

# Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Brazil

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10122

**Countries**

Brazil

**Project Name**

Seventh Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Programme in Brazil

**Agencies**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

8/20/2020

**Review completed by PM**

3/14/2021

**Program Manager**

Mark Zimsky

**Focal Area**

Multi Focal Area

**Project Type**

FSP

## PIF ☐

### CEO Endorsement ☐

#### Part I ? Project Information

##### Focal area elements

**1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared.

##### Agency Response

##### Project description summary

**2. 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  
9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

##### Agency Response

**3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

na

## Agency Response

### Co-financing

**4. 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

10/6/2020

3- On Co-financing:

- (i) Co-financing letters were not found
- (ii) A project/program is not a co-financier. In the "Name of Co-Financier" field, please provide the name of the entity that provides the funding, rather than the name of the project with which it is associated. (see reference to a USAID project)

11/23/2020

Cleared.

## Agency Response

20 Nov 2020

- (i) The remark is well noted. The co-financing letters were appended but it appears as though there has been an issue submitting these through the portal. We look forward to working with the GEF IT team to ensure that all documentation is successfully received.
- (ii) Projects are no longer listed as co-financiers; institutions are named as co-financiers

Please refer to the attached Responses to the GEF Review Sheet regarding the comments included under the section GEFSEC Decision

Recommendation, as there is no space for the agency response in the section below.

#### **GEF Resource Availability**

**5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response  
**Project Preparation Grant**

**6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response  
**Core indicators**

**7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

No.

The significant change in the allocation of hectares under core indicator 4 away from hectares that benefit biodiversity was substantial (a dropped by 50%), but no explanation is provided nor is there a discussion on how this impacted CC-mitigation

benefits which stayed steady which does not make sense. Given that the SGP is being funded almost entirely by the BDFA we expect a more significant biodiversity return on the investment. Please revise.

9/24/2020

Yes. Cleared

#### Agency Response

9/22/2020

Thank you, the main thrust of the project is to primarily support biodiversity protection often as a result of combating land degradation, thereby reducing pressure on biodiversity from conversion of new lands to agriculture. Core Indicator 4 will remain at a target of 200,000 hectares. After thorough analysis and discussion among project partners in response to the GEF review, the proposal for Sub-indicator 4.1 is to target 195,000 hectares (vis a vis the 199,000 target proposed at PIF stage), while sub-indicator 4.3 will target 5,000 hectares (vis a vis the 1,000 target proposed at PIF stage). This revision has been discussed and agreed with the project's Implementing Partner. The reason for the increase from 1,000 to 5,000 hectares for Indicator 4.3, is because a number of agricultural communities will promote sustainable land management systems in the service of biodiversity protection. The Climate Change Mitigation Report appended in Annex 12 provides the analysis for how the mitigation benefits were identified.

#### Part II ? Project Justification

**1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?**

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

#### Agency Response

**2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?**

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. However, please address the core indicator change as noted above.

11/23/2020

Cleared.

Agency Response

**7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**Project Map and Coordinates**

**Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**Child Project**

**If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

NA

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

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

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

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**Private Sector Engagement**

**If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier  
and/or as a stakeholder?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared



Agency Response

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Very elaborate risk analysis with adequate mitigation measures. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

## **Knowledge Management**

**Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

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 CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Fully and comprehensively discussed and documented. Cleared.

Agency Response

**Monitoring and Evaluation**

**Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**Benefits**

**Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response  
**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response  
**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response  
**GEF Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

NA

Agency Response  
**Council comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

Yes. Adequate response to UK and Germany. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**STAP comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

NA.

Agency Response  
**Convention Secretariat comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

NA.

Agency Response  
**Other Agencies comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

NA

Agency Response  
**CSOs comments**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request  
9/15/2020

NA

Agency Response

**Status of PPG utilization**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

Yes. Cleared

Agency Response

**Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

NA

Agency Response

**Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows.**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

NA

Agency Response

**Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows?**

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

### Agency Response

### GEFSEC DECISION

### RECOMMENDATION

#### Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

## Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9/15/2020

No. Please revise core indicator targets are described above.

9/22/2020

No. Please address all of the issues identified including the issues below:

1- The expected implementation start is inaccurate as well as the duration (wrong implementation start will affect reports on UNDP when calculating the project's duration time)

2- PPG was not selected - please tick the box

4- Budget:

(i) Cost associated with Project Execution are covered exclusively by the GEF portion of the PMC. There is no evidence of the use of the PMC from co-financing portion to cover the costs associated with the project's execution. Due to this, the costs of some project's staff (such as the Project Manager, Technical Assistants, Program Administrative Assistant, is charged to the project's components). Note that nearly 7 million (65%) of the co-financing funds are represented in grants. As per the Guidelines, the Execution functions are financed through Project Management Costs (PMC), which are funded partly by the GEF funding and partly by the counterpart funding of the beneficiary government or other co-financing resources. Please utilize the co-financing portion allocated to PMC (\$473,382) before charging the execution costs to the project's components. After this requirement is met, the project's staff that would be covered by the project's components need TORs that reflect the specific contribution to the respective component.

(ii) The cost associated with the Mid-term Review and the Terminal

Evaluation has been assigned in two different parts: for component 1 and in the M&E Budget (where it should be). Please amend.

(iii) Associated with (ii) above, this project was submitted first time for CEO Endorsement on August 2020, when the updated Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle were already effective. The requirement of using the template in Annex 7 of the Guidelines was not followed, which is why it is not possible to differentiate what is charged to the M&E. Please include the items included in the M&E Plan in budget in concordance with the purpose of the Template which is to understand which budget items are charged to which sources (PMC, M&E, Project's components).

2/1/2021

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this project that responds to the recent audit findings.

3/14/2021

Yes, CEO endorsement is recommended as the audit template was included.

#### Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>First Review</b>	<b>9/15/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/6/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>11/23/2020</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>2/1/2021</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>3/14/2021</b>	

#### CEO Recommendation

#### Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

SGP Brazil during its Seventh Operational Phase will support community organizations to achieve landscape resilience and sustainable development at the scale of rural landscapes in the Cerrado and Caatinga biomes, with the aim of progressively acquiring critical mass to reach a tipping point of adoption by rural and urban constituencies of adaptive practice and innovation for resilience-building. To achieve this, the project will foster adaptive management capabilities by enhancing technical know-how, developing planning and organizational skills, and strengthening innovation and experimentation capacities to enhance their agency in developing plans and priorities and carrying them out for landscape resilience. The project will also invest in strategic projects, which build knowledge and capacity, and generate synergies among other smaller local actions, with the aim of building long-term ecological social and economic resilience in rural landscapes. The project has a strong commitment to attending the specific needs of vulnerable sub-groups within the communities that often tend to be placed on the margin of social processes: women, youth and traditional communities (quilombolas, indigenous, etc.), through supporting their productive and sustainable initiatives.

Due to the rapid spread of the pandemic, risk mitigation procedures will be developed to address possible operational delays or pauses on an ongoing basis, to follow the latest guidance and advisories. Increased communication will be considered when consulting with local beneficiaries regarding possible impacts, and site-specific protocols will be followed. Changes in the scope or timing of planned activities may be necessary through workplan adjustments. An **Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF)** will be undertaken during the first months of project implementation. As COVID-19 is an evolving situation, and could potentially exacerbate other vulnerabilities and risks, it will be necessary to conduct the ESMF to identify possible changes in risk levels and how mitigation strategies can be adapted to address changing threat levels. This ESMF will not just include high risks but include consideration of all risks and will be monitored through the life of the project. The project also includes a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan. A grievance redress mechanism for identification, assessment, resolution, and management of any complaints will be outlined as part of the ESMF.