GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT FACILITY
INVESTING IN OUR PLANET

Brazil Sustaining Healthy Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Project

Basic Information

GEF ID
10190

Countries
Brazil

Project Title
Brazil Sustaining Healthy Coastal and Marine Ecosystems Project

GEF Agency(ies)
World Bank

Agency ID

GEF Focal Area(s)
Biodiversity

Program Manager
Mark Zimsky

PIF

art I – Project Informatic

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, fully aligned with GEF's biodiversity strategy with strong focus on MPA effective management and sustainable finance as well as biodiversity mainstreaming.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, this is a well-reasoned PIF that builds on MAR1 with clear components and objectives and achievable outcomes and deliverables with regards to the core indicators.

Agency Response

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, robust amounts of cofinancing presented with a clear explanation of how investment mobilized was assessed.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, in line with GEF policy and guidelines.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

NA.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

NA

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes.

Agency Response

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

No. Please remove the "X" in the box on Wildlife for Sustainable Development as that is not germane here.

Please also complete the Climate Finance Rio Markers.

April 24, 2019

Cleared.

April 16, 2019

Thank you for the explanations. Cleared.

Agency Response

This is addressed in the Portal datasheet. The taxonomy worksheet does not have an option for Rio Marker "0".

As the project was not designed to have explicit adaptation or mitigation benefits, following the GEF and OECD DAC guidance we have assigned the Rio Markers for both adaptation and mitigation as 0.

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

The project has a well-articulated problem statement and analysis of the root causes and barriers.

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

The baseline projects are adequately described for this stage.

By the time of CEO endorsement please expand this section to also include the resource investment per baseline project and activities associated with each project.

Agency Response Noted. The team will address this during project development.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, the alternative scenario and the expected outcomes per component are adequately described.

Agency Response

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Project is fully aligned with the GEF biodiversity strategy and the work on sustainable protected area systems and biodiversity mainstreaming.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Please include a description of the incremental reasoning for the GEF investment per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12.

April 16, 2019

Adequate clarification provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

The following text has been included in the updated PID:

GEF financing is necessary to support the Brazilian Government in protecting globally significant biodiversity through strengthening the sustainable management of the country's Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (MCPA) network. Given the complexity involved in the management of marine ecosystems, without GEF's additional support Brazil's MCPA system (built under GEF MAR1 resources) would be at risk of underperforming and failing to effectively balance biodiversity conservation with sustainable use of resources. The long-term

benefits of the proposed Project, are dependent upon this extra push to fully strengthen management capacity of protected areas across the country.

Moreover, with the GEF financing, this project will not only strengthen the management of the MCPA system in the country, but it will also build the enabling conditions for transitioning to a blue economy in targeted areas thus adding a dimension of sustainable economic opportunity in balance with biodiversity conservation. Not making a concerted effort to invest resources in effective management of the MCPA system would jeopardize the economic opportunities that are dependent upon a healthy and well management coastal and marine environment. In other words, investing in stronger management means investing in future sustainable economic opportunities that will benefit local communities and aid in maintaining strong management arrangements of the MCPA system over the long-term. In summary, GEF financing would secure the future status of the MCPA management for biodiversity conservation and it will also incubate the critical enabling conditions necessary for transitioning to a blue economy.

6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes core indicator target is reasonable and achievable.

Agency Response

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

The project builds on MAR1 and also on innovations piloted in ARPA which has proven the potential for sustainability and scaling with regards to effective PA management and financing. In addition the focus of Component Two in setting the conditions for the blue economy provides a foundation for sustainability in the long-term and as such represents both an innovation while reflecting the principles of sustainable mainstreaming that have been made evident in GEF's mainstreaming portfolio.

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates

Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

No. It is not clear from the map and the project description where are the 1.6 million hectares of MPAs that the project will focus on managing better. Please identify this more clearly on the map and also include the WDPA IDs in the core indicator worksheet.

April 16, 2019

Adequate clarifications provided. Cleared.

Agency Response This is addressed. A new map and updated core indicators worksheet have been provided.

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, this builds on MAR1 with an established, functioning, and proven mechanism for stakeholder engagement.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, this builds on MAR1 with an established approach to foster gender equality and empowerment of women.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, a solid case is made for the type of private sector engagement that will be employed building on MAR1.

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

A fully examined risk analysis has been conducted and reasonable mitigation strategies are currently in place for MAR1 and will be the basis for risk management in MAR2.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, fully elaborated and building on MAR1.

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, fully aligned with the NBSAP.

Agency Response

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Yes, entire component is focused on KM to further the goals of the project and collective understanding of the natural capital that sustains the blue economy.

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 8, 2019

Please provide a revised endorsement letter that does not include the request for resources from the IW focal area.

April 16, 2019

Please provide a revised endorsement letter that does not include the request for resources from the IW focal area.

April 24, 2019

A revised endorsement letter has been presented. Cleared.

Agency Response

A new letter has been requested and will be provided as soon as possible.

April 24 Response:

The new letter dated 24 April reflecting the appropriate financing amount and signed by the current GEF focal point has been uploaded in the Portal form.

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

April 24, 2019

Yes. The PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

/iew Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/8/2019	4/12/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/16/2019	4/24/2019
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2019	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		