

Enabling Lesotho's Enhanced Transparency Framework

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10635

Countries

Lesotho

Project Name

Enabling Lesotho's Enhanced Transparency Framework

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

7/20/2020

Review completed by PM

7/20/2021

Program Manager

Namrata Rastogi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF

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

8/11/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF climate change focal area strategy.

Agency Response

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

8/11/2020: The project is organized under one component and one outcome (which is the same as the project's objective). We suggest breaking it into additional project outcomes to provide additional clarity as to how the resources will be distributed among the different areas of work and to further breakdown the outputs which are quite broad.

6/4/2021: While we see changes in the submitted PDF, these have not been fully reflected in the Portal, particularly the breakdown of resources by output.

7/20/2021: Changes have been reflected in table B of the portal. Cleared.

Agency Response

July 15, 2021

The resources per output have now also been broken down in the GEF Portal.

April 9, 2021

The comment was duly considered and, in response, the component and outcome statements have been reworded to differentiate from the objective statement. Most importantly, the single outcome has been restructured so that the 3 outputs are organized by theme (institutional arrangements, GHG inventories and MRV system/NDC tracking), following guidance from UNEP's Quality Assurance Section (QAS). This restructuring implied a reorganization of activities and also a more balanced distribution of the budget among the three outputs, as per Table B (p. 1-2) and Section 3. Alternative scenario (p. 16-25).

We have also taken the opportunity of this review sheet to update the CBIT Lesotho PIF in line with the latest GEF guidance on M&E. As such, the M&E budget has been segregated as a separate line in Table B. The US\$ 45,000 budgeted for M&E include the costs of the Inception Workshop and the Terminal Evaluation, which were previously budgeted for under the different project Outputs.

Note: all the edits have been highlighted in yellow in the updated PDF version of the CBIT Lesotho PIF uploaded in the "Documents" tab of the GEF portal.

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

8/11/2020: Please clarify from which ministry or government office the expected in-kind co-financing would come from.

6/4/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2021

The Ministry of Energy and Meteorology through Lesotho Meteorological Service (LMS) has been included as the co-financier in Table C.

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

8/11/2020: The GEF financing requested seems high for the proposed project and context. Please comment.

6/4/2021: While this is true, we note that Lesotho is a much smaller economy than the countries listed by comparison. In addition, Lesotho has ongoing work on its first BUR and Third NC that has been approved since 2014. We are simply asking for clarifications on how the project's cost was estimated considering the context.

7/20/2021: This has been sufficiently explained. Cleared.

Agency Response

July 15, 2021

The proposed budget reflects the need to undertake a number of activities and produce deliverables to improve national climate transparency in order to meet the requirements of the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement. Several activities, products and services that are required have their costs determined not by the size of the country's economy but rather by fixed minimum start-up costs of investment for the implementation of a MRV system on a permanent basis (the proposed software tools and other tracking tools indicated in outputs 2 and 3 are good examples in this regard). Moreover, some activities such as training events require the preparation of training materials and manuals, which entails high costs regardless of the number of attendees.

We would like to emphasize the fact that the country government is also committing to provide in-kind co-finance which amounts to over 18% of the GEF grant requested, demonstrating the relevance attributed by the country to the CBIT project ? a commendable effort given the size of the country's economy.

Finally, even though Lesotho is a small economy, as pointed out by the GEF reviewers, the vulnerabilities of Lesotho to climate change are quite remarkable and go beyond the size of its economy. In this instance, the effectiveness of the CBIT initiative in the country will also depend on an adequate budget that responds to the challenges posed by climate change.

April 9, 2021

The GEF financing being requested for this project ? US\$ 1,182,500 ? stands in the standard range for a CBIT national project. Examples from other approved CBIT projects in Africa include CBIT Sierra Leone (US\$ 1,344,495) CBIT Burkina Faso (US\$ 1,180,000), CBIT Ghana (US\$ 1,100,000) and CBIT South Africa (US\$ 1,100,000).

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 8/11/2020: N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 8/11/2020: N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 8/11/2020: N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 8/11/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
8/11/2020: As of this date there are sufficient resources in the CBIT set-aside to support
this project.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 8/11/2020: N/A

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

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 8/11/2020: Yes, a PPG request of \$50,000 is made, which is within the allowable cap for a MSP.

Agency Response

Core indicators

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 8/11/2020: Yes, a number and explanation for target beneficiaries has been provided. Please note that by CEO endorsement we will also ask for the CBIT qualitative indicators to be reported on.

Agency Response

April 9, 2021

This is well noted. We will make sure the CBIT qualitative indicators are included in the project results framework of the CEO Endorsement Document.

Project/Program taxonomy

7. Is the project/program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 8/11/2020: Yes, the project is properly tagged.

Agency Response

Part 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

8/11/2020: We're specifically interested in learning more about the context for Lesotho and the root causes and barriers to meeting the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework and other transparency-related activities in line with national priorities. Please review this section so that it is more relevant to Lesotho and the context of the project. We note that some of this information is provided under the baseline scenario.

6/4/2021: Not cleared. The section added of limited capacities does not seem to be specific to Lesotho. Please revise and be more specific.

7/20/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

July 15, 2021

Section "1. Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed" has been improved to include specific information on the limited capacities of Lesotho to carry out transparency-related activities, as per a recent self-assessment as well as reports issued by external consultants in the context of the preparation of the country's first BUR (p. 7).

April 9, 2021

Section "1. Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed" has been amended to include an analysis of the root causes and barriers in Lesotho to meeting the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework and other transparency-related activities (p. 6-7).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/11/2020: Please address comments below:

1. While the section elaborates on key gaps and barriers as informed by the CBIT self-assessment tools, we found some of the information to be quite broad and lacking a level of prioritization. We suggest this section and the previous one are further revised to provide additional clarity (including identifying areas where additional information/detail may be needed, which is what the PPG can further support).

2. We appreciate the inclusion of several projects serving as baseline; however, these are lacking time frames to further explain their relevance and potential synergies. Please provide.

3. Additional specific information as to the experience of the country in the implementation of its enabling activity projects, including the one currently underway (TNC and first BUR) is needed. What is the current implementation status for those projects? Why have they been so delayed since approval in 2014 and 2015? What specific barriers have been identified from these experiences and how do they inform this proposal? The inclusion of the different activities under the BUR 1 project, which overlap with this project is confusing. The way it is presented undermines the incremental reasoning for this project. Please clarify.

6/4/2021: This section was significantly strengthened.

1. Cleared.

2. Cleared.

3. Please update this section on NC and BUR submission as according to the UNFCCC website these reports have not yet been submitted.

7/20/2021: The expected end dates of the NC and BUR projects have been updated.
Cleared.

Agency Response

July 15, 2021

3. The section has been updated with information according to which the submission of the TNC and BUR to the UNFCCC is expected for September 2021 (p. 14).

April 9, 2021

1. Section "2. *Baseline Scenario*" has been revised to provide additional clarity on gaps and barriers, including areas where additional information could be obtained through PPG support (p. 7-16).

2. Further information on the baseline projects, such as timeframes, relevance and potential synergies, have been added to this section (p. 14-16).

3. Additional clarification has been provided on the status of the TNC and BUR1 projects, barriers identified, and activities that will feed into this CBIT Project (p. 8-10; 13-15); coordination to avoid overlap has been further explored in Section "6. *Coordination*". Moreover, all along Section "3. *Alternative Scenario*", the text now mentions how CBIT will build upon these projects, including their specific partial results that informed the elaboration of this PIF.

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/11/2020: See comment above on Table B regarding the proposed structure of the project. Overall, it is difficult to assess this section, without further clarity on the barriers and baseline scenario per the comments above. We found this section to be repetitive and too broad at times, so it could use a revision as well. Simplifying this section would aid the review process, particularly in areas where there is not a lot of clarity at this stage. See additional questions below on each output:

Output 1: Activity 1.3 seems to anticipate the results of Activity 1.1, which aims to analyse the current transparency framework and identify gaps and barriers, and Activity 1.2, which will propose formal institutional arrangements based on that analysis, will lead to the need for the creation of a "climate transparency unit". Further, Activity 1.4 should likely be part of the consideration taken in the analysis and proposal under Activities 1.1 and 1.2.

Output 2: This output is quite wide in scope and it is unclear how it builds upon existing capacities and systems. Additional prioritization (or plans for prioritization during PPG is not known at this time) is needed. Activity 2.1: What is meant by an NDC implementation tracking system? What institutional arrangements are expected to support this? Activity 2.2: How do these tools, templates, protocols and guidelines build on existing ones and how will it respond to gaps in data availability, etc.? Activity 2.4: What impact are default emissions factors having on Lesotho's inventory and are country-specific emission factors expected to have a large impact? Is this a priority when compared to the rest of the needs in the country's transparency system? Activity 2.5: Is there an existing website for this type of information? How is this activity informed by experience? Will it be an information portal only or will it also be used for data management?

Output 3: Consider re-organizing Outputs 2 and 3 to integrate training under the specific topics, instead of bundling all training under a separate output. Activity 3.1 would be aligned with Activity 2.6, Activity 3.2 would be aligned with Activity 2.1.

6/4/2021: Thank you for the clarifications. This section has also been significantly strengthened. Our comments have been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2021

Sections "1. *Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers*", and "2. *Baseline scenario*" have been improved for additional clarity (p. 6-16).

Section "3. *Alternative scenario*" has also been re-worked and outputs restructured. Below are further details for each Output:

Output 1, which has been reformulated as *"Institutional arrangements and legal framework to collect and manage GHG Inventory data and NDC tracking data drafted and submitted to the government for adoption"* now comprises the following activities, in reply to the concerns raised in the comment (p. 18-20):

- *Activity 1.1 Analyse the current transparency framework in Lesotho, various institutions, mandates, roles and responsibilities and identification of gaps, barriers and needs related to the collection and management of GHG Inventory data and NDC tracking data in view of the ETF and its various reporting requirements*
- *Activity 1.2 Draft and propose for Government adoption formal institutional arrangements and the associated legal framework needed to collect and manage GHG Inventory data and NDC tracking data at the national level*
- *Activity 1.3 Identify national budget and staff needs to establish the institutional arrangements proposed and the implementation of the associated legal framework*

As previously stated, the single outcome has been restructured so that the 3 outputs are organized by theme (institutional arrangements, GHG inventories and MRV system/NDC tracking). **Output 2** has thus been amended to focus on GHG inventories and its new formulation is *"National GHG Inventory Management System improved and relevant stakeholders trained on IPCC's latest guidelines and tools for national GHG inventories"*. Moreover, its activities were reviewed for a more efficient prioritization, based on the analysis of deliverables produced under the BUR1 project: the activity on the development of country-specific emission factors and activity data has been replaced by the development of methodologies to apply protocols for QA/QC of GHG Inventory data. Output 2 now comprises activities centered on: protocols and methodologies for collecting, managing and undertaking QA/QC of GHG Inventory data; a climate data collection and tracking tool; and related training. Also, the analysis established by the country with regards to the processes of preparation of the last two National GHG inventories has identified the need for the country to progressively move away from a system of preparation of these inventories through the work of international consultants, with limited interaction with national government counterparts towards a system based on a permanent involvement of the Government GHG Inventory team. Together arises the need to review the availability and suitability of existing tools, templates, protocols and guidelines, considering also the declared interest of the country to start implementation of the 2006 IPCC guidelines for national inventories. Conclusions from previous projects for the preparation of GHG inventories will help to identify appropriate sources of activity data and shed light on how to respond to gaps in data availability. These will be further analyzed at PPG stage. Finally, with regards to the

preparation of a web-based climate data display tool as part of the national MRV system of Lesotho (Activity 3.3), currently there is no similar tool, as information on projects and its results are displayed on an ad-hoc basis according to the objectives of different climate-related projects (p. 25). A different climate data collection and tracking tool will be built under activity 2.3 of this Project, as further clarified below with respect to Information Technology (IT) tools.

Output 3 is now formulated as *National MRV system designed, tested and operationalized and Ministry staff/local authorities and other relevant stakeholders trained on tracking Nationally Determined Contributions according to the ETF, including co-benefits for SDGs achievement*. It now encompasses activities focused on: an NDC implementation tracking system ? indicators, tools, templates, protocols and guidelines ? including for support needed and received, climate change impacts and adaptation; a web-based climate data display tool; capacity-building and tools to implement the national MRV system; and peer-exchange through the CBIT Global Coordination Platform.

Further clarification has been provided in the description of *Activity 3.1 Develop and adopt an NDC implementation tracking system, including indicators for monitoring and evaluation* (p. 24, previously, Activity 2.1).

- Concerning current *Activity 3.2. Elaborate tools, templates, protocols and guidelines for tracking of NDC commitments, including support needed and received as well as information related to climate change impacts and adaptation*, as mentioned in the description of Output 3, the templates, protocols and guidelines for data management will build upon work under BUR1, activity 5.2. ?Develop and document protocols and operation procedures for the MRV System?. An NDC implementation tracking system will be inaugurated, with the provision of new formalized protocols and methodologies for data collection and reporting with standardized sectorial guidelines, templates and tools will ensure that climate data and information flow properly, especially from line and auxiliary agencies (p. 24). CBIT will establish an NDC implementation tracking system which is missing, according to the Second National Communication report, as indicated in section 2. *Baseline scenario* (p. 13). Additional information on tools has been provided under *Activities 2.3 and 3.3* (p. 22; p. 24-25), as further explained below.

- Previous *Activity 2.4 Develop country-specific emission factors and activity data, prioritizing the energy and AFOLU sectors* has been replaced by *Activity 2.2 Develop methodologies to apply protocols for QA/QC of the GHG Inventory data*. Based on the analysis of deliverables produced in preparation for the Third National Communication and BUR1, priorities have been reviewed with regards to the skills to be developed and associated tools. After an assessment of the two last GHG inventories prepared in 2018 and 2020 by external firms, priorities have shifted from the

development of local emissions factors to enhancing QA/QC and training. Additional information on QA:QC has been provided in the output description (p. 20-21).

- For the sake of clarity, two IT tools were distinguished:

(i) one focused on collecting and managing data for internal use of the technical staff in relevant institutions, which is the focus of *Activity 2.3 Test and operationalize a climate data collection and tracking tool*, under output 2 (p. 22), aimed at improving data collection and management, with the double objective of enhancing the preparation of the National GHG Inventory and the NDC implementation tracking (further information is provided in the description on which BUR1 project activities will inform activity 2.3); Results of this activity will allow Lesotho to properly keep track of its progress in NDC implementation, and in producing high quality transparency reports, in order to allow the Party to report under the ETF set by the PA, and provide useful and accurate inputs to the global stocktaking, as well as to assist the country in providing information to feed the web-based climate data display tool (described in Activity 3.3 cited below);

(ii) the other tool, to be developed under *Activity 3.3 Develop and operationalize a web-based climate data display tool as a part of the national MRV system of Lesotho*, will be oriented towards displaying data and information to external users from the national and international community, providing direct access to national information and data on climate change, including the impacts of climate policies and actions, to all relevant institutions and the general public (now under output 3, p. 24-25).

Details on the software and hardware specification related to such tools will be further developed at PPG stage.

4. Training activities have been reorganized under the specific topics of outputs 2 and 3.

Now the following activities include training:

- *Activity 2.4 Train staff from government institutions and relevant stakeholders to use the climate data collection and tracking tool and manage relevant data associated with the preparation of the National GHG Inventory* (p. 22)

- *Activity 3.4 Enhance skills and provide tools to implement the national MRV system of Lesotho including tracking progress of NDC implementation* (p. 25).

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/11/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

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

8/11/2020: This is ok at this stage, although additional clarity on the previous sections will strengthen this reasoning.

6/4/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2021

This is well noted. Refer to our replies above for further details.

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

8/11/2020: yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/11/2020: Consider the role of Lesotho as a leader among LDCs and how this might be able to play a role in scaling up and innovation.

6/4/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2021

Section "7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up" has been amended to include mentioning to the country?s role as a LDC (p. 28).

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

8/11/2020: This is a national capacity-building project.

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

8/11/2020: Thank you for providing the detailed list of key stakeholders. Please comment on whether any stakeholders were part of consultation during the project identification stage.

6/4/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2021

Stakeholders consultation at PIF stage happened through the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC). The text under Section "2. Stakeholders" has been amended accordingly (p. 30-31).

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

8/11/2020: 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
8/11/2020: Yes.

Agency Response
Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

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
8/11/2020: Please add climate-change related risks.

6/4/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

April 9, 2021

Climate change risks have been added to the ?Risks? section (p. 36).

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
8/11/2020: Please remove repetitive information in the description of the baseline projects and focus on specific areas of coordination and differentiate between activities/projects that will inform this project, activities/projects that will happen in parallel to this project and thus will require active coordination, and activities/projects that will be informed by this project. For example, under the Lesotho Adaptation of Small-Scale Agriculture (LASAP) project, the description mentions that meteorological stations and downscaled models can feed directly into early warning systems and

mechanisms in this project. However, it is not clear which Component, Output, Outcomes this is referring to. Please clarify.

6/4/2021: Thank you for the additional clarifications. Please consider further simplifying the section to only include projects with which there will be direct coordination. (i.e. informing the design of the project falls more under KM than coordination). This section should not be repetitive to the baseline scenario section.

7/20/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

July 15, 2021

Section ?6. Coordination? has been further simplified to avoid repetition vis-?-vis the baseline scenario, as suggested by the reviewer (p. 39).

April 9, 2021

Section ?6. Coordination? has been amended to provide additional information on projects that will inform the CBIT project and also those that will require active coordination with this initiative, indicating the specific outputs and activities involved (p. 37-40).

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

8/11/2020: 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

8/11/2020: Yes.

7/26/2021: On the KM approach please address the following:

1. Please include a brief discussion of how this project learns from and builds on relevant previous experience, evaluations and GEF investments.
2. Please include plans to develop and implement a strategic communications plan to ensure outreach and dissemination of project results.

7/29/2021: This is sufficient information at this stage, but please elaborate and provide details at the CEO Approval stage. Cleared.

Agency Response

July 28, 2021

1. This CBIT Project will build on lessons learned through the implementation of previous NCs and BURs, as well as assessments undertaken through participation in the CBIT Global Coordination Platform. Such analysis already is presented in section 1) *Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers* and in 2) *The baseline scenario* section of the PIF, especially concerning gaps and barriers identified through the above-mentioned initiatives, and will be further explored at PPG stage. A reference to the lessons learned from the NCs and BURs has now also been made in the Knowledge Management section of the PIF, p. 42.

2. A paragraph has been included in the Knowledge Management section of the PIF (p. 42) to provide a brief overview of the strategy to disseminate project results. This plan will be further elaborated during the PPG phase. However, given the special nature of CBIT projects, the project will not include a Communications Plan *per se*, since it is not meant to target a very broad audience beyond the ministries, agencies and other relevant national stakeholders directly involved in the project's implementation.

Environmental and Social Safeguard (ESS)

Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately documented at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/11/2020: Yes.

Agency Response

Part 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

8/11/2020: Yes, Mr. Stanley Damane has endorsed the project.

Agency Response

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

8/11/2020: N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC 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

8/11/2020: Please address comments above.

6/4/2021: Please address remaining comments.

7/20/2021: Technically cleared.

7/26/2021: Please address remaining comments highlighted in yellow above.

7/29/2021: Comments have been addressed. PM recommends technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

7/29/2021: As mentioned above, the following information should be provided at the CEO approval stage:

1. Core Indicators section - information on the CBIT indicators
2. In the KM section, ensure that at the CEO approval stage details are provided for how the CBIT project will 1) learn from and builds on relevant previous experience, evaluations and GEF investments and; 2) a strategic communications plan including a budget.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	8/11/2020	4/9/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/4/2021	7/15/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/20/2021	7/28/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/26/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/29/2021	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval