



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

GEF ID:	4560		
Country/Region:	Brazil		
Project Title:	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Brazil		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	4578 (UNDP)
Type of Trust Fund:	GEF Trust Fund	GEF Focal Area (s):	Multi Focal Area
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	BD-2; CCM-5; LD-1; CD-2; CD-5; IW-3; Project Mana; LD-1; CD-5; Project Mana;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$0	Project Grant:	\$5,000,000
Co-financing:	\$5,050,000	Total Project Cost:	\$10,050,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	November 01, 2011
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Danielius Pivoriunas	Agency Contact Person:	Nick Remple

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, Brazil is eligible. Cleared. 06/21/2011	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	Yes. Cleared. 06/21/2011	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	UNDP has been implementing Small grants program in Brazil from 1992 and has gained significant experience in implementing the program. Cleared. 06/21/2011	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A. Cleared. 06/21/2011	

*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)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, it does. Cleared. 06/21/2011	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	Yes, BD-2mln , LD -1mln , CC-2mln , Cleared. 06/21/2011	
	• the focal area allocation?	LSH/June 16 2011: Yes for Climate GF/June 17 2011: Yes for BD Cleared. 6/23/2011	
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access	N/A Cleared. 06/21/2011	
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?	N/A Cleared. 06/21/2011	
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
	• focal area set-aside?	No. Cleared. 06/21/2011	
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	Yes, the project is consistent with focal area strategies and results frameworks. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	LSH/June 16 2011: Yes for Climate GF/June 17 2011: Yes for BD Yes, identified. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	GF/June 17 2011: Yes consistent. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	GF/June 17 2011: Yes Yes, it does. Cleared. 06/23/2011	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
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?	Yes, sufficiently described and based on sound data and past experience. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	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?	Provided. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	The framework is sound and clear. However, some clarification is needed for the following items: a) It is not clear how activities listed in the table B under 1.1.5 are relevant to biodiversity. b) Why KM strategy is necessary in the table B under 4.2.1 section. c) M&E costs seem quite high. Please justify or reduce. Additional information is requested. 6/23/2011 Aug 25/LH: c) Justification on M&E costs is adequate. Additional information is provided. Cleared 8/29/2011	
	15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?	LSH/Climate June 16 2011: For carbon benefits these are appropriate at this stage. Text adequately describes need for further work such as on the baseline, etc. Provided. Cleared. 06/23/2011	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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, provided. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigeneous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	Yes, addressed. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	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)	Yes, it does take into consideration potential major risks. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	Yes, consistent and well coordinated. Cleared. 06/23/2011	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	Yes, adequate in most of cases. However, it is not clear why the project can not be implemented with the same number of staff as it is today or like in any other country program. Please provide additional clarification. 6/23/2011 It is not clearly presented why the number of staff to be employed is so high. Please provide details. 9/07/2011	
	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?	Not appropriate. It is not clear on what basis management costs were estimated and why 0.9mln US\$ is needed to manage the project. Management costs shell be significantly decreased at least from the GEF side. Additional changes are requested. 9/07/2011	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	Yes appropriate in most of cases. However, monitoring and and evaluation costs should be revised and significantly decreased and additional clarification provided. 6/23/2011 Provided. Cleared 8/29/2011	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	Indicative agency co-financing is very low and shell be reconsidered. Additional information is requested. 6/23/2011 Reconsidered. Agency co-financing is increased by 1mln USD. Cleared 8/29/2011	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	Co-financing is provided in amount of 100K US\$ in cash and in kind which makes only 2%. Higher co-financing shell be considered. Additional clarification is requested. 6/23/2011 Considered. Cleared	
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?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments?		
	• Other GEF Agencies?		
Secretariat Recommendation			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?	<p>LSH/Climate June 16 2011: Please address cost-effectiveness issue and M&E cost concern.</p> <p>GF/June 17 2011: From BD, the recommendation is to clear the PIF, provided other comments in this review have been addressed.</p> <p>Clearance is not recommended yet, additional information is requested. 6/23/2011</p> <p>Clearance is not recommended yet, additional information is requested. 9/07/2011</p> <p>Technically cleared, CEO clearance is recommended. 8/29/2011</p>	
	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*	June 23, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)	September 07, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion ¹	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	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.