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

GEF ID:	**5276**		
Country/Region:	**Brazil**		
Project Title:	**Sustainable Land Use Management in the Semi-arid Region of North-east Brazil (Sergipe)**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**3066 (UNDP)**
Type of Trust Fund:	**GEF Trust Fund**	GEF Focal Area (s):	**Land Degradation**
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**LD-1; LD-3; Project Mana;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$84,886**	Project Grant:	**$3,815,192**
Co-financing:	**$16,955,200**	Total Project Cost:	**$20,855,278**
PIF Approval:	**February 21, 2013**	Council Approval/Expected:	**April 01, 2013**
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Mohamed Bakarr**	Agency Contact Person:	**Helen Negret**

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**?	February 7, 2013 Yes, Brazil is eligible. Cleared	
	2. Has the **operational focal point** endorsed the project?	February 7, 2013 Yes, the OFP letter dated August 31, 2012 is included. Cleared	
Resource Availability	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the **resources available** from (mark all that apply):		

*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.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	• the STAR allocation?	February 7, 2013 Yes, the total $4,270,585 (including Agency Fees and PPG) requested is available. Cleared	
	• the focal area allocation?	February 7, 2013 Yes, the proposed project is LD focal area stand-alone. The full amount requested is available under the country's LD allocation. Cleared	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	n/a	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/a	
	• the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund	N/a	
	• focal area set-aside?	February 7, 2013 No FA set-aside is requested. Cleared	
Strategic Alignment	4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF **results framework and strategic objectives**? *For BD projects: Has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track progress toward achieving the Aichi target(s).*	February 7, 2013 Yes, the proposed project is fully aligned with the LD focal area results framework and strategic objectives. It will contribute to LD1 and LD3. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Is the project consistent with the recipient **country's national strategies and plans** or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?	February 7, 2013 Yes, consistency with the country's NAP and a national public plan to eradicate extreme poverty (Brazil without Poverty) is highlighted. In addition, the project is consistent with the State Action Plan to Combat Desertification (PAE-SE) in the northeastern State of Sergipe, which is targeted for investment in SLM. Cleared Cleared	
Project Design	6. 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?	February 7, 2013 Yes. Building on planned and existing baseline investments by the National and State Government to implement the PAE-SE, the proposed GEF will leverage nearly $121.5 million over four years to combat desertification in affected areas of Sergipe State. Cleared	
	7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the **project framework** (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?	February 7, 2013 Yes, the project framework is sound and appropriately detailed for a PIF. Two main components are included, with indicative targets for outcomes related to SLM coverage and institutional transformations. Cleared	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	8. Are **global environmental benefits** adequately identified, and the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the **incremental/additional reasoning** sound and appropriate?	February 7, 2013 Yes, the incremental reasoning is sound and appropriate. GEBs have been identified, included indicative targets of areas to be impacted directly from uptake and implementation of SLM interventions by land users. It is expected that baseline estimates for appropriate indicators will be established during project preparation. Cleared	
	9. 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?		February 7, 2013 Yes, the target beneficiaries and proposed nature of socio-economic benefits have been described. It is stated that the beneficiaries and benefits will be more accurately established during project preparation. Cleared
	10. Is **public participation**, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	February 7, 2013 Yes, the project will use a participatory approach for stakeholder engagement in planning and implementation, including gender considerations. An umbrella organization for CSOs will be fully involved as one of the executing entities. Cleared	
	11. Does the project take into account potential **major risks**, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e.,	February 7, 2013 Yes, relevant risks and mitigation measures have been identified. These should be further elaborated during	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	climate resilience)	project development. Cleared	
	12. Is the **project consistent and properly coordinated** with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	February 7, 2013 Yes. Brazil has an excellent track record with SLM projects in the drylands (caatinga, cerrado). Achievements and lessons from previous investments have been noted potential for coordination with existing projects highlighted. Cleared	
	13. Comment on the project's **innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up**. - Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not. - Assess the project's sustainability strategy and the likelihood project outcomes will be sustained or not based on the evidence in the literature. - Are there measures to secure the institutional and financial stability of the project? - Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention strategy and critique the plan for scaling up.	February 7, 2013 A fundamental barrier to implementing SLM for combating desertification is the land use policy and governance framework. An innovative aspect of the proposed project is to capitalize on existing national and state commitment to address this challenge in the context of poverty reduction and drought mitigation. Consequently, SLM will be mainstreamed as a tool for enhancing sustainability, while empowering local land users to implement appropriate interventions on the ground with environmental and socio-economic benefits. The land governance framework and commitment by the national and state governments will ensure that successes and gains are sustained, with potential for scaling up to other affected areas.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	14. Is the **project structure** sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	15. 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?		
Project Financing	16. Is the **GEF funding and co-financing** per component appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	February 7, 2013 Yes Cleared	
	17. At PIF: Is the amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role? Any comment on the indicated amount and composition of **cofinancing**? At CEO endorsement: Has co-financing been confirmed?	February 7, 2013 Yes. UNDP is contributing $250,000 in cash, which is appropriate given its role as technical partner. Cleared	
	18. Is the funding level for **project management cost** appropriate?	February 7, 2013 Yes, the PMC is about 5%. Cleared	
	19. If there is **a non-grant instrument** in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/a	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	20. Have the appropriate **Tracking Tools** been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	21. Does the proposal include a **budgeted M&E Plan** that		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion [1]	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	22. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		February 7, 2013 Please respond as appropriate.
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	**23. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?**	February 7, 2013 Yes, the PIF is technically cleared and maybe included in a future WP.	
	24. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	February 7, 2013 1. Completed LD TT 2. A detailed assessment of project beneficiaries, including gender. 3. More accurate measure of targets and baselines for outcomes and GEBs.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	25. At PIF, is PPG requested and approved? At CEO endorsement/ approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?	February 7, 2013 PPG was submitted in an email dated 1/17/13, and already accounted for in the OFP endorsement. CEO approved PPG 2/21/13.	
	26. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?		
Review Date (s)	First review*	February 08, 2013	
	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.**