

Establish an integral MRV/M&E system to enhance climate transparency in Paraguay

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10342

Countries

Paraguay

Project Name

Establish an integral MRV/M&E system to enhance climate transparency in Paraguay

Agenices

UNEP

Date received by PM

9/15/2019

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF

Part I – Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes this project is aligned with the CCM focal area strategy and the CBIT programming directions.

Agency Response

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: We suggest Table B is further broken down into different project components that show how the resources will be allocated to the 3 different outputs listed under component 1 currently, and activities as described are added as outputs. This will also allow the project to budget M&E as a separate component if it chooses to.

11/5/2019: Comment above was incorporated. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 10/14/2019: Table B budget has been broken down into the three different Outputs, so the resources allocation is now visible.

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

9/27/2019: In-kind cofinancing of \$350,000 is listed. Please consider adding co-financing to the PMC row, considering PMC activities are usually financed from the GEF project financing and co-financing source.

We also note that the description included under "Describe how many any "investment Mobilized" was identified" does not need to be filled out in this case as there is no cofinancing that falls in that category.

11/5/2019: Co-financing was added to the PMC and explanation for investment mobilized has been removed. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 10/14/2019: In discussion with the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, the possibility of using part of the co-finance for the PMC was agreed. USD 50,000 of in-kind cofinance related mainly to office space and materials has been added under PMC.

The explanation of how investment mobilized was identified has been removed.

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

9/27/2019: Yes the proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines. At this time there are sufficient resources from the CCM CBIT set aside indicative allocation.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes the proposed financing is in line with GEF policies and guidelines. At this time there are sufficient resources from the CCM CBIT set aside indicative allocation.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

n/a

Agency Response**Project Preparation Grant**

5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes the PPG requested 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 correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes.

Agency Response**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

9/27/2019: Yes.

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

9/27/2019: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes, the baseline scenario is very clearly described and identifies the key needs and gaps of the country to meet the enhanced requirements, and how priorities have been identified.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: In general yes, the alternative scenario proposed addresses the barriers identified in the baseline and covers all key aspects of the requirements under the enhanced transparency framework. Per our comment above, please consider reorganizing the project into various project components with their corresponding outcome and series of outputs (which are right now described as activities).

Further, we note that the political risk identified is a very important issue to take into account in project design. At the moment there are no specific outputs that focus on connecting the capacity-built and strengthened information of the CBIT project to the wider national agenda and thus ensure political buy in to support these activities in the future via national budgets.

11/5/2019: The above comments have been incorporated. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 10/14/2019: The advice of showing the budget breakdown per Outputs has been followed. However, experience shows that in small projects such as CBIT projects all activities lead to one main Outcome, so we prefer to keep the structure as it is.

In order to address the political risk, an activity (3.6) has been added under output 3 which will link the information generated through these systems with the national processes.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes, the project is aligned with the GEF-7 climate change focal area strategy.

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

9/27/2019: Not really. The incremental reasoning of the project is well described throughout the proposal with regards to how this CBIT support will build on a strong baseline and identified gaps to help Paraguay meet the requirements under the Paris Agreement's enhanced transparency framework. Suggest to strengthen this section with this understanding in mind instead of what is included at the moment (further, there is no full agreed cost basis for CBIT activities.)

11/5/2019: The incremental reasoning of this CBIT project has been better explained in this section. Comment cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 10/14/2019: The section has been strengthened with additional paragraphs describing better the incremental reasoning of the project (p.19 and 20)

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

9/27/2019: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes.

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

Not necessary, this is a national capacity-building project.

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes. To date engagement has been limited to key government stakeholders, but additional stakeholder engagement will take place during the PPG phase.

Agency Response

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

9/27/2019: Yes, there is some articulation on how the gender context will be taken into account and will be further developed during PPG phase.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: Yes key private sector stakeholders will be engaged during project implementation.

Agency Response

Risks

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

9/27/2019: Yes risks and measures are adequately identified.

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

9/27/2019: Yes, this project will coordinate with the recently approved climate change enabling activity project being implemented by UNDP as well as with the CBIT Global Coordination Platform and the regional South-South network.

The Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development has been identified as the executing agency. Please confirm with the government whether all execution activities can be carried out by this agency.

11/5/2019: As the agency knows, the implementation and execution roles on GEF projects are meant to be separate per policy and guideline. The GEFSEC will analyze any requests for dual role playing by an agency at the time of CEO endorsement and only approve those cases that it deems warranted on an “exceptional” basis. We strongly encourage the agency to look at third party options as a preferred way forward. We also strongly encourage the agency to discuss any and all options for execution that do not include the government with the GEFSEC early in the PPG phase. The technical clearance of this PIF in no way endorses any alternative execution arrangement.

Agency Response

UNEP 10/14/2019: In discussion with the government, it has been confirmed that the Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development cannot carry out the financial execution of the project. The financial execution will have to be done by another entity. UNEP-ROLAC is being considered as one of the potential organisations. It will depend on the number and type of transactions need and which organisation is best suited to do this. During the preparation phase, an important task will be to identify the most suitable organisation to provide financial and administrative execution to the Ministry.

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

9/27/2019: The PIF outlines several national priorities with which this project is aligned. We do note that it seems to have missed a section on the NDC specifically.

11/5/2019: NDC alignment information has been added. Cleared.

Agency Response

UNEP 10/14/2019: Text on the alignment and benefit to the NDC has been added (p27).

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

9/27/2019: Yes.

Agency Response

Part III – Country Endorsements

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

9/27/2019: We note that the PIF was endorsed by the former OFP Carlos Vecca (valid at time of submission). However, please submit an updated OFP letter from the current OFP Mrs. Graciela Soledad Miret Martinez. Please also try to submit it as a PDF or Word document so it is clearer to read and shows the total on the table.

11/5/2019: Updated Endorsement Letter was submitted. Comment cleared.

Agency Response UNEP 10/14/2019: A new letter signed by the new GEF Operational Focal Point has been uploaded to the portal.
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

n/a

Agency Response**GEFSEC DECISION****RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not yet. Please address minor comments above.

11/5/2019: Agency has addressed all technical comments. PM recommend PIF technical clearance and PPG approval.

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		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		