



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

GEF ID:	<b>5378</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Brazil</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Fourth National Communication and Biennial Update Reports to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>5187 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-6;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$7,528,500</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$22,885,500</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$30,414,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>May 02, 2013</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	<b>June 20, 2013</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Rawlestone Moore</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Oliver Page</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
<b>Eligibility</b>	1. Is the participating <b>country eligible</b> ?	Brazil is eligible to receive resources.	Same as PIF stage.
	2. Has the <b>operational focal point</b> endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter from the operational focal is on file.	Same as PIF stage.
<b>Resource Availability</b>	3. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the <b>resources available</b> from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	The resources are available in the STAR Allocation.	Same as PIF stage.
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or		

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

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.  
FSP/MSP review template: updated January 2013

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	US\$852,000 is available from the focal area set aside for this project.	Same as PIF stage.
Strategic Alignment	<p>4. Is the project aligned with the focal area/multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF <b>results framework and strategic objectives</b>?</p> <p><i>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).</i></p>	The project is aligned with GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist Brazil to prepare its fourth national communications and submit biennial update reports to the UNFCCC.	Same as PIF stage
	<p>5. Is the project consistent with the recipient <b>country's national strategies and plans</b> or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, NBSAP or NAP?</p>	The project is consistent with national strategies and plans in Brazil, for example the National Plan on Climate Change.	Same as PIF
Project Design	<p>6. Is (are) the <b>baseline project(s)</b>, including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	Yes. The project responds to a requirement which countries have, to prepare national communications to the UNFCCC.	Same as PIF stage
	<p>7. Are the components, outcomes and outputs in the <b>project framework</b> (Table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	The components, outcome and outputs in the project framework table are clear and sound.	Same as PIF stage.
	<p>8. (a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? (b) Is the description of the incremental/additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	The project will assist in preparing the national communications for Brazil and thus it is not necessary to demonstrate additional reasoning.	The project will also assist in preparing biennial update reports for 2016 and 2018 for Brazil.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	9. Is there a clear description of: a) the <b>socio-economic benefits</b> , 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 there is a clear description on issues related to gender.
	10. Is the role of public participation, including CSOs, and indigenous peoples where relevant, identified and explicit means for their engagement explained?	Information on public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, has been provided. Further information should be provided by CEO Endorsement.	Yes. The role of public participation is clearly explained. Public consultations will involve stakeholders representing indigenous people.
	11. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk mitigation measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)	No major risks have been identified for the implementation of this project, other than delays due to coordination with a large number of stakeholders. Mitigation measures have been identified to minimize any delays in coordination amongst institutions for the implementation of the project.	Yes the project takes into account potential risks.
	12. Is the <b>project consistent and properly coordinated</b> with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent and properly coordinated with other initiatives in Brazil.	Same as PIF stage.
	13. Comment on the project's <b>innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess whether the project is innovative and if so, how, and if not, why not.</li> <li>• Assess the project's strategy for sustainability, and the likelihood of achieving this based on GEF and Agency experience.</li> </ul>	The project is designed to allow Brazil to fulfill its commitments to the UNFCCC.	Same as PIF stage.

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the potential for scaling up the project's intervention.</li> </ul>		
	14. Is the project structure/design sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		The project is sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF stage.
	15. Has the cost-effectiveness of the project been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		Cost effectiveness has been sufficiently demonstrated.
Project Financing	16. Is the GEF funding and co-financing as indicated in Table B appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The GEF funding is appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcome and outputs.	Same as PIF stage
	17. <u>At PIF</u> : Is the indicated amount and composition of co-financing as indicated in Table C adequate? Is the amount that the Agency bringing to the project in line with its role? <u>At CEO endorsement</u> : Has co-financing been confirmed?	As this is an enabling activity co-financing is not required.	Same as PIF stage
	18. Is the funding level for <b>project management cost</b> appropriate?	The level for project management costs is appropriate.	Same as PIF stage
	19. <u>At PIF</u> , is PPG requested? If the requested amount deviates from the norm, has the Agency provided adequate justification that the level requested is in line with project design needs? <u>At CEO endorsement/ approval</u> , if PPG is completed, did Agency report on the activities using the	There is no PPG request for this project.	Same as PIF stage

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	PPG fund?		
	20. If there is a <b>non-grant instrument</b> in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?	N/A	N/A
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	21. Have the appropriate <b>Tracking Tools</b> been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		N/A
	22. Does the proposal include a <b>budgeted M&amp;E Plan</b> that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		Yes, the project includes a budgeted M&E plan.
Agency Responses	23. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• The Council?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	24. <b>Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The PIF has been technically cleared and may be included in an upcoming Work Program.	
	25. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	The CEO endorsement is contingent upon the submission of the third national communication and the first biennial update report to the UNFCCC  Please provide further information on the applicability of the Brazilian Earth System Model to other countries in the region.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	26. <b>Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		The project is not currently recommended for endorsement. Please provide indicative dates in 2016 for the

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
			<p>second Biennial Update Report (BUR), and in 2018 for the submission of the Fourth National Communication. Please clarify on the submission of the Third National Communication (TNC) as a copy of the TNC is not available on the UNFCCC website.</p> <p>Update March 5th 2015</p> <p>The indicative dates for the submission of the second biennial update report and the fourth national communications have been provided, however the third national communications has not been submitted to UNFCCC. The project can only be recommended for CEO Endorsement once the third national communications is submitted to UNFCCC. UNDP should communicate to the GEF Secretariat when the third national communications has been submitted to the UNFCCC</p> <p>Update May 9, 2016</p> <p>The Third National Communication was submitted to the UNFCCC on April 20, 2016. The indicative dates of submission for the Second BUR, Third BUR and Fourth NC have been revised to December 31, 2016, December 31, 2018 and April 20, 2020, respectively.</p> <p>The project is recommended for CEO Endorsement.</p>
	First review*	April 15, 2013	January 15, 2015

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Review Date (s)	Additional review (as necessary)		March 09, 2016
	Additional review (as necessary)		May 09, 2016

**\* 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.**