



Control and reduction of mercury emissions from the cement industry in Brazil

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11574

Countries

Brazil

Project Name

Control and reduction of mercury emissions from the cement industry in Brazil

Agencies

UNIDO

Date received by PM

3/21/2024

Review completed by PM

3/29/2024

Program Manager

Evelyn Swain

Focal Area

Chemicals and Waste

Project Type

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the project meets the criteria for CW funding and the project information table is correct.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?

Secretariat's Comments

GEBs should be added to the project summary description.

ES, 4/24/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

GEBs were added to the project summary description; description of calculations remains in the specific section.

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

b) Are the components, outcomes and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?

Secretariat's Comments

The table showing Component Balances is confusing. Is this table intended to show technical assistance and investment amounts? If so that is not clear.

There are many abbreviations in the document. Please spell out the first time and abbreviation is used so it is clear what is being discussed.

The components and outputs are well designed and a Theory of Change is provided.

ES, 4/24/24: Comments cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

Table B on the indicative project description summary was edited for clarity.

Abbreviations were spelled out in the document.

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments Yes. Gender considerations were well-integrated across the project components and outputs. Please ensure when developing the Gender Action Plan, that it is budgeted, monitored, and reported on.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

This is duly noted, a gender action plan will be developed during the PPG and will be properly integrated into the M&E framework as well as the budget.

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments Yes the situation is clearly described, however there are many figures that are only available in the annex which makes it difficult to read. Is it possible to add the figure to the portal? There should be a way to upload them.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

Attempts were made to upload directly in the to the portal; unfortunately, without success to date. Please kindly advise, whether there is an alternative way to submit the figures from the back-end.

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?

c) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

The project justification is well developed with other project that it will coordinate with.

Stakeholder roles have been well described.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, there is a Theory of Change presented.

Agency's Comments

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

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

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) Is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

It is clear that the Ministry of Environment will be the main executing partner, but otherwise the implementation arrangements are not well defined. Please provide implementation arrangements.

4/24/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

Information on the implementation arrangements for the Project have been described under section B "Project Description".

5.4 a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

Regarding the methodological approach and underlying logic to justify target levels of Core Indicators,

mercury and Benefiting People are explained, but there is no explanation on GHG Emission. please add it.

4/24/24: Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

Description of the calculation for GHG emissions reduction is now provided under the specific section.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's CommentsYes, risks are included. At the time of CEO Endorsement please use the new risk template.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

Noted, we will make sure to use the new risk template at the time of CEO Endorsement phase.

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, this project is one of the first projects addressing mercury in cement which is a priority of the Minamata convention. The knowledge platform will be key for scaling up and providing lessons learned through the project in Brazil and other countries.

Agency's Comments

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, this project is aligned with CW priorities under the Minamata Convention.

Agency's Comments

6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors)

Secretariat's Comments Yes, the project is aligned with national priorities.

Agency's Comments

6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e. BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments Yes, a stakeholder consultation list is provided.

Agency's Comments

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

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

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's CommentsNA

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments

1. The PPG Agency Fee included in Portal (US\$ 27,000) is higher than the amount Endorsed in LoE (US\$ 19,000) ? please request a new LoE with the amount of US\$ 27,000 or reduce the amount in Portal to US\$ 19,000.

ES, 4/24/24: Please provide the new LOE

ES, 4/26/24: The LOE has been provided. Comment cleared.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

A revised LoE will be provided but is still pending signature by the OFP. We will provide it at the earliest possible.

UNIDO 26.04.2024

A revised LoE has been uploaded to the portal.

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments

Please provide the names of co-financiers for the private sector as source of co-financing.

ES, 4/24/24: Names will be provided during PPG.

Agency's Comments Although thorough consultations were led with the industrial sector, which expressed interest in the project proposal, the Project has not established a closer collaboration to individual companies that would be foreseen for co-financing. We would like to conduct these consultations during PPG and to provide specific names of co-financiers at that stage.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country?(ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat's Comments

1. The incomplete LoE included in the email indicates that the project will be executed by ?a national entity identified by the Ministry during the PPG phase?. However, in Portal the executing partner is the ?Ministry of Environment and Climate Change?. Please ask the Agency to (i) modify the executing partner in Portal, so they will match the executing partner in LoE ; or (ii) get new LoEs (the executing partner can be changed during the preparation phase).
2. The template utilized for this LoE (as included in the email) removed the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?. While the removal of the footnote seems to be trivial, it is not: this footnote reduces the chances of having an executing partner that does not meet the fiduciary and procurement standards required to safely execute the project. Please get an email from the OFP accepting this footnote to be part of the LoE (this is an alternative to request a new LoE).

ES, 4/24/24: LOE is still missing.

ES, 4/26/24: Comment cleared

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

A revised LoE will be provided but is still pending signature by the OFP. We will provide it at the earliest possible, with the footnote which was missing.

UNIDO 26.04.2024

A revised LoE has been uploaded to the portal. In the portal, the executing partner was modified to match the letter of endorsement. The footnote from comment 2) is included in the LoE.

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

8.8 Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments Yes.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments NA

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

Not at this time. Some issues remain.

ES, 4/24/24: Not at this time. LOE needs to be submitted.

ES, 4/26/24: PIF is recommended for technical clearance.

Agency's Comments

UNIDO 19.04.2024

Issues hopefully addressed as all comments were considered; the ones related to the corrections needed on the Letter of Endorsement, as a revised version is still awaiting signature from the Operational Focal Point in Brazil.

UNIDO 26.04.2024

A revised LoE has been uploaded to the portal.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/ Approval

Secretariat's Comments

Agency's Comments

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/29/2024	4/19/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/24/2024	4/26/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/26/2024	

PIF Review

Agency Response

Additional Review (as necessary)
Additional Review (as necessary)