

Building capacities in Burundi to implement the Enhanced Transparency Framework under the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10648

Countries

Burundi

Project Name

Building capacities in Burundi to implement the Enhanced Transparency
Framework under the Paris Agreement

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

2/17/2022

Review completed by PM

3/30/2022

Program Manager

Namrata Rastogi

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

PIF
CEO Endorsement

Part I ? Project Information

Focal area elements

1. Does the project remain aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as presented in PIF (as indicated in table A)?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, the project is aligned as presented in the PIF. Minor changes have been made from the PIF in terms of budget allocations across components but this has been explained.

Agency Response

Project description summary

2. 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

3/2/2022: In Table B, please fill out all sections of Table B including Project Components, Project Outcomes, Project Outputs including M&E.

3/16/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

An outcome and an output have been included for the M&E component in Table B, as requested.

Note to reviewer: for ease of review, UNEP has uploaded a pdf version of the CEO Endorsement Document on the Portal which shows all adjustments / edits highlighted in yellow.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Co-financing

4. 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 3/2/2022: We note that the official co-financing letter (in French) has the wrong GEF ID#. However, since the English translation has the correct GEF ID this is cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/2/2022: Yes, the financing presented is adequate and presents a cost-effective approach.

Agency Response

Project Preparation Grant

6. Is the status and utilization of the PPG reported in Annex C in the document?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/2/2022: Yes, this has been increased from PIF stage and remains realistic.

Agency Response

Part II ? Project Justification

1. Is there a sufficient elaboration on how the global environmental/adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers, are going to be addressed?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

2. Is there an elaboration on how the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects were derived?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/2/2022: The portal document includes a short description of the GHG inventory system and the National Transparency Portal, it is not fully clear what is currently in place. There is also a mention of a monitoring system. Is this the same? Please clarify and describe what system(s) exist (for GHG inventory, and for tracking NDC), what sectors it covers etc. The focus in this section seems to be more on what the gaps are, rather than what exists. Please clarify. In this context, the description mentions also the GEF funded project "Capacity Building to Improve the Quality of Greenhouse Gas Inventories in West and Central Africa? (2005). Provide any relevant details from this.

We welcome the detailed explanation of the ongoing related initiatives in this section and through the document. However, please add a table that clearly shows the work that is being undertaken by the BUR1, NC4 and how the CBIT project will build on these. This will help make it clear how existing work will be leveraged upon by this CBIT project and how duplication of activities will be avoided.

Provide a short description in this section on the Decree 100/2006 of September 2021.

3/16/2022: The comments have been well addressed. This is cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

The first two sections have been reorganised, with the 'Root causes and barriers' section focusing on the barriers, gaps and needs, followed by the 'Baseline scenario' section which has been further consolidated to provide a clearer picture of what is currently in place.

Details have also been provided in the updated document on the GHG project of West and Central Africa.

The inclusion of a table has been considered inappropriate because the NC4 project document is still under preparation and its outcomes and outputs may draw upon the BUR1 under completion, as well as the CBIT project. However, the final part of the baseline section has been amended to better explain how the CBIT project will build on previous reporting initiatives up to the BUR1, including synergies (p. 22-23).

A short description of Decree 100/206 is provided in the updated document (p. 22).

3. Is the proposed alternative scenario as described in PIF/PFD sound and adequate? Is there sufficient clarity on the expected outcomes and components of the project and a description on the project is aiming to achieve them?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

2/3/2022: Please address comments below:

Output 1.1: Mention which stakeholders will be involved.

Please provide some additional details on what types of arrangements and legal framework are envisioned or being considered here - will these be MoUs, etc.

Output 1.2: Mention the ministries/sectors/stakeholders that will be involved in this output, specifically related to the inter-sectoral group mentioned. Please clarify if there would be any overlap with this specific task of this output with Output 1.1, and how this will be avoided.

Output 1.2 and 1.3 mention a possible collaboration with the University of Burundi for training activities. Please expand on what is envisioned under this, and how training can be embedded into the country through a MTV/transparency curriculum by the University, a formal partnership or other means. Another option would be to have an expert "sit" within the government for hands-on capacity building. Additionally, the budget focuses on stand alone training workshops and the use of consultants. We would like to see how capacity building can be anchored more firmly in the country, and this reflected in the budget accordingly.

3/16/2022: Comments cleared. We note that the description provided in the portal states that a collaboration framework between University of Burundi and OBPE is already in place and that this will be strengthened as appropriate.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

Output 1.1: The list of stakeholders is provided in Table 4 (in the ?Stakeholders? section) with the outputs to which they will contribute, including Output 1.1.

Output 1.2: The document has been amended to clarify this point, namely how staff of the university will participate in all capacity building activities to complete their training to become trainers after the project closure. OBPE aims at formalizing this through an MOU over and above the existing collaborative arrangements. This is already earmarked in Table 4 under stakeholders and their engagement and contributions under Output 1.2.

There are no overlaps since Output 1.1 will address the legal framework and procedural agreements to consolidate and formalize existing arrangements with collaborating institutions for reporting, whereas Output 1.2 will address shortcomings in the functioning of the GHG inventory management system (MRV emissions) and technical issues to enable the country to prepare and report on its emissions in accordance with the MPGs of the PA.

Output 1.3: The text for this output has also been amended to include additional information on collaboration with the University of Burundi and sustainability of training activities. The budget has not been changed since the university staff are earmarked as participants of all capacity building sessions.

4. Is there further elaboration on how the project is aligned with focal area/impact program strategies?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

5. Is the incremental reasoning, contribution from the baseline, and co-financing clearly elaborated?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes.

Agency Response

7. Is there further and better elaboration to show that the project is innovative and sustainable including the potential for scaling up?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been elaborated.

Agency Response

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: This is a national level project. A map has been provided.

Agency Response

Child Project

If this is a child project, is there an adequate reflection of how it contributes to the overall program impact?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

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

2/3/2022: The first paragraph in the portal document of this section is not clear - it states that restricted consultations were undertaken, and then later states that broader consultation was conducted. Please revise the paragraph to clearly state what was undertaken and why, and at what stage.

The portal document states that IPLC will be engaged with. However, there is only one CSO mentioned in the Table in this context. Please consider adding more or provide an explanation why there is only one.

We note the stakeholder consultation and validation documents provided in French.

However, in the portal document please add details on the specific stakeholders

consulted, the results of the consultations and how these informed the design of the project.

3/16/2022: The English Translations have not been uploaded. Please upload and kindly ensure that the last comment on specific stakeholders consulted, results of the consultations and how it informed this CBIT project is addressed.

3/23/2022: This has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

The text has been revised to reflect the two stages of consultations, namely PIF and PPG stages.

In fact, there are 8 (eight) CSOs listed in the same cell of Table 4 ? List of stakeholders. They have been numbered for clarification. Moreover, they will all be called upon to participate on an equal basis under Outputs 1.2 and 1.3, as described in the document.

English translations of the stakeholder consultation and validation workshop reports have now been uploaded on the Portal, which include the detailed list of stakeholders involved and the outcomes of the workshops. In addition, the ?Stakeholders? section also includes several paragraphs with details on the stakeholder consultation workshop (p. 40-41) and the stakeholder validation workshop (p. 41).

21 March 2022

Our apologies for the oversight ? the English translations have now been uploaded on the Portal.

The text in the ?Stakeholders? section of the CEO Endorsement Document has been amended to provide further information, as required.

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

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

Private Sector Engagement

If there is a private sector engagement, is there an elaboration of its role as a financier and/or as a stakeholder?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been elaborated on.

Agency Response

Risks to Achieving Project Objectives

Has the project elaborated on indicated risks, including climate change, potential social and environmental risks that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved? Were there proposed measures that address these risks at the time of project implementation?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided including a COVID risk and opportunities analysis.

Agency Response

Coordination

Is the institutional arrangement for project implementation fully described? Is there an elaboration on possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided. However, please note the comment above on a table detailing the BUR, NC4 and how this CBIT project builds on that work.

3/16/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

Please refer to the final part of the baseline section on how the CBIT project will build on previous reporting initiatives up to the BUR1, including synergies (p. 22-23).

Consistency with National Priorities

Has the project described the alignment of the project with identified national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under the relevant conventions?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Please include the TNA in the table.

3/16/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

The TNA has been included in Table 10, Section 7. Consistency with National Priorities.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed ?Knowledge Management Approach? for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Please address comments below:

The current description, including the table 12, focuses on overall deliverables for the project. Please revise to focus this section on knowledge products, such as newsletters, articles, briefs, lessons learned documents etc. that may be generated through this project. The National Transparency Portal would be part of this. Also consider specifically adding workshops, including peer exchange workshops through CBIT Coordination Platform and others.

Consider including knowledge exchange and coordination with CBIT AFOLU and CBIT Forest.

Please include a brief summary on how this project learns from and builds from previous GEF experiences.

Provide details for the development of a strategic communications plan for outreach and dissemination.

3/16/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

The text of the ?Knowledge Management? section and respective table have been amended in the updated document to provide the information requested.

Additional information has been provided on the CBIT AFOLU and CBIT Forest projects.

Moreover, a paragraph has been added to explain how this project learns and builds on previous GEF initiatives.

Finally, the different elements of the strategic communication plan have been included in the updated document.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: The risk is low.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes. However, there is a typo in this section where the country mentioned is Mauritania and not Burundi. Please check and revise as needed.

3/16/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

The typo has been corrected and information checked under Section 10. Benefits.

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: The budget has been provided but see comment in the alternative scenario section related to this.

3/16/2022: This has been clarified in the previous section. Cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

Please refer to the explanation provided above on the alternative scenario concerning the budget.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Please include Quality of MRV Systems and the Qualitative Assessment of Institutional Capacity for Transparency-related Activities as per CBIT Programming Directions. We note that similar indicators have been included in the Framework, but it is not clear if these are the same. To avoid confusion please use the indicators as specified, or add them in addition.

Clarify what is meant by Indicator 1.2: Number of stakeholder capable of benefitting from the training dispensed... In other words, we recommend simplifying and clarifying the language.

Please add gender indicators as outlines in the Gender Action Plan to the framework.

3/16/2022: We note the changes made. This is cleared.

Agency Response

16 March 2022

The indicators Quality of MRV Systems and the Qualitative Assessment of Institutional Capacity for Transparency-related Activities as per CBIT Programming Directions have been included in the Project Results Framework (Annex A).

Moreover, the Indicator 1.2 statement has been reformulated in the updated document.

Finally, the Gender Action Plan indicators and targets have been included in Annex A.

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

3/2/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

3/30/2022: The addition of the amount spent to day (\$34,166.72) and the amount committed (\$8,501.23) which equals \$42,667.95 does not match the budgeted amount (\$50,000). Please complete the missing information in the table so that the \$50,000 requested for PPG is accounted for.

3/31/2022: We note the explanation provided however this is not sufficient. Please provide details on how the remaining \$7,332.05 will be utilized (as amount committed) and ensure that these activities are as per GEF guidelines. Along with an explanation please add this into the table (and add additional line items if needed).

5/9/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

30 March 2022

It is correct that US\$ 34,166.72 have been spent so far and US\$ \$8,501.23 are still committed for outstanding payments, leading to a total of US\$ \$42,667.95. The balance,

i.e. US\$ 7,332.05, has neither been spent nor committed - that is why it is not shown in the table.

However, we would like to clarify that the following supporting explanation had been provided in the text under the table, in Annex C:

?At the present time, Burundi has not yet decided how they will use the unspent PPG funds (US\$ 7,332.05). It has therefore been agreed that during the project's inception phase, the OBPE (the Executing Agency) will consult with UNEP (the Implementing Agency) to decide for which type of complementary preparation activity(ies) the leftover PPG funds could be used, to further inform and support the CBIT project. If these leftover funds are not used for preparatory activities within one (1) year of CEO approval, they will be returned to the GEF, as per the standard practice.?

We hope you will find this in order.

9 May 2022

We thank you for your comment. The Annex C (Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant) has been further updated with the latest status of expenditures and commitments.

Following additional consultations with the national counterparts in Burundi, it was decided that the unspent PPG funds (US\$ 7,232.89) will not be used for additional preparatory activities and will therefore be returned to the GEF as per the standard policy. This has also been clarified in the text under the PPG status table, in Annex C of the CEO Endorsement Document.

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 3/2/2022: Yes.

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	3/2/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/16/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/30/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	3/31/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

2/3/2022: Please address comments.

3/16/2022: Please address remaining comments.

3/23/2022: PM recommends technical clearance.

3/30/2022: Address remaining comment highlighted in yellow.

3/31/2022: Address remaining comment.