

Biodiversity C:\Users\wb263215\AppData\Local\Temp\notes04FF5A\~\$tober 2011 - intersessional Work Program.doc

GEF Project ID	4577
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Conservation and Sustainable Use of Agro-biodiversity to Improve Human Nutrition in Five Macro Eco-regions
Country	Bolivia
Region	Latin America and Caribbean
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 16, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	FAO
Executing Agency	Ministry of Environment and Water (Viceministry of Environment, Biodiversity, Climate Change, and Forest Development) Ministry of Rural Development and Land
Description	Conservation in situ and sustainable use of agrobiodiversity through: valuation of nutritional values and climate variability; resilience of selected crop/plant ecotypes; agrobiodiversity-friendly and nutrition labeling and promotion of products; and mainstreaming the conservation of agrobiodiversity into national policies and programmes on health, nutrition, food security and sovereignty.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	2,600,000 US\$
GEF Grant	2,600,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	6,050,000 US\$
Project Cost	8,650,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	260,000 US\$
Project Documents	
PIF Document for WPI (Revised)	
Review sheet	
STAP Review (PDF)	

We support this project which is globally well designed.

We share and would like to emphasize STAP's questions on the project which should be addressed during project development:

a) - the project should better establish the baseline status of agrobiodiversity and how agrobiodiversity monitoring will be implemented and sustainably financed beyond the project?

b) - the profitability of the agrobiodiversity-friendly cultivation practices compared to current agricultural systems should be thoroughly assessed from a micro-economic point of view (level of the smallholders). If this profitability is not secured (which is usually the case, because payment of certification of agrobiodiversity-friendly cultivation practices are usually beyond market prices acceptability), the project should establish a sustainable financing strategy for the agrobiodiversity-friendly cultivation practices (probably a mix of market prices, labels and transversal assistance from taxes or conservation trust funds to the conservation of Agrobiodiversity).

Opinion: favourable, if the above recommendations (a) and (b) are addressed during project development.

Botswana - Improved Management Effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of Protected

GEF Project ID	4544
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Improved Management Effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of Protected Areas
Country	Botswana
Region	Africa
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	July 20, 2011
PPG Approval Date	August 23, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	Department of Wildlife and National Parks, University of Botswana, Department of Environmental AffairsMinist Agriculture/Botswana College of Agriculture
Description	To strengthen management effectiveness of the Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti Matrix of PAs to respond to existing and emerging threats
Implementation Status	
PPG Amount	90,910 US\$
GEF Project Grant	1,818,182 US\$
GEF Grant	1,909,092 US\$
Cofinancing Total	5,695,000 US\$
Project Cost	7,604,092 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	181,818 US\$

The project tries to develop an integrated landscape approach to strengthen protected area management within the globally important 14,282 km² Chobe-Kwando-Linyanti matrix of PAs, comprising Chobe National Park and 6 Forest Reserves, and in surrounding buffer areas covering 2000 km².

The project operates through two main components:

- Component 1: Strengthening Core PA functions to Address Existing and Emerging Threats to Biodiversity
- Component 2: Establishing Collaborative Governance to Address Threats in the PA and Buffer Zones

The project is well designed and there is no question with the justification and importance of the intervention in this globally significant area. The project strongly emphasizes its objective to tackle through a holistic manner the emerging threats to the biodiversity of the landscape.

We are particularly concerned with the wild fire management threats. If the project seems based on a sound approach to try to control the pressure of wildfire, it remains very weak in assessing the cause of wildfire. Particularly, the PIF should present a thorough technical, social and economical assessment of the social groups at the origin of wildfire, the reason of their practice of wildfire, and what could be the alternatives activities or practices that could be proposed to them. Trying to manage the pressure is good, but managing the cause of the pressure is better.

In this regard, the component 2 dedicated to collaborative governance is even not designed at trying to engage a dialog and improvement process with the groups at the cause of this threat. (this component is mainly designed at involving communities in establishing regulation and

enforcement in within PA and buffer zone, but not in trying to develop alternatives to the causes of the threats).

The same question will apply to poaching, increase encroachment into wildlife dispersal areas and unsustainable utilization of natural resources within and in adjacent lands of the PA. For the unsustainable use of natural resources, no technical and economical assessment proves that “joint natural resource management system” will not increase cost of verification and lower profitability for local stakeholders. Such an assessment is considered necessary to support this part of the project.

Without necessarily advocating to go back to Integrated conservation and development projects (ICDPs), the project would be strengthened if additional funding was invested by the national agency in charge of rural development to assist this project in supporting adapted alternatives to the causes of the main threats identified by this project. If the Government of Botswana is ready to invest 4,695 M \$ for conservation in co-financing of this project, it could be explored whether GoB could try to mainstream and coordinate rural development actions in this area to develop a more comprehensive strategy of biodiversity conservation.

Mainstreaming biodiversity in all sector is repeatedly called for in international arenas, but to date mostly remains a concept. This project is an opportunity to translate the concept into action.

Opinion: favourable, if the management of threats causes is integrated into the project and addressed during project development.

Jordan - Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Tourism Sector Development in Jordan

GEF Project ID	4586
UNDP PMIS ID	4587
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Mainstreaming Biodiversity Conservation in Tourism Sector Development in Jordan
Country	Jordan
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Focal Area	Biodiversity
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 16, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	Ministry of Tourism and Antiquities (MoTA)
Description	Biodiversity Conservation Objectives are Effectively Mainstreamed and Advanced into and through tourism development in Jordan
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	2,700,000 US\$
GEF Grant	2,700,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	8,710,000 US\$
Project Cost	11,410,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	270,000 US\$

The project aims at strengthening biodiversity conservation into tourism sector in Jordan.

Tourism is one of the most important sector of Jordanian economy and the increasing of visitor number is the threats for Jordanian biodiversity : fragmentation and loss of habitat, uncontrolled plant collection, effluent discharges, ...

The project will support the strengthening of policy and regulatory framework and improve measures for friendly tourism development. Financial mechanisms to ensure the long-term sustainability of biodiversity protection will be identified by the project.

FFEM is funding a project supported by Royal Botanical Garden that aims at identifying mains endangered ecosystems and protecting them. **This project could be linked with this GEF project.**

Climate Change

Global - SolarChill Development, Testing and Technology Transfer Outreach	
GEF Project ID	4682
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	SolarChill Development, Testing and Technology Transfer Outreach
Country	Global (Colombia, Kenya, Swaziland)
Region	Global
Focal Area	Climate Change
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 23, 2011
PPG Approval Date	September 23, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	PPG Approved
GEF Agency	UNEP - United Nations Environment Programme
Executing Agency	UNICEF, Programs for Appropriate Technologies in Health (PATH), Greenpeace International, Danish Technological (DTI), Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)
Description	1. To determine technical performance, user compliance, and potential market demand for SolarChill technology through scale field tests of the SolarChill vaccine refrigerators (SolarChill A) and pilot introduction of the SolarChill household commercial refrigerators (SolarChill B) in three developing countries (Colombia, Kenya and Swaziland). 2. To support modification and optimization of the SolarChill technology developed in Swaziland. 3. To interest potential manufacturers globally, and more specifically in Africa and Latin America, in the SolarChill technology through: (a) a market analysis of the commercial potential of the technology; (b) preparation of a technology transfer package; (c) conduct of technology workshops and outreach initiatives aimed at manufacturers and potential buyers.
Implementation Status	
PPG Amount	131,529 US\$
GEF Project Grant	2,583,000 US\$
GEF Grant	2,714,529 US\$
Cofinancing Total	5,662,900 US\$
Project Cost	8,377,429 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	258,300 US\$

The project aims to commercialize and transfer the solar chill vaccine refrigerator and to begin the process of commercializing and transferring the Solar Chill and light commercial refrigerator.

The main outcome of the project is the dissemination of 600 refrigerators in three countries, and supporting the development, certification, promotion of a particular technology, based on three producers. This note raises questions of principles on the use of public subsidy in favor of one specific equipment and three private companies.

The document does not contain at all any analysis of technical, economic and commercial (business plan), market analysis, of this technology. This technology would be hyper-funded, under the justification of research and development.

From a strictly ecological point of view, as outlined in the STAP, the consequences in terms of reducing emissions of greenhouse gases are completely negligible. The cost per tonne of CO₂ avoided equals the amount outstanding of € 1453 per tonne of CO₂ avoided.

Finally, as underlined by the STAP, the issues of maintenance and service are absolutely not mentioned.

We consider that the project document should address all the above-mentioned issues before it can be implemented.

Climate Change

Regional - ASTUD Asian Sustainable Transport and Urban Development Program (PROGRAM)	
GEF Project ID	4638
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	ASTUD Asian Sustainable Transport and Urban Development Program (PROGRAM)
Country	Regional (Bangladesh, China, Mongolia)
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Focal Area	Climate Change
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 19, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	PFDCleared
GEF Agency	ADB
Executing Agency	
Description	To support Asian cities in realizing greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions and local co-benefits through the integration of low carbon and climate resilient transit infrastructure and transport services with transit-supportive, low-carbon urban development.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	13,611,000 US\$
GEF Grant	13,611,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	988,000,000 US\$
Project Cost	1,001,611,0 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	1,089,000 US\$

The aim of the program is to support Asian cities in realizing greenhouse gas (GHG) reductions and local co-benefits through the integration of low carbon and climate resilient transit infrastructure and transport services with transit-supportive, low-carbon urban development.

AFD (French Development Agency) is currently considering co-financing a draft corridor express bus to Dhaka with ADB. This request for contribution of the GEF, including the promotion of non-motorized modes, which are complementary modes of bus speed, is y in the right direction. The program is quite consistent and will benefit from a French commitment in Bangladesh through a French Development Agency soft loan.

With regard to funding multi-country and multi-object, the main issue could be the method of monitoring and evaluation of operations financed which are quite disparate.

Opinion: favourable

Climate Change

Liberia - Lighting One Million Lives in Liberia

GEF Project ID	4336
IBRD PO ID	124014
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Lighting One Million Lives in Liberia
Country	Liberia
Region	Africa
Focal Area	Climate Change
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	IBRD - The World Bank
Executing Agency	Liberia Rural and Renewable Energy Agency (RREA)
Description	To support the development of sustainable energy supplies and services in Liberia.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	1,454,540 US\$
GEF Grant	1,454,540 US\$
Cofinancing Total	4,050,000 US\$
Project Cost	5,504,540 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	145,454 US\$

The broad objective of the project is to support the development of sustainable energy supplies and services in this country. The project further aims to support capacity strengthening and policy regulations for market development in Liberia, and specifically aims at promoting solar energy for the rapid scale up of access to modern lighting.

The following issues could be addressed during the full project development:

1. Rationale for focusing on the technology of solar lanterns;
2. Sustainability of lighting programme: During the next phase of the project cycle, sustainability of the lighting programme post GEF project period should be considered to show how lighting programme would expand and continue beyond the GEF project period. Furthermore, the PIF states that under the baseline scenario households are paying very high cost for diesel fuel based power generation. A solar lantern would cost around \$40 with a potential net cost of \$29 for the households. This could be a potential barrier for many poor households and this risk/barrier needs to be addressed;
3. Recycling issues: CFL are highly polluting to the environment in case of uncontrolled release or breakage due to the mercury they contain. Recycling of the lamp in a dedicated circuit is required to limit the impact on the environment.
4. Health issues: the French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health Safety (ANSES) has published its expert appraisal on the health issues surrounding lighting systems using LEDs; such a study has never been carried out before. Because of their low electricity consumption and high efficiency, lighting systems using LEDs are at the forefront of technology in terms of energy performance and are well-fitted to play a role in energy-saving policy. However, risks have been identified concerning the use of certain LED lamps, raising potential health concerns for the general population. The principal characteristic of diodes sold for lighting purposes is the high proportion of blue in the white light emitted and their very high luminance ("brightness"). The issues of most concern identified by the Agency concern the eye due to the toxic effect of blue light and the risk of glare. ANSES recommends that only LEDs belonging to Risk Groups similar to those of traditional lighting systems be accessible to the general public, with higher-risk lighting systems being reserved for professional use under conditions in which it is possible to guarantee the safety of workers. Furthermore, ANSES emphasises the need to reduce the perceived luminous intensity, in order to mitigate the risk of glare. The project should integrate this health risk.

Opinion: we strongly urge that the comments above be taken into account

Climate Change

Suriname - Development of Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency and Electrification of Suriname

GEF Project ID	4497
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Development of Renewable Energy, Energy Efficiency and Electrification of Suriname
Country	Suriname
Region	Latin America and Caribbean
Focal Area	Climate Change
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	August 31, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	IADB
Executing Agency	The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNH) - Suriname
Description	This project will promote the use and development of renewable energy (RE) and energy efficiency in Suriname
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	4,400,000 US\$
GEF Grant	4,400,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	21,500,000 US\$
Project Cost	25,900,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	440,000 US\$

The main objective of the project is to promote the use and development of Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency systems and technology in Suriname. The proposal aims to address both renewable energy and energy efficiency.

The PIF raises from us the following observations:

1. The document establishes a link between the increase in diesel prices and deforestation. However, the two power sources (diesel and biomass) are not easily substitutable to each other in their uses. In other words, deforestation and land degradation is probably not due to the substitution of the use of diesel fuel from biomass. Biomass is generally used for cooking, diesel fuel is used either as final energy in engines, either as primary energy for electricity generation. In the Surinamese hinterland, electricity can be used for cooking. The development of renewable energy will have little or no impact on the use of biomass energy and thus deforestation / land degradation. We share the STAP's recommendations on the need to analyze the causes of deforestation and to analyze the opportunity of energy efficiency technologies and renewable energy to reduce it.
2. A public policy on energy efficiency is not just the building. A more comprehensive approach to energy efficiency is necessary incorporating all sectors (industries, services, etc.). It is therefore necessary to establish a diagnosis of global consumption and energy efficiency potential before proposing solutions.
3. The project encompasses several themes: production of electricity from renewable energy sources (solar, biofuel) energy efficiency. It may be too dispersed if not previously established a coherent analysis of the sector.
4. The project aims to develop pilot projects using renewable energy resources grant: installation and investment in pilot projects for renewable energy and energy efficiency. It is stated that the GEF funds help to finance investment. This approach involves significant risk in terms of sustainability. There is a:
 - Risk of excessive subsidies of these pilot projects making projects financially unsustainable, or not duplicable (and thus making the term "pilot" inappropriate) because of their lack of profitability without subsidy in investment or operating cost;
 - Risk of lack of integration within a consistent pricing policy for electricity, making supporting subsidy charges too high to be sustainable;
 - Risk of failure to build a lasting and sustainable policy for the public finances;

- Crowding out the private sector and lack of public-private partnership to work on incentive schemes and technical and economic sustainable for considering a financial sustainability of these operations.
- 5. The PIF mention the difficulty of maintenance of diesel group in Hinterland. The renewable energy could have the same difficulties
- 6. The project proposes to fund the installation of weather stations. How this logic of investment subsidy can it be sustained?

Opinion : we strongly urge that the comments above be taken into account.

International Waters

MULTI FOCAL AREAS

Global - Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program - Implementing the program using STAR resources I

GEF Project ID	4541
UNDP PMIS ID	4561
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program - Implementing the program using STAR resources
Country	Global (Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Peru, Papua New Guinea, Tanzania, South Africa)
Region	Global
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 22, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	UNOPS
Description	Global Environmental Benefits secured through community-based initiatives and actions
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	35,924,519 US\$
GEF Grant	35,924,519 US\$
Cofinancing Total	35,924,519 US\$
Project Cost	71,849,038 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	1,436,981 US\$

The project's objective is to use the STAR resources to contribute to the GEF/UNDP Small Grants Programme (SGP) Fifth Operational Phase. It recalls that: "Through its first 18 years, SGP has supported 2,846 community-level projects with over \$64.3 million in funding, leveraging over \$96.7 million in cash and in-kind co-financing in the countries covered by this PIF."

This SGP STAR funding will support at least 649 projects (should the maximum grant amount of \$50,000 be utilized) to as many as 1,298 projects (at the average grant making of \$25,000 per project). More than 724 CSOs are expected to be engaged in SGP projects in OP5.

The project try tackle the following issue: "Sixteen SGP countries with more than \$15 million STAR, have no access to the global core fund for grants, and it is critical for these countries to obtain sufficient STAR funds to sustain the Country Programmes' grant-making activities. This PIF is intended to obtain STAR funds to cover the grant allocation of **these sixteen SGP Country Programmes**, so that GEF continues to channel funds to CBOs and CSOs in these countries."

First, we would like to stress that the names of these sixteen countries are unclear, as the Project detail only mention thirteen of them: "Cuba, Egypt, Ethiopia, Indonesia, Iran, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Malaysia, Peru, Papua New Guinea, Turkey, Tanzania, South Africa". Which are the three other countries?

We recognize the value of the initiative and share STAP appreciation and broad support of the small grants program (SGP) overall.

Nevertheless, recognizing the justification of the program shouldn't prevent to permanently look for improved monitoring and efficiency of such program. And in this regard, after 18 years, we think that the PIF long general argumentation of SGP justification and SGP output indicators in terms of number of small projects financed is no more sufficient and satisfactory.

Several issues should be addressed to improve the new SGP phases:

a) the expected outputs of the project Framework should be completely revised and instead of number of project funded, it should set output indicators in terms of biodiversity conservation, climate change attenuation or adaptation, desertification/land degradation reduction, transboundary waters management, POPs reduction and concrete indicators of CBOs/CSOs capacities improvements.

b) the purpose of the SGP remain unclear between a long term assistance to all CBOs/CSOs project in each SGP countries (without clear phasing out strategies or capacity improvement process with clear steps) or the purpose of creating sustainable and long lasting capacities amongst CBOs/CSOs beneficiaries (then with a clear purpose of steps by step improvement and capacity building goal).

In one hand the PIF state that SGP should continue to fund CBOs/CSOs beyond this past 18 years because "The programme is a critical resource for SGP's partner organizations and communities, without which their available support channels would be reduced and their ability to confront environmental issues limited (p16)." This seems to mean that without this new SGP phase, investments made in the past 18 years in CBOs/CSOs would be lost.

On another hand, the PIF state that "SGP will continue developing capacity of civil society organizations (CSOs), with priority for community-based organisations (CBOs) and indigenous peoples organisations" and "To ensure sustainability of community capacity, SGP will ensure beneficiaries of capacity development are rooted in and deeply connected within the communities, so when projects are completed, the knowledge and technical skills remain within the communities to continue carrying out environmental protection activities." In this case, the PIF should clearly put output indicators in terms of CBOs/CSOs with sufficient sustainable capacities instead of number of CBOs/CSOs' funded projects.

Our recommendation is to clarify the role of SGP in terms of capacity building output and methodology to help low capacity organizations to reach a point of sustainable capacities to manage global environment issues. We suggest SGP to put in place new challenging output like CBOs/CSOs increased leveraging funding capacity indicators, or goals of helping CBOs/CSOs moving from SGP small grant management to medium size or even full size project management.

c) One shouldn't avoid recognizing adverse effects of SGP on the field after 18 years of operation in some countries. One known adverse effect in some SGP countries is the development of CBOs/CSOs projects brokers who are "selling" to community to other community the drafting of the same type of project which is perfectly fitting with SGP criteria and get usually selected for funding against a % fee of the amount awarded by SGP to the community. It would be good that SGP monitoring tools track for example if the exactly same template of projects are funded other different communities and time within one SGP country program. Other kind of area of improvement could be assessed. Currently the PIF doesn't provide information on its assessment of areas of improvement for the future.

Opinion: favourable, if the above recommendations (a), (b) and (c) are addressed during project development.

MULTI FOCAL AREAS

Regional - LCB-NREE Lake Chad Basin Regional Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Energy Efficiency (PROGRAM)

GEF Project ID	4680
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	LCB-NREE Lake Chad Basin Regional Program for the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Energy Efficiency (PROGRAM)
Country	Regional (Central African Republic, Cameroon, Niger, Nigeria, Chad)
Region	Africa
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 30, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	AfDB
Executing Agency	
Description	The goal of the program is to maintain the ecosystem services in the Lake Chad Basin by conserving the water and agro-sylvo ecosystems and ensuring the sustainability of use of resources in a context of energy efficiency and food security.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	20,503,086 US\$
GEF Grant	20,503,086 US\$
Cofinancing Total	172,563,158 US\$
Project Cost	193,066,244 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	1,640,247 US\$

The goal of the program is to conserve the water and agro-sylvo ecosystems of Lake Chad Basin through improved governance and integrated ecosystem management to ensure the sustainability of the resources and improved food security and water quantity and quality.

It aims at mitigating the threats to the stability of the ecosystems, the rehabilitation of degraded lands and the conservation and sustainable exploitation of the biodiversity. It will also contribute, through demonstration actions such as plant cover restoration measures, to reduce land degradation and boost carbon sequestration reserves. It will address the causes of soil impoverishment through participatory protection of source heads (notably in CAR) and banks. It will provide significant world ecological benefits through biodiversity restoration and increased fuel energy capital.

To complete this program (AfDB/GEF) and another current program (Prodebalt), FFEM is expected to implement a new project that aims to support the Lake Chad Basin Strategic Action Program. The objective of the project is to develop a decision making tool for the lake sustainable management. FFEM contribution is 0.8 M Euros.

Opinion: favourable.

MULTI FOCAL AREAS

Brazil - Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Brazil	
GEF Project ID	4560
UNDP PMIS ID	4578
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Fifth Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program in Brazil
Country	Brazil
Region	Latin America and Caribbean
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	UNOPS with Instituto Sociedade Populacao e Natureza (ISPN)
Description	Conservation of the Cerrado and Caatinga biomes of Brazil through community initiatives on sustainable resource use, and actions that maintain or enhance carbon stocks and increase areas under sustainable land management
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	5,000,000 US\$
GEF Grant	5,000,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	5,050,000 US\$
Project Cost	10,050,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	400,000 US\$

We globally support the Brazilian SGP initiative.

The project objective is to contribute to the conservation of the Cerrado and Caatinga biomes of Brazil through community initiatives on sustainable resource use, and actions that maintain or enhance carbon stocks and increase areas under sustainable land management.

Interestingly this project propose much more result oriented outputs than the global project 4541, showing that such design work is feasible. Moreover this country programme is directed at two main geographical areas/biomes, while the global project 4541 doesn't provide some clear assessment of geographical needs and focus in each of the sixteen countries of interventions.

Globally the Brazilian 5th Operational Phase of the GEF Small Grants Program is well informed and seems based on sound experiences. We regret that the PIF lack of an assessment of previous SGP supports, successes and failures and the current capacity building status and needs of the Brazilian grant beneficiaries. There is some general and very broad information on the Brazilian SGP program activities p12, but little if no detailed outcomes statistics and numbers on the results: how much sustainable activities generated? Sustainable income generated? How much SGP grantees have sufficient capacities, are now leveraging funds on their own and are no more SGP "clients" compared to how much grantee have benefited from 2, or 3 or event 4 successive SGP grants? Etc.

Some of the questions raised for the global project 4541 apply to the Brazilian SGP program:

- The description of the socioeconomic benefits to be delivered by the Project is not convincing (p16). It states that: "Small grant projects will support activities that improve the communities' quality of life (e.g., food security, improved water quantity and quality), generate income, and enable them to stay on their land while also achieving global environmental benefits" but doesn't explicitly demonstrate if those activities are profitable and can last beyond SGP support or if those activities can only

be maintained with grants from the SGP (and need to be subsidized to be sustainable over the long term). The Brazilian SGP (using its previous experience in country) should provide precise information on the amount and sustainable amount of income generating activities which can be developed with the SGP, and clearly state if those activity are not profitable and need subsidize over the long term by SGP, or if they are profitable and self sustainable. In this regard, the chapter in p11 and 12 about “Barriers to communities’ contribution to biodiversity conservation, sustainable land management and maintenance of carbon stocks in the Cerrado and Caatinga biomes” let think that most of the incomes generating activities supported by SGP are probably not sustainable without permanent subsidizing from SGP. Some clarifications are needed on the objective of the SGP in this matter.

- Because of the above difficulty (and like the global SGP 4541), the purpose of this Brazilian SGP remain unclear between a long term assistance to all CBOs/CSOs project in the two biomes (without clear phasing out strategies or capacity improvement process with clear steps) or the purpose of creating sustainable and long lasting capacities amongst CBOs/CSOs beneficiaries (then with a clear purpose of steps by step improvement and capacity building goal).

Opinion: favourable, if the sustainability of activities supported and clear goals to bring some Brazilian CBOs/CSOs in capacity to continue to work without SGP assistance are addressed during project development.

MULTI FOCAL AREAS

Guatemala - Sustainable Forest Management and Multiple Global Environmental Benefits	
GEF Project ID	4479
UNDP PMIS ID	4637
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Sustainable Forest Management and Multiple Global Environmental Benefits
Country	Guatemala
Region	Latin America and Caribbean
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	June 17, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	Ministry of the Environment and Natural Resources of Guatemala (MARN); Protected Areas National Council (CONAP); Fundación para el Ecodesarrollo y la Conservación (FUNDAECO)
Description	To strengthen land/forest management processes and biodiversity conservation in order to secure the flow of mu ecosystems services while ensuring ecosystem resilience to climate change.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	4,400,000 US\$
GEF Grant	4,400,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	13,160,000 US\$
Project Cost	17,560,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	440,000 US\$

The project is an important contribution to Guatemala sustainable forest management (SFM) and sustainable land management (SLM). The project will implement two main components. The first will integrate principles of SFM and SLM in the regulatory and institutional framework, and strengthen integrated environmental land management capacity. The second will support pilot projects for SFM/REDD+ and SLM reduce land degradation, improve carbon stocks, and enhance biodiversity conservation in south-eastern and western Guatemala.

The project will involve major executing partners like MARN, CONAP and FUNDAECO which is a well known partner from FFEM. FUNDAECO present very strong experience records. One previous FFEM's grant to FUNDEACO went through a final independent evaluation in 2010 which delivered a very satisfactory opinion on the projects outcomes and the NGO administrative capacities.

We recognize the value of the initiative but we share and even strengthen the STAP concerns and recommendations on project revision.

Yet, we would like to share several threats on the projects which were raised by our recent independent evaluation of our previous supports to the Guatemala and which are not clearly addressed in the PIF. The following issues should be addressed during project preparation:

a) The project stress that 40 % of forest loss in Guatemala is due to illegal logging in PAs. The project lacks of an assessment of which social groups are involved in illegal logging activities. Our evaluations and several independent organizations in Guatemala can provide evidences that narcotraficants willing to operate money laundering by investing in large Fincas and extensive cattle ranching are threatening smallholders to sell their lands or bribing local officials to convert land in agribusinesses outside, in periphery and sometimes in PAs.

Our evaluation call for strong law enforcement, control and vigilance of land tenure and protected areas, particularly to protect small holders benefiting from PINFOR our PINEP assistance from being forced to sell their lands. Our recommendation is that the project should consider assisting the Guatemala State in securing more internal budget and capacities (notably from joint patrols of CONAP, Police and Army forces which are already operating in some places) to protect smallholders against narcotrafficants' land grabbing pressures.

b) The project doesn't recognize the effort made recently by CONAP and FUNDAECO to increase the involvement of local indigenous communities in Protected Areas co-management schemes. The current PA laws in Guatemala don't allow local communities to participate in PAs co-management schemes. Previous pilot projects were implemented with the help of Netherland and France and demonstrated that co-management schemes were feasible (examples are already in places in the Izabal Province). Using Municipal Development Councils (as stated in the PIF p 10) is not operating to involve local indigenous communities in PAs co-management and involvement in benefits and protections activities. Our recommendation is that the project should support the PAs institutional framework and help CONAP to pass adequate legal bills to officially establish PAs co-management schemes with local indigenous communities. Integrating local indigenous communities in the co-management of PAs is the best way to reduce the numerous conflicts existing between the CONAP's PA system and local indigenous communities associations around illegal activities and land claims.

c) The FFEM recently approved a grant of 1.496.000 Euros to FUNDAECO to support CONAP and the Guatemala PA system in three main departments of Izabal, Peten and Huehuetenango. In this third department, the FFEM grant will help FUNDAECO to implement similar activities as the ones proposed in the proposed PIF. As the FFEM's grant to FUNDAECO in Huehuetenango department is not identified by UNDP office in Guatemala, we strongly request that clear cofinancing and coordinating schemes should be establish within this UNDP/GEF project with the FFEM's Grant to FUNDAECO and CONAP in order to avoid any double financing risks.

Opinion: favourable, if the above recommendations (a), (b) and (c) are addressed during project development.

MULTI FOCAL AREAS

Uganda - Addressing Barriers to the Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management practices through an integrated approach

GEF Project ID	4644
UNDP PMIS ID	4493
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Addressing Barriers to the Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management practices through an integrated approach
Country	Uganda
Region	Africa
Focal Area	Multi Focal Area
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 23, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNDP - United Nations Development Programme
Executing Agency	Implementing partner: Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) Other partners: Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE), National Agricultural Research Organisation (NARO), Uganda National Council of Science and Technology (UNCST)
Description	To secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin challenges of unsustainable utilisation of biomass for wood (including charcoal) and poor land management practices common in Uganda's Woodlands via technology transfer and enhancement of the national policy framework; and promotion of SLM and SFM practices.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	3,480,000 US\$
GEF Grant	3,480,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	7,559,167 US\$
Project Cost	11,039,167 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	348,000 US\$

The project aim to secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin challenges of unsustainable utilisation of biomass for charcoal and poor land management practices common in Uganda's Woodlands via technology transfer and fuel switch; improved data collection and carbon monitoring; and promotion of SLM and SFM practices.

The program is consistent, well-defined. Risks are well understood.

Opinion: Favourable

POPs

Algeria - Environmentally Sound Management of POPs and Destruction of PCBs Wastes

GEF Project ID	4508
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Environmentally Sound Management of POPs and Destruction of PCBs Wastes
Country	Algeria
Region	Africa
Focal Area	POPs
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	UNIDO - United Nations Industrial Development Organization
Executing Agency	Ministry of Land Planning and Environment (MATE)
Description	The objective of this project is to reduce adverse effects of PCBs to human health and the environment in Algeria through capacity building and the elimination of use and release of PCBs.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	6,300,000 US\$
GEF Grant	6,300,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	19,550,000 US\$
Project Cost	25,850,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	630,000 US\$

In Algeria, large stocks of PCB-based waste pose financial, technical and environmental problems. Operators in the industrial and energy sectors possess the largest stocks of PCBs. They own 51% of transformers inventoried, of which 30% are owned by several public and private companies, such as the National Company of Electricity and Gas (SONELGAZ). The steel company Arcelor Mittalowns own more than 400 PCB transformers, FERTIAL (group ASMIDAL) 85 transformers, and COTITX has in its' possession 83 discarded transformers.

It was found that more than 5,000 tons of wastes containing PCB- exist in Algeria.

The objective of this project is to reduce adverse effects of PCBs and POPs on human health and the environment in Algeria through capacity building (to manage waste containing PCBs and POPs) and the elimination of use and release of PCBs and POPs waste. The project will establish final disposal processes that can be applied to PCB and POPs waste. It will support sustainable operation of the processes by building institutional and technical capacities for environmentally sound management (EMS) of PCBs and POPs waste.

A critical issue is to involve operators in the project, especially on component 3 "Technical assistance for the ESM of PCBs and planning of phase-out and disposal of PCB waste". That will require dialogue as well as incentives and coercion measures to promote involvement and commitment of those key stakeholders.

Opinion : Favorable.

POPs

China - Municipal Solid Waste Management	
GEF Project ID	4617
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Municipal Solid Waste Management
Country	China
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Focal Area	POPs
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 15, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	IBRD - The World Bank
Executing Agency	Foreign Economic Cooperation Office (FECO) of the Ministry of Environmental Protection (MEP)
Description	In support of China's fulfillment of its obligations under the Stockholm Convention (SC) on Persistent Organic Pollutants the proposed project aims to: a) Reduce unintentional production of PCDD/F in pilot municipalities by applying best available techniques and best environmental practices (BAT/BEP) to municipal solid waste (MSW) management; and b) Establish conditions for replication of demonstrated BAT/BEP across China, including a stronger policy and regulatory framework, increased awareness of among city administrators and MSW management professionals
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	12,000,000 US\$
GEF Grant	12,000,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	48,004,000 US\$
Project Cost	60,004,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	1,200,000 US\$

The role of incineration in MSW management has been increasing and will continue to increase due to a shortage of available land for landfills and the incinerators potential ability to generate heat or electricity. Residential waste collected still contains a considerable proportion of plastic bags, packaging materials, while plastics lead to dioxin precursors, both causing PCDD/F generation and release.

The project tries i) to reduce the production of PCDD/F in pilot municipalities by applying best available techniques and best environmental practices (BAT/BEP) to municipal solid waste management and ii) to establish favourable conditions for replication of demonstrated BAT/BEP across China, including policy framework and increased awareness of among city administrators

The project operates through two main components:

- demonstrating modern MSW management practices meeting SC BAT/BEP
- support to replication through strengthening the policy and the regulatory environment building institutional capacity, dissemination and public awareness raising.

It seems to us i) that people's awareness of good practices (at source waste separation) and differences in the dioxin releases and associated health risks from incinerators with and without BAT/BEP, and ii) disseminating the lessons learnt from the project, are critical issues insufficiently developed in the project.

Opinion: favourable

POPs

Vietnam - Hospital Waste Management Support Project	
GEF Project ID	4614
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Project Name	Hospital Waste Management Support Project
Country	Vietnam
Region	Asia and the Pacific
Focal Area	POPs
Operational Program	
PIF Approval Date	September 23, 2011
Approval Date	Not Yet Approved
Project Status	CEO PIF Clearance
GEF Agency	IBRD - The World Bank
Executing Agency	Vietnam Health Environment Management Agency, Ministry of Health (VIHEMA) Sub-executing Agency: Vietnam Environmental Administration, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (VEA)
Description	The project development objective is to reduce environmental degradation and potential risks for human health through improved management of health care waste in Vietnam's hospitals. This will be achieved through improved health care waste management in Vietnam's hospitals, and a strengthened Government stewardship role in regulating, promoting implementation support, monitoring and enforcing effective health care waste management practices. GEF grant will be provided to the IDA PDO with a focus on reduction of releases of Persistent Organic Pollutants, Mercury and toxic wastes from the healthcare sector. Specific Objectives: - Significant amount of unintentionally produced Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) reduction achieved through development and pilot application of BAT/BEP options for healthcare facilities. - Environmental human health risk related to POPs and PTS releases from healthcare sector assessed and reduced. - Integrated policy and institutional framework for management of POPs and PTS releases in healthcare sector established, strengthened and introduced to be applied nation-wide. - Mercury inventory, risk management mechanism and reduction of mercury achieved in healthcare sector.
Implementation Status	
GEF Project Grant	7,000,000 US\$
GEF Grant	7,000,000 US\$
Cofinancing Total	150,000,000 US\$
Project Cost	157,000,000 US\$
GEF Agency Fees	630,000 US\$

In Vietnam, only 65% of hospitals separate waste and only 7% of hospitals have the capacity to properly treat hazardous waste. Hence, only 20 to 25% of hospital waste is treated as hazardous.

The first component of this project aims to strengthen of the policy and institutional environment: (i) create enabling policy environment for effective management of health care waste generated by the health sector, and (ii) strengthen the institutional capacities of relevant ministries and agencies to implement, monitor and enforce health care waste pollution standards and associated management practices.

The second component aims to strengthen the management of waste generated by health care facilities environmentally sound health care and of occupational safety practices. Grants will be provided to finance sub-projects (micro projects) in eligible hospitals (at central and provincial levels), giving priority to larger hospitals (typically larger waste generators) in more densely populated areas.

Two issues should be emphasized:

1°) Capacity building, to shift from incineration practices to environmentally sound solid waste disposal technologies that do not imply burning waste but combine several alternative technologies to treat different types of waste.

2°) as STAP underlines, there is no discussion of handling of destruction residues in the PIF. The project should be developed to address the proper disposal of potentially toxic residues generated by the destruction of health care waste.

Opinion : Favourable.