

Enabling China to Prepare Its Fourth National Communication, and Biennial Update Reports on Climate Change

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10707

Countries

China

Project Name

Enabling China to Prepare Its Fourth National Communication, and Biennial Update Reports on Climate Change

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/8/2021

Review completed by PM

3/7/2022

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Non-Expedited Enabling Activity req (PIF)
Non-Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO) **Part 1: Project Information****Focal area elements**

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response**Project description summary**

Is the project structure/design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs as in Table B and described in the project document?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Jan 31, 2022: Comments cleared.

Dec 15, 2021: The structure is mostly the same as in the PIF while there are some minor changes. Please see comments in Part II and just accordingly. Also, please address comments below.

The co-financing amount on PMCs on Table B is not the same ratio with the GEF funding on PMCs. Please adjust the allocation.

Please also separately describes BUR3 and BUR4 on the dates of such reports on Part I: Project Information so that we will understand the exact information on each BUR including submission dates.

Agency Response

Comment:

The co-financing amount on PMCs on Table B is not the same ratio with the GEF funding on PMCs. Please adjust the allocation.

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

To make the ratio of the co-financing for PMC the same to that of the GEF funding for PMC, the amount of co-financing for PMC is reduced to US\$ 69,410. The co-financing for Component 5 is increased to US\$ 161,310 resulting in an increased co-financing sub-total. The new co-financing sub-total is US\$ submission dates to UNFCCC.

(reference: CERDoc: Part I, Sec. B)

Comment:

Please also separately describes BUR3 and BUR4 on the dates of such reports on Part I: Project Information so that we will understand the exact information on each BUR including submission dates.

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

The submission dates to UNFCCC for BUR3 (31 Dec 2022) and BUR4 (31 Dec 2024) are now stated in Part I of the 4NC CEO Endorsement Request Document (CERDoc). The submission date of the BTR1 is also 31 Dec 2024, but the preparation of the BTR1 is not part of this 4NC Project.

(reference: CERDoc: Part I)

Co-financing

Are the confirmed expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented, with supporting evidence and a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified [and meets the definition of investment mobilized, and a description of any major changes from PIF, consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?]

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The co-financing amount is the same as at PIF. Please see the comment above on co-financing on PMCs.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

**Are they within the resources available from:
The STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes as stated in GEFSEC comment at the PIF above.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes as stated in GEFSEC comment at the PIF above.

Agency Response

Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Jan 31, 2022: Comments cleared.

Dec 15, 2021: Yes. Please see the below comments on the budget table (and a table in ProDoc).

We note that budget lines are handled by FECO and MEE, while the executing entity of the project is MEE only. Financial audit seems to be handled by UNDP while UNDP is not an executing entity of the project. Please revise.

Also, please change "miscellaneous expenses" as GEF does not fund unspecified expenses.

"Detailed description" is not easy to read. Please simplify and/or expand the column.

Agency Response

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

For the execution of this project, the project implementing partner (MEE) has designated one department under it, which is the Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center (FECO). FECO will be responsible for the execution of the project on behalf of MEE under the technical guidance of the Department of Climate Change (DCC) of the MEE. The project management office (PMO), headed by a deputy director general who will report to the MEE, is set in FECO. To avoid confusion, all 'FECO,MEE' entries in the budget table have been changed to 'MEE'.

Regarding the financial audit, like the mid-term and terminal project evaluations, is an independent evaluation. Per the advice of the GEFSec for other projects, financial audit must be conducted by UNDP as part of GEF Agency oversight responsibilities. The implementing partner must not manage/conduct this audit, as that will be tantamount to auditing itself.

Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification

Background and Context.

Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Jan 31, 2022: We understand through discussions that the BTR1 and BUR4 will be prepared in a coordinated way and the submissions will be also coordinated while the two reports will meet respective requirements. Comments cleared.

Dec 15, 2021: Largely yes. The main activities are mostly the same as in the PIF. Please address/clarify the comments below.

Recalculation of previous inventories: We note that recalculation of inventories at BUR3 will be only year 2005, which has been changed from the PIF and the rationale in the response to the GEFSEC comment is that year 2005 is the base year of the NDC as per the requirement of MPGs. However, the MPGs are more relevant to BTR1 and BUR4 (as a joint report) than BUR3. Please clarify.

GHG inventory year at BUR4: As per the expected joint reporting with BTR1, the latest inventory year will be 2021 or 2022 instead of 2020, as BTR1 needs to report inventories with the latest year of either x-2 or x-3 (x is the reporting year). Please revise relevant descriptions including Table B. Also, please clarify the coverage of gases at BUR4.

Format of BUR4 with alignment with BTR1: As the format for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement has been adopted*, is it envisaged that the BUR4 be aligned with the BTR format to the extent possible given the arrangement of a joint reporting with BTR1? In this regard, will component 3 for BUR4 also include MPGs requirements such as tracking the NDC implementation? Streamlining such reporting formats/contents would help the country avoid the duplication of efforts with the BTR1 preparation as discussed at the PIF stage.

*https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cma2021_L21E.pdf

The linkage with ongoing CBIT project: We note the descriptions on the linkage with the CBIT project, which are helpful, and that this project would be a basis for the CBIT project implementation. However, the vice versa (of the linkage) also applies because capacity-building by the CBIT project will enable China to conduct BUR4 reporting in line with MPGs. As such, please adjust the relevant descriptions.

Agency Response

Comment:

Recalculation of previous inventories: We note that recalculation of inventories at BUR3 will be only year 2005, which has been changed from the PIF and the rationale in the response to the GEFSEC comment is that year 2005 is the base year of the NDC as per the requirement of MPGs. However, the MPGs are more relevant to BTR1 and BUR4 (as a joint report) than BUR3. Please clarify.

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

Recalculation of inventories for the BUR3 will only be for Year 2005 because there will not be enough time to do more years of recalculation of inventories since the planned submission is on 31 Dec 2022. The other years recalculation of inventories will be done for BUR4. According to the new plan, there will be no joint BUR4-BTR1 report but rather the BUR4 and BTR1 will be prepared and submitted separately.

Comment:

GHG inventory year at BUR4: As per the expected joint reporting with BTR1, the latest inventory year will be 2021 or 2022 instead of 2020, as BTR1 needs to report inventories with the latest year of either x-2 or x-3 (x is the reporting year). Please revise relevant descriptions including Table B. Also, please clarify the coverage of gases at BUR4.

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

MPGs requirement on GHG inventory year for non-annex I parties is x-3, which means that the China BTR1 will include inventories for Years 2021 and 2020. According to the new plan, BTR1 will be a stand-alone report covering the GHG inventory years 2020 and 2021 which meets the MPGs requirement. The coverage of gases in BUR4 will at least include CO₂, CH₄, and N₂O. China will make efforts to report emissions of HFCs, PFCs SF₆ and other F-gases to the UNFCCC, based on the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities.

Comment:

Format of BUR4 with alignment with BTR1: As the format for Article 13 of the Paris Agreement has been adopted, is it envisaged that the BUR4 be aligned with the BTR format to the extent possible given the arrangement of a joint reporting with BTR1? In this regard, will component 3 for BUR4 also include MPGs requirements such as tracking the NDC implementation? Streamlining such reporting formats/contents would help the country avoid the duplication of efforts with the BTR1 preparation as discussed at the PIF stage. *https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/cma2021_L21E.pdf*

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

The BUR4 and BTR1 will be prepared separately and both reports will be submitted on 31 Dec 2024. The BUR4 will be prepared using the required BUR template and the BTR1 will be prepared using the recently adopted BTR template. The tracking of the NDC implementation will be covered in the BTR1.

Comment:

The linkage with ongoing CBIT project: We note the descriptions on the linkage with the CBIT project, which are helpful, and that this project would be a basis for the CBIT project implementation. However, the vice versa (of the linkage) also applies because capacity-building by the CBIT project will enable China to conduct BUR4 reporting in line with MPGs. As such, please adjust the relevant descriptions.

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

The response to the query regarding the synergy between the 4NC Project and the CBIT Project brings up the notion that with such partnership the former will bring about capacity that are necessary for implementing the latter. Actually such partnership is reciprocal since the CBIT Project will also build capacity in preparing the BUR4 in line with the MPGs.

Firstly, the CBIT Project will support China's GHG inventory team to adopt 2006 guidelines as much as possible in a voluntarily manner. Secondly, the normalized reporting mechanism designed and established by CBIT will improve the efficiency of the 4NC Project team in terms of reporting. Lastly, the methodology developed in CBIT (such as mitigation policy, adaptation, FTC support) can also be potentially used in the preparation of the 4NC report, where necessary.

Stakeholders.

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the

implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Jan 31, 2022: Comment cleared.

Dec 15, 2021: Please also add the summary of stakeholder engagement plan in CER (under the headline of stakeholders). Please indicate what kind of CSOs are envisaged to be involved at this stage, as other stakeholders are more specific.

Agency Response

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

A summary of stakeholder engagement plan has been added in the CERDoc. Apart from these, the various other pertinent stakeholder groups, such as CSOs (e.g., think tanks, and industry associations) will be confirmed during the implementation of the 4NC Project. The names of such groups cannot be provided for now since the 4NC Project implementation has not yet started. The 4NC Project will welcome those potential CSOs to provide technical expertise and bring in international experience, networking and platform for communication, and possibly participate in some activities such as training, communication and public awareness under projects.
(reference: CERDoc: Part II; Key stakeholders, p. 17)

Gender equality and women's empowerment.

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Jan 31, 2022: We note the response. Comments cleared.

Dec 15, 2021: The gender section in CER says "Gender analysis and a gender action plan have been formulated and gender-sensitive indicators will be incorporated into the project's logical framework." While we note that Annex in ProDoc has gender-sensitive indicators and goals in this regard, we do not find narrative gender analysis or plan. Please clarify and elaborate the descriptions in the headline of gender in CER to the extent possible.

Also, please clarify why the indicators in the Annex will be incorporated in the provided result framework during the project implementation, rather than at the CER stage.

Agency Response

Comment:

The gender section in CER says "Gender analysis and a gender action plan have been formulated and gender-sensitive indicators will be incorporated into the project's logical

framework." While we note that Annex in ProDoc has gender-sensitive indicators and goals in this regard, we do not find narrative gender analysis or plan.

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

Annex 8: Gender Analysis and Gender Action Plan in the ProDoc has been further elaborated to include the summary of the gender analysis that was done and used as basis for the Gender Action Plan.

Comment:

Please clarify and elaborate the descriptions in the headline of gender in CER to the extent possible. Also, please clarify why the indicators in the Annex will be incorporated in the provided result framework during the project implementation, rather than at the CER stage.

Response (to Dec 15, 2021):

The section on Gender in the CERDoc has been further elaborated.

Gender analysis and a gender action plan have been formulated and gender-sensitive indicators are incorporated into the project's logical framework. In mid-term and final evaluation of the project, women's participation and benefits will be assessed.

The indicators in the project log frame already include gender-sensitive indicators. For example Indicator 1 of the Project Objective; and gender equity is implicitly stated the indicators of all capacity development outcomes such as Indicators 5-7, 9, 10-13. The indicators in the Gender Action Plan will be used in the evaluation of the project (PIRs, MTR and TE) to assess the extent of women's participation and benefits.

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, the plan and the total budget are mostly the same as those in the PIF.

Agency Response

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. The project will benefit from the ongoing CBIT project, previous reports and review processes including ICA.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The FA set-aside resource is within the cost range, with the STAR allocation resource.

Agency Response

Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Following the FSP process, the PIF was endorsed by the OFP at the PIF stage.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

GEF Secretariat Comment

Dec 15, 2021: Yes. Thank you also for adding responses to GEFSEC comments. In this regard, please see the below.

The first comment on "Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?" comes from the CER document format rather than a GEFSEC comment.

The last comment on "RECOMMENDATION Is CEO clearance/approval recommended?" comes from the review sheet format rather than a GEFSEC comment.

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. The project will be circulated to council members for their comments.

Agency Response

STAP Comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 7, 2022: Comment cleared.

March 7, 2022: We note the revision on start dates. Please revert back completion dates as they were also changed to the same as start dates.

March 1, 2022: Previous comments cleared. Please amend the start dates for implementation considering 4-week council review.

Dec 15, 2021: Please address the comments above. We also note the checklist included in the documents.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/15/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/31/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations