

Strengthening the national transparency system in Brazil under the Paris Agreement (DataClima+)

Basic Information

GEF ID

10932

Countries

Brazil

Project Title

Strengthening the national transparency system in Brazil under the Paris Agreement (DataClima+)

GEF Agency(ies)

UNEP

Agency ID

UNEP: N/A

GEF Focal Area(s)

Climate Change

Program Manager

Namrata Rastogi

PIF

Part 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

3/15/2022: Yes, the project is aligned to the GEF focal area. However, please change the "sector" from Enabling Activity to the appropriate sectors covered in the project.

04/7/2022: This is cleared.

Agency Response 31 March 2022. Changed. The portal does not allow to select multiple sectors, so we selected: "Mixed & others".

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 3/15/2022: Yes.

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 3/15/2022: Yes, this has been provided. The government will provide \$500,000 in in-kind co-financing.

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

3/15/2022: We note the GEF financing request for this project. Please justify the amount, and as required, alter the scope of the project. Note also, comments made below in relation to potential overlap between GEF project 10801 (combined project for NC5+BUR5+BTR1 and 2).

04/07/2022: As per discussion on April 5 and the follow up email exchange, we look forward to receiving a revised budget proposal.

5/4/2022: This has been revised. Cleared.

Agency Response

31 March 2022. Justification on the amount added to chapter 5: incremental/additional cost reasoning. A table has been added to the beginning of the alternative scenario section to explain the differences, complementarities and synergies between the GEF 10801 combined project and the proposed CBIT project.

29 April 2022. Project budget updated.

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 3/15/2022: This project requests funding from CBIT set aside.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

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 3/15/2022: Yes, PPG is requested and within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/15/2022: Core indicator 11 target is 160 beneficiaries for this project. Please reconsider making this higher especially considering the size and scope of the project. There also seems to be a mistake as later in the PIF (in the alternative scenario section) the number of beneficiaries indicated is higher. Please check and consider increasing this target accordingly.

04/07/2022: We note that the explanation has been revised and targets have been increased. However, please see comment made in the alternative scenario section on workshop participants and if possible, consider revising this.

5/4/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

01 May 2022: Core indicator 11 target is 160 beneficiaries for this project.

31 March 2022. Core indicator 1.1 and its explanation have been revised.

29 April 2022. Number of beneficiaries increased through capacity-building through online channels. Text changed in section F, deliverables 1.5.2, 2.1.4, 2.2.6, 2.3.4, 2.4.3 and 3.1.4, and annex B.

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 3/15/2022: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Part 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

3/15/2022: Yes, this has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/15/2022: Please provide additional details on the following:

1. We note that some systems (SINAPSE and others) were launched in 2021. It is not clear from the current description if these have been established with the intent of an overarching integrated system, or if these have been set up as siloed. Given that this CBIT project is being proposed in 2022, we would like to understand better the vision/current approach for this, and the challenges that it may bring. Please address this in this section or the previous section.
2. Table 1: please add the GEF project details 10801 - NC5, BUR5, BRT 1 and 2. Please make the required adjustments to Table 3 as well highlighting the combined nature of the project including NC, BUR and two BTRs. Also add any REDD+ baseline projects and other bilateral projects in the country.
3. Please include a table(either here or on the next section) that clearly details the capacity needs from NC4 - and what GEF 10801 will cover, and what the CBIT project will cover.

04/07/2022: Please address the remaining comments:

1. On #1: We note the description provides an explanation of the need for an integrated transparency system and the current system where there are different IT and data structures. However, describe if challenges related to an integrated system has been considered while developing this PIF - for example, integrating various IT structures (existing and those that will be new) can be complicated and software/hardware may not be compatible. Similarly since GEF 10801 is closely linked to this CBIT project, please provide an overview of how the CBIT project may address potential delays in the GEF10801 project that may impact this CBIT project.
2. On Annex E - the description only covers the GEF 10801 project and how it covers the gaps identified by the NC4. However, it is not clear how the CBIT project addresses the gaps from the NC4. Please revisit and provide an explanation.

5/4/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

31 March 2022

1. Text to respond to this comment has been added to the previous section under the sub-heading B1.
2. Tables 1 and 3 have been adjusted.
3. This table exists in the document as annex E. Would it be fine to keep there, as it has many pages. Apologies as we did not make many references to this annex in the baseline section. To address this, we have added text to section C of the baseline chapter, after table 1, highlighting the existence of annex E.

29 April 2022

1A. Text noting challenges in integrating IT structures may be found on page 6 (second paragraph under B1).

1B. Text on addressing potential delays added to section 6: coordination.

2. Text added to annex E to explain how the CBIT project supports addressing of NC4 gaps.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/15/2022: Please address following comments:

1. Several comments below and in other sections relate to the potential overlap or duplication of the work between the CBIT project and the GEF 10801 project. Please address in various sections, and include a clear table (as mentioned later in these comments under Coordination) how the project will build on the GEF 10801 work avoid duplication. The GEF 10801 project is a sizeable project with several workstreams that seem to have similar scope as some of the components in this project.

2. Deliverable 1.1.3: Please provide additional details on which reports, and clarify how this would not duplicate the work of the previously mentioned GEF project 10801.

3. Output 1.2 mentions "system based on NC5" project. Please provide additional details on this. It is also not fully clear if the DataClima plus is a web only platform (1.2.6) or something more (1.2.7) - please clarify. Please comment on how this system would be financially sustainable beyond the life of the CBIT project.

4. Please provide additional details on what is envisioned under this deliverable 1.3.1 and provide more details on 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 - i.e. it is not clear who the workplans are for, what is the technical body (is this new or an existing body etc.), and how it may engage with other existing committees etc. Please also clarify if the Technical Body is the same as the Transparency Technical Body, and please use the same term consistently if it is indeed the same.

5. Output 2.1: please clarify if the project will contribute to putting in place a mechanism to compare and validate the bottom-up data from the Corporate GHG Inventories.

6. Output 2.3: please provide additional details on what is being elaborated under the NC5 project (GEF 10801 combined project) and what additional elements will this include. ie it is not clear what database is being developed under the combined project and how this will be enhanced within this CBIT project. Is this specifically moving from an excel to a more sophisticated IT tool or something more?

7. Please consider the numbers associated with the workshops listed, especially in Component 2. This relates to the comments made under the number of beneficiaries as well.

04/07/2022: Please address remaining comment:

1. On #7, considering that one of the challenges for Brazil is the "complex national circumstances: it has a population of over two hundred million people in a federal system of 26 states (and a federal district), more than 5000 municipalities and 18 federal ministries." Please consider using various channels to increase the beneficiaries of these workshops, especially in Component 2 (Activities 2.1.4, 2.2.6, 2.3.3, 2.4.3 and 3.1.4).

5/4/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

31 March 2022.

1. New table 4B and accompanying text have been added to the start of chapter 3 to clarify the differences, complementarities and synergies between the 10801 combined project and the proposed CBIT project.

2. Clarification to 1.1.3 has been added. This deliverable focuses on developing a long-term timeline for UNFCCC reporting through to 2050, which will complement timelines developed through the GEF 10801 project.

3. Output 1.2 has been rewritten to respond to the reviewer's questions. Financial sustainability is covered by output 1.3, which has also been rewritten to clarify this. Table 4B provides additional clarification on the differences, complementarities and synergies between the two projects on this issue.

4. Output 1.3 and its deliverables have been rewritten to respond to the reviewer's questions.

5. Output 2.1. A mechanism will be put in place to ensure quality assurance of the reported inputs to the corporate inventory. Deliverable 2.1.1 has been adjusted to make this clear. In the short to medium term it will be difficult to compare bottom-up emissions with top-down emissions, as the methodologies used are different and bottom up corporate reporting will be voluntary.

6. Output 2.3 has been written to respond to the reviewer's questions. Table 4B provides additional clarification on the differences, complementarities and synergies between the two projects on this issue.

7. Numbers of workshop participants has been revised and the number of direct beneficiaries updated as noted above.

29 April 2022

Number of beneficiaries increased through capacity-building through online channels. Text changed in section F, deliverables 1.5.2, 2.1.4, 2.2.6, 2.3.4, 2.4.3 and 3.1.4, and annex B.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

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

3/15/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

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

3/15/2022: Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/15/2022: Please note comment made in alternative scenario in relation to this.

04/07/2022: We note that the financial sustainability issue has been addressed in the alternative scenario section, specifically in Output 1.3. Please align in this section.

5/4/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

31 March 2022. Noted and responded in the section above on the alternative scenario.

29 April 2022. Text updated.

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

3/15/2022: This is a national project and map of Brazil has been provided.

Agency Response

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

3/15/2022: Yes this has been provided. Cleared.

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

3/15/2022: Yes. Cleared.

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

3/15/2022: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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

3/15/2022: Yes, this has been provided. Cleared.

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

3/15/2022: As mentioned above, please provide additional details on how this CBIT project will not duplicate the work being undertaken by GEF 10801 project. In this context, elaborate further and provide additional details in Table 9.

04/07/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response 31 March 2022. The requested additional information has been included at the beginning of section 3, including through table 4B. Text has been added to this coordination section making reference to section 3 and table 4B. Table 9 has now been deleted as it is replaced by table 4B.

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

3/15/2022: Yes, cleared.

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

3/15/2022: Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/15/2022: This is marked as low. Cleared.

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

3/15/2022: Yes, the project has been endorsed by Marcus Cesar Ribeiro Barretto, GEF OFP.

5/4/2022: Please upload revised LoE with the new budget amount.

5/5/2022: This has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response 4 May 2022. Revised LoE uploaded.

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) 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 in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

Agency Response

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

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/15/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/7/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/4/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

3/15/2022: Please address comments.

04/07/2022: Please address remaining comments.

05/04/2022: Please address remaining comment

03/04/2022: Please address remaining comment.

05/05/2022: PM recommends technical clearance.