda of biodiversity conservation.	The Municipal Governments will assist in the negotiation to allow extension agents to enrol in the training programs planned for Pouso Alto APA. In addition, some are interested in increasing the incentive to create Private Reserves of the Natural Heritage in Pouso Alto APA supporting some of the Projects activities. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Owners Association of Private Reserve of the Natural Heritage of Goiás and Distrito Federal (APRPPN) Private sector. Social organization that represents the owners of RPPNs in the	The APRPPN has sought to strengthen the initiatives to create Private Reserves of the Natural Heritage and its tourism. However, this association is weak and uninvolved. Hence, the APRPPN will be a partner strengthened by the project. It will help to increase biodiversity/native forests appreciation in private areas through incentives to create and strengthen the Private Reserves of the Natural Heritage in the pilot area of

region of APA of Pouso Alto.	Pouso Alto APA. It will participate in the component 1 of the project.
Observatório do Código Florestal (Forest Code Observatory). Network of several civil society institutions aims at monitoring the implementation of the LPVN (Forest Code) in Brazil.	The group is involved in several discussions related to the LPVN implementation, create databases, develop research and group discussions in order to assure a more transparent and effective implementation of the Law. A collaboration with the group will support the project by contributing to up-to-date information on the LPVN implementation. Also, it will contribute to the correct implementation of the CAR and its validation, reducing any risks it might have. It will participate in component 1 of the project
National Agency for rural extension (ANATER). Private Sector. Promotes, incentivizes and stimulate the implementation of rural extension projects focusing on best practices, considering innovative and effective instruments.	The Agency was created in order to recognize the importance of technical extension assistance to rural landowners, and develop several projects for the implementation of sound and innovative instruments for the improvement of rural techniques that are beneficial to the environment. ANATER can contribute for the pilot area of Rio de Janeiro State, particularly for the implementation of Demonstration Units, as well as in the development of the Training course. It will participate in Component 1 of the project

The project has a number of indicators on stakeholders:

Component	Outcome	Indicator on stakeholder
1	1.2	Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, community associations) trained regarding implementation of conservation actions in private areas
	1.3	Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, extension agents, private sector, community associations) trained regarding incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas
2	2.1	Area occupied by the companies that signed the agreement (% of the total area administered by the forestry sector)
3	3.1	Number of engaged stakeholders to point bottlenecks and solutions regarding sustainable native vegetation management in LRs
	3.2	Number of federal and state public sector and third sector key stakeholders trained and engaged to apply the conservation value in private area database

A.4. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment. Elaborate on how gender equality and women's empowerment issues are mainstreamed into the project implementation and monitoring, taking into account the differences, needs, roles and priorities of women and men. In addition, 1) did the project conduct a gender analysis during project preparation (yes ☒ /no☐)?; 2) did the project incorporate a gender responsive project results framework, including sex-disaggregated indicators (yes ☒ /no☐)?; and 3) what is the share of women and men direct beneficiaries (women X%, men X%)? [9]

In Brazil and worldwide, women are essential economic agents that contribute to the family income and the development of their communities in many ways, especially in rural areas. They work as entrepreneurs, as rural workers in family

[9] Same as footnote 10 above.

businesses, as autonomous. Likewise, they also play an important role on the conservation of natural resources as they utilize and conserve these resources to supply basic needs for their families.

Unfortunately, women contribution is still limited by unequal access to resources as well as the persistent discrimination and rigid gender roles, issues that need to be addressed to ensure the full range of its potential. Biodiversity conservation and recovery of native vegetation cannot be done without the involvement and training of women. They need to have their awareness raised on the values and of biodiversity and ecosystem services. They must be not only recognized as land managers but also supported by relevant incentives and policy instruments. Understanding the differences between women and men regarding the management of biodiversity and ecosystem services should be considered an essential element of designing and planning project interventions.

In order to address this need, this project will be designed and implemented (following UNEP and national guidelines) based on a gender analysis that was carried out during the development of the project proposal (refer to PRODOC's Sub-Section 2.5).

The inclusion of women can increase the workforce, produce wealth and foster entrepreneurship, expand family business opportunities, and promote the sustainable use of natural resources. In 2010 almost half of the Brazilian families were headed by women. Women have increased their share in the income of Brazilian families: about 40% of women contribute to the income of families in the country - in rural areas, the proportion reaches 42.4% (IBGE, 2010). When it comes to access to land, 72% of the properties of the agrarian reform are today registered in the name of the woman.

Even so, they still represent the minority of the economically active force: while 72% of men are active, only 50% of women are active. In Brazil, women represent only 18% in the Senate and 9.9% in the Chamber of Deputies. In addition to that, the pay gap is a reality: women earn about 30% less than men.

When it comes to restoring forest landscapes, there is a huge growth potential for the role of women that deserves to be fostered: in developing countries, women make up 43% of the workforce in the rural areas and can grow by 20-30% results if they have the same access to inputs as men. In activities such as seed production and seedlings women already account for 50% of the workforce. The work with seeds and seedlings is historically linked to women, because while men went out to work in agriculture women were involved in activities linked to nature. Other productive activities, such as the making of jewellery and handicrafts, are also linked to women.

Unlike men, whose income from the forest reaches one-third of the total, forestry deals represent 50% of the income of the rural women and is of great importance for their livelihood.

Women tend to work in groups and easily recognize native and medicinal plants, which are fundamental to the success of complex projects of conservation value assessment and restoration of native vegetation. The ability of women to work with people and generate empathy is an asset to be tapped into global challenges. In the chain of restoration, the woman has the ability to work from the base to the top, especially for her ability to communicate with others.

The gender analysis was a critical first step to set the baseline and develop the project design with a gender responsive approach to actions and results. Based on the analysis, the project designed gender responsive approaches – sex-disaggregated indicators (refer to PRODOC's Sub-Section 3.11 and Appendix 4). Attention was given to ensure that the outcomes of this project promote equal opportunities and have no negative impact on women. It will also ensure that women-headed households and landowners, as well as, lower income groups are given prioritised support.

The role of women on the integrated landscape and property management and the biodiversity conservation and the provision of ecosystems services will be acknowledged and strengthened by this project. Women knowledge about the importance of biodiversity value in private areas and the access to economic incentives will be promoted and gender issues will be taken in consideration by the legal instruments that will be developed during the course of this project.

Restoration efforts offer gender neutral opportunities by involving women in operations on the ground related to pilots, such as nursery operations. Improving public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas also offer gender consideration by involving women that work at public agencies. The project will generate gender data and input gender dimensions into the elaboration of Component 1 and Component 3 and in the development of results frameworks, implementation plans and work plans. The PPG process has determined that gender considerations are not solely a women's issue but rather looks at yielding advantage to whole communities and benefitting both genders and vulnerable groups.

Finally, gender is considered in four indicators of the project, Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, community associations), both women and men, trained regarding implementation of conservation actions in private areas (Outcome 1.2), Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, extension agents, private sector, community associations), both women and men, trained regarding incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas (Outcome 1.3), Number of engaged stakeholders (both women and men) to point bottlenecks and solutions regarding sustainable native vegetation management in LRs (Outcome 3.1), and Number of federal and state public sector and third sector key stakeholders (both women and men) trained and engaged to apply the conservation value of private areas database (Outcome 3.2).

A.5 Risk. Elaborate on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, and, if possible, the proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation.(table format acceptable):

Since the project depends on the implementation of environmental laws (e.g. LPVN) and third-party interest/participation (e.g. farmers), there are some risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved, but can be mitigated through several specific actions (Table 4).

Table 2. Risks, risk assessment and project mitigation.

Risk	Assessment (low, medium, or high)	Mitigation
Stakeholders of the pilot areas do not engage in project`s activities	Low	To prevent non-engagement, the project will be conducted in a bottom-up strategy so stakeholders would be involved in decision making. Throughout the preparation phase of the Project, workshops were held in both pilot areas, and contacts with local associations, state and municipal governments were made and maintained. Furthermore, the projects foreseen events and activities such as raising awareness and training among landowners to mitigate the risk of non-engaging.
Non-compliance of landowners with the LPVN	Medium	Although LPVN is already in force, landowners involved in the project (within the Atlantic Forest's pilot area) might risk not complying with this law. In such pilot area the main goal is to support forest recovery so that landowners comply with the LPVN. The process of law compliance will be speeded since the project will have activities for CAR validation and PRA initiation. Once CAR is validated, landowners in the São João APA can implement PRA and start recovering native vegetation in their lands. Hence, the risk of non-compliance in this region is minimized. Nevertheless, in other regions in

		Brazil this risk is medium, because it will be mitigated only after the dissemination of the lessons learned in this pilot area.
Non-validation of the CAR in the next years	High	State governments are responsible for validating CAR. Although the risk of non-validation if the CAR for the entire territory is high, this risk is reduced in the São João APA, where validation is most essential for the project development. As mentioned above, in the São João APA the project will support CAR validation, so this risk is mitigated in this region. In the Pouso Alto APA TFCA project (see sub-section 2.7) is promoting CAR and, consequently, enabling validation afterwards, so that the risk of non-validation is reduced. Therefore, although the risks are high for the national territory, our mitigation strategies reduces them for the two pilot areas.
Inefficient establishment of PRAs by state governments	Medium	As the project team is in close contact with Brazilian Forest Service, which is in charge of technically supporting and monitoring PRAs in the states, the risk of inefficient PRA implementation is mitigated. Besides, this risk is additionally mitigated by some project activities such as raising awareness among landowners and training of extension agents with focus on compliance with LPVN (which includes PRA implementation), supporting CAR validation and PRA initiation, developing incentive packages for native vegetation conservation and recovery.
Mechanisms of incentives for native vegetation conservation and recovery are not implemented	Low	This risk will be mitigated by the project through several actions. Some incentives have already been studied and discussed with the stakeholders from the pilot areas throughout the preparation of the project. Furthermore, additional consultations with local stakeholders will be held to determine which incentives are the most viable and accepted. Finally, the reasons why some incentive mechanisms implemented in the region have or have not worked will be assessed.
Agreement with Forestry sector companies is not signed	Low	FBDS have already briefed and consulted the main representatives in the Forestry sector (e.g. president of Ibá) about such agreement, and the

		latter have expressed interest in signing it. FBDS will continue to interact with such representatives in order to minimize the risk of the agreement not being signed.
Regulation bodies do not incorporate proposals of spatial database and changes in regulations	Medium	During the development phase of the project, the team set several meetings with regulation agencies (e.g. Brazilian Forest Service) to engage them in the project. Furthermore, the project plans to develop an advocacy strategy to minimize the risk of such bodies not incorporating project proposals.
Research group do not make databases available for the spatial modelling regarding biodiversity value	Low	The project team has been articulating with researchers to form a group of synthesis for the Atlantic Forest and the Cerrado. The formation of such groups must encourage researchers of the other biogeographical regions to form their respective research groups and mitigate the risk of databases not being available for spatial modelling regarding conservation value.
Some strategies of the Management plan of the APA of Pouso Alto are not implemented in every municipality in the APA	High	The Pouso Alto APA has a great variety of rural landowners, from small to large ones. The activities to be implemented in the project (and based on the Management plan) will hardly be completely implemented in every municipality in the APA. Therefore, the project will focus on the municipality of Alto Paraíso (the only municipality whose area is completely inside the APA and where the touristic potential is best developed), but certain strategies can be focused in other municipalities. Thus, there can be a balance between strategy risk and effectiveness. In addition, during the development and execution of the project, the lessons learned from other projects and from this project will be considered to ensure effectively and replicability in other municipalities.
The rural landowners do not improve biodiversity conservation in their properties	Medium	The project will conduct activities that will raise landowners awareness (bottom-up approach) so that they recognize the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services and understand practices that reconcile biodiversity conservation with farming production. Furthermore, extension agents will be

		trained on how to assist landowners to achieve that. Incentive packages for native vegetation conservation or recovery will be negotiated with banks so that they are available to landowners. Finally, the lessons learned and examples in the pilot areas will provide proof of the economic and environmental benefits of conservation should minimize the risk of landowners not improving biodiversity conservation in the other biogeographical regions in Brazil.
Rural landowners do not give access to their properties	Low	As abovementioned, there will be several activities aimed at raising awareness among landowners, which will be executed along with organizations that have been in touch with these landowners in the pilot areas for many years, which will mitigate the risk of them not allowing access to their properties.
Low replicability, sustainability and amplification of the project	Low	There is a specific strategy in the project to systematically disseminate lessons learned so that they can be repeated and magnified in other places. In addition, once core strategies such as improvement of regulations (e.g. sustainable forest management), training of stakeholders (e.g. landowners and extension agents), and development of incentive mechanisms are implemented, they become self-sustainable.
Climate Change and extreme weather events affect negatively the project implementation, SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery, and biodiversity conservation	High	The project considers possible climate change and variations in weather into its strategies in order to make them more resilient, as well as to mitigate these effects. For instance, the selection of the species to be used in the restoration initiatives will take into account each species vulnerability to climate change. In the Pouso Alto APA, the environmental education and training programmes will pay particular attention to climate adaptation measures, including improved fire management and water resources management techniques. Further, the implementation of the project on the ground practices (such as Demonstration Units) and all awareness, training and capacity building efforts will consider practices that contribute to reducing GHG emissions, as well as increasing climate resilience through climate-smart

		agriculture and ecosystem-based adaptation. Finnaly the potential os specific regions to act as climate refugia in the context of climate change will be considered in the development of the databases of the conservation value of private lands.

A.6. Institutional Arrangement and Coordination. Describe the institutional arrangement for project implementation. Elaborate on the planned coordination with other relevant GEF-financed projects and other initiatives.

Institutional framework: project internal and external structures are shown in Appendix 10 of PRODOC. The proponents have chosen UNEP as Implementation Agency for this project. The International Institute for Sustainability (IIS) was appointed as one of the executing agencies of the project on the account of its broad experience and recognition by the scientific community in development of policies related to biodiversity conservation, ecosystem services and sustainable management practices, and because it has long-term experience with assisting decision-makers from governmental and non-governmental organizations on sustainable land management.

The MMA – through Secretariat of Biodiversity, Department of Conservation of Ecosystems (DECO) -, the other executing agency, **will be in charge of ensuring the proper execution, coordination, monitoring and assessment of the project goals.** Therefore, it will constitute the **Project Coordination Unit (PCU) which will consist of a Project Supervisor and staff, established at the municipality of Brasília. PCU will oversee the Project Management Unit (PMU).** As Executive Agency, the IIS will be responsible for the execution of every activity in the project, under supervision of the MMA, and will provide administrative, logistical, and financial support to the project. As Implementation Agency, the UNEP will be responsible for the Project supervision, follow-up and evaluation, including the supervision of intermediate and final evaluations, as well as the review and approval of regular reports (financial and technical).

A Project Steering Committee (PSC) will be created, whose chairperson will be from MMA, having seats for a representative of IIS, for two representatives of MMA, for a representative of the UNEP, and for two representatives of civil society – one of the APA of the São João River Basin / Mico Leão Dourado and other of the APA of Pouso Alto, who will meet at least once a year. The PSC can invite representatives of some relevant institutions (Section 5) to participate in the meetings. The main roles of the PSC are: to ensure the achievement of the Project goals and targets, to monitor activities, to provide strategic guidance, to supervise compliance with the regular work plan, to support inter-institutional coordination, and to ensure active participation of stakeholders and compliance with the commitments made along the project. It is also responsible for the review of evaluation reports and for the project follow-up and monitoring in the medium term and at the end of the process.

The PMU will be established in Rio de Janeiro at the IIS (Executive Agency) headquarters, as well as the entire project staff. The PMU will consist of the Project Supervisor (PS), the Senior Project Director (SPD), the three Senior Directors for Components (SDCs), the Project Management, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer (MMEO), the Communication Manager (CM), the support professional staff, and the administrative, logistical, and financial staff. The Task Manager (from UNEP) for this project will be based in Panamá and will remain in continuous communication with PMU throughout the project execution.

A senior director (SDC) will be hired to deal with the implementation of each of the Project Components. They will be responsible for the coordination, execution, and follow-up of every activity of each Component. Each Component will have a Support Team, under the supervision of the SDC, who shall execute the activities relevant for each Outcome and Component. The Project Administrative Supporter (PAS) and the Pilots Logistic Supporter (PLS) will provide support the SPD, SDCs, and the MMEO in every administrative and logistical matter associated with the project execution. Local Focal Points (LFP) will be hired to lead the implementation of pilots in the APA of São João River Basin/Mico Leão Dourado (Atlantic Forest) and in the APA of Pouso Alto (*Cerrado*). The LFPs will plan actions with the Senior Director for Component 1 and with the MMEO and supervise the implementation of work plans in the field.

The collaborator appointed as Communication Manager will support the SDCs and the SPD with respect to communication activities and dissemination strategy.

The project partners will contribute to the execution of different activities and of counterpart initiatives in the three components. Furthermore, they will provide information, technical and institutional support, and assistance to the pilots. The involvement of each partner will be formalized through agreements that will last for the five years of the Project execution.

The present project shows a connection with other projects, either GEF- or non-GEF funded.

GEF Projects

The project **'National Strategy for Conservation of Threatened Species – PROSPECIES**' (GEF Project ID9271), whose goal is to promote initiatives to reduce the threats and strengthen the conservation status of endangered species in all Brazilian biogeographical regions, has two components that will contribute to the achievement of our project's goal. The first component focus on mainstreaming threatened species conservation into sectoral policies, e.g. agriculture, which can orientate the establishment of partnerships with universities and institutions to monitor endangered species in the two pilot areas of the present project and the spatial prioritization (considering the landscape connectivity for endangered species) for forest recovery in one of them, São João APA (Component 1). The second component of PROSPECIES has an output related to the training of at least 200 enforcement agents to apply the intelligence and capacity related to tackle illegal wildlife trade and poaching. Since such trained agents can disseminate information in areas where the present project acts the second component of PROSPECIES complements the present project.

Aligned with the goal of the present project, the goal of the project **'Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Management Strategies to enhance *Caatinga*, *Pampa* and *Pantanal* Biodiversity – GEF Terrestre**' (GEF Project ID 4859) is to contribute to survival of priority endangered species, to avoid carbon emissions, and to increase forest and non-forest areas under sustainable management practices. There is a component of recovery of degraded areas in priority areas that involves formulating recovery plans and protocols to monitor such areas. The formulation process of these plans and protocols can be a valuable source of information when the present project shares biodiversity monitoring data from forestry companies into national and international targets (Component 2).

The regional project **'Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program' (GEF Project ID 9272)** aims at protecting biodiversity and implementing policies to encourage sustainable land use and native vegetation recovery. The project conducted by Brazil and focused on the Brazilian Amazon will also contribute to the present project even though the Amazon is not addressed in the latter. The integrated landscape management component of the regional project aims at encouraging the restoration of ecosystems to increase ecologic connectivity amid the protected areas and, consequently, the resilience of the services provided by ecosystems. The activities of this component will promote practices that reduce deforestation, enhance forest recovery, and generate income to farmers. Such component might give insights to conduct some activities in the São João APA (Component 1 of the present project) regarding wide-scale implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery (Outcome 1.1; refer to sub-section 3.3). The other component of the regional project focuses on strengthening the abilities of federal and state governments to develop and implement sectorial policies and financial mechanisms that aim at reducing deforestation and promoting forest recovery. The activities of this component will prioritize building capacity to monitor forest recovery and improvement of financial incentives for landowners to invest in native vegetation recovery. This component might also contribute to the biodiversity inventory and monitoring data retained by forestry companies (Outcome 2.1) and the improvement of incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in both pilot areas of the present project (Outcome 1.3; refer to sub-section 3.3).

The present project will benefit from the results of the project **'Improving Brazilian Capacity to Conserve and Use Biodiversity through Information Management and Use'** (GEF Project ID 3722), whose goal is to facilitate and integrate information on biodiversity (through the Information System on Brazilian Biodiversity - SiBBr) in decision-making. The present project intends to use a module of SiBBr to support decision-making, which will support many activities and studies in specific geographic areas related to biodiversity conservation.

Furthermore, another project that presents connection with the present project is the one titled **"Mainstreaming**

biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into NTFP [Non-Timber Forest Products] and AFS [Agroforestry Systems] production practices in multiple-use forest landscapes of high conservation value" (GEF Project ID 5091). This project, focused on the Amazon, *Caatinga,* and *Cerrado*, has a double approach. The first approach includes setting harvest limits to avoid the use of wild resources beyond sustainable limits, improving understanding about production value of NTFP and its contribution for the economy and the livelihoods and strengthening decision support system to add value to the production of NTFP and AFS. The second approach seeks to increase profitability of and scale up incentives for NTFP and AFS by disseminating information on production levels to access different markets and improving quality of such products and access to funding.

Finally, there is a potential convergence between the present project and the project **'Sustainable, Accessible and Innovative Use of Biodiversity Resources and Associated Traditional Knowledge in Promising Phytotherapic Value Chains in Brazil'** (GEF Project ID 9449). The present project, if applicable to some local community in its pilot areas, can benefit from the GEF Project ID 9449 with respect to strengthening phytotherapic value chains (originated from the use of either preserved or restored native vegetation) within local productive arrangements[10]. This action would contribute to the Outcome 1.3 - SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery in private areas are developed and improved through incentive schemes (refer to sub-section 3.3).

Other projects

The present project also has synergies with several non-GEF projects. One of them is the project **'Biodiversity and Climate Change in the Atlantic Forest'.** This project is coordinate by MMA and funded by the Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety (BMUB) of Germany, with technical support from the *Deutsche Gesellschaftfür Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH* and financial support from the KFW (German development bank), in the scope of the International Climate Initiative (IKI)[11]. The project aims to promote biodiversity conservation and vegetation recovery in some mosaics of protected areas in the Atlantic Forestto contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation. In the first component of such project there are activities such as prioritization of areas for conservation and recovery of biodiversity than can enlighten the spatial prioritization for forest recovery in the Atlantic Forest's pilot area of the present project (Outcome 1.1; refer to sub-section 3.3). It also supports the landowner's inscription on CAR and their validation by states, which might give insights to support the use of CAR in the São João APA (Outcome 1.1; refer to sub-section 3.3). The second component focus on increasing the availability of financial resources for the recovery of native vegetation in large scale, which relates to the improvement of incentive schemes for SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery in private areas (Outcome 1.3; refer to sub-section 3.3).

The Project **'Biodiversity Conservation through ecosystem services integration in public policies and in business activity' (TEEB Regional-Local)** aims at integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services in decision-making processes by public stakeholders and companies. One of the activities conducted in this project is to give incentives to landowners from the Federal District (within biogeographical region of Cerrado) that adhere to PRA and whose properties are in compliance with LPVN. The development process of an incentive scheme for conservation in the Pouso Alto APA (Outcome 1.2; refer to sub-section 3.3) can learn from such experience.

The Project **'TEEB Regional-Local'** aims to integrate biodiversity and ecosystem services in decision-making processes by public stakeholders and companies in the Federal District (within biogeographical region of Cerrado). Among the activities conducted, it promotes awards for environmental services originated at rural properties adherents to the Environmental Regularization Program (PRA) that have at least 20% of its area covered by native vegetation, and that do not have consolidated rural area affecting PPA or LR. This will happen with the establishment of specific rules targeting two benefits: preferred participation of these environmental services providers in the Agricultural Production Acquisition Program, with product sales at prices up to 30% higher than the reference prices, and in the

[10] Local productive arrangements are clusters of businesses located in the same territory, which present a profile of productive specialization and maintain joint linkages, interaction, cooperation and learning from each other and with other stakeholders, as a means of promoting local development.

[11]https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/projects/projects/details/biodiversity-and-climate-protection-in-the-mata-atlantica-363/?no_cache=1?b=4,4,30,0,1,0&kw=.

sales of products to the National School Feeding Program with product sales at prices up to 20% higher than the reference prices, and individual sales limit up to 50% higher than the other producers.

The "**TFCA – Tropical Forest Conservation Act",** established in 1998 by the Department of Treasury of United States of America, has appropriated over $95 million in Congressional funding via grants and debt-for-nature agreements for twelve developing countries, mostly in Latin American and the Caribbean. While the majority of TFCA money are transformed into debt-swaps for protection of tropical forests, a substantial portion — over $18 million — has been converted into bilateral "Tropical Forest Conservation Funds" to support grants for sustainable management of tropical forests. In Brazil TFCA is focused on the biogeographical regions of the Caatinga, Cerrado, and Atlantic Forest. One of the actions of such initiative is intrinsically related to the present project because as it promotes the CAR in Pouso Alto APA, directly supporting refinement and implementation of its management plan (Outcome 1.2) and improve incentive schemes for SLM, SFM and native vegetation recovery in private areas in the Cerrado's pilot area (Pouso Alto APA) (Outcome 1.3).

Component 1 will be benefited by ongoing projects that are focusing on the increased capacity of federal, state and local institutions to implement the LPVN, particularly focusing on the implementation of the CAR, as well as the development of the PRA. The first project, entitled "Land and environmental management (Cadastro Ambiental Rural)" is developed by GIZ and funded by BMZ, and executed by the Brazilian Forest Sector (SFB). The second, "Rural Environmental Registry in the Amazon", is funded by BMZ and implemented by KfW, with partnership with the Brazilian government. Although both are focused in the Amazon biogeographic region, and developed specifically in the São João APA, where the training programs will be developed and to the implementation of legally binding arrangements (PRA) will be made, the experiences from these projects can contribute to a better implementation of Component 1 (Output 1.1) of this project.Finally, both Outcomes 1.2 and 1.3 of the present project will benefit from the project **"CAR-FIP in the Cerrado"**, included in the projects of the Brazilian Investments Plan, funded by the Brazilian Government in the scope of FIP (Forest Investment Program), linked to the Climate Investment Fund. Currently developed by the MMA in partnership with state environmental agencies, it aims at supporting implementation of CAR in the Cerrado as a strategy to promote the reduction of native vegetation conversion and degradation, and the improvement of forest sustainable management so that CO2 emissions are reduced, and forest carbon stocks are protected.

The proposed project will coordinate its efforts with all of the abovementioned initiatives in different levels and through different strategies. The project will have a coordination and communication strategy which will include activities for project coordination with other initiatives. The first coordination activity was already developed at the PPG, during which several stakeholders responsible for those projects participated in the project conception. In the project inception phase, a workshop with project managers from the related projects will be held in order to maximize synergies and minimize overlaps between the projects. In this meeting an inter-project coordination strategy will be developed. This and other projects will be in constant communication through the Project Coordination Unit (PCU), and in practical terms through meetings between the coordination and management teams. Further, the project will have a protocol to establish regular meetings for project development communication to partners. Finally, according to the project communication strategy, several documents will be released with project news and results. These will all be disseminated to partners and other institutions.

Additional Information not well elaborated at PIF Stage: NA.

A.7 *Benefits.* Describe the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the project at the national and local levels. How do these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of global environment benefits (GEF Trust Fund) or adaptation benefits (LDCF/SCCF)?

The project will create mechanisms to enable diversification of production and maintenance of income, conciliating sustainable farming and compliance with national environmental laws. Specifically, environmental education and capacity building can help to increase landowner knowledge on the importance of biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services provision. This approach will be performed in all components of the project and will have impact on both environmental and socioeconomic spheres. This is so because by increasing the landowners'

knowledge on integrated landscape and property management, sustainable farming will be conciliated with native vegetation recovery. Thus, on one hand, these landowners will follow the LPVN (avoiding monetary penalties, market access restrictions, and more expensive credit schemes, for example) and conserve biodiversity in these areas. On the other hand, these rural producers will be implementing activities (good agricultural practices, timber production) that may contribute to the diversification of production and reduction of its risks. The ultimate result of these actions will be observed in a long term, when farmers will comply with the LPNV, biodiversity will not be lost, and production will be maintained with increased profits for farmers. Increased ecotourism in rural lands might also lead to increased revenues, improved credit access for restoration, and, consequently, reduced costs for farmers to comply with legislation.

Conciliating socioeconomic development and environmental conservation will also be met at other levels: i) sector level - Forestry Sector Companies and ii) national level through the improvement of environmental national legislations. In the first case, the main benefits will be to include the efforts of the forestry sector on biodiversity monitoring into national reports regarding CBD commitments. Areas of high value for conservation will be identified and monitored in an effective manner, thus providing information on the role of such areas for biodiversity conservation and, consequently, supporting spatial prioritization for biodiversity conservation. From a socioeconomic point of view, forestry companies may benefit as their efforts on biodiversity monitoring will be more visible than before. Regarding changes in the national level legislation on sustainable native vegetation management in LRs, these may bring large-scale socioenvironmental benefits as it will enable landowners to sustainably manage the forest rather than cut them. Thus, less native vegetation area will be deforested and degraded, and more landowners will be able to develop extractive activities, diversifying their production.

Therefore, this project will provide both environmental and socioeconomic benefits at several scales: i) property scale, as its integrated management will result in compliance with the LPVN and production diversification, with easy access to incentive for doing so; ii) sectorial scale, as many of the stakeholders involved with the forestry sector will benefit from contributing to the national targets regarding CBD commitments; iii) national scale, by the improvement of activities related to native vegetation management and production diversification in LRs. Finally, one important benefit of this project will be to disclosure the role of private areas for biodiversity conservation, so the abovementioned activities can be further developed in these properties according to its conservation importance.

A.8 *Knowledge Management.* Elaborate on the knowledge management approach for the project, including, if any, plans for the project to learn from other relevant projects and initiatives (e.g. participate in trainings, conferences, stakeholder exchanges, virtual networks, project twinning) and plans for the project to assess and document in a user-friendly form (e.g. lessons learned briefs, engaging websites, guidebooks based on experience) and share these experiences and expertise (e.g. participate in community of practices, organize seminars, trainings and conferences) with relevant stakeholders.

This project aims to raise society awareness on the importance of conservation value of private areas, as well as to increase coordination and collaboration among institutions. Therefore, several knowledge management strategies as well as different forms of disseminating lessons learned from the project and from other projects have been developed. The collaboration and engagement of the stakeholders mapped in preparation of the project - landowners, extension agents, federal, state, and municipal agents, civil society, community leaders, research institutions – are vital to achieve the project outcomes. Actions aimed at raising awareness, disseminating information, networking, promoting participation of stakeholders and training based on learning and social capital[12] were encouraged. For instance, the project activities were developed together with actors involved in other projects and initiatives (GEF Projects IDs 9271 and 4859). Also, in the first half of the project we will learn from other institutions and projects around the world that address similar topics, when workshops and meetings to share experience and learned lessons will take place. Throughout the project, we also aim at learning from other projects and initiatives, particularly from local institutions and landowners in the pilot areas, through workshops and other meetings. Knowledge exchange is a pivotal part of this

[12] The references of Social Learning fall into collaborative socioenvironmental educational practices. Social capital refers to characteristics of social organization such as networks, trust, norms and systems that contribute to increase efficiency, coordination and cooperation for mutual benefits (Putnam 1996).

project, so we will develop activities that fit to the local context. Thus, these workshops and meetings can enable the project to learn from previous experiences and implement innovative and more efficient initiatives.

The project also relies strongly on activities focused on raising awareness and disseminating lessons learned. Communication in the project will be tailored to each target-audience. Some examples of dissemination and knowledge exchange activities are:

Component 1 – implementation of Demonstrative Units, training of extension agents and landowners, implementation of the Environmental Education Program, and creation of conservation networks. *Approach and communication strategies*: Several media items (brochures, publications, scientific papers) will be made available to raise awareness and guide environmental agents, rural landowners and general community about the ongoing actions and outcomes achieved in the pilot areas (Atlantic Forest and Cerrado). The extension agents training course will be divided in modules with textbooks for theoretical classes and constant visits to the Demonstrative Units for practical classes. To scale up the training, the project will produce manuals and video-lessons that will assist trained technicians to spread learned knowledge to other technicians in the region. Landowners engaged will become tutors and contribute to project and practices dissemination. The Environmental Education Program will use integrated dynamics and a participatory planning so that stakeholders recognize the value of local biodiversity and ecosystem services. The large-scale replication of pilot actions will happen through the visit of state public agents to pilot areas. The lessons learned in the pilots, disseminated through publications and brochures, will help states and municipalities in each biogeographic region to improve ongoing plans and programs by reconciling biodiversity conservation and farming. Specific publications (scientific papers) will also be produced.

Component 2 – Synthesis of current biodiversity inventory and monitoring data, and conservation strategies, the agreement with Forestry Sector companies for establishing a scheme for sharing these data and its incorporation into national reports in the scope of CBD; map on restoration prioritization, approach and communication strategies. A dissemination program will be created for this component including workshops and meetings involving forestry companies and governmental environmental bodies to improve and standardize biodiversity monitoring protocols aligning expectations regarding the features of monitored data and of companies monitoring capacity.

Component 3 – Proposal of an improved sustainable native vegetation management regulation applied to LRs, development of spatial databases on conservation value to be added in the SiCAR and other public policies, training of federal and state agents to use the spatial databases, and replication of project actions in other biogeographic regions. Approach and communication strategies: communication media, such as brochures and publications, focused on the community, environmental agents and rural landowners, will be produced to spread actions and outcomes achieved in the project. An international engagement program will also be part of this component, both to learn and provide lessons on the incorporation of conservation in private lands into public policies.

Throughout the project, there will be events with several key-actors to maintain the alignment of actions with outcomes and stakeholder's expectations. At the end of the project, every achieved outcome will be presented in a closing event where key stakeholder involved in the different stages and fronts of the project will be invited to participate and contribute with their impressions and evaluations. Communication and dissemination material will be produced according to the need of each target-audience considering gender issues, as well as any approach with key-actors of this project. Seeking to validate the project and boost replicability of actions, the project will also have a press office, which will be in constant contact with other professionals of mass media. This office will have a key-role in spreading the outcomes to the community and reinforcing the importance to value biodiversity conservation in private areas. This initiative complements the effort of the MMA to ensure transparency of programs under development on the subject and contributes to compliance of the country with CBD and UNFCCC commitments.

B. DESCRIPTION OF THE CONSISTENCY OF THE PROJECT WITH:

B.1 *Consistency with National Priorities.* Describe the consistency of the project with national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions such as NAPAs, NAPs, ASGM NAPs, MIAs, NBSAPs, NCs, TNAs, NCSAs, NIPs, PRSPs, NPFE, BURs, INDCs, etc.:

The project is consistent with national strategies, plans, and policies aimed at conservation, sustainable use, and restoration of biodiversity.By implementing SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA (KBA area in the State of Rio de Janeiro; Outcome 1.1), the project aligns to Proveg, LPVN, Bonn Challenge, Initiative 20x20, NBSAP, and NDC. Furthermore, it is consistent with ABC Plan in the context of pasture recovery, adoption of integrated crops-livestock-forestry and of agroforestry systems, no-till farming, biological nitrogen fixation, reforestation, and waste treatment. Further, all of the activities are aligned and complement the Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Deforestation and Fires in the Cerrado (PPCerrado), as this initiative aims at reducing deforestation in this biogeographic region and its consequent GHG emissions through monitoring, landscape planning and development of sustainable management. Finally, it contributes to achieve the National Biodiversity Target 7 ("by 2020 the incorporation of sustainable management practices is disseminated and promoted in agriculture, livestock production, aquaculture, silviculture, extractive activities, and forest and fauna management, ensuring conservation of biodiversity"), Target 8 ("by 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity"), Target 14 ("by 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, traditional peoples and communities, indigenous peoples and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable"), and Target 15 ("by 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced through conservation and restoration actions, including restoration of at least 15% of degraded ecosystems, prioritizing the most degraded biomes, hydrographic regions and ecoregions, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combatting desertification").

The activities focused on the implementation of conservation actions of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan in private areas (Outcome 1.2), such as environmental education, creation of RPPNs, and partnerships with universities and institutions to monitor endangered species, are in line with the National Environment Policy, given its principles (protection of areas under risk of degradation, environmental education), objectives (circulation of environmental information and raise of awareness on the need to preserve environmental quality and ecological balance), and instruments (protected areas, national information system on the environment, and economic instruments); the Pro-Species Program; the SiBBr; and the NBSAP. These activities also contribute to achieve the National Biodiversity Target 1 ("by 2020, at the latest, Brazilian people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably"), **Target 11** ("by 2020, at least 30% of the Amazon, 17% of each of the other terrestrial biomes, and 10% of the marine and coastal areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through protected areas foreseen under the SNUC Law and other categories of officially protected areas such as PPAs, LRs, and indigenous reserves with native vegetation, ensuring and respecting the demarcation, regularization, and effective and equitable management, so as to ensure ecological interconnection, integration and representation in broader landscapes and seascapes"), **Target 12** ("by 2020, the risk of extinction of threatened species has been significantly reduced, tending to zero, and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved"), and **Target 19** ("by 2020, the science base and technologies necessary for enhancing knowledge on biodiversity, its values, functioning and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved and shared, and the sustainable use of biodiversity, as well as the generation of biodiversity-based technology and innovation are supported, duly transferred and applied; by 2017, the complete compilation of existing records on aquatic and terrestrial fauna, flora and microbiota is finalized and made available through permanent and open access databases, with specificities safeguarded, with a view to identify knowledge gaps related to biogeographic regions and taxonomic groups").

The development and improvement of incentives schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas (Outcome 1.3) is consistent with **NBSAP, NDC, Bonn Challenge, LPVN, National Environment Policy (economic instruments), and Proveg** as it promotes compliance of rural properties with environmental legislation and aims at spatial prioritization of areas with conservation or recovery potential and at identification of a package of

economic incentives for the conservation of such areas. Further, it complements and is aligned to the ENREDD+, as it will contribute with incentives for deforestation reduction, improved sustainable management, and forest recovery. Such incentive schemes support the **National Biodiversity Target 3** ("by 2020, at the latest, incentives harmful to biodiversity, including the so called perverse subsidies, are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize negative impacts; positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the CBD, taking into account national and regional socioeconomic conditions").

The incorporation of biodiversity inventory and monitoring data in private areas from the Forestry sector companies into national reports in the scope of CBD (Outcome 2.1) is aligned with SiBBr, the **National Biodiversity Targets 7 and 19**, and the objectives (environmental data circulation) and instruments (national environmental information system) of the **National Environment Policy**.

Wide spreading and advocating the Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas to key stakeholders (Outcome 3.1) enhance the sustainable management of Legal Reserves and other forests, of public or private domain, foreseen in the **LPVN**, contributing to the **National Biodiversity Target 7**.

The consideration of biodiversity value in the governmental management tools related to the application of the **LPVN** and other policies (Outcome 3.2) boosts the compliance with such law by enhancing the implementation of **SiCAR and PRAs.** It also contributes to the achievement of the **National Biodiversity Target 2** ("by 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values, geo-diversity values, and socio-diversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction and inequality reduction strategies, and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and into planning procedures and reporting systems").

C. DESCRIBE THE BUDGETED M &E PLAN:

The project will follow UN Environment standard monitoring, reporting and evaluation processes and procedures. Substantive and financial project reporting requirements are summarized in Appendix 8 of the project. Reporting requirements and templates are an integral part of the UN Environment legal instrument to be signed by the executing agency and UN Environment.

The project M&E plan is consistent with the GEF Monitoring and Evaluation policy. The Project Results Framework presented in Annex A includes SMART indicators for each expected outcome. These indicators along with the key deliverables and benchmarks included in Appendix 6 of PRODOC will be the main tools for assessing project implementation progress and whether project expected results are being achieved. The means of verification of these elements are summarized in the Project Results Framework.

A costed first draft of project M&E Plan is presented in Appendix 7 of PRODOC. Costs mentioned in this tool are fully integrated in the project budget, presented in Appendix 1 of PRODOC.

An inception workshop will be held at the onset of project implementation to ensure all actors understand their roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis project monitoring and evaluation. Project coordination and supervision will be the responsibility of the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and day-to-day project execution will be the responsibility of the Project Management Unit - PMU. It is the responsibility of the Senior Project Director - SPD to inform UN Environment of any delays or difficulties faced during project implementation so that the appropriate support or corrective measures can be adopted in a timely fashion.

The Project Steering Committee - PSC will issue reports every year on progress by the project and make recommendations concerning the need to revise any aspects of the Project Results Framework, or the M&E plan. Supervision to ensure that the project meets UN Environment and GEF policies and procedures is the responsibility to the UNEP-GEF Task Manager. The Task Manager will also review the quality of draft project outputs, provide feedback to the project partners, and establish peer review procedures to ensure adequate quality of project outputs in close collaboration with the PMU.

The Task Manager will develop an initial supervision plan that will be communicated to the project partners during the inception workshop for comments. The emphasis of the Task Manager supervision will be on outcome monitoring but without neglecting project financial management and implementation monitoring. Progress vis-à-vis delivering the agreed project global environmental benefits will be assessed by the PSC. Project risks and assumptions will be regularly monitored both by project partners and UN Environment. Risk assessment and rating is an integral part of the Project Implementation Review (PIR). The quality of project monitoring and evaluation will also be reviewed and rated as part of the PIR. Key financial parameters will be monitored quarterly to ensure cost-effective use of financial resources.

UN Environment will be responsible for managing the mid-term review/evaluation and the terminal evaluation. The Project Supervisor, the SPD, and partners will participate actively in the process. The project will be reviewed or evaluated at mid-term. The purpose of the Mid-Term Review (MTR) or Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE) is to provide an independent assessment of project performance at mid-term, to analyse whether the project is on track, what problems and challenges the project is encountering, and which corrective actions are required so that the project can achieve its intended outcomes by project completion in the most efficient and sustainable way.

The PSC will participate in the MTR or MTE and develop a management response to the evaluation recommendations along with an implementation plan. It is the responsibility of the UN Environment Task Manager to monitor whether the agreed recommendations are being implemented. An MTR is managed by the UN Environment Task Manager. An MTE is managed by the Evaluation Office (EO) of UN Environment. The EO will determine whether an MTE is required or an MTR is sufficient.

An independent terminal evaluation (TE) will take place at the end of project implementation. The EO will be responsible for the TE and liaise with the UN Environment Task Manager throughout the process. The TE will provide an independent assessment of project performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of impact and sustainability. It will have two primary purposes:

i. to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
ii. to promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UN Environment and executing partners.

While a TE should review use of project funds against budget, it would be the role of a financial audit to assess probity (i.e. correctness, integrity etc.) of expenditure and transactions.

The TE report will be sent to project stakeholders for comments. Formal comments on the report will be shared by the EO in an open and transparent manner. The project performance will be assessed against standard evaluation criteria using a six-point rating scale. The final determination of project ratings will be made by the EO when the report is finalized. The evaluation report will be publicly disclosed and will be followed by a recommendation compliance process. The direct costs of reviews and evaluations will be charged against the project evaluation budget.

PART III: CERTIFICATION BY GEF PARTNER AGENCY(IES)

A. GEF Agency(ies) certification

This request has been prepared in accordance with GEF policies[13] and procedures and meets the GEF criteria for CEO endorsement under GEF-6.

Agency Coordinator, Agency Name	Signature	Date (MM/dd/yyyy)	Project Contact Person	Telephone	Email Address
Kelly West Senior Programme Manager & Global Environment Facility Coordinator Corporate Services Division UN Environment		January 26, 2018	Robert Erath Task Manager UN Environment /GEF Programme Officer	+507 305 3171	robert.erath@un.org

[13] GEF policies encompass all managed trust funds, namely: GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF and CBIT

ANNEX A: PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK (either copy and paste here the framework from the Agency document, or provide reference to the page in the project document where the framework could be found).

Please refer to Appendix 4 of the UN Environment 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 Comments from Council

GERMANY:

Germany agrees with the proposal. The PIF addresses a crucial question of combating deforestation and biodiversity loss in the non-Amazonian regions in Brazil through fostering the framework conditions for the monitoring of native vegetation in private rural lands. The project aims at supporting the implementation of the forest code that is of paramount importance for the achievement of the Aichi Targets in Brazil. However, Germany sees some major conceptual concerns regarding the involvement of key actors, the design of a multi-level strategy as well as regarding the definition of the ecosystem services component, among others.

Suggestions for improvements to be made during the drafting of the final project proposal:

Comment: With relation to stakeholder involvement

• Germany suggests that in order to achieve a greater local empowerment through a bottom-up approach in Part II – 2 additional national public policy institutions such as the Brazilian Forestry Agency (SFB), who is responsible for the implementation of the Brazilian Forest Code, and the Environmental Organizations of the Brazilian States (Environment Secretariats and their implementing agencies) should be included in the project implementation.

Response: We agree that these two mentioned stakeholders are extremely important for the development and implementation of the project and to the outcomes achievement, particularly to achieve greater local empowerment through a bottom-up approach, as stated. We made sure that these two suggestions were included (both the Brazilian Forest Service (SFB), and the Environmental Organizations of the Brazilian States (OEMAS).

Regarding the **SFB**, we included this institution in the PRODOC under section 2.5 (*Stakeholder mapping and analysis)*, Table 2 (*Stakeholders/Institutions, sector, role and project participation functions*). We have further detailed what the SFB role in the project will be and its contributions to achieve the project outcomes, as stated above.

Stakeholder, Sector and Role: Public sector. Linked to the MMA, it promotes knowledge, sustainable use and expansion of native cover (particularly forests), making this agenda strategic for the country's economy. The SFB manages the SiCAR, supports the implementation of the Rural Environmental Registry and of the Environmental Regularization Programs in the states, and manages the issuing of the Environmental Reserve Certificates.

Participation in the Project: Federal governmental Institution. They are responsible for the Rural Environmental Registry (CAR) and its online System (SiCAR), in addition to acting in the forest management area. Therefore, it will be a vital partner to the project. They will provide training to those hired by the project to validate the CAR and initiate the Environmental Regularization Programs with the landowners at the São João APA. They will create a module within SiCAR where a spatial database on biodiversity value in private areas will be added. They will assist in the stakeholders training on the use of this spatial database in SiCAR. Furthermore, they will also assist to expedite/improve the procedure to approve sustainable forest management in areas of existing or recovering LR (e.g.

bottleneck diagnosis, identification of possible solutions, formulation of the regulation proposal and advocacy). They will potentially assist in the development/implementation of mechanisms to value biodiversity/native forests in private areas. For example, using spatial database on biodiversity value in private areas to negotiate the CRAs. It will participate in the components 1 and 3 of the project.

Regarding the **OEMAS**, briefly stated their participation in the PIF (section 2 – Stakeholders). In the PRODOC we have included more details on the role of different state and municipal institutions, particularly those related to our pilot areas (in the States of Rio de Janeiro and Goiás). Examples are:

*The **Rio de Janeiro State Environmental Institute (INEA),** Public sector. Governmental State institution that aims to protect, conserve and recover the environmental heritage of the State of Rio de Janeiro through an agenda of sustainable development.; **Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock of Rio de Janeiro State- Rio Rural Programme** Public sector. This state program aims at funding the sustainable rural development in micro-watersheds in the state of Rio de Janeiro; **Technical Assistance and Rural Extension – EMATER.** Public sector. It is responsible for technical assistance and rural extension in the State of Rio de Janeiro. **Agricultural Research Corporation of Rio de Janeiro State (PESAGRO)**, Public sector. It enables technological solutions and funds public policies for rural development in the State of Rio de Janeiro; **Consulting board of Pouso Alto APA,** Public sector. Created by the Decree (No. 5.419, from 05/07/01), it is formed by members from federal, state and municipal governmental bodies and entities and by the civil society. Its goal is to promote the sustainable development and preserve the flora, fauna, springs, geology and landscaping in the region of Pouso Alto, located at Chapada dos Veadeiros; **Secretariat for the Environment, Water Resources, Infrastructure, Cities and Metropolitan Affairs (Secima / MARH) of the State of Goiás,** Public sector. State secretariat responsible for environmental issues in the state of Goiás; **Municipal Governments of Pouso Alto APA** Public sector. Municipal management, including the agenda of biodiversity conservation; **Environment Secretariat of Silva Jardim**, Public sector. Municipal institution that aims at protecting, conserving and recovering the environmental heritage of the Municipality of Silva Jardim.*

More details on the role of each institution can be found on under section 2.5 (*Stakeholder mapping and analysis)*, Table 2 (*Stakeholders/Institutions, sector, role and project participation functions*).

Comment:

• Furthermore the proposal would benefit from a closer cooperation with national networks such as Observatório do Código Florestal and with rural extension agencies at federal level (ANATER) or at regional level, especially for mainstreaming capacity building efforts.

Response: Thank you for the suggestion on these groups and institutions. We hadn't added the Observatório do Código Florestal initially, but we do agree that it is fundamental that we participate in their discussions. Thus, we have added it to our list of stakeholders, under section 2.5 (*Stakeholder mapping and analysis)*, Table 2 (*Stakeholders/Institutions, sector, role and project participation functions*). Details are specified below:

Observatório do Código Florestal (Forest Code Observatory). *Network of several civil society institutions aims at monitoring the implementation of the LPVN (Forest Code) in Brazil. The group is involved in several discussions related to the LPVN implementation, create databases, develop research and group discussions in order to assure a more transparent and effective implementation of the Law. A collaboration with the group will support the project by contributing to up-to-date information on the LPVN implementation. Also, it will contribute to the correct implementation of the CAR and its validation, reducing any risks it might have. It will participate in component 1 of the project.*

National Agency for rural extension (ANATER). *Private Sector. Promotes, incentivizes and stimulate the implementation of rural extension projects focusing on best practices, considering innovative and effective instruments. The Agency was created in order to recognize the importance of technical extension assistance to rural landowners, and develop several projects for the implementation of sound and innovative instruments for the improvement of rural techniques that are beneficial to the environment. ANATER can contribute for the pilot area of Rio de Janeiro State, particularly for the implementation of Demonstration Units, as well as in the development of the Training course. It will participate in Component 1 of the project.* The same was made regarding ANATER. Both of these institutions will be contacted, and a close cooperation will be proposed during the project inception phase.

Other state level rural extension agencies were included in the PRODOC under section 2.5 (*Stakeholder mapping and analysis)*, Table 2 (*Stakeholders/Institutions, sector, role and project participation functions*), such as: ***Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock of Rio de Janeiro State- Rio Rural Programme; Technical Assistance and Rural Extension – EMATER; Agricultural Research Corporation of Rio de Janeiro State (PESAGRO).***

Comment:

• The final proposal should consider how cooperation with further academic institutions beside the PUCRio can be established in order to support the implementation of all three components for example with the department of Ecology, Landscape Management and Conservation (LEPAC) from the University of São Paulo (USP), in particular the "Interface Project" which focuses on the evaluation of ecosystem services in restored forest landscapes.

Response: We agree, and we have included in the PRODOC more details on how the interactions between the project and the University can contribute to the implementation of project strategies in each of the components. We also appreciate the suggestion of including LEPAC in the Project. IIS has already a long-term history of collaboration and joint research publications with Jean Paul Metzger, the LEPAC's group coordinator. We have discussed the project with him, and will collaborate closely in the project. Partnership with several University will be of major importance in **Component 1** in three main activities:

1- During workshop development, including the ones for information exchange on biodiversity conservation experiences. *"The second activity, which will support the implementation of both pilots, is to promote workshops with national and international specialists to collect experiences on biodiversity conservation in private areas and integrated property and landscape management (2)"*. (see section 3.3, Outcome 1.1; activity 2);
2- For the development of an endangered species monitoring plan for the São João and Pouso Alto APAs, which will be made together with key research institutions, including Universities (Sub-Output 1.1.1.5). "*These institutions will be engaged in the Project (29) and the existing data on endangered species will be compiled (30). A working group will be conducted with the aim of developing the monitoring plan (31), and the plan will be implemented (32). These data will be analysed and systematized (33) to better reflect the current status of endangered species, as well as to help developing future strategies for these species persistence (34). The team of the 'National Strategy for Conservation of Threatened Species – PROSPECIES' project (GEF Project ID9271) can be one of the partners in this activity (refer to sub-section 2.7). Another relevant institution is Universidade de São Paulo, particularly the group on Landscape Management and Conservation (LEPAC), and the associated "Interface Project", which focuses on the evaluation of ecosystem services and biodiversity in fragmented ecosystems" (*see Section 3.3, Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2, activities 29-33*).*

Regarding **Component 2**, Universities will also contribute for the development of **a multicriteria restoration prioritization of Forestry Sector company areas, considering the landscape area** (which includes endangered species distribution; Sub-Output 2.1.2.1). *This map will assist in the: i) identification of the natural regeneration potential in those areas, ii) indication of priority properties for native vegetation recovery, iii) incorporation of their*

results in programs for forest recovery of companies, and iv) implementation of an integrated landscape management. The development of workshops with interested Forestry sector companies to discuss scenarios and variables to be included in the multicriteria prioritization map will be the first activity to be developed (117). Environmental and socio-economic data will be collected in order to give input information into the model (118). (See section 3.3, Component 2, Outcome 2.1).

The Partnership with Universities will also be of extreme importance in **Component 3**, Outcome 3.2 (*Conservation value of private areas mainstreamed into public policies and tools*). The development of a special database on conservation of private areas will be produced for five biogeographical regions based on data gathering from several Universities and other research institutions. "*In the context of Outcome 3.2, spatial databases on conservation value of private areas will be produced for five biogeographical regions (Sub-Outcome 3.2.1.1). To generate this spatial database, the first step will be to map, articulate, and engage key institutions and research groups within each biogeographical region (134) to create collaborative networks (research groups that study biodiversity in private areas) in each biogeographical region (135). The project will organize one workshop for each biogeographical region to gather researchers and formalize the networks (total of five workshops and five synthesis networks). Data collected from each research group (ecological, social, and economic data) will be compiled in a database and made available (136). Once the database is complete, specialists will discuss on a second round of workshops about: i) data that affect the conservation value of private areas (which data should be considered in the modelling) and ii) spatially explicit modelling methods. The analysis will result in a predictive model for conservation value in private area for each biogeographical region, which will consider the patterns presented by environmental data gathered in the field and the socioeconomic factors that most influence the conservation value*" (See Section 3.3, Component 3, Outcome 3.2).

Comment: Regarding the "associate projects"

• Germany suggests to consider closer cooperation with the following projects of German cooperation for Sustainable Development "Environmental regulation in Brazil – CAR" (funding BMZ, implemented by GIZ), "Rural Environmental registry in the Amazon" (funding BMZ, implemented by KfW), as well as "Biodiversity Conservation through the integration of Ecosystem Services into Public Policy and Business Action (TEEB RegionalLocal)" (funding BMUB, implemented by GIZ) regarding the ecosystem services dimension.

Response: We thank the GEF Council for the suggested projects. **Biodiversity Conservation through the integration of Ecosystem Services into Public Policy and Business Action (TEEB RegionalLocal)"** is considered in the PRODOC. *"The Project 'Biodiversity Conservation through ecosystem services integration in public policies and in business activity' (TEEB Regional-Local) aims at integrating biodiversity and ecosystem services in decision-making processes by public stakeholders and companies. One of the activities conducted in this project is to give incentives to landowners from the Federal District (within biogeographical region of Cerrado) that adhere to PRA and whose properties are in compliance with LPVN. The development process of an incentive scheme for conservation in the Pouso Alto APA (Outcome 1.2; refer to sub-section 3.3) can learn from such experience.* (See Section 2.7 – Linkages with other GEF and non GEF projects).
Furthermore, we have also incorporated the opportunity for developing closer cooperation with the projects "**Land and environmental management – Cadastro Ambiental Rural (CAR)",** (developed by GIZ and funded by BMZ). It is now described as follows:
Component 1 will benefit by ongoing projects that are focusing on the increased capacity of federal, state and local institutions to implement the LPVN, particularly focusing on the implementation of the CAR, as well as the development of the PRA. The first project, entitled ***"Land and environmental management (Cadastro Ambiental Rural)"*** *is developed by GIZ and funded by BMZ, and executed by the Brazilian Forest Sector (SFB). The second,* ***"Rural Environmental Registry in the Amazon"****, is funded by BMZ and implemented by KfW, with partnership with the Brazilian government. Although both are focused in the Amazon biogeographic region, and developed specifically in the São João APA, where the training programs will be developed and to the implementation of legally binding arrangements (PRA) will be made, the experiences from these projects can contribute to a better implementation of Component 1 (Output 1.1) of this project.*

Comment: With regard to "consistency with national priorities"

• Germany suggests to include clear reference to the "Action Plan for Prevention and Control of

Deforestation and Fires in the Cerrado – PPCerrado", as it is a federal operative program that includes land use planning for conservation of biodiversity, protection and sustainable use of water resources as well as actions to encourage economic activities and an environmentally sustainable maintenance of natural areas and restoration of degraded forests. In addition, regarding specifically the incentive schemes and the output 3.2.1., the National REDD- strategy "ENREDD+" that aims to contribute to climate change mitigation through the elimination of illegal logging, conservation and recovery of forest ecosystems and the development of a sustainable low carbon forest economy, generating economic, social and environmental benefits should be taken into account.

Response: We agree and thank the council for the suggestion of both initiatives. We have acknowledged the importance of these and they are reflected in the PRODOC, as follows:

"*… all of the [project] activities are aligned and complement the Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Deforestation and Fires in the Cerrado (PPCerrado), as this initiative aims at reducing deforestation in this biogeographic region and its consequent GHG emissions through monitoring, landscape planning and development of sustainable management.*" (see Section 3.6). and

"*… it [the project] complements and is aligned with the ENREDD+, as it will contribute with incentives for deforestation reduction, improved sustainable management, and forest recovery*." (Section 3.6).

Comment: With relation to components 1 and 2:

• Germany would like to emphasize that the full proposal should clarify the proposed indicator system for ecosystem services. Specifically, elaborate on how the output 2.1 will be achieved since the proposal does not define any baseline/indicators for ecosystem services provision. This should include identification of those ecosystem services and how these will be measured. According to the CBD, the indicator "Trends in the delivery of ecosystem services and equitable benefits from protected areas" is one of the additional proposed indicators for measuring the environmental regulation (e.g. CAR registration, validation of CAR, elaboration and implementation of Environmental Programs – PRA). Therefore the risks classification should be revised in two cases: The establishment of the CRA market will be time- consuming. Although the regulatory framework for the new incentive scheme is at the design stage, there is no time perspective when this market will be fully operational. Therefore Germany recommends that the risk for the implementation of the CRA market should be changed from "medium" to "high". In addition, the validation of CAR registries should be considered as "high" risk because of the importance of validation for the quality of the information from SiCAR. Without validation, no further measures can be taken in regard to the conservation of private set-aside areas.

Response: During project development the project better defined and established the indicator system, both to the project objective and to each of the Components and Outputs. Detailed information of these indicators, baselines and mid-term targets are presented in Appendix 4: Results Framework, from the PRODOC. These indicators are varied and include not only ecosystem services, but also socioeconomic, and institutional changes. Regarding ecosystem services, the project has explicit indicators for habitat availability and carbon storage and sequestration.

Specifically, for Outcome 1.1 (Previously 2.1 in the PIF), we have included the indicator: *"Area under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans"*. Currently (baseline), there are no legally binding forest recovery plans yet implemented, and the final target is that there is 4,000 hectares under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans (PRA).

In a national scenario, the project tracking tool calculates that the emission of approximately 28 million tCO2eq will be avoided due to the project implementation.

Regarding the risks, the project will no longer focus on the establishment of a CRA market. Therefore, this risk, which was previously included in the PIF, has been removed.

We agree and have changed the risk of a non-validation of the CAR to "high". Nevertheless, we made clear in the mitigation strategy that although this risk is high for the entire national territory, it will be lower at the two pilot areas, where strategies related to its validation will be developed:

"State governments are responsible for validating CAR. Although the risk of non-validation if the CAR for the entire territory is high, this risk is reduced in the São João APA, where validation is most essential for the project development. As mentioned above, in the São João APA the project will support CAR validation, so this risk is mitigated in this region. In the Pouso Alto APA TFCA project (see sub-section 2.7) is promoting CAR and, consequently, enabling validation afterwards, so that the risk of non-validation is reduced. Therefore, although the risks are high for the national territory, our mitigation strategies reduces them for the two pilot areas."

Responses to STAP review

Q1. This is an exciting project, but will benefit from much clearer analysis and conceptualization. STAP recognizes the enormous importance of innovative approaches to private sector conservation, and strongly encourages that this project be pursued because it is addressing a vital component of conservation (the private sector) that has been largely neglected, not to mention that conserving 88 million hectares of Private Set-Aside Areas is a powerful goal. However, the documentation and approach to this project is unwieldy and needs to be clarified in several important aspects.

Response: *Thank you. We clarified and improved all issues raised by STAP in the Project Document. Below, we answer them point-by-point. During the PPG, we had the opportunity to review the threats and root causes analysis and establish a more detailed logic of intervention, especially through the formulation of the Theory of Change.*

Q2. The central assumption of the document seems to be that more centralized monitoring, regulation and enforcement is necessary. STAP is skeptical that this will work without far greater consideration of stakeholder processes, landholder rights, empowerment, engagement and incentives. Therefore STAP requests that the proposers give serious consideration to flipping the project logic, and using field level implementation of the three pilot projects to define and drive demand for other requirements, rather than taking regulation and central monitoring as the starting point. This implies a much more learning/adaptive approach than the somewhat blueprint/top down approach envisaged.

Response: *We agree and adjusted the project logic accordingly. Indeed, top-down imposed actions and regulations have often led to opposition of society, to non-involvement of landowners in restoration programs, to hostility against the government and even against natural resources (Chomitz et al. 2006)[14]. Thus, stakeholders´ perception, motivations, barriers, bottlenecks, and strategies to increase conservation value of private areas will be assessed through an on-the-ground participatory approach. For example, the activities in both pilot areas were redesigned within a bottom-up*

[14] Chomitz K.M., Fonseca G.A.B., Alger K., Stoms D.M., Honzák M., Landau E.C., Thomas T.S., Thomas W.W. & Davis F. 2006. Viabl Reserve Networks Arise from Individual Landholder Responses to Conservation Incentives. Ecology and Society. 11: 40.

approach to include different types of local stakeholders, and the demands identified during the project development (workshops in pilot areas) guide the design of the project (more detailed information below). The activities in both pilot areas (Component 1) and in the areas covered by the agreement to be signed with the Forestry Sector companies (Component 2) will directly support the improvement of public capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas at national scale (Component 3).

Clarification. *Since PIF our intention has been to implement two pilot areas - not three. The first will be developed in the São João APA, in the Atlantic Forest biogeographical region, and the second will be in the Pouso Alto APA, in the Cerrado biogeographical region. As stated in the Table 2 of the CEO Endorsement request, during PPG, the agreement with Forestry sector companies is not a pilot area (i.e. the area covered by the sectorial agreement is not considered as a third pilot area). To clarify it, we have placed the Agreement with Forestry sector companies to the Component 2 and the implementation of the two pilot areas to the Component 1.*

Q3. In either scenario, STAP recommends that the Project Description Summary includes very clear indicators of what success looks like. For example, what is a governance and coordination strategy, and what exactly will it achieve? While STAP finds this project potentially very innovative, the approach to mainstreaming is not sufficiently based on scientific/technical evidence to be confident that the approach is workable.

Response: *We have followed the STAP recommendations and thoroughly developed the project indicators and the Theory of Change through an adaptive approach to maximise project success. In this process we were provided with a guidance of specialists that have experience with such topic. We present below examples of the project and outcome indicators which are in the PRODOC's appendix 4:*

Project Indicators:

a) Area under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans (PRA); b) Area under refined and implemented management plan that supports SLM; c) Percentage increase in habitat availability for the endangered species population of Golden Lion Tamarin; d) Number of public policies incorporating spatial databases on conservation value of private areas.

Component 1:

Area under restoration as per legally binding forest recovery plans; Habitat availability for key endangered species population of Golden Lion Tamarin; Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, community associations) trained regarding implementation of conservation actions in private areas; Area under refined and implemented management plan that supports SLM; Number of endangered species with improved monitoring; Endangered species monitoring incorporated into endangered species national Action Plans; Number of stakeholders (e.g. landowners, extension agents, private sector, community associations) trained regarding incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas; Number of incentive schemes for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas developed/improved.

Component 2:

Area occupied by the companies that signed the agreement for improving and implementing protocols for biodiversity monitoring, SLM and SFM; Percentage area of high value for conservation where biodiversity monitoring, SLM and

SFM protocol are implemented; Percentage of partner forestry companies' areas under restoration that consider the spatial prioritisation developed by the project.

Component 3:

Number of engaged stakeholders to point bottlenecks and solutions regarding sustainable native vegetation management in LRs; Number of spatial databases on conservation value of private areas for biogeographical regions integrated into the SiCAR; Number of public policies incorporating spatial databases on conservation value of private areas; Number of federal and state public sector and third sector key stakeholders trained and engaged to apply the conservation value of private areas database.

We also clarified the issue of governance and coordination not only in the root causes analysis (refer to PRODOC's Sub-Section 2.3) but also in the intervention strategy (refer to PRODOC's Sub-Sections 3.1, 3.3, and 3.4). One of the main contributing factors that drive unsustainable farming and unsustainable native vegetation management (two of the three main threats to our conservation target, landscapes with value for biodiversity-habitat, processes and species) is low institutional capacity and inadequate governance. It can occur in different scales, from federal to municipal spheres. The lack of connection among public initiatives hinders strategy sharing, which makes them less synergetic and effective. This keeps projects isolated in their fields of knowledge and coverage. Decision-makers lack understanding regarding how landowners react to the adoption of environmental laws. Low institutional capacity and inadequate governance leads to a series of other contributing factors of the abovementioned threats: insufficient technical assistance and rural extension focused on environmental-friendly techniques, which, in turn, drives to poor knowledge of landowners regarding these techniques; lack of complementarity and clarity among federal and state legislations, which is one of the causes of insufficient economic incentives for the conservation of biodiversity and provision of ecosystem services in private areas and of lack of environmentally sound regulation for native management in private areas; insufficient monitoring and enforcement, which leads to low compliance with environmental legislation in force; and lack of integrated landscape planning (see PRODOC's Figure 4).

Since these contributing factors that derive from low institutional capacity and inadequate governance – and not the low institutional capacity and inadequate governance itself – were identified as key intervention points (the contributing factors selected for project intervention) and the strategies to address such key intervention points relate to outcomes and outputs of the three components of the project (refer to PRODOC's Figure 6 and Appendix 5), the PIF's governance and coordination strategy (Output 1.1.1) was dispersed across all Components. For instance, it is now linked to the programme for implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA (Output 1.1.1) through the engagement and awareness program to landowners regarding technical and financial aspects of best practices for SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery with a principal focus on LPVN compliance (Sub-Output 1.1.1.1), the training program to local extension agents focused on the implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery (Sub-Output 1.1.1.3), the set of legally binding commitments to native vegetation recovery (PRA) considering landscape connectivity signed by landowners towards compliance with LPVN (Sub-Output 1.1.1.4), and the dissemination program for lessons learned and replicability of activities implemented in the São João APA (Sub-Output 1.1.1.6). It is also linked to the spatial database related to the prioritization for restoration in forestry sector companies' areas (Output 2.1.2), through the dissemination program and lessons learned from the agreement and conservation actions developed with Forestry sector companies (Sub-Output 2.1.2.2). In the Component 3, it's related to the Sustainable Native Vegetation Management Regulation proposal to support SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas (Output 3.1).

Q4. Specifically, STAP recommends that: GEBs [Global Environmental Benefits] are included in the Project Document in the form of biodiversity baselines and targets (areas to be considered, how the "quality' of this conservation will be measured, etc.). STAP specifically recommends that measurable baselines and indicators are provided for: six globally threatened species on the 150,700 ha Sao Joao Basin site, 45 globally threatened species in the 850,000 ha site Cerrado Global hotspot, improved provision of ecosystem services on 1 million hectares in these sites, including what exactly this means and how it will be measured, institutional outcomes of the mainstreaming process, including landholder buy-in, socio-economic indicators that will be affected by regulatory approaches.

Response: *We have included specific targets for conservation and specific Outputs for monitoring threatened species. These are related to aspects that might experience significant changes from the baseline during the lifetime of the project that can be attributable directly or indirectly to the project. Examples of these are: Sub-output 1.1.1.5 – Endangered species monitoring plan co-developed with key research institutions for the São João APA; Sub-output 1.2.1.5 – Endangered species monitoring plan co-developed with key research institutions for the Pouso Alto APA (see appendix 4 of PRODOC).*

At the moment, we do not foresee significant changes in populations of threatened species during the lifetime of the project, so the main indicators are related to changes in habitat availability for these species and in the enabling conditions that will be established for longer-term impacts. The project´s Global Environmental Benefits are related to the changes in habitat availability and their associated climate mitigation benefits, both of which will be monitored.

That being said, the project will develop specific partnerships with NGOs and research organizations on both pilot areas, who already conduct monitoring of endangered species in the pilot areas, and we will report on their monitoring efforts (Component 1; Outcomes 1.1 and 1.2).

Q5. The incremental cost reasoning in this project needs to be clarified and simplified (p22-23), including how it is incremental to the many on-going initiatives listed (p10-11).

Response: *This section has been revised following STAP´s advice. It has been simplified and focused on how this project is incremental to baseline efforts (please refer to PRODOC's Sub-Section 3.7 for details).*

Q6. STAP therefore suggests that the approach to this project is far more targeted and simplified, for example by focusing on the three pilot approaches in Component 2, developing and testing these approaches, then incorporating these lessons nationally.

Response: *We agree, and this project is now based on the suggested approach. The three Components presented in the PRODOC are: 1) implement pilot areas in the Atlantic Forest and Cerrado, developing forest recovery in rural properties and supporting key conservation actions of the Management Plan; 2) establish a agreement with Forestry sector companies to integrating biodiversity data of private areas from the Forestry sector companies into national and international biodiversity-related protocols and increase conservation value in private lands, and 3) increase public competence to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas (see more at PRODOC – Sub-section 3.3 - Project components and expected results). In Component 1, for example, the pilot implementation will be based on capacity building and understanding landowners' perception and on implementation of good agricultural practices and integrated landscape management. Thus, activities in both pilot areas (Component 1) and the areas under the agreement with the Forestry Sector companies (Component 2) will directly support the improvement of public*

capabilities to plan and implement conservation policies in private areas to upscale lessons learned at the national level (Component 3).

Q7. A significant weakness of the project (see comments and suggestions below) is the failure to analyse and include scientific and technical lessons from elsewhere, especially regarding landholder conservation processes, including from Brazilian, GEF project and elsewhere. The sequencing of this project requires more rigorous analysis.

Response: *During the PPG we included scientific and technical lessons from different projects that are related to this project, including the GEF projects in Brazil (see, for example, the CEO Endorsement request - section A.6. - GEF Projects, and the PRODOC – Sub-section 2.3.2. - Barrier analysis). The current basis for our project is in accordance with FAO's principles for a successful SLM and SFM projects, which is focused on people-centred approaches, multi-stakeholders' involvement, multi-sectorial approaches, multi-scale integration, and integrated land use planning (Liniger et al. 2011)*[15].

There are various examples across the PRODOC and the CEO Endorsement request to show that we took into account lessons learned from other projects and initiatives in our Components. For example, in Component 1, the approach that will guide the activities in the pilot area of the São João APA is inspired by the National Plan for Native Vegetation Recovery (Planaveg), in which a set of complementary strategies aim to create the enabling conditions for landowners to implement forest recovery and to comply with the Brazilian Law of Protection of Native Vegetation. Also, in this pilot area, the activities related to integrated property management were structured based on lessons learned from several other projects developed in the region, country, or elsewhere. Further, detailed activities will be defined after workshops with landowners and other stakeholders, incorporating their previous experience. Then, workshops with national and international specialists will be held in order to synthesize experiences in biodiversity conservation in private areas and integrated property and landscape management to help the implementation of the practices suggested and requested by the landowners of the area. Regarding the Pouso Alto APA, the activities in this other pilot area will be based on the recently published (but not implemented yet) Management Plan of the APA.

Q8. How does policy and regulatory change really work? Do regulators set new rules, and landholders follow them? Or is it more effective to pilot new guidelines and rules with landholders, and then incorporate and norm them into the regulatory environment? If the latter, the balance and sequencing of the project could be flipped, emphasizing a collaborative adaptive management process in the three pilot sites as a way of piloting, testing and designing the regulatory environment, not the other way around as is currently proposed.

Response: *The practiced and instituted rule are divergent aspects of the Brazilian public policy, which is negatively reflected on the quality of environmental management. This irregularity in complying with environmental laws has multiple causes and is certainly one of the main challenges against environmental degradation in the country. Experience shows that lack of understanding of what drives landowners to biodiversity conservation can lead to simplistic policies, compromise the effectiveness of actions and programs, and possibly alienate potential stakeholders to adopt more sustainable practices (Langpap 2006, Selinske et al. 2015; refer to Section 8 of PRODOC). Given the correlations between motivations and barriers, understanding the reality of rural landowners can simultaneously*

[15] Liniger H.P., Studer R.M., Hauert C. & Gurtner M. 2011. Sustainable Land Management in Practice – Guidelines and Best Practices for Sub-Saharan Africa. TerrAfrica, World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

increase the participation and interaction among local actors, assist in proposing appropriate incentives, and remove barriers to sustainable measures (Moon & Cocklin 2011; refer to Section 8 of PRODOC).

Studies have shown that the compliance with environmental rules and regulations tend to be higher when the process is clear, practical and participative, when it brings tangible benefits and/or when non-compliance is very expensive. Actions based on participatory mechanisms can allow multiple stakeholders to get involved and become interested in the matter. There is an increasing number of articles showing that these conditions are not rightly met by the Brazilian Law of Protection of Native Vegetation (LPVN) and other regulatory measures (Fearnside 2003, Lima et al. 2011, Langpap 2006, Guimarães & Almeida 2007, Brito 2009, Rajão et al. 2012, Stickler et al. 2013; refer to Section 8 of PRODOC). Consequently, the regulation per se may not suffice to compel landowners to manage their property in a way that is beneficial to the ecosystems. Therefore, based on lessons learned from other projects, bottom-up strategies are better received by landholders and have better on-the-ground outcomes. Hence, we flipped the project sequence and consequently its logic.

At the same time, recent studies in different biogeographical regions in Brazil have shown that LPVN is powerful tool to motivate farmers to keep the native vegetation at their rural private lands, sometimes the single most important factor (Latawiec et al., 2017, Strassburg et al. 2016; refer to Section 8 of PRODOC). This is also, because the rural landowners in Brazil need to comply with the law to access credit. Therefore, combining bottom up approaches of capacity building with top down command-and-control and monitoring may be the way forward.

To this end, our project is now based on a participatory approach, which includes three key activities: workshops, focus groups, and networks of stakeholders. During the PPG, we have conducted two workshops in the two pilot areas (São João and Pouso Alto APAs) with a range of stakeholders thereby obtaining an initial overview of the local situation. The series of workshops will continue throughout the duration of the project. The main objective will be to understand stakeholders' motivations towards biodiversity conservation to identify the knowledge gap with respect to sustainable land use techniques, to encourage communication among key actors, and to propose incentive schemes in the area.

To support landowners and encourage the exchange of experiences and initiatives underway in the region, we aim to bolster the organizations in place at the pilot areas through the adoption of Conservation Networks and Programs. All these suggestions were enthusiastically shared by the workshop participants in the pilot areas and we included them in the sections 2 and 3 of the PRODOC. For example, in the Pouso Alto APA the participants of the workshop suggested forming the Network of the Networks – which basically means building on the existing networks that lack coherence, stimulation, and vigour. Indeed, literature shows (Pasquini et al. 2010, Sundaresan & Riginos 2010, Selinske et al. 2015, Ecker 2016)[16] the importance of personal contact between conservation agencies and NGOs with landowners as well as highlights the need to promote social capital among them, supporting the creation of groups and associations with a strong regional coordination that brings multiple landowners together. Additionally, since Brazil is a member of the GEF-CSO Network and this project is aligned with their action plan, it could also play an important role in strengthening the capacity of the Network and CSO members to participate in GEF-related activities.

[16] Pasquini L., Fitzsimons J.A, Cowell S., Brandon K., Wescott G. 2011. The establishment of large private nature reserves by conservation NGOs: key factors for successful implementation. Oryx, 45(3), 373-380.
Sundaresan S.R., Riginos C. 2010. Lessons learned from biodiversity conservation in the private lands of Laikipia, Kenya. Great Plains Research 20: 17-27.
Selinske M.J., Coetzee J., Purnell K., Knight A.T. 2015. Understanding the Motivations, Satisfaction, and Retention of Landowners in Private Land Conservation Programs. Conservation Letters. 8.
Ecker S. 2016. Social dimensions of biodiversity conservation programs. In: Learning from Agri-enviromental schemes in Australia: investing in biodiversity and other ecosystem services on farms. Ansell D, Gibson F, Salt D.(Eds.) ANU Press.

In Component 3, we will establish bases to potentially change current regulatory frameworks. Our aim is to improve the procedures to allow sustainable management of native vegetation in private areas (in LRs) in a way that is compatible with biodiversity conservation. To change the current regulatory framework on this issue, it is necessary to: i) understand the bottlenecks of the current regulation through a deep diagnosis of the theme, ii) propose tangible on-the-ground solutions through a participatory multi-stakeholder process and validate it, and iii) promote advocacy and disseminate the proposal to boost engagement of society in conservation.

Q9. There are a number of statements in the document that are poorly defined. STAP would like to see some cross-referencing of what "biome specific SLM Guidelines" are, and how they have worked (or not) in other places.

Clarification. This issue was indeed unclear in the PIF. Part of these guidelines – related to the improvement of biodiversity monitoring and restoration protocols and the adoption of spatial strategies for LR and PPA restoration - are in fact related to the Agreement with Forestry Sector companies. By the way, we removed the word "Guidelines", because there are already guidelines being implemented in the forestry companies. However, these guidelines can be improved in the aspects of biodiversity monitoring and native vegetation restoration. During the PPG, we concluded that the use of project resources would be optimized by focusing on the improvement of guidelines and protocols implemented by different companies from the Forestry Sector to monitor biodiversity and implement SFM and SLM. Currently, the Forestry Sector uses company-specific protocols and guidelines, and shares hardly any information. Besides, the agreement with Forestry Sector companies will also include the identification of areas of high value for conservation, a prioritization analysis for native vegetation recovery, and incorporation of biodiversity data from the Forestry companies into national reports regarding CBD commitments (refer to Table 2 above and to section 3 of the PRODOC).

The other part of PIF's "SLM guidelines" would support the management of private areas, registered in the SiCAR, according to their conservation value and landscape context (e.g. importance for connectivity, ecological corridors and buffer zones). These guidelines were expected to include spatial strategies for conserving or restoring LR and productive areas (agriculture and pasture land) in a landscape approach; support the identification of ecosystem services and the establishment of private protected areas; and clarify types of sustainable native vegetation management appropriate for LRs. This approach is included in the PRODOC's Output 1.1.1 - Programme for implementation of SLM, SFM, and native vegetation recovery in private areas at the São João APA (refer to PRODOC's Appendix 5 for details). It's also incorporated in the PRODOC's Output 1.2.1 - Programme for implementation of conservation actions of the Pouso Alto APA's management plan in private areas (refer to PRODOC's Appendix 5 for details).

Finally, PRODOC's Outcome 3.1 also reflects part of PIF's "SLM guidelines" since the first aim of the latter is to clarify procedures related to sustainable management of native vegetation in LRs in at least five biomes, one of the goals of the former (refer to PRODOC's Sub-Section 3.3).

Q10. Similarly, the proposal needs to provide a scientific and technical description of what it means by the "tools [for] integrating biodiversity conservation and land management considerations for a proper integrated land management planning at macro and project levels" p8. STAP has recently published a report on Sustainable Land Management which may be useful to project planners: https://www.thegef.org/gef/node/11790.

Response: *We thank for the suggestion of the SLM report, which we used for PRODOC preparation.*

Clarification: *In the PIF, we proposed to create a tool to consider the conservation value in private lands. Here we clarify that this tool will be inserted into the National System of Rural Environmental Register (SiCAR). During the PPG, we engaged the Brazilian Forest Service (which is under the Brazilian Ministry of Environment), responsible for this federal system. We concluded that, since there is already an official system in place, the project's activities should focus on improving the existing system rather than creating a new one.*

The lack of information on the conservation value of private areas often prevents an appropriate application of sustainable land-use practices. To fill this gap, information on biodiversity (ecological and socio-economic data) in private areas will be systematized in collaboration with Universities and research centres. Then, spatial databases on the conservation value of private lands for five biogeographical regions will be developed, made available to key stakeholders, and included in the SiCAR to support decision-making about public policies.

In addition, it is necessary that decision-makers and civil society recognize the conservation value of private areas. Limited knowledge on conservation value of private areas and low institutional capacity and inadequate governance are significant barriers that lead to a series of other barriers that must be removed, at least in part. The project will contribute to diminishing this barriers through the implementation of actions in the pilot areas (activities in the Component 1 that result in the Outcomes 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3), in the forestry sector, and at national level through the generation of spatial databases on the conservation value of private lands and dissemination lessons learned.

Q11. STAP seeks technical clarity on output 3.1.1, especially what is meant by "PSAA conservation", "natural capital measuring" and "biodiversity and ecosystem services management", how exactly these will be done, examples of success/failure from elsewhere, and how success will be measured (i.e. targets and indicators).

Response: *Indeed, there was no clear definition for some of the terms used in the PIF, as well as detailed information on how outcomes and outputs will be achieved and measured. We re-worded the terms from the PIF in the PRODOC to clarify them and fit them to outcomes and outputs. To this end, we created a definition table for each key term mentioned in the PRODOC ("Terms and definitions" in Section 1). Here we highlight some of them:*

- *´Natural capital´ (in PIF) is now called ´conservation value´ (in PRODOC), which means the importance of exuberance of living organisms (individual and species), communities, ecosystems, their ecological complexities and provision of ecosystem services.*
- *´Biodiversity conservation effectiveness´ (in PRODOC) means to consider actions that allow populations and species to be viable and to persist in the long term.*
- *´Integrated landscape management´ (in PRODOC) means a form of landscape management that considers different elements in the landscape (e.g. different landowners) for a particular purpose.*
- *´Integrated property management´ (in PRODOC) means a form of property management that aligns conservation and sustainable use of renewable natural resources.*
- *´Sustainable management´ (in PRODOC) means the management that allows rational use with techniques of minimum environmental impact on natural resources.*
- *'PSAAs' (in PIF) is now called 'private lands' (in PRODOC) because increased conservation value can be achieved not only in native vegetation areas within private lands that are protected by the LPNV, but our project will also address the areas of native vegetation that could be legally deforested or degraded (areas that exceed legal requirements). n other words, the additionality of the project is even higher as the non-protected areas of native vegetation within private lands are also considered in the project.*

Output 3.1.1. was stated in the PIF as "Natural Asset Management System (NAMS), a national PSAA management system based on three nested components: i) improving PSAA conservation, ii) natural capital measuring, and iii)

biodiversity and ecosystem services management". It was an output of Outcome 3.1: "Natural capital in Private Set Aside Areas would be better managed by the creation of a national management system". However, as explained in **Q10***, there is already a new and promising federal system to support decision-making - SiCAR. Thus, rather than creating a new, uncoordinated, and unofficial system we will use project resources in a more incremental manner and include the spatial databases on conservation value in private lands within this system (as an additional module on it). This value will be obtained for all private land in the five biogeographical regions covered by the project by the creation of a biogeographical region-specific network for collaboration which will systematize data on biodiversity in private lands. Once these collaboration networks are created and data are shared, workshops will be organized to refine methods and analyses. The spatial database with the data will be created and will be inserted in the SiCAR. The insertion of the spatial database in the SiCAR can guide more effective decision-making actions. As these layers will also be freely available, any mechanism and project that targets biodiversity conservation, Payment for Ecosystem Services, creation of RPPNs, REDD+ will be able to use this layer. Thus, the specific outputs for this part of the Component 3 are: 3.2.1. Spatial databases on conservation value of private areas for five biogeographical regions, 3.2.2. Guidelines to train federal and state agents to use the spatial database integrated into SiCAR, 3.2.3. Engagement and training program for federal and state agents to mainstream conservation value of private areas into public policies, and 3.2.4. International program for learning and disseminating lessons of managing and improving the conservation value of private areas.*

In fact, the proposed spatial database to be available in a federal system is innovative, with no examples across the world, especially because the discussion about OECMs is still hindered by knowledge gaps. Nonetheless, it is critical to highlight that the approaches used to build this spatial database will be based on network of collaborators (Universities and research institutes). This is an approach already well established and successful in many projects elsewhere. We will also be collaborating closely with the team behind SIBBr (another governmental platform to support decision-making) and learning from their positive and negative experiences on how databases can be used to effectively support policy. It should be noted that the SiCAR is a much more policy-oriented platform, more focused on private lands and is already being used by several national, state, and municipal actors.

Q12. STAP also suggests that the process of piloting SLM guidelines be carefully thought and articulated in terms of stakeholder buy in (e.g. landholders, or special interest imposing their agenda on landholders) and sequencing: will these guidelines be designed by in a top down fashion or will they be developed hand-in-hand with the landholders they are intended to affect. The proposal would be greatly strengthened by including scientific and technical knowledge about managing stakeholder/landholder processes, with reference to other examples of such activities.

Response: *We altered the project logic to a more participatory approach. A range of stakeholders will be involved to propose activities related to SLM and SFM in the pilot areas (Component 1) and in the areas managed by Forestry companies (in Component 2). This participatory approach was initiated during the PPG workshops: i) in the pilot areas to understand landowners' perceptions, motivations, barriers and opportunities to implement SLM and SFM activities in these areas, and ii) with the Forestry sector to discuss the points that would be included in the sectorial agreement. In the context of the PRODOC's Outcome 3.1, public agents, civil society, rural landowners (from the pilot areas) will be engaged.*

Clarification. *SLM and SFM are targeted in all three project's Components (Appendix 5 of PRODOC) through bottom-up strategies (workshops, meetings, interviews, and networks) aimed to fill in the gaps identified during the PPG and in the reference literature. The main bottlenecks related to the stakeholders were the lack of knowledge on sustainable land use and technical assistance, insufficient environmental awareness, lack of know-how about credit lines and other*

incentives, compliance with forestry regulation, licensing to forest management, difficulties in creating RPPNs, and barriers related to current protocols in the forestry sector.

Since biodiversity conservation in private areas is dependent, among other factors, on stakeholders, bottom-up initiatives are of paramount importance. The project strategies to involve stakeholders in the decision-making process are aligned to others' scientific and technical work. For example, in the same region as the pilot area in the Atlantic Forest (São João APA), Buckley and Pegas (2015)[17] used interviews to analyse the four main limiting factors (ecological, legal, social, and financial) affecting local stakeholders and identified that local NGOs, even with limited funds, could aid landowners and contribute to the conservation of a species of monkey threatened with extinction. Kamal et al. (2015)[18] analysing the institutional perspectives of the factors influencing the effectiveness and the challenges of private land in the USA and Poland found that lack of voluntary initiatives and awareness contributed to limited scope and understanding of the subject. FAO (2011)[19] suggests including awareness raising, promotion, training and financial support, followed by monitoring and assessment to facilitate the embrace, adjustment and spread of SLM best practices. Liniger et al. (2011)[20] have several study cases in Sub-Saharan Africa involving SLM and SFM, and they all emphasized that landholders must be actively involved in all phases of the approach, should adopt and upscale changes in land user's mind-set and provide good technical know-how to increase potential for adoption.

Q14. STAP notes that a key barrier is the "severe lack of technical assistance" to farmers relating to conservation and extension, yet addressing this barrier is not specifically noted in the outputs and outcomes as "there is far more mention of rules than of providing and getting knowledge to farmers. Similarly (p7) the criticism that farmers don't really understand conservation and its regulations, needs to be complemented by the criticism that conservationist regulators often do not understand farmers and their motivations, an important issue in designing this project.

Response: *We entirely agree that these issues were not addressed in the PIF and that there is a range of factors influencing sustainable land management that are independent of the farmers and that the regulators should have knowledge of to foster change. Over recent years, the members of this project have been participating in research that looked into barriers to improved pasture management in Brazil and it was clear that in some regions the principal bottleneck pointed out by the farmers was quantity and quality of skilled labour and credit access (Latawiec et al. 2017)[21]. However, in some areas such as Atlantic Forest, we found that farmer awareness and cultural reasons together with financial motivations and technical assistance were the principal factors (Alves Pinto et al. 2017, Latawiec et al. 2017)[22].*

To this end, we have addressed in detail these issues in the PRODOC (especially, section 2 - Barriers analysis). In addition, we have introduced participatory methodologies in all three Components to understand landowner and

[17] Buckley R.C. & Pegas F.V. 2015. Four hurdles for conservation on private land: the case of the golden lion tamarin in Brazil's Atlantic Forest. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution.

[18] Kamal S., Grodzińska-Jurczak M. & Brown G. 2015. Conservation on private land: a review of global strategies with a proposed classification system. Journal of Environmental Planning and Management 4: 576-597.

[19] FAO. 2011. The state of the world's land and water resources for food and agriculture (SOLAW) – Managing systems at risk. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome and Earthscan, London.

[20] Liniger H.P., Studer R.M., Hauert C. & Gurtner M. 2011. Sustainable Land Management in Practice – Guidelines and Best Practices for Sub-Saharan Africa. TerrAfrica, World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) and Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO).

[21] Latawiec A.E., Strassburg B.B.N., Silva D., Alves- Pinto H.N., Feltran-Barbieri R., Castro A., Iribarrem A., Rangel M., Kalif K., Gardner T. & Beduschi F. 2017. Improving land management in Brazil: the producers' perspective. Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment, 249: 276-286.

[22] Alves-Pinto H.N., Latawiec A.E., Strassburg B.B.N., Barros F.S.M., Sansevero, J.B.B., Iribarrem A.; Crouzeilles R., Lemgruber L., Rangel M., Silva A.C.P. 2017. Reconciling rural development and ecological restoration: Strategies and policy recommendations for the Brazilian Atlantic Forest. Land Use Policy, v. 60, p. 419-426.

stakeholder perception and motivation towards conservation, native vegetation recovery, SFM and SLM and to identify environmental bottlenecks in their current practices as well as in the regulations. Specifically, in the pilot area of the São João APA, we will develop activities related to training rural landowners and extension agents to develop integrated landscape and property management practices, forest recovery and guidance/facilitation to access credit lines and incentives for forest recovery. We will do it through meetings, workshops, training activities, capacity building courses and implementation of Demonstration Units. Some of the specific courses will be given in partnership with the governmental technical assistance programme - ATER (Technical Assistance and Rural Extension), aiming to improve the quality of technical assistance and rural extension services, integrate and socialize information on public policies, introduce forest recovery and conservation practices, management and sustainable rural development to strengthen local landholders.

Q15. The top-down bottom-up conundrum. As noted, STAP recommends that this project thinks through far more carefully how it is going to combine a top-down, regulatory approach with private land holders and a bottom-up participatory approach.

Response: *We agree and carefully incorporated STAP's recommendations in the project structure to integrate top-down and bottom-up approaches to amplify the project´s chances of success. During the PPG, two workshops already took place in both pilot areas to assess local situation, to identify main environmental and social issues, and to engage with relevant stakeholders. Indeed, in an exclusive top-down regulatory approach, when society is not interested and/or not involved, we might expect weak implementation or lack of compliance. In fact, that was the fate of two zoning projects in the Amazon (Mahar 2000, World Bank 2003, Chomitz et al. 2006)[23]. However, when a top-down approach is used with participatory mechanisms, it allows stakeholders to better integrate, get involved and interested in the process. In that sense, this project will indeed be mainly focused on a bottom-up approach, especially in the pilot areas, but will also mix top-down and bottom-up approaches and a different set of stakeholders to increase awareness, promote integration among actors, provide technical assistance to support SLM, SFM, biodiversity conservation and native vegetation recovery.*

Q16. To some extent this idea is introduced with the forest industry (albeit with little operational or technical detail), but participation and pathways to uptake are not specifically described in the two pilot areas, with little or no mention of landholder associations, conservation extension mechanisms, and so on.

Response: *We agree and this was explicitly included in the PRODOC in the context of the Theory of Change. Participation and pathways to uptake are now described in the two pilot areas. The strategy is built upon the participation and coordination of a range of local actors through broader networks that include landowner associations, technical extension groups, and conservationists. For example, in the São João APA, the activities developed will include engagement, awareness raising, and training program for rural landowners and extension agents on integrated landscape management and forest recovery. For further details, see the section 3 of the PRODOC.*

[23] Chomitz K.M., Fonseca G.A.B., Alger K., Stoms D.M., Honzák M., Landau E.C., Thomas T.S., Thomas W.W. & Davis F. 2006. Viable Reserve Networks Arise from Individual Landholder Responses to Conservation Incentives. Ecology and Society. 11: 40.

Q17. STAP recommends that the project should analyse the lessons of Brazil's current regulatory approach, and strengthen this with experience from more inclusive approaches in GEF and elsewhere (see notes below). This should be reflected in the barriers section, including a better understanding of if and how landholders are responding to the current regulatory approaches.

Response: *We agree, and the project will analyse the lessons from the current regulatory system, identifying what is working and what is not, as we started doing during the PPG. During the PPG several workshops and meetings were conducted to gather a range of actors. During these meetings, complementary actions amid different projects were coordinated and a communication network with other projects funded by the GEF was established (please refer to PRODOC sub-section 3.1. Project rationale, policy conformity and expected global environmental benefits). This assessment will also be based on extensive literature review complemented with other national and regional workshops with a range of stakeholders. Also, it is important to highlight that Component 1 will include a range of workshops and meetings with local and regional stakeholders in the two pilot areas to assess their compliance with regulatory measures. These lessons learned will be then carried towards national consideration and merged within broader context of producer engagement as per projects cited below (Component 3).*

Q18. There needs to be more clarity on if this proposal is really recommending more of the same, or if and how it is testing a more innovative approach that includes multi-stakeholder learning and devolved regulation.

Response: *We now explicitly present that the main innovation of the project is to create the third pillar of conservation in Brazil – a fully innovative aim for a country that focus its conservation efforts on the conservation of native vegetation areas mainly through governmental public protected areas. It is important to highlight that the project aims not only to help implementing regulatory measures but also to ensure conservation of private areas through the recognition of their value. The project was significantly reshaped into a more participative approach that involves a range of stakeholders following STAP recommendation of valuing the input of local stakeholders to fill the knowledge gaps regarding restoration, sustainable agricultural practices, and biodiversity conservation. By implementing a strategy that addresses different governmental strata, stakeholders and society sectors, we aim to build the capacity on biodiversity conservation and ecosystem services, creating mechanisms for more sustainable biosystems and bioeconomy.*

Q19. An innovative aspect of this project is the potential partnership with forest sector in addressing issues of sustainability, because it links central technical approaches to a demand by forest managers. The approach to addressing biodiversity conservation in the two pilot production landscapes, however, is aspects of participation, governance, self-regulation, extension, and in its vagueness does not provide confidence that it will work.

Response: *In the PRODOC we now describe in detail how to create the enabling conditions for forest recovery in the Atlantic Forest's pilot area (São João APA) and how to implement some key conservation actions from the Management Plan in the Cerrado's pilot area (Pouso Alto APA). Two workshops have already taken place in both areas when the most important stakeholders were brought on board to ensure inclusivity and cooperation. In the conceptual model and Theory of Change constructed within a participatory approach we also considered broader range of on the ground actions. For example, the main steps in the São João APA will be: i) engagement, increasing awareness, and conducting a training program for rural landowners and extension agents on integrated landscape management and*

forest recovery; ii) establishment of Demonstration Units; iii) signing by landowners a set of legally binding commitments to native vegetation recovery considering landscape connectivity towards compliance with LPVN; iv) facilitation of credit access and incentives for forest recovery; v) monitoring plan for endangered species co-developed with key research institutions; and vi) disseminating lessons learned for replicability of activities implemented within this project. The main steps in the Pouso Alto APA will be: i) implementing an engagement and awareness program to key stakeholders, especially local communities, regarding the implementation of the Pouso Alto APA's Management Plan; ii) promoting an environmental education program; iii) supporting an integrated network of Community associations for sustainable extractivism; iv) supporting the creation of RPPNs in key areas, v) developing incentive packages for actions that favour biodiversity conservation and sustainable management; vi) developing an endangered species monitoring plan with key research institutions; and vii) producing a dissemination program for lessons learned and replicability of activities implemented.

Q20. Indeed, the regulatory approach into which much has been invested is apparently not working on its own, which is presumably the justification for this project, yet the project seems to propose more of the same, rather than looking for what is transformational. It is therefore not particularly innovative or incremental, except that it targets private conservation.

Response. *Current regulatory approaches related to land use in Brazil have been largely ignored for the past 40 years. To address this, Brazil launched a multibillion effort (through the implementation of the LPVN, the SiCAR system and associated national and state level efforts). These mechanisms, although incomplete, are already transforming how these regulations are perceived, monitored, and enforced. The innovativeness and incremental value of this project is to tap into this multibillion legal system by analysing, recognizing, and appropriately incorporating the conservation value of private areas. In addition, since currently the farmers' compliance with the LPVN, especially in some areas, is low there is a need for an incentive system. To that end, this project will assess incentives to boost such compliance. Besides, as recommended by STAP, the bottom up participatory approach from pilots will provide lessons learned to support law compliance at national scale.*

Q21. The very similar challenges in the soil conservation and management following the American dust bowl, including consideration of concepts like "soil conservation districts", conservation and extension, and so on. Particular attention is drawn to Zimbabwe's "Intensive Conservation Area Approach' initiated in the late 1940s, not only pre-empting many of the principles laid out by Ostrom in the 1990s, but describing how to build local catchment institutions, link them to conservation and extension systems, manage conflicts locally and through natural resource courts, state land inspections, and so on. A more recent approach, though less institutionally sophisticated, is the private land stewardship programme supported by the UNDP-GEF Grasslands Project in South Africa. The authors of this project are referred to the extensive documentation of this project, and encouraged to engage with the people who actually implemented this project (see, for example, http://biodiversityadvisor.sanbi.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/key-principles-in-mainstreaming-biodiversity-from-the-gp.pdf.)

Response. *We thank for the suggestion. We reviewed the document and we will include it during the project implementation.*

Q22. Finally, on a readability note, this was a difficult project to review. The document needs to be carefully edited and shortened, and also needs either to reduce the number of acronyms or to provide a table of these to enable the reader to follow which organization the authors are referring to.

Response. *We thank these suggestions; we carefully edited the PRODOC aiming at conciseness. In addition, we provide two tables: one with the acronyms (which were also reduced in term of numbers; we kept only the main acronyms) and other with the definition of terms.*

ANNEX C: STATUS OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT PREPARATION ACTIVITIES AND THE USE OF FUNDS[24]

A. Provide detailed funding amount of the PPG activities financing status in the table below:

PPG Grant Approved at PIF: **182,648**			
Project Preparation Activities Implemented	***GETF/LDCF/SCCF/CBIT Amount ($)***		
	Budgeted Amount	***Amount Spent Todate***	***Amount Committed***
Project development (local consultants)	162,011	162,011	
Workshops and meetings	20,637	20,637	
Total	182,648	182,648	0

[24] If at CEO Endorsement, the PPG activities have not been completed and there is a balance of unspent fund, Agencies can continue to 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. Agencies should also report closing of PPG to Trustee in its Quarterly Report.

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

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

Non applicable.