



GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	4637		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Marine and Coastal Protected Areas (GEF MAR)		
GEF Agency:	World Bank	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Biodiversity
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-1; BD-1; BD-2; BD-2; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$18,200,000
Co-financing:	\$98,400,000	Total Project Cost:	\$116,600,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Nicole Glineur	Agency Contact Person:	Jocelyne Albert

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	yes	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	please provide endorsement letter	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	yes	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?		
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	yes	
	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

¹ Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Resource Availability	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the STAR allocation? 	Yes, the proposed grant, including agency fees, is within the BD STAR available for Brazil. However, the focal area objectives proposed go beyond BD to include capacity development objectives. CD funds can only be used if the project is addressing the three conventions, i.e.: if it is developing cross-cutting capacity through BD, LD, and CC focal areas. Hence please adjust table A to reflect BD objectives using BD STAR allocation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the focal area allocation? 	yes for BD	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund focal area set-aside? 		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?		
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	No Given that Brazil has been championing mainstreaming of BD in terrestrial landscapes, and that coastal zones harbor large industries, this might be an opportunity to further enhance these aspects as mentioned on p.9.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant	yes.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?		
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	yes	
Project Design	11. Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem (s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?	The baseline, as well as the risks, should include the inter/intra institutional and cross sectoral issues re. coastal management and heavy administrative system of different agencies and clearly highlight the role and potential of SNCUCs which clearly provide a sound legal basis as well as opportunities for coordinated action between federal, state, municipal, and PS as highlighted in section A. The baseline should also include the role and contribution of Government and Petrobras, two instrumental actors in the project.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	Are the necessary institutional capabilities and legal basis not there? Are SNCUCs not enough? Is it not opportune to focus on their implementation and fine-tune institutional aspects while doing so?	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The project framework would benefit from fine-tuning, including: 1. inclusion of the 5% MPA target 2. hopefully not only elaboration of	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		management plans but also implementation 3. Component 3: does Brazil not yet have a marine BD monitoring system or a managerial effectiveness system which may need improvement and implementation?	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?		
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/additional benefits?	yes	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	yes	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	Please refer to section 11.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	yes	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	please elaborate	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	Please adjust not to exceed 5% of total costs	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	yes	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Co-financing is 1:5.4 It would be useful to explain what the Government and Petrobras will fund beyond the co-financing letter. If not doable now, it should be done at the CEO endorsement stage.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?		
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	This is a strategic project for Brazil as it has one of the biggest coastline globally	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
PIF Stage		reported to account for about 70% of GDP. PIF will be recommended for approval pending addressing of the above comments. 9/14/11. All above comments have been addressed satisfactorily in the PIF re-submission. PIF is recommended for submission.	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.		
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	3. Is PPG approval being recommended?	

	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	
	Additional review (as necessary)	

* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.