



GEF-6 GEF Secretariat Review For Enabling Activity Proposal

GEF ID:	9530		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Review and update of the national implementation plan for the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Brazil		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Chemicals and Waste
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):			
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	\$250,000
Co-financing:		Total Project Cost:	\$250,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Ogawa Masako	Agency Contact Person:	Kevin Helps

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	Yes.	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes.	
Project Consistency	3. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?	Yes.	
	4. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	Yes, this is a NIP Update project.	
Project Design	5. Are the components in Table A sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project	Table A needs adjustment. First, there should only be a Project Objective listed at the top of Table A,	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	objectives and the GEBs?	<p>Project Outcome is not standard in the GEF template. Second, Monitoring and Evaluation should be listed as a separate component (in this case component 3) with an associated budget.</p> <p>The Project Objective includes reporting obligations under Article 15, however there is no component addressing reporting obligations in the project. Reporting obligations under article 15 are not considered enabling activities, however reporting is eligible for GEF funding. If reporting will be included in this project there should be a component that clearly lays out the process and it would be expected that the country provide a report to the next COP in 2017.</p> <p>Component 1 is not clear. Why would this EA evaluate NIPs worldwide? Output 1.1 is also not clear. What countries will be targeted when this is a single country project? In outcome 1.1.2 What are the regional discussions that will take place? How will these regional discussions help develop the Brazil NIP update?</p> <p>Component 2 should focus on NIP update not NIP development. The GEF has already supported an initial NIP.</p> <p>Throughout the document it is not</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>clear if the completed activities under the initial NIP are being discussed or if new activities planned for the NIP update and being discussed.</p> <p>The initial NIP supporting by the GEF in 2006 was about \$1.5M. Because that NIP took about 9 years to complete some New POPs were included in the initial NIP. It the funding request adequate for completing remaining elements needed for the NIP update?</p> <p>ES, 9/15/16: All issues have been addressed. -Comments cleared</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	Yes.	
	7. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes.	
	8. Is indicated cofinancing appropriate for an enabling activity?	The is no co financing for this project. It is not a requirement for EAs.	
Other Comments	9. Comments related to adequacy of information submitted by country for the financial management and procurement assessment ¹ .		
Resource Availability	10. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? • The focal area allocation? 	Yes.	

¹ Question 9 is applicable only to direct access proposal while question 10 (on fees) is not applicable to direct access proposal.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<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"> • The focal area set-aside? 		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation	11. Is EA clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>Not at this time there are a number of issues that need to be addressed.</p> <p>ES, 9/15/16: All issues have been addressed. CEO Endorsement is recommended by the program manager.</p>	
Review Date (s)	First review*	July 08, 2016	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 15, 2016	
	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.**