Strengthening Chile?s Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) Transparency Framework ? Phase Two (CBIT-2)

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11660

Countries

Chile

Project Name

Strengthening Chile?s Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) Transparency Framework ? Phase Two (CBIT-2)

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

7/11/2024

Review completed by PM

7/30/2024

Program Manager

William Holness Carrasco
Focal Area

Climate Change
Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

Part I - General Project Information

1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Yes, the Project Information Table is correctly filled, including the Ministry of Environment of Chile as Project Execution Entities. Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A
b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Yes, it is correctly filled out. Rio Marker 2 for CCM and 1 for CCA. Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A
2. Project Summary.
a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected results?
b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: References to the first CBIT of Chile have been made throughout the document making using of its GEF ID: 9835. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: The project summary makes reference to some of the tangible outcomes from the first CBIT project for Chile that serve as the basis for the scope of work of this second CBIT project in the country. In order to explicitly differentiate the first and second CBIT projects of Chile,

please make all references to the first CBIT using its project GEF ID (9835).?Please amend accordingly throughout the document.

Agency Response

10/08/2024

Noted, all references to the first CBIT project of Chile now mention the GEF ID.

3. Project Description Overview
a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?
b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?
c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and appropriately funded?
d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024:

1. References to gender approach considerations have been made on Outputs 1.1.3, 1.2.2, 3.1.2, and 3.2.2. Reports on the Gender Action Plans will be included as part of the Annual Progress Reports of the CBIT project, and this mention has been included in the M&E Plan. References to differentiated impacts based on gender have been made to Outputs 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 3.2.1. It is confirmed that the Gender Action Plan has been updated to include a budget to perform the activities cited, mainly through the hiring of the Gender Expert and an ad hoc workshop. Comment cleared.

2. The outcome and output sections of the M&E component have been filled out in the GEF Portal. Cleared.

3. The GEF Project Financing and the Co-Financing Contributions for PMC correspond to 7.73% of the total GEF grant and total co-financing contributions, respectively. Cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Please address the following comments:

1. If possible, please ensure that relevant Outputs (e.g., 1.1.3, 1.2.2, 2.1.1, 3.1.2, and 3.2.2), include gender dimensions explicitly in this section. In addition, Under M&E, ensure the new gender dimensions are reported and monitored on. In addition, please ensure the meaningful participation and engagement of women and gender experts in developing the indicators and the adaptation guidelines (e.g., Outputs 2.2.1, 2.2.2, and 3.2.1). Please ensure that the GAP is budgeted and during project implementation, that the PIRs, the MTE and the TE include a review and reporting of the GAP and relevant gender dimensions of the project. Please amend accordingly.
2. Please fill out the outcome and output sections of the M&E Component in the GEF Portal. Kindly complete this section accordingly.

3. The GEF Project Financing and the Co-Financing Contributions for PMC correspond to 7.73% and 8.06% of the total GEF grant and total co-financing contributions, respectively. If possible, please adjust the co-financing contribution to the PMC so that it is proportional to the GEF project financing contribution and that none of the PMC is above 10% without proper justification. Please amend and revert accordingly.

Agency Response

10/08/2024

Thank you for the comments.

1. The outputs were reviewed to be more explicit on the inclusion of gender dimensions. On the participation and engagement of women, it will be continuously monitored by the gender expert that will be part of the PMU, and during relevant monitoring and evaluation milestones this will also be monitored by the implementing agency. A mention has been included into the Monitoring and Evaluation section of the Agency Project Document (Annex G). On budget, the GAP has been updated to include the estimated costs associated with the proposed actions, most of them to be carried out by the gender specialist of the PMU.

2. Noted. The sections have been filled.

3. The cofinancing was reviewed to adjust the difference (0.3%), as requested by GEFSEC.

4. Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: The Stakeholder Engagement Plan now includes references to activities to be carried out in close coordination with civil society, academia, and the private sector. Cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: The section includes an overview of how climate change is affecting Chile and the progress made by the country in terms of meeting the provisions of the ETF. The roles of the stakeholders (particularly State actors) have been expressly stated and the interactions between this CBIT project and other transparency-related initiatives that will be executed in parallel in the country have been cited. However, the project states that civil society, NGO?s, academia, private sector are essential for designing and validating LT-LEDS and that the implementation of multi-stakeholder, multi-level, cross-sectoral, and transparent participatory processes must incorporate the perspectives and opinions of all stakeholders, as civil society, NGO?s, Academia and private. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan does not elaborate on any activities of these stakeholders. Please Agency to clarify

or provide more details on the roles and responsibilities of these stakeholder including timing/means of engagement both in this section and update the Stakeholder Engagement Plan accordingly.

Agency Response

10/08/2024

Thank you for the comment. The stakeholder engagement plan (Annex J of the Agency Project document) was updated with the expected roles and ways of engagement for civil society, academia and private sector.

5 B. Project Description

5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Is there a description of how theGEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?

c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks are properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?

d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?

e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?

f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?

g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this MSP)?

h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?

i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component description/s?

j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?

l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 12/20/2024:

16. Activity 2.2.3.1 has been reformulated to address the development of institutional arrangements and technical capacities for the development of indicators for reporting loss and damage, which makes the activity now aligned with what could be covered with CBIT funding. Comment cleared.

19. Activity 3.2.1.4 and all activities within output 3.2.2 have been adjusted and clarified to ensure alignment with the CBIT as they relate to building capacities on NDC tracking and accounting systems. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: Please review and address the following outstanding comments (Specific comments 16 and 19).

General comments:

1. Requested information up to the activity level has been included for each of the project components in the GEF Portal. Cleared.

2. A coherent explanation for the budget increase for this new CBIT project has been provided, considering an implementation approach of the arrangements and systems conceptualized during the first CBIT project for Chile (GEF ID 9835) and additional elements under the ETF. Cleared.

Specific comments:

3. Stakeholders to be included under activity 1.1.1.1 have been stated. Cleared.

4. Explanation of sectorial or economy-wide scope of work has been provided to activities 1.1.1.2 and 1.1.2.1. Cleared.

5. Comment cleared and the sectors shall be expected to be identified as soon as the outcomes of the workplan upon completion of the GHGI are completed. Cleared.

6. Gender and sustainability considerations are explicitly stated as part of activity 1.1.3.2. Cleared.

7. An explanation of the current stage of the institutionalization of the LMCC as a means to provide a comprehensive list and institutions involved as part of output 1.2.1. Cleared.

8. Justification on gender approach considerations and institutions involved has been provided. Cleared.

9. Gender considerations, institutions involved, and sustainability aspects have been considered as part of activity 1.3.1.3. Cleared.

10. Scope of work of activity 1.3.1.4 is contingent on the results of the first BTR, which will in turn inform the implementation of the activity. Comment cleared.

11. Comment cleared.

12. Gender and sustainability considerations have been included as part of output 2.1.1. for all its relevant activities. Cleared.

13. Comment cleared.

14. Brief mentions to the indicators to be updated from ARClim and further developed from scratch have been made. Cleared.

15. Comment cleared.

16. The CBIT provides support to enhancing institutional arrangements and technical capacities related to the ETF, including tracking of adaptation measures and development of related indicators. However, activities to develop a nation-wide conceptual framework on loss and damage and capacitate on it (punctually activity 2.2.3.1) go beyond the CBIT mandate. Please remove or reformulate this activity so it is within the CBIT scope.

17. Comment cleared.

18. Comment cleared.

19. The CBIT provides support to enhancing institutional arrangements and technical capacities related to the ETF, including NDC tracking and the development / enhancement of its indicators. However, activities to build capacities around the formulation and consultation of the NDC and the LT-LEDS updates go beyond the CBIT mandate (punctually activities 3.2.1.1, 3.2.1.2, 3.2.1.4, and all activities under output 3.2.2). Please remove or reformulate these activities so they are within the CBIT scope.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Please address the following comments:

General comments:

1. Please include in the GEF Portal directly and as applicable, information from relevant sections from the Outcomes, Outputs, and activities that this CBIT project aims to cover. The current description of this section in the Portal is only making general references at the Component level and this section will benefit from providing details such as stakeholders involved, sectors covered, type of intervention (i.e.: capacity-building schemes, creation or enhancement of virtual platforms, institutional arrangements to be developed, etc.) up to the activity level, if possible. You might copy and paste relevant sections from Annex C of the Agency Project Document into the GEF Portal and include the relevant details requested under the Specific Comments section below. Please amend accordingly.
2. Please justify the increase in budget for the CBIT2 project compared to its predecessor, CBIT1.

Specific comments:

3. For activity 1.1.1.1, please indicate the institutions involved in adapting the interinstitutional coordination of the SNI. Please provide a concise list accordingly.
4. For activities 1.1.1.2, 1,1.2.1, please confirm if the documentation system improvement for the GHGI and GHGI estimations and QC will involve all the emitting sectors and categories of Chile or if there will be a particular focus on some of them. Please indicate accordingly.
5. Considering limited funding, please indicate the expected emitting sectors and categories for which the development of activity data and emission factors will take place as part of activity 1.1.2.1 and

the relevance for the selection of such sectors and categories to increase the overall accuracy of the country?s based on their share of total emissions. Please indicate and justify accordingly.

6. For activity 1.1.3.2, if possible, please indicate that gender considerations will take place as part of the capacity-building scheme. In addition, please cite if there will be any mechanism in place to sustain the capacities overtime even after project intervention, considering government staff turnover. Kindly indicate accordingly.
7. For the activities under Output 1.2.1, please the sectors involved in the improvement work under the SNP and, consequently, the relevant institutions that will be involved under each of the activities of the output. Kindly include this information accordingly.
8. For activities 1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.2, please indicate if gender considerations will take place as part of the capacity-building scheme. In addition, please cite if there will be any mechanism in place to sustain the capacities overtime even after project intervention, considering government staff turnover. Moreover, for activity, 1.2.2.1, please cite the institutions that will be involved in the training sessions. Kindly indicate accordingly.
9. For activity 1.3.1.3, please indicate the sectors and institutions involved in the training and if gender considerations will take place as part of the capacity-building scheme. In addition, please cite if there will be any mechanism in place to sustain the capacities overtime even after project intervention, considering government staff turnover. Kindly indicate accordingly.
10. For activity 1.3.1.4, if possible, please indicate the specific group of measures for which the project team will enhance the estimations of achieved mitigation. Moreover, please also specify the measures for which general recommendations will be formulated as part of this activity. Please indicate accordingly.
11. For activity 2.1.1.1, please indicate the institutions involved in the development of the tool for support received and subsequent training on its use. In addition, please cite if there will be any mechanism in place to sustain the capacities overtime even after project intervention, considering government staff turnover. Please indicate accordingly.
12. Similarly, for activity 2.1.1.2, 2.1.1.3, and 2.1.1.4, if possible, indicate if gender considerations will take place as part of the capacity-building schemes. In addition, please cite if there will be any mechanism in place to sustain the capacities overtime even after project intervention, considering government staff turnover. Kindly amend accordingly.
13. For activity 2.1.2.3, please confirm if the analysis of effects on needs of the support received will encompass all sectors or specific ones for its purposes. Please cite the sectors that will be covered by this activity.
14. For activity 2.2.2.4, please indicate the set of vulnerability indicators that will be updated and those that will be developed from scratch to complete the set as part of the ARClim initiative cited. Please provide a concise list, if possible.
15. For activity 2.2.2.5, please indicate if the information collection efforts will be done for all climate vulnerability indicators or if there will be a specific sub-set of indicators for which this activity will take place. Please indicate the scope of work of this activity accordingly.
16. Considering the laser-focus of the CBIT as it relates to meeting the provisions of Article 13 of the Paris Agreement, its Enhanced Transparency Framework, kindly advise on how activity 2.2.3.1: the development of a nation-wide conceptual framework on loss and damage, and subsequent activities 2.2.3.2, and 2.2.3.3, are aligned with the objectives of the CBIT and the ETF. Please clarify accordingly. In addition, please identify the institutions involved in the scope of work of these activities and please cite if there will be any mechanism in place to sustain the capacities overtime even after project intervention, considering government staff turnover for activity 2.2.3.1. Please clarify accordingly.
17. For activity 3.1.2.1, please indicate if the participation on regional workshops for lesson dissemination will make use of the CBIT Global Support Programme ? Spanish speaking LAC network and their related activities or other relevant CBIT Global projects implemented by FAO such as CBIT Forest II and AFOLU+ projects. Please briefly elaborate on the coordination with such global initiatives as part of this activity.
18. For activity 3.2.1.3, please indicate the sectors for which the analysis of the robustness of mitigation projections will take place. Please also indicate if this activity will inform the sectorial scope of work of the trainings of activities 1.2.2.1 and 1.2.2.2, which also focus on sectoral projections for institutional stakeholders. Please indicate accordingly.

19. In addition, for Outcome 3.2, and particularly for Outputs 3.2.1 (activity 3.2.1.4) and 3.2.2 more broadly, considering the laser-focus of the CBIT as it relates to meeting the provisions of the Enhanced Transparency Framework, kindly advise how the significant and resource-consuming efforts of updating the NDC and revising the LT-LEDS of the country, fit the global objectives of the CBIT. Kindly consider that the focus that CBIT normally provides in this context is mostly on the tools and capacity-building necessary to track progress made in implementing and achieving country?s Nationally Determined Contributions under Article 4, and not on updating these policy instruments. Please elaborate as appropriate for their reconsideration.

Agency Response

12/13/2024

Thank you. Regarding pending comments.

16. Activity 2.2.3.1 was reformulated to ensure alignment with CBIT scope.

19. A justification was included for activities 3.2.1.1., 3.2.1.2, 3.2.2.4, 3.2.2.2 and 3.2.2.3, while activities 3.2.1.4, 3.2.2.1, 3.2.2.4, 3.2.2.5 and 3.2.2.6 were reformulated to ensure alignment within the scope of CBIT support.

A detailed description of activities can be found on Annex E of the Agency Project Document. A thorough review of the project document was also carried out to ensure consistency.

10/08/2024

Thank you for the comments.

1. Noted. More detail has been included into this section as suggested, while trying to be as concise as possible, taking information from Annexes C and E of the Agency Project Document, which contains further detailed description of outcomes and outputs.

2. Noted. A paragraph justifying the increase in budget has been included at the end of this section.

3. A brief list was included.

4. The requested information has been included into both activities.

5. At this time, the particular activities cannot be determined, as they are contingent upon the outcomes of the work plan that will be developed upon the completion of the GHGI currently in progress.

6. Noted, an explicit mention to gender and sustainability were included.

7. An explanation on the definition of institutions was included, as this is an ongoing process.

8. A mention to gender considerations has been included into the narrative of the output which includes the activities, and also an explanation on the definition of institutions, as this is an ongoing process.

9. Noted, the description has been updated to include the topics mentioned.

10. Kindly note that at this time, the particular measures cannot be determined, as they are contingent upon the outcomes of the first BTR. A mention has been included into this activity.

11. Kindly note that at this time, the particular institutions cannot be determined, as they are contingent upon the outcomes of the first BTR. A mention to this has been included into the description of the activity. Reference to sustainability has been included into the description of output 2.1.1, being common to the activities part of the output.

12. The description of outcome 2.1.1 which covers the mentioned activities, was updated with reference to gender considerations and sustainability.

13. Thank you for the comment. We confirm that the analysis will cover all sectors and categories, a mention to this was included.

14. Noted, a brief list was included in the description of the activity.

15. The activity will collect data on all identified vulnerability indicators. A mention has been included.

16. The description of output 2.2.3. has been updated, as it covers the mentioned activities. A mention on alignment was also included.

17. Noted, mention has been included into the description of this activity to CBIT GSP. Other initiatives will be explored during implementation.

18. Noted, the description was updated to include references as requested.

19. A description has been included into outcome 3.2 on the NDC and CBIT.

5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.
a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?
b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in support of the request?
c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: Confirmation that the NPD designated by the government will not be financed by GEF funding has been provided. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: We take note of the exceptionality request for fully internal budget execution by FAO on behalf of the MMA. Please address the following comment:

1. Kindly confirm if the National Project Director (NPD) to be designated by the government are considered public servants and if they will be financed in any way through GEF funding for this CBIT project. Please clarify accordingly.

Agency Response

10/08/2024

1. Thank you for the comment. We confirm that the NDP is not covered by GEF funding, and their time is actually considered as part of the co-finance of the project. A mention has been included into this section.

5.3 Core indicators

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

b) Are the project?s targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable? Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared. The project team expects 320 people benefiting from this CBIT project (160 male and 160 female).

Agency Response

N/A

5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: Explanation of the Overall Risk Rating has been included. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Please address the following comment:

1. Kindly include an Explanation of Risk and Mitigation Measures for the Overall Risk Rating designated as Low at the end of the table. Kindly amend accordingly.

Agency Response
10/08/2024

1. Thank you for noting this, an explanation was included.

5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A
6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities
6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A
6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A
6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A
7 D. Policy Requirements
7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: References to the private sector have been made to the Policy Requirement section and throughout the document. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Currently, the private sector engagement portion of the Policy Requirement sections is empty. Please include their engagement in this section, even it is currently deemed as limited or indirect. Please amend accordingly.

Agency Response
10/08/2024

Thank you for the comment. The stakeholders engagement plan was updated mentioning the involvement of non-state actors, including the private sector. Section B was updated accordingly and also Annex J of the Agency project document.

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: While the Gender Action Plan is uploaded, if possible, please ensure that relevant Outputs (particularly 1.1.3 and 1.2.2) include gender considerations explicitly and are included within the scope of work of the Gender Action Plan. If deemed appropriate, kindly include and amend accordingly.

Agency Response
10/08/2024

Thank you for the comment which is welcomed. The outputs were reviewed to be more explicit on the inclusion of gender considerations in line with the Gender Action Plan.

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF/WHC 12/20/2024: cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Please update the Stakeholder Engagement Plan based on comments to non-State actors as expressed on section 4.A Project Rationale above.

Agency Response
10/08/2024

Thank you for the comment. The Stakeholder Engagement Plan (Annex J of the Agency project document) was updated to include non-State actors.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that

apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A

SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?

b) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared. The Agency is requesting $50,000 for PPG. In Annex D, it is specified that $45,364 have been spent to date and the remaining $4,636 is committed.

Agency ResponseN/A

8.3 Source of Funds

Does the sources of funds table match with the OFP?s LOE? Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country?s STAR allocation

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency Response

N/A

8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines? e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: The co-financing amounts for Investment mobilized and Recurrent expenditures coincide at the CEO Approval Document and the co-finance letter. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Thanks for providing the Letter of Co-financing by the Ministry of Environment. Nevertheless, in the paragraph below the table ?Confirmed Co-financing for the project, by name and type?, the sum for Investment mobilized in detail add up to $ 295,537 ($ 129,287 + 62,500 + 81,250 + 22,500), instead of the $ 395,538 described on the table itself and the co-financing letter. Please amend accordingly so that these amounts coincide. In addition, for the recurrent expenditures section, the amount reflected in the table is $ 575,025, whereas the one in the paragraph is cited as $ 575,026 as in-kind co-financing from the MMA. Please amend accordingly so that both amounts coincide as well.

Agency Response

10/08/2024

Thank you for noting this, the description of co-financing has been reviewed to ensure consistency with the letter.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A

b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A

c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A

8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.7 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?

b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of the budget (too high? Too low?)

c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?

d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

8.8 Are geo-referenced information and maps provided indicating where the project interventions will take place ?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: Cleared.

Agency ResponseN/A

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.10 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?

b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024: TORs of the Chief Technical Advisor of the project have been updated to include technical tasks related to each of the three technical components of the projects to which the position is being charged, while the Finance and Administrative Officer will be in charge of daily administrative management of the project. Comment cleared.

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: A Chief Technical Advisor has been charged across components and the PMC. Per Guidelines, the costs associated with the project?s execution have to be covered by the GEF portion and the co-financing portion allocated to PMC. When the situation merits (i.e. not enough co-financing funds) the project? staff could be charged to the project?s components with ?clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective component? (paragraph 4 ? page 42 of the Guidelines). Looking at the terms of references of this position, it does seem like a managerial position for the project. Please review and update the Terms of Reference to provide unique outputs related to each of the technical components or further clarify.

Agency Response

10/08/2024

Noted. The TORs of the Chief Technical Advisor were updated to be more explicit on the technical outputs that this person will deliver. Also, it is important to note that a finance and

administer officer, fully charged to PMC will be largely supporting the day to day management of the project.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.11 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.

b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.

c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024: N/A

Agency ResponseN/A

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF/WHC 12/20/2024. The PMs recommend the project for further processing.

EBF/WHC 10/17/2024. Please address the comments above and highlight them in magenta for ease of reference. Also, please ensure changes are visible in the CEO Approval form (?portal form?).

EBF/WHC 7/29/2024. Please address the comments above and highlight them in green for ease of reference. Also, please ensure changes are visible in the CEO Approval form (?portal form?).

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	**7/29/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)	**10/17/2024**	

	1SMSP CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
Additional Review (as necessary)	**12/20/2024**	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		