



GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR PROGRAMMATIC FRAMEWORK DOCUMENT* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	9272		
Country/Region:	Regional (Brazil, Colombia, Peru)		
Program Title:	Amazon Sustainable Landscapes Program		
GEF Agency:	UNDP, World Bank and WWF-US	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Multi Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1 Program 1; BD-1 Program 2; BD-4 Program 9; BD-4 Program 10; CCM-2 Program 4; LD-1 Program 2; LD-2 Program 3; LD-3 Program 4; SFM-1; SFM-2;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Program Grant:	\$113,684,455
Co-financing:	\$682,980,000	Total Program Cost:	\$796,664,455
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	October 01, 2015
Program Manager:	Mark Zimsky	Agency Contact Person:	Paola Agostini

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comments	Agency Response
Program Consistency	1. Is the program aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? ¹	8-11-15 Yes. It is aligned with the GEF-6 Programming Directions (See "Programming of SFM Resources for an Amazon Basin Program"). The PFD lists the Aichi Targets that the program will contribute to (p.19). On the front page of the PIF, please note that the correct GEF Program ID is 9272	

¹ 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)?

Program Design	<p>2. Is the description of the baseline scenario reliable, and based on sound data and assumptions? Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/additional reasoning?</p> <p>8-11-15</p> <p>NOTE: The Comments and suggestions below, are intended for the PFD to be modified accordingly. A response matrix should only be used to communicate, in a succinct manner, issues that have not been addressed in the revised PFD.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> <p>THE GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROBLEM</p> <p>The Root Causes and Barriers section would benefit from more concrete and recent data that supports the analysis. The GEF Secretariat suggest tapping into the information of the Atlas: RAISG, 2012. Amazonia Under Pressure, 68 pages. RAISG is the Amazon Network of Georeference Socio-environmental Information (www.raisg.socioambiental.org). It contains synthetic and valuable information on Drivers of Deforestation across the Amazon Biome.</p> <p>BASELINE SCENARIO</p> <p>The Baseline Scenario should describe the activities that will take place during the next 72 months, whether or not the GEF PFD is approved. Once the baseline is described in that manner, the description of the Alternative Scenario and the articulation of the Incremental Reasoning could be made easier and clearer. The GEF Secretariat suggest to remove or relocate the Background Information</p>	
-----------------------	---	--

		<p>(Past Investments) from the Baseline, in order to make the reading of the PFD easier.</p> <p>The alignment of the "Barriers to achieving Amazon sustainable landscapes" (p. 6) and the "Baseline Scenario" (p.8) and the "Program Results Framework" (p.2) could be improved. If the program identifies a number of drivers of deforestation and habitat loss, and barriers to achieve the objective of the program, they would need to be addressed in a consistent manner in the baseline and alternative scenario (i.e. components of the Results Framework).</p> <p>For instance, Barrier 4 ("Financial Incentives to Farmers") and Barrier 6 ("Sustainable Infrastructure"), are not mentioned in the baseline information of any of the three countries. Barrier 3 (Government Policies on the agricultural sector) and Barrier 7 (on Monitoring of Deforestation and Technical assistance to farmers), are only mentioned in Brazil's baseline. The baseline for Regional Cooperation would need to be added.</p> <p>The relationship between the Drivers of Deforestation and Habitats Loss (p.6) and the baseline for the three countries could be enhanced. Of the seven drivers, only mining and illegal timber are mentioned in the baseline of Colombia, and Agricultural expansion and energy infrastructure in Peru. The case would need to be made on how this program is tackling the drivers of deforestation,</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>directly or indirectly.</p> <p>ALTERNATIVE SCENARIO</p> <p>In order to visualize the current and proposed Amazon Landscape under the GEF Amazon PFD, it would be beneficial to include a map that shows which parts of the Amazon are protected (i.e. National System of Protected Areas and Indigenous Territories) and under SFM/SLM, and compare it to one that shows the areas the program will be targeting. The GEF suggest looking at the Amazon Network of Geo-reference Socio-environmental Information (www.raisg.socioambiental.org) for a background map.</p> <p>INCREMENTAL REASONING</p> <p>This section could be enhanced to better understand how the GEF funding will make a difference in the conservation and sustainable development of the Amazon Biome. The "Incremental Reasoning" would result from the comparison of the "Baseline" and "Alternative Scenario".</p> <p>OTHER</p> <p>Performance Indicators: Are not specified (p.14). The GHG emissions reduction should be included as one of them.</p> <p>Innovation: This needs to be revised to make a better case for a GEF regional program and the innovations it is proposing to address the drivers of</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>deforestation (i.e. "Transportation Infrastructure", "Energy Infrastructure", "Mining", "Oil and Gas", and "Illegal Timber Trade).</p> <p>Sustainability: This section would benefit from a more in-depth assessment of the Financial, Institutional and Ecological Sustainability of the program.</p> <p>Potential for scaling-up: The potential for scaling-up to the other countries in the Amazon basin (i.e. Bolivia, Ecuador, Guyana, Suriname and Venezuela) could be considered here.</p> <p>National Priorities. In addition to the generics of the Rio Conventions' obligations, it would be beneficial to cite the relevant country National strategies and Priorities. It is also necessary to cite alignment to UNFCCC national communications, biennial update reports, and if applicable intended nationally determined contributions, as well as to national climate change strategies.</p> <p>Table C. The type of co-financing needs to be specified.</p> <p>Table D. The source of SFM funds is the GEF Trust Fund (see reference to LDCF for UNDP's MFA in Peru). Climate Change funding is also from the GEF Trust Fund (see WB/UNDP Colombia (blank)).</p> <p>Table E. While the Program aims at improving management of landscapes of</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>around 10% of the Amazon Biome (0.7 Million ha of 6.7 Million), the target for CO2 mitigation appears low compared to the standing carbon stock in the biome (only 0.3%). Please elaborate on this subject. During project preparation, the GEF suggest using approved methodologies, such as X-ACT, for estimating sustainable forestry and GHG emissions benefits.</p> <p>Part III. Please include Position and Ministry of OFP. (p.20).</p> <p>Restoration. Since restoration is an integral part of the program (cited in the Objective and in the Results Framework), it would be desirable to have a working definition of the term. Please consult the SFM strategy.</p> <p>September 8, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
3. Is the program framework (Table B) sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve program objectives and the GEBs?	<p>8-11-15</p> <p>NOTE: The Comments and suggestions below, are intended for the PFD to be modified accordingly. A response matrix should only be used to communicate, in a succinct manner, issues that have not been addressed in the revised PFD. Thanks.</p> <p>The Program Results Framework is sound and clear for the most part, and should allow the delivery of the program objectives and Global Environmental Benefits.</p>	

	<p>The structure of the program would greatly benefit from enhancing the Regional activities to deliver tangible and measurable Global Environmental Benefits. There are two low-hanging fruits that could be considered for development and implementation in the context of regional cooperation: Rivers & Freshwater Fisheries, and Trans-boundary Protected Areas. Management of rivers and fisheries could be carried out between neighboring countries by means of: 1) Strengthening fisheries management in critical sub-basins and trans-boundary areas with agreements to manage the migratory fish that represent 80% of the fish catch in the basin), 2) Ensuring PA networks protect key and representative wetlands and other aquatic ecosystems, and 3) mitigating the impacts of infrastructure and other large scale development projects on the Amazon river system, especially in the western Amazon. The establishment of a coordinating body for these activities could be considered as a first step.</p> <p>The indicators and targets in the Program Outcomes (Results Framework), need to be provided. These numbers would need to add-up to those provided in Table E (GEBs).</p> <p>September 8, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people,</p>	<p>8-11-15 NOTE: The Comments and suggestions</p>

	<p>and CSOs considered?</p>	<p>below, are intended for the PFD to be modified accordingly. A response matrix should only be used to communicate, in a succinct manner, issues that have not been addressed in the revised PFD. Thanks.</p> <p>The socio-economic benefits of the program are missing from the PFD (item 4. Benefits, p.17).</p> <p>The text on stakeholders could be applied to any program. It is necessary to be region and country specific as much as possible. In addition, there is no discussion on participation of indigenous people in the program (item 2. Stakeholders, p. 16).</p> <p>September 8, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Does the program 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)</p>	<p>8-11-15</p> <p>NOTE: The Comments and suggestions below, are intended for the PFD to be modified accordingly. A response matrix should only be used to communicate, in a succinct manner, issues that have not been addressed in the revised PFD. Thanks.</p> <p>The program takes into account some potential risks and described response measures to address them. Nevertheless, there is one significant risk that needs to be stated separately. The risk of Economically powerful Drivers of Deforestation (i.e. expansion of agribusiness, development of transport and energy infrastructure, illegal gold mining</p>	

		<p>and Oil & Gas) to overrun the plans to develop new protected areas and mainstream biodiversity conservation into the broader landscape, specially outside conservation areas and indigenous territories. Please address this risk as appropriate.</p> <p>September 8, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	6. If there is a non-grant instrument in the program, is the GEF Agency(ies) capable of managing it?	NA	
	7. Is the program coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?	<p>8-11-15</p> <p>There is detailed information on how the program will secure coordination among countries and child projects within the program. The coordination with other initiatives outside the GEF would need to be added (see Coordination p.18 of PFD).</p> <p>September 8, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	8. Is the program implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	<p>8-11-15</p> <p>Yes. This program will have one Lead Agency (WB), and three agencies (WB, UNDP and WWF) leading the implementation of the child projects.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	9. Does the program include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	<p>8-11-15</p> <p>The Program includes a Component (No.4) to develop a monitoring system to support implementation.</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
	10. Does the program have description of knowledge	<p>8-11-15</p> <p>Yes. See p.18 of PFD</p>	

	management plan?	Cleared	
Resource Availability	11. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	<p>8-11-15 The child projects will make use of STAR allocations from the participating countries.</p> <p>Please check the Total program Cost of the PFD on Table B (\$112,184,455). PMIS give us a slightly different number (\$112,184,425).</p> <p>September 8, 2015</p> <p>Cleared.</p>	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access?		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• focal area set-aside?	<p>8-11-15 The PFD will make use of SFM Set Aside in support of a Global Coordination grant to the WB</p> <p>Cleared</p>	
Secretariat Recommendation			
PFD Clearance	Is the PFD recommended for clearance to include in the work program?	<p>8-12-15 No. Please address outstanding issues under items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 11. Thanks. The GEF Secretariat is available to discuss these comments and requests with the Lead Agency as needed.</p> <p>9-8-15</p>	

		<p>We welcome the GHG emissions benefit estimated conservatively at this stage based on avoided deforestation due to improved management effectiveness of Protected Areas. We recognize that there are different approaches among the countries involved in estimating these numbers, and we look forward to the opportunity to work together during project development to ensure that these estimates are refined and improved based on each child project and utilizing GEF-approved methodologies.</p> <p>September 8, 2015</p> <p>The PM recommends CEO PFD clearance.</p>	
Review Date (s)	Review*	August 14, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	September 08, 2015	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the program. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.