Strengthening the capacity of institutions in Nigeria to implement the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10809
Countries

Nigeria
Project Name

Strengthening the capacity of institutions in Nigeria to implement the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement
Agencies

CI
Date received by PM

4/5/2021
Review completed by PM

Program Manager

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
4/29/2021, NPR: The project is aligned with the GEF climate change focal area strategy. However, please revise the Rio Markers as follows: Climate Change Mitigation - 2.

11/18/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response
CI-GEF 11/09/2021:

Rio marker updated to CC-M2

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

4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, the components in Table B are sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives. However, please see comments under Alternative Scenario that suggests some changes to the structure of the project components.

11/18/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response CI-GEF 11/09/2021: We have updated Table B based on comments received in the Alternative Scenario section
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 4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, this is adequate.

Agency Response
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 4/29/2021, NPR: The resources requested are in line with GEF policies and guidelines. At the time of this review, there were sufficient resources available to support this project.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Not applicable.

Agency Response
The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Not applicable.

Agency Response
The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Not applicable

Agency Response
The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Not applicable

Agency Response
Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Not applicable

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Not applicable

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 4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, a PPG request of $50,000 has been made which is within the allowable cap.

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

4/29/2021, NPR: Information on Core indicator 11 has been included. However, please provide an explanation of how the target of direct beneficiaries of 190 , and 25%-75% break up was estimated and provide this information below the core indicator table.

11/18/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response CI-GEF 11/09/2021: The number of target beneficiaries which is 190 (48 women and 142 men) was estimated based on the existing technical staff at the Ministry of Environment and target government institutions. This number is not final. A thorough assessment and methodology for selecting the target number of beneficiaries will be provided during PPG Phase.
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 4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, this has been 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
4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, the PIF adequately describes the environmental/adaptation problems in relation to CBIT.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/29/2021, NPR: While the portal document provides information on the baseline scenario and the baseline projects, there is some missing information. Please address the following:

1. Please correct the typo in this section from Bi-annual Update for 2018 to ?Biennial Update Report (BUR) 2018?.

2. Provide information on the Nigeria's experience preparing reports, such as the first and second BUR

3. The portal doc states ?The 2018 Nigeria Bi-Annual Update however highlights that to make the NIMS fully operational and sustainable over time is a major challenge, and strongly recommends capacity building and strengthening institutional arrangements. This project therefore will fill some of the gaps in capacity and support the NIMS and the DCC to have better capacity, and a stronger MRV system.? Please provide additional details on what the recommendations are, and which gaps this CBIT project will address, and other projects that may be being conducted that other projects address.

4. Provide details on the ICA process that Nigeria engaged in, and any learning/needs identified through that process.

5. While the portal document mentions the NDC, we recommend providing brief additional details on the mitigation and adaptation component (i.e. what is the emissions reduction component, sectors covered, baseline and target year, and a brief description of the adaptation component). Mention the anticipated update of the NDC - i.e. the timeline and what it may include, if that information can be shared at this stage. Since this project focuses on the key GHG emitting sectors in Nigeria, please provide a brief summary of this.

6. Provide additional details on the following to fully describe the baseline scenario in relation to transparency. a) A description on the institutional framework (such as the Specialized Climate Change Unit on Climate Change) currently in place related to transparency. This should include responsible institutions, their roles, and potentially a figure indicating how these inter-relate. b) Current processes in place for MRV/transparency in place that address transparency ? existing QA/QC processes, IT systems, data collection and sharing arrangements etc. if any. c) Provide information on the IPCC methodologies being used, and the differences that may occur by sector.

7. The portal doc mentions that NIMS is being set up. However, please provide additional information such as the current status of the process and its funding source (domestic of international).

8. On the list for baseline projects, please includes those that are relevant to the project and clarify which ones are ongoing (and their end dates) and which have been completed. We would recommend providing this information in a table format.

9. Please comment on, and provide details where relevant, on whether other bilateral or multilateral initiatives are supporting Nigeria in transparency- and MRV-related projects.

11/18/2021: Most comments have been addressed. However, please address the following remaining comment:

#4: Please provide learnings/needs identified through the UNFCCC International Consultation and Analysis (ICA) process of the BUR that Nigeria participated at in 2019 and how this CBIT project may be addressing some of these needs and capacity constraints that were identified.

12/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

CI-GEF 12/09/2021: addressed with the following text: According to Nigeria?s second biennial update report, Nigeria still faces many reporting challenges to meet its obligation to the convention. To address this, Nigeria strengthened the personnel of the DCC, its national GHG inventory management system, and institutional arrangements. However, challenges persist, including data availability for the national inventory. As a result, for previous inventories, substantial data was sourced from international databases or extrapolated. This project will identify priority gaps and constraints that will be strengthened through targeted training and appropriate resourcing. The specific interventions will be identified through a needs assessment and stakeholder engagements in the PPG phase.

CI-GEF 11/09/2021:

1. Typo corrected throughout the PIF. All the relevant sections have been updated to read: Biennial

2. We have done the following to show Nigeria?s experience and commitment to climate transparency: Paragraphs 9 to 11: We have identified the transparency reports submitted by Nigeria to the UNFCCC to date, ranging from the BURs, NCs, INDC, and the NDC. We have also described the existing institutional structure in Nigeria that supports climate transparency e.g., the establishment of the Department of Climate Change (DCC) of the Federal Ministry of Environment that coordinates implementation of the UNFCCC, its protocol, and any other legally binding agreements for implementing climate change activities.

3. Addressed: Refer to **Paragraph 12 and Table 2**

4. For the PIF development, we mostly engage with leaders and key stakeholders in the ministry, and the OFP to identify areas of focus for the project. We did this through several meetings with them, as we collectively developed the PIF. We anticipate that during the PPG phase, we will have the opportunity to convene at least 2 stakeholder

workshops with sector leads, focal points, and representatives; and work more closely with them to identify priority areas for intervention as we develop the detailed Project Document for implementation.

5. Added in paragraph 19.

6. Addressed in paragraphs 9 to 14, and 19

7. Addressed in paragraphs 13 and 14

8. Addressed. A table has been added under the baseline projects section

9. Nigeria has benefited mostly from GEF support for their MRV related work and there has been very little support from other bilateral or multilateral initiatives.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/29/2021, NPR: **Overall Comments**

1. We note and acknowledge the focus of this CBIT project on GHG inventory and MRV of mitigation. Please confirm. Also please present a brief rationale as to the reasoning behind this and why adaptation is not included.
2. In general, the description of outcomes and outputs are not very clear and they seem to overlap substantially. Specific comments are provided below. Please clarify and add additional details where relevant so that it is clear what the objective of the output/outcome is, who the target audience is, and what the output involves.

Outcome 1.1:

1. The logical flow of the Outcome 1.1. and its associated outputs is not clear. For example, from our perspective it would make more sense to undertake the capacity needs assessment and mapping stakeholder roles first (Output 1.1.2), followed by establishing a framework for inter-ministerial coordination (Output 1.1.1) and then identification of focal points, including for gender (Output 1.1.3 and Output 1.1.4). i.e. The flow should be what are the needs (i.e. mapping, capacity assessments/gaps), how to address it (framework for institutional coordination) and what specifically should be done (identification of focal points). Please reconsider or clarify the current structure.
2. Output 1.1.3: the portal doc states ?Focal points will be identified from key government ministries and institutions and *their capacity strengthened to collect, process, document, and archive GHG data*.? Provide additional details on what is envisioned in terms of strengthening this capacity. Is this through

training, involving academia etc. It seems that this may overlap with outcome 2.1. If the training will be conducted under Outcome 2.1, then it is not clear what exactly this output will focus on apart from identifying focal points (this is the same for Output 1.1.4). Please provide details.

3. Output 1.1.1: Clarify what the ?framework for inter-ministerial coordination? would include. Would this include MOUs for example? How will the GHG hub and focal points fit in the existing framework. Please confirm that stakeholders here refers to line ministries, and provide an indicative list of which ministries this will involve.
4. Output 1.1.4: we welcome the inclusion of gender focal points. Please clarify what their aim/purpose will be.

Outcome 1.2

1. Output 1.2.1: The portal doc states ?The existing enabling institutional arrangements will be reviewed and structured to support data collection, processing and sharing across the sectors.? However, this seems to be covered in the previous Output 1.1.2. Please clarify. Also, provide some additional details on what the technical guide would cover ? does this include data sharing agreements?
2. Output 1.2.2: based on the description provided it seems that the training for this output for technical staff is focused on the IT infrastructure aspect of transparency. Please confirm. Please provide additional details on what is anticipated in terms of MRV equipment ? are these computers, building an online database, etc.
3. Output 1.2.3: please clarify what is meant here by NDC sector interactions. And what is anticipated to be covered in the trainings. Please clarify the inclusion of ?development and operationalization of GHGI and MRV system? in this output since it seems to be already covered in the previous one.

Outcome 2.1

1. Please clarify what is the difference between Outcome 1.2 and Outcome 2.1. They both are focused on training and building capacities and there seems to be overlap between them. Please clarify.
2. Output 2.1.3 We note that this output is to prepare and submit a BUR and NC report. This output does not fall within the remit of CBIT. The focus of CBIT is to help build capacity for transparency, and GEF supports countries on reporting through enabling activities. Please remove this output.
3. Output 2.1.4 and Outcome 3.1: comment on how this project may coordinate and leverage the ongoing work under CBIT Coordination Platform.

Outcome 3.1

1. Output 3.1.1: please clarify what the establishment of such a platform involves. For example, is this an online database, and if so have the IT implications of this been taken into consideration.
2. Please address typos in this section ? UNCCC to UNFCCC.

11/18/2021: We welcome the changes made to the project. Please address the remaining comments:

1. Specifically for Outcome 1.2, we recommend considering identifying a national institution that can embed training and capacity building and reduce the dependence on external consultants. While mention of an institution has been made we would like to see this strengthened in Outcome 1.2 where an university(ies)/institution(s) are identified to anchor the trainings and build capacities on an ongoing basis within the country. While we recognize that detailed work will be carried under the PPG phase, we recommend mentioning the model this would use, and what potential universities/institutions may be considered for this.
2. For component 3, please provide additional information on how the platform would be used to advance decision making for policy makers, including updating NDCs etc. and how it may support improving transparency over time. Comment also on what strategies may be adopted for the one-stop shop platform to continue beyond the life of the project (i.e. financial sustainability).
3. Outcome 1 - either at this stage or at CEO endorsement stage, consider the number of MOUs as an indicator.

12/13/2021: Cleared. At the CEO Approval stage, please provide details on the model/modality used to build capacities by anchoring in a national university.

Agency Response
CI-GEF 12/09/2021:

1) Addressed in the description of Outcome 1.2 (refer to the yellow highlight): A formal arrangement between the Federal Ministry of Environment and this institution will be facilitated. Potential universities include:The University of Nigeria ? that in the past received $2.31million from the Open Society Foundation to Build Transdisciplinary Climate Change Adaptation Capacity.The National Open University of Nigeria ? that has fully developed Climate Change and Environment courses at its faculty of sciences. The Federal University of Technology ?has climate change courses offered and a dedicated center for climate change and freshwater resources.

2) Addressed in the description of Outcome 3.1 refer to the yellow highlight):
Displaying national GHG data from key emitting sectors by sources and sinks is essential to decision-makers to guide the allocation of efforts and resources to sectors

that need priority action and investments for Nigeria?s NDCs. The platform will also have the capacity to be updated regularly, enabling Nigeria to access information for their monitoring, reporting, and verification work. The national GHG inventory that will now be accessible through the online platform will contribute to NDC updates, BURs, and other reporting mechanisms that often suffer from inadequate data and information. To increase its sustainability, the project will train key stakeholders on its importance and application, and also train key people in each sector to update it. Government agencies will then be encouraged to mainstream MRV into their budget and work plans through activities to strengthen coordination, data sharing, and engagement in outcome 1.1.

3) Refer to Table B and the description of Outcome 1.1. Added a new output 1.1.4: Inter-institutional MoUs for GHG data sharing signed between the Ministry of Environment (Department of Forestry) and Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) from each GHG emission sector

We have chosen not to add MoUs as an outcome indicator because Outcome Indicator 1.1.2 encompasses this aspect

CI-GEF 11/09/2021:

1) Yes, this project focuses on GHG inventory and MRV of mitigation. Rationale: GHGI and MRV were identified by national stakeholders from the Ministry of Environment as the key areas of interest. The Nigeria Third National Communication identified GHGI and MRV as an area of interest. Nigeria is a big country hence the project funds might not be sufficient for us to focus on several areas.   The GHG inventory and MRV of mitigation aspect is aligned with the GEF?s CBIT programming directions: One of the objectives of the CBIT is to provide relevant tools, training, and assistance for meeting the provisions stipulated in Article 13 of the Agreement. The GHGI and MRV system were identified by Nigerian stakeholders, TNC, and the NDC as some of the key tools that can improve transparency in Nigeria.

Another objective of the CBIT is: to assist in the improvement of transparency over time.? Transparency overtime will be achieved in Nigeria by ensuring the key transparency tools such as the GHGI and MRV system are functional and that?s there is national technical and institutional capacity to operationalize these tools

2. Outcomes and outputs revised.

1. Outcome 1.1 revised

2**. Outcome 1.1.3:** Focuses on training and strengthening the technical capacity of GHG sector teams from government institutions to collect, process, document, and archive GHG data. Through strengthening their technical capacity, the sector teams will be able to collect and process quality GHG data, ensure they meet the IPCC requirements, prepare GHGI reports, etc. In due course, they will be able to track progress made towards achieving Nigeria?s NDC, prepare and submit the GHGI reports, prepare and ensure the reports submitted to the UNFCCC meet the required standards hence, over time, improving transparency.The training will be conducted by a credible institution TBD during PPG and will involve all the key stakeholders (including academia)

Outcome 1.2 focuses on strengthening institutional capacity with work on strengthening coordination, implementation arrangements, and includes basic trainings on MRV and GHGI systems.

Outcome 2.1 focuses on individual capacity building which includes mainly training of stakeholders on data management around MRV and GHGI systems ? to increase the number of experts in Nigeria.

Output 1.1.4 has been deleted

3. Additional text has been added under Output 1.1.1 for clarity

A sector hub will be established at DCC. The sector hubs will comprise key government institutions, CSOs, private sector from the GHG emitting sectors. Each institution will have a representative(s) in the sector hubs (focal point). Once it is clear how data will be shared amongst the government institutions that fall in different Ministries, then data sharing MoUs will be signed amongst the ministries. In summary, this inter-ministerial MoU is what we are calling the inter-ministerial coordination framework

Yes. The stakeholders here refer to line ministries. A tentative list of Government institutions and Ministries   that will be involved in provided in the PIF

3. Out 1.1.4 has been deleted

Outcome 1.2:

Output 1.2.1: revised . Output 1.2.1 will focus on the preparation of a technical guide which will be developed for use by sectors to report to the hub. Following training and anticipation of future staff turnover, a guide will help in technical backstopping and as a reference for data collection and reporting.

Output 1.2.2: Additional text has been added under Output 1.2.2 for clarity. We have merged outputs 1.2.2 and 1.2.4 hence output 1.2.2. We have merged them because they both focus on technology.

The project will develop an online MRV system for Nigeria and will train its users. It does include IT infrastructure of transparency but involves the national GHGI and MRV system.

In terms of equipment - we left this as it is, with the hope of carrying out PPG phase engagement with stakeholders to determine what specific equipment would be required. Additionally, the final list of equipment will be validated as part of the capacity needs assessment that will be undertaken during the implementation phase.

Output 1.2.3 has been deleted because trainings will take place in other outputs and Component 3 is a strong knowledge management component

Outcome 2.1:

1. Outcome 1.2 focuses on strengthening institutional capacity with work on strengthening coordination, implementation arrangements, and includes basic trainings on MRV and GHGI systems. Outcome 2.1 focuses on individual capacity building which includes mainly training of stakeholders on data management around MRV and GHGI systems ? to increase the number of experts in Nigeria.

2. Noted. Output 2.1.3 removed.

3. Text updated under output 2.1.4: The project will hold a webinar on the CBIT coordination platform to share lessons learnt and upload this final report on the CBIT coordination platform.

Text updated under outcome 3.1: This project will actively provide updates and participate in engagements with the CBIT coordination platform. For example, by appointing a CBIT national focal point who will represent Nigeria in the annual CBIT Conference, sharing lessons via Webinars hosted by the CBIT coordination platform, uploading project information on the CBIT Coordination Platform

Additionally, Output 3.1.1 has been re-rewritten as follows: An integrated knowledge management platform for sharing transparency activities established and operational and actively providing updates and engaging with the CBIT coordination platform.

Outcome 3.1:

1. Additional text has been added under Output 3.1.1 to show the link with the Global Coordination platform.

The platform will be developed to display the national GHG inventory data showing emissions by sources and sinks per sector. It will be an online platform integrating national datasets that is accessible to policymakers and the public. The hub will be trained to manage and update the data regularly.

Additionally, Output 3.1.1 has been re-rewritten as follows: An integrated knowledge management platform for sharing transparency activities established and operational and actively providing updates and engaging with the CBIT coordination platform.

Text has been added under Output 3.1.2 for clarity about the online platform.

2. Typos updated.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/29/2021, NPR: 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

4/29/2021, NPR: 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

4/29/2021, NPR: Additional information on Core Indicator 11 and how it is estimated has been requested. Based on information that is provided for that section, this will be confirmed.

11/18/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response CI-GEF 11/09/2021: The following was included: The number of target beneficiaries which is 190 (48 women and 142 men) was estimated based on the existing technical staff at the Ministry of Environment and target government institutions. This number is not final. A thorough assessment and methodology for selecting the target number of beneficiaries will be provided during PPG Phase.
7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, the portal document adequately describes this.

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

4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, a map of Nigeria has been provided as this is a nation-wide 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
4/29/2021, NPR:

1. The portal document states that stakeholders were consulted in the project identification phase. Please provide a description of the stakeholder engagement undertaken during the project identification phase and include a list of stakeholders consulted.
2. We note table 3 is incomplete. Please provide full details on stakeholder engagement in project preparation including a more comprehensive list including CSOs, gender based organizations, industry associations and others that may be involved. Include indicative role and responsibility and means of engagement. Move the relevant information from the previous section into this one.

11/18/2021: Cleared

Agency Response
CI-GEF 11/09/2021:

1. Only officials from the Federal Ministry of Environment and the Operational Focal Point were consulted for the PIF development. It is expected that extensive consultations will be done at the PPG phase.

2. Table 3 is now Table 4 . The means of stakeholder engagement is already provided in the PIF (paragraphs 43 to 44).

We have added Table 5: Stakeholder mapping and assessment

Table 4 has been updated to include a tentative list of organizations that will be involved. The table also captures the proposed role of the stakeholders identified. This list and responsibilities will be refined during PPG Phase

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
4/29/2021, NPR:

1. Please respond to all the questions in this section. i.e. there is no response to the following "Does the project expect to include any gender-responsive measures to address gender gaps or promote gender equality and women empowerment? - closing gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources; - improving women's participation and decision-making; and/or - generating socio-economic benefits or services for women."
2. Please mention the inclusion of gender focal points here ? output 1.1.4.

11/18/2021: Cleared

Agency Response
CI-GEF 11/09/2021:

1) the relevant boxes of the gender section have been selected. This is typically how we include information for this section at PIF stage.

2) We have deleted output 1.1.4 after considering your comments and restructuring the results framework

Paragraph 45: We have added information about gender mainstreaming

Paragraph 48: We have provided an indicative gender target of ensuring at least 25% of women are involved in the implementation of project activities.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion
4/29/2021, NPR:

1. Please respond to the question "Will there be private sector engagement in the project?"
2. Please address the comments made in the Stakeholder Engagement section and accordingly add additional relevant information.
3. Address typo here: IPCCC to IPCC.

11/18/2021: Cleared. However, please check typos in the document - change IPCCC to IPCC and check spelling of UNFCCC in the document.

12/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response
CI-GEF 12/08/2021:

One IPCC typo corrected and in the PIF?s Private sector engagement section. Cross checked UNFCCC, no typo in the PIF

CI-GEF 11/09/2021:

1) there will be private sector engagement in project (as indicated in the portal)

2) Table 4 (previously Table 3) has been updated to include a tentative list of organizations that will be involved. The table also captures the proposed role of the stakeholders identified. The private sector and its potential roles in the project are also captured in Table 4. The specific private sector institutions will be identified during PPG Phase. Paragraph 50 captures these details.

3) typo corrected

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
4/29/2021, NPR: Please include risk of staff turnover.

11/18/2021: Cleared.

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
4/29/2021: 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
4/29/2021, NPR: Please provide, in table format preferably, a listing of all the national priorities and a brief description of them ? such as NDC, NC, BUR, etc. This is currently missing. Information on the KM activities should be moved to the relevant section.

11/18/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response CI-GEF 11/09/2021: Added **Table 7:** Consistency with National Priorities. KM activities moved to KM section.
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
4/29/2021, NPR: Please move the KM relevant information from the previous section here. Provide details on how this project will coordinate with the CBIT Coordination Platform and leverage its work.

11/18/2021: Please include plans for strategic communications in the KM Approach. Also comment on how this project will learn from other relevant projects/initiatives and how the KM Approach will contribute to the overall impact of the project.

12/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response
CI-GEF 12/08/2021:

Strategic comms included in Table 8 and the following text:

Plans for strategic communications in the knowledge management approach: The project?s communications strategy will aim to ensure critical knowledge is tailored to the target audience and disseminated on platforms accessible to the target audience. Strategic communication in knowledge management will be used as a tool to influence policy, improve the design and implementation of transparency projects and initiatives in the country, prompt innovation, and generate more impact on climate transparency at national, regional, and global levels. The key target audience will be identified during PPG Phase from the following priority stakeholder groups:

    Government Ministries, Departments, and Agencies working in the key GHG emission sectors
    Private sector
    CSOs
    Academia
    Donors e.g., the GEF

Monitoring and evaluation of the knowledge management and communications strategy: Bi-annually, the PMU will undertake M&E to establish the effectiveness of the implementation of the knowledge management and communications strategy. The following criteria will be used to evaluate and update the tabulated communications strategy below:

    Progress on the activity plan in the communications strategy

Assess the size and type of the audience through hit counts on websites, views, and comments on social media posts, and the number of publications shared on external platforms.

Audience Engagement: number of shares and likes on social media handles, comments on blogs, and feedback on conference presentations

Draft communication strategy for the project: Both the Nigeria Federal Ministry of Environment and Conservation International have well-established communications departments. The PMU team will work closely with the communication?s focal points from both institutions to prepare and disseminate knowledge management products throughout the project life. **A knowledge management budget will be allocated to ensure the delivery of the communication strategy.**

The table below will be filled by the PMU with support from the Communications focal points from the Nigeria Federal Ministry of Environment and Conservation International during the PPG Phase. Information in this table will guide the project?s strategic communications in knowledge management.

How the KM approach will contribute to the overall impact of the project including in the following:

Through platforms such as Zoom, Teams and the CIGEF CBIT WhatsApp group, this project will interact and share lessons with the following ongoing CBIT projects that are implemented by Conservation International: CBIT Rwanda, CBIT Madagascar, CBIT COMESA Multicounty (Comoros, Eritrea, Seychelles, Zambia) and CBIT Gambia. Additionally, the CBIT Nigeria project team will be connected to the CBIT coordination platform where they will connect, learn and share with other global CBIT project teams. Lastly, the CBIT Nigeria project team will be given access to knowledge materials that were prepared by CI?s CBIT projects that have been closed.

How the knowledge management approach will contribute to the overall impact of the project: This project will generate, store, and disseminate information related to climate transparency hence in the process: (i) raise awareness about the status of climate transparency in Nigeria, (ii) share lessons learnt and recommendations that will address the barriers impeding achievement of climate transparency in Nigeria, and (iii) raise awareness about the transparency support received by Nigeria to date. Through this information, the key stakeholders, as well as donors, will be able to pinpoint and understand the key gaps and interventions required to improve transparency in Nigeria. This information can be used to improve the design of future transparency initiatives and catalyze climate finance from donors which will result in new transparency initiatives that will further strengthen national capacity to track the NDC and achieve transparency over time.

CI-GEF 11/09/2021: Information about how this project will co-ordinate with the CBIT Coordination Platform and leverage its work has been added

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
4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, a preliminary ESS has been conducted.

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
4/29/2021, NPR: Yes, the LOE has been endorsed by the appropriate GEF focal point.

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
Not applicable
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
4/29/2021, NPR: Not yet. Please address the comments above.

11/18/2021: Not yet. Please address comments above.

12/13/2021: 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

Review Dates

	PIF Review	**Agency Response**
First Review	**4/29/2021**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**11/18/2021**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval