



## GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	<b>9413</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Brazil</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Realizing the Biodiversity Conservation Potential of Private Lands</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Multi Focal Area</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>BD-4 Program 9; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-2;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$182,648</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$8,953,425</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$38,800,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$47,753,425</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 01, 2016</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Mark Zimsky</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Robert Erath</b>

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>The PIF fails to discuss how the project is related to and responds to the GEF BD, LD or SFM strategies.</p> <p>We would like to remind UNEP that this should always be explicitly explained under Part II. Project Justification Section 3.</p>	

<sup>1</sup> For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Regardless of this lack of exposition and justification in the PIF as required, the content of the components does not justify funding from the Land Degradation Focal Area, thus, the project would not be eligible for the SFM incentive.</p> <p>Furthermore, based on the component presentation, the alignment with the biodiversity strategy is also very tenuous. It is not clear if the project is best placed under BD Program one or two or BD Program nine. It is not eligible under Program 10.</p> <p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>Adequate explanation and clarification of project's alignment with LD FA strategy and SFM incentive.</p> <p>Please clarify what biodiversity indicators will be used to assess project achieving outcome 9.1 in GEF-6 biodiversity strategy.</p> <p>April 25, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions. Cleared.</p>	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>It is impossible to assess this as the</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	under relevant conventions?	<p>writer of the PIF just cut and pasted language from the Aichi Targets.</p> <p>Please cut all that text out of the PIF and describe how the project is aligned with Brazil's NBSAP.</p> <p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>Adequate adjustments.</p> <p>April 25, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions. Cleared.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No.</p> <p>The problem statement and project logic is unclear, the presentation of the baseline situation and the incremental reasoning weak, and the description of the global environmental benefits generic.</p> <p>The PIF fails to describe the fit with any of the GEF strategies. It appears to have potential as a biodiversity project, but this is not assured.</p> <p>The project support from GEF appears premature as the CAR is not</p>	

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>yet complete and it seems necessary for this step to be completed and the 90 million hectares of private set aside areas identified so that an analysis of threats to these areas can be conducted and the design of a response to the drivers of biodiversity loss can be fully developed for the targeted sites which in this version of the proposal is 5 million hectares.</p> <p>Only at this time would we know which sites are actually of global importance and meet the GEF criteria for investment (KBA standard--see GEF-6 biodiversity strategy).</p> <p>Given the lack of a specific problem analysis based on specific sites, the project design is activity driven and the activities themselves are very generic such as component two on economic incentives.</p> <p>Sustainability is not addressed, and this is particularly concerning for the first component which apparently is seeking funding for database development and information capture etc. which is not an incremental investment and not GEF eligible. The development of these database systems and MRV should be part of the project's baseline.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Component two can only be developed properly once sites are identified and only then can the economic incentives that might be appropriate to change behavior in favor of biodiversity be properly identified and designed. Currently the text and descriptions are so generic, they could be applicable to any country.</p> <p>Component three would be potentially be eligible, once we knew what 5 million hectares we were investing in as noted above.</p> <p>Much of what is presented in Component four is not eligible for GEF funding.</p> <p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>Please identify the physical coordinates of the KBAs, referenced in footnote 8 and 9 and on page 22. Please clarify what biodiversity will be monitored and measured in these KBAs to assess success of the project investments. Please clarify how these KBAs meet the IUCN KBA classification.</p> <p>Please clarify why in Table F, the</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>total hectares impacted is totally different than the impacted hectares listed in Section 5 under global environmental benefits. With regards to the scaling up to at least 12 million hectares, what will be measured in the 12 million hectares to assess biodiversity condition.</p> <p>Overall, the PIF is confusing in terms of the area impacted by the investment and what element of biodiversity will be monitored and measured to assess biodiversity outcomes in these areas. Please clarify this confusion.</p> <p>April 25, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions. Cleared.</p>	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No. The section on incremental reasoning does not make any sense.</p> <p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No. Table B is very generic and lacks specificity with no measurable and discrete biodiversity outcomes, no sites identified, outputs mixed with</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>outcomes, etc. In short, Table B and the project objective need rewritten as part of an overall re-design.</p> <p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>While the revised PIF is a vast improvement on the first draft, Table B still lacks specifics with no measurable and discrete biodiversity outcomes in the KBAs or in the hectares that will be impacted by the sectoral agreements. Please improve as also noted above.</p> <p>April 25, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions. Cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>As with much of the PIF, the text addressing these issues is very generic and does not get into any real specifics. This is particularly true for the section on gender, and there is no substantial consideration of socio-economic issues.</p> <p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>Adequate revisions.</p>	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	<p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>SFM resources are currently available; however, availability will need to be re-checked at time of actual work program inclusion.</p>	
<b>Recommendations</b>	<p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p>	<p>March 17, 2016</p> <p>No.</p> <p>The ideas presented in this PIF may have the potential to be developed into a GEF-eligible biodiversity project, but the conceptualization of the project needs redone to address the numerous issues above.</p> <p>Please also take note of the fact that project does not make a sufficient case for the use of the SFM incentive.</p> <p>We would recommend that a discussion with the proposing agency from Brazil and UNEP be arranged</p>	



PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>prior to investing any more time in this proposal.</p> <p>Please also note that for this submission the following errors were noted:  ERROR in PIF - Fee in Finance Breakdown record(s) exceed(s) 9.5% (limit for this project)  ERROR in PIF - Finance Breakdown and Finance Overview  GEF Project Grants / Fees differ</p> <p>In any resubmission, please ensure that the numbers entered are correctly and follow standard requirements.</p> <p>April 19, 2016</p> <p>The revised PIF is a vast improvement over the first submission and addresses most, but not all, of the issues raised in the first review.</p> <p>Please address the issues above and resubmit.</p> <p>April 25, 2016</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>The PM recommends CEO PIF/PFD clearance.</p>	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 17, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 19, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 25, 2016	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	Additional Review (as necessary)		