



# Promoting zero-emission buildings in Brazil through climate technologies and policies (EDinova)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

11072

**Countries**

Brazil

**Project Name**

Promoting zero-emission buildings in Brazil through climate technologies and policies (EDinova)

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

8/30/2024

**Review completed by PM**

9/23/2024

**Program Manager**

Patricia Marcos Huidobro

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

FSP

**Non-Expedited Enabling Activity req (PIF)  
Non-Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)**

**Part 1: Project Information**

**Focal area elements**

**Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

**No.** Kindly address the following comments:

- Under "Project Tags" please note "Innovation" refers to the call for proposals launched by the GEF in the first semester of 2024. Therefore, please change this to "No" since the proposed project is using STAR resources instead. In case this cannot be edited from the agency workspace, please reach out to the GEF IT Portal technical team at [ITSOP\\_GEF\\_Portal\\_technical\\_team@worldbankgroup.org](mailto:ITSOP_GEF_Portal_technical_team@worldbankgroup.org) copying the Program Manager for this project Patricia Marcos at [pmarcoshuidobro@thegef.org](mailto:pmarcoshuidobro@thegef.org)

- As per the "Project Information" table, the project executing entity is the "Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI)". However, under the "Institutional Arrangement" section it seems the Brazilian Council for Sustainable Development (CBCS) is a co-executing partner. Moreover, under the budget table, the CBCS appears as the responsible entity for all the budget lines. Kindly clarify the responsibilities for both entities and update the Project Information Table, the budget, and/or the Institutional Arrangement section accordingly.

**Agency Response**

**Project description summary**

**Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

Yes.

Agency Response

Co-financing

**Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified [and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?]**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

**No.** Co-financing letter from the Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation (MCTI) is missing. Also, in the section below the co-financing table "**Please describe the investment mobilized portion of the co-financing**", **explain the reasons for the significant reduction in co-financing from PIF to CEO Endorsement stage. Also, elaborate further on the efforts made the implementing agency to raise further co-financing.**

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

**Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Are they within the resources available from:  
The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

**Yes.**

Agency Response

**The focal area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

**Focal area set-aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

N/A.

Agency Response

**Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification**

**Background and Context.**

**Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Goals, Objectives, and Activities.**

**Is the project framework sufficiently described?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

**Stakeholders.**

**Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**9/20/2024 PM:**

**Yes , with suggestions.** This is has been provided in the Project Document submitted by the Agency. In the CEO Endorsement document of the GEF, please include a summary of the consultations conducted (# of stakeholders, key dates, etc.), since this is the only document which will be available to our GEF Council Members.

Agency Response

**Gender equality and women's empowerment.**

**Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

**Yes.** This is has been provided in the Project Document submitted by the Agency.

Agency Response  
**Monitoring and Evaluation.**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

**a) Yes.**

**b) No.**

**b.1.)** Please note Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2 shall be tagged as Technical Assistance instead of Investment, as they focus on the creation of a campaign and an alliance. Only Outcome 2.3. focuses on the development of pilots. Please disaggregate Component 2 in Investments (Outcome 2.3) and Technical Assistance (Outcomes 2.1 and 2.2). Please create two rows for Component 2, one tagged as "Investment" only with the outputs focus on investment activities, and a second row for Component 2 tagged as "TA" with the outputs focus exclusively on TA activities.

**b.2)** In addition, please add at the beginning a table with the main project changes from PIF to CEO Endorsement stage. A similar table has been included in the Agency project document. Please copy this table in the CEO Endorsement document and elaborate further on other changes, no only on the changes for the components. For instance, please explain the significant changes in co-financing from PIF to CEO Endorsement, as well as other relevant changes.

**c) No.** Please address the following comments:

c.1) We noted project outcomes 2.1, 4.2 and 4.3 have been tagged as gender-responsive. Please consider also tagging as gender-responsive the following project outcomes: 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 3.1 and 3.3.

c.2) Integrate some of the indicators developed under the Gender Action Plan in the Project Results Framework.

c.3) On Monitoring and Evaluation, ensure that gender-related results are monitored and reported on.

d) Yes.

e) Yes.

Agency Response  
Cost Effectiveness.

**Is the project cost effective?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
Cost Ranges

**If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP**

**Country endorsement**

**Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
**9/20/2024 PM:**

**No.** The OFP letter has been uploaded in the GEF portal and the OFP name and position have been checked against the GEF database (kindly note there has been a change in OFP since the signature of the letter, but not further action is needed on this regard). However, the letter is missing the following footnote *[1] Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate?*. This is a very important footnote for the GEF, so there are two options going forward:

1. Get a new LoE following the new template - <https://www.thegef.org/documents/gef-8-operational-focal-point-endorsement-letter>
2. Get an email from the new Brazilian OFP confirming they are ok with the missing footnote.

Agency Response  
**Response to Comments**

**Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)**

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**STAP Comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response  
**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

**Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/20/2024 PM:

**No.** Please address comments identified above.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**