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Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not entirely. The Project is aligned with the SGP strategic directions approved for GEF-7.

However, the funding and activities under CCM2-6 ("Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts for food systems, land use and restoration impact program") as presented are not eligible under the approved GEF-7 programming directions.

This is because, CCM-2’s land use and restoration activities are only eligible in GEF-7 as they relate to the Food Systems, Land Use, and Restoration Impact Program (FOLUR IP). The IP has not been submitted nor has it been approved by Council yet.

Please review.

11/21/2018 - Reviewed.

Climate Change mitigation was revised and now includes the FA’s objective -CCM1-1: Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs for decentralized power with energy storage. Regarding this particular entry point, the priorities approved in the GEF-7 programming directions are on innovative actions, that are aligned with NDCs, and are complementary to other financial mechanisms. In addition, this objective “supports innovation and technology transfer at key early and middle stages of development, focusing on the demonstration and early deployment of innovative technologies to deliver sustainable energy solutions that control, reduce, or prevent GHG emissions.”

Please explain how project outcome 1.4 (Increased adoption -development, demonstration and financing- of renewable and energy efficient technologies at community level) is aligned with the approved priorities and objectives for CCM1-1 as explained above. Particularly explain how interventions by CSOs and CBOs (biogas, fuel-efficient stoves, etc.) will support innovative breakthroughs and technology transfer to deliver energy solutions that can be scaled-up?

Please revise 11/21/2018
Agency Response

Table A has been duly revised to reflect eligibility under GEF-7 Programming Directions for CCM.

23/01/2019: Further response to comment above regarding CCM 1-1 and Outcome 1.4: SGP Brazil works with community organizations in remote and underserved areas of the Cerrado and Caatinga biomes. Grants to community organizations in these areas will support decentralized power generation from renewable energy (e.g. microhydro, solar, wind, biomass). While the energy technologies are, in and of themselves, fairly well known at a global and national level, they represent dramatic innovations in the remote landscapes served by SGP, and as decentralized power generation systems, they are locally managed and governed, which strengthens organizational and community capacities. Experience and capacities gained from application of these technologies will permit communities to advocate for larger or more robust systems, as well as to solicit credits to finance system extension and follow-on or spin-off applications for productive uses. SGP Brazil will systematize and document all experiences with specific power generation technologies and applications. This information will be presented to local, state and other authorities as inputs to potential policy dialogues highlighting innovative breakthroughs regarding decentralized power generation in remote and underserved areas of the Caatinga and Cerrado biomes.

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not entirely. Please refer to the comment on CCM2-6 above and reformulate Table B. For this purpose, please refer to the Programming Directions under the CCM Focal Area approved for GEF-7, particularly in terms of eligibility of agroecology activities. Outside the Impact Program investments, CCM Focal Area actions in GEF-7 are only eligible if it supports developing countries to make transformational shifts.
Program investments, CCM Focal Area actions in GEF-7 are only eligible if it supports developing countries to make transformational shifts towards low emission and climate-resilient development pathways. To achieve this goal, the strategy emphasizes three fundamental objectives:

- Promote innovation and technology transfer for sustainable energy breakthroughs;
- Demonstrate mitigation options with systemic impacts; and
- Foster enabling conditions for mainstreaming mitigation concerns into sustainable development strategies.


Please revise Table B further as per comment made above regarding Table A and the need to revise the proposed activities and outputs under CCM1-1.

Revised

Cleared 02/11/2019

Agency Response

Table B has been revised to agree with Table A and GEF 7 Programming Directions.

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please review the Investment Mobilized" (IM) included in the table.

The indicative information provided in Table C and in the description of how Investment Mobilized (IM) is not complete or accurate.

To review this, please refer to the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines.

The relevant Policy requirement at PIF stage is the following:

" Agencies provide indicative information regarding the expected amounts, sources and types of Co-Financing, and the sub-set of such Co-Financing that meets the definition of Investment Mobilized (IM)". IM is defined as the "sub-set of co-financing that excludes recurrent expenditures."

Reviewed. Please also clarify how the co-financing classified as Investment Mobilized meets that definition.

Please revise 11/21/2018

FURTHER REVISION IS NEEDED:

The description field describes the process whereby investment mobilized was identified. In addition, please describe the definition/approach used to differentiate between "investment mobilized" and "recurrent expenditures". For further details, please refer to the Co-Financing Guidelines (http://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/Cofinancing_Guidelines.pdf).

04/25/2019

Agency Response

Table C has been revised to confirm sources and types of cofinancing, including Investment Mobilized and Recurrent Expenditures.
23/01/2019: Further response to comment re IM, above: Investment Mobilized figures are based on discussions with the UNDP Country Office and internal discussions within ISPN, the project’s executing agency. These figures represent solid commitments in cash to project objectives and outcomes. These and all other figures will be formally confirmed through co-financing letters identifying amounts and kinds of contributions. SGP global policy requests grant recipient CSOs to contribute to their projects in cash to the best of their abilities. The National Steering Committee will foster compliance with this policy as appropriate with the aim of achieving the cofinancing targets expressed here by end of the project and as an overall contribution from the aggregate of grantee organizations. These contributions will only be confirmed during project implementation as grant projects are approved.

29 April 2019: The SGP National Coordinators were instructed to differentiate cofinancing commitments between those corresponding to recurrent costs e.g. salaries of NGO or government staff, costs of premises, etc., and Investment Mobilized, corresponding to new and additional funding either directly contributed to SGP to apply to project grants, as grantee contributions in kind and in cash, or mobilized to support project objectives but not managed by SGP.

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
See below under STAR

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
With regards to the proposed utilization of STAR under CCM2, please refer to the comments above, please review and resubmit.

Please consider the comments for Table 1 regarding under CCM1-1.

11/21/2018
Revised

Cleared 02/11/2019

Agency Response
The CCM allocation request has been modified to focus on eligible activities under CCM Objective 1.

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
N/A

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?
5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
The proposed project includes an estimated 200,000 hectares of land restored as well as 200,000 hectares of landscape under improved practices. This would imply that there are 400,000 hectares in total Is this a coincidence or is it a duplication?
In addition, when reviewing the CCM2 component, please also review sub-indicator 6.1 (Carbon Sequestered or Emissions Avoided in the AFOLU -Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use)- as CCM2 cannot be used for activities, unless there are part of the FOLUR Impact Program. Finally, please explain how the number of direct beneficiaries (3,000 female, 3,000 male) was calculated.

12/5/2018 Additional comment: Please note that projects (including the SGP) can only report targets in the portal for those indicators that are calculated using the methodology included in the GEF-7 Results Framework (as per the Guidelines). Please refer to these Guidelines. We understand that because of the nature and scale of the SGP projects, there's a need to capture results by using particular methodologies. SGP May still report on those indicators separately. However, those results from indicators using a different methodology will not be aggregated and again, cannot be included in this table, nor can they be reported as part of the GEF-7's results framework.

Please revise or clarify.

Explanation provided and figures revised.

FURTHER REVISION REQUESTED:

As per the new GEF results guidelines, all GEF projects are required to submit an estimate of their expected results at the PIF stage. While we understand the PIF-stage results may change, the estimate of expected results is required at PIF submission. Please provide your best estimated core indicators, as per the Guidelines.

4/25/2019

Agency Response

Note that these figures are considered estimates which will be adjusted or refined as a result of project preparation activities financed through a PPG. Table F, as well as the Core Indicator Annex, have been revised to reflect reformulated CCM activities. Initial estimates of direct beneficiaries were done based on previous experiences and considering the landscapes selected. These figures are considered estimates which will be adjusted or refined as a result of project preparation activities financed through a PPG.
23/01/2019: Response to comment 12/05/2018 re Indicators, above: Given that the nature of SGP Country Programmes with their focus on participatory landscape strategy development, which includes the identification of individual community-based grant projects within these landscapes as part of project implementation, it is difficult at this stage of project development to identify targets for the relevant indicators with any precision. While the indicators for this project are not expected to change, the targets will be carefully calculated during the PPG-financed Project Preparation Stage using the corresponding GEF-7 guidance as applicable. Note that, as such, Table F and the Core Indicator Annex have been revised to reflect this by using the term “TBD”.

29 April 2019: Estimates for core indicators have been added as requested.

These indicators were derived based on the past decades of experience with SGP grants; knowledge of the target landscapes where SGP is active; knowledge of the landscape resilience strategy which targets focal-area specific outcomes, and knowledge of the developing pipeline of community-based proposals from conversations, draft proposals, and other informal means. Using these factors, the Core Indicator targets are estimated and then questioned and vetted by UNDP GEF staff.

In estimating GHG emissions avoided, SGP National Coordinators made a number of assumptions: 1) since SGP grants will be provided for renewable energy applications the baseline can be considered as zero without the GEF contribution; 2) renewable energy applications will vary from grant project to grant project depending on the RE resource available, as well as other factors, affecting the volume of GHG emissions avoided per each Project; and 3) as such, precise calculations of GHG emissions avoided are not possible, therefore a broad estimate based on previous SGP experience with RE applications provides a figure that can be adjusted during Project implementation as an adaptive response to new information, and differences in community-based demand for RE applications during overall Project implementation.
7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

art II – Project Justification

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes
3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**
Yes

**Agency Response**

4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**
To some extent. Please refer to the CCM comments above.

Reviewed.

11/21/2018 - Please review again in light of comments about CCM1-1

Revised

Cleared 02/11/2019
Agency Response

The PIF has been revised to ensure that the project is eligible under CCM Objective 1 of the GEF 7 Programming Directions.

5. Is the incremental / additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

6. Are the project’s/program’s indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
See comments about Core Indicators

GEBs (as included in GEF-5 and GEF-6) have been replaced by the core indicators. Targets should be set using the approved methodology.

Please review core indicators as per the comment on the need to fully align with the methodology of the GEF -7 Results Framework.

12/5/2018
Revised

HOWEVER, as per indicated above, FURTHER REVISION IS REQUESTED:

As per the new GEF results guidelines, all GEF projects are required to submit an *estimate* of their expected results at the PIF stage. While we understand the PIF-stage results may change, the estimate of expected results is required at PIF submission. Please provide your best estimated core indicators as per the Guidelines.
Agency Response

The indicative estimated targeted contributions to GEB have been reviewed and adjusted to reflect the project focus on CCM Objective 1. Note that these targets will be adjusted or refined as a consequence of project preparation.

23/01/2019: Response to comment 12/05/2018 re Indicators, above: Given that the nature of SGP Country Programmes with their focus on participatory landscape strategy development, that includes the identification of individual community-based grant projects within these landscapes, it is difficult at this stage of project development to identify targets for the relevant indicators with any precision. While the indicators for this project are not expected to change, the targets will be carefully calculated during the PPG-financed Project Preparation Stage using the corresponding GEF-7 guidance. Note that, as such, Table F and the Core Indicator Annex have been revised to reflect this by using the term “TBD”. The figures for number of beneficiaries have been estimated initially based on knowledge of likely grantees living in the different landscapes but these figures will only be confirmed during project preparation.

7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

Project/Program Map and Coordinates
Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes
Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

Risks

Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response
Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response
Knowledge Management

Is the proposed "knowledge management (KM) approach" in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes

Agency Response

art III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
Yes. Letter signed on October 5 by current OPF.

Agency Response

EFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?
Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Review Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIF Review</th>
<th>Agency Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Review</td>
<td>10/29/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review</td>
<td>12/21/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as necessary)</td>
<td>12/5/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Review</td>
<td>2/11/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(as necessary)</td>
<td>4/25/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>