

First and Second Biennial Transparency Report and Fifth Communication National (1BTR + 5NC & 2BTR)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11302

Countries

Paraguay

Project Name

First and Second Biennial Transparency Report and Fifth Communication National
(1BTR + 5NC & 2BTR)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

4/14/2023

Review completed by PM

5/1/2023

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO)

Section I - Enabling Activity Summary

Funding elements.

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF funding elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF-8 Programming Directions? Is the General Enabling Activity Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/10/2023: This project is aligned with the GEF-8 climate change focal are strategy. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Cost Ranges.

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

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/10/2023: The project has no deviations in the cost range. The costing is in line with the [information note GEF/C.62/Inf.15](#).

Agency's Comments

Enabling activity summary.

Is the enabling activity summary clear? Are the components in Table B and as described in the enabling activity request sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objectives?

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/22/2023: Cleared.

EBF 5/10/2023: The Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADES) appears (as highlighted in the screen capture below) as implementing agency in the stakeholders table. Please use the appropriate GEF terminology and change the word "Implementing" for "Executing".

Stakeholder	Role in the project	Means of Engagement
Governmental Institutions		
Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADES)	Implementing agency, overall coordination, GHG inventory and mitigation lead.	Focal point
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)	Provision of AD for the GHG inventory	Interinstitutional meetings and workshops
Ministry of Industry and Commerce (MIC)	Provision of AD for the GHG inventory	Interinstitutional meetings and workshops
Ministry of Public Health and Social Welfare (MSPBS)	Relevant data for improving the information to be reported in the Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation chapter.	Interinstitutional meetings and workshops

Agency's Comments

The requested text has been adjusted in the EA document.

Section 2 - Enabling Activity Supporting Information

Eligibility Criteria.

Is this enabling activity eligible for GEF funding?

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/22/2023:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared

EBF 5/10/2023: Please address the following comments:

1. Please provide a time reference to Output 1.1.4 (e.g., up to 2022).
2. Please review the wording of Outputs 2.1.3, 2.1.4, and 2.1.5 to ensure that they include a verb describing the main action to be taken (e.g., "compiled"). If any verb is missing, kindly correct it.
3. Considering that the fourth National Communication (NC4) is yet to be submitted to the UNFCCC. Please indicate in the project proposal that the resources for the first

Biennial Transparency Report (BTR1), the combined Fifth National Communication (NC5) and second Biennial Transparency Report (BTR2) will be disbursed to the executing partner after the UNFCCC submission process of the NC4 is confirmed.

Agency's Comments

1. Time reference has been included- (2021)
2. The name has been reformulated, adding a verb, it applies to 1.1.3, 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5 and 2.1.6.
3. Reference incorporated in the proposal (section B highlighted in yellow)

Institutional framework.

Are the institutional arrangements for implementation adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, institutional arrangements, including the narrative description of the project activities are well elaborated.

Agency's Comments

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, \$3,000 are budget for M&E related activities.

Agency's Comments

Section 3. Information Tables

GEF resource availability.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, it is in line with GEF policies and guidelines.

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

STAR allocation?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF (Adaptation or Tech Transfer)?

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, this is in line with the [information note GEF/C.62/Inf.15](#).

Agency's Comments

Rio Markers.

Are the Rio Markers for CCM ,CCA, BD and LD presented?

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes.

Agency's Comments

Country endorsement.

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point at the time of the EA submission and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database? Are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in Portal

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, the project has been endorsed by the GEF OFP of Paraguay and the endorsed amounts are consistent with the amounts in the Portal.

Agency's Comments

Response to Comments

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

Gef Secretariat comments

Secretariat's Comments

N/A

Agency's Comments

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

Council comments

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

STAP comments

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
CSOs comments

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments
Project Budget Table.

Is the project budget table attached? Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?

Secretariat's Comments
EBF 5/22/2023: Cleared.

EBF 5/10/2023: Please include the terms of reference of the project's staff describing the specific deliverables to the respective components from where their salary will be paid.

Agency's Comments
The ToRs are available in Annex 7 of the ProDoc and indicate the distribution between the technical components. (The ToR annex is also separately uploaded in the Portal's document section)
Environmental and Social Safeguards.

If there are screening documents or other ESS documents available, have these been attached? (only as applicable)

Secretariat's Comments
EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, they have been attached. The overall project risk is categorized as low risk.

Agency's Comments
**GEFSEC DECISION
RECOMMENDATION.
Is CEO endorsement/ approval recommended?**

Secretariat's Comments

EBF 5/22/2023: The PMs recommend the clearance for CEO Approval.

EBF 5/10/2023: Please address the comments above.

REVIEW DATE(S)

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/10/2023	5/19/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/22/2023	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF

CEO

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 5/10/2023: This project is aligned with the GEF-8 climate change focal are strategy. Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 5/10/2023: Yes.

Agency Response

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 outcomes?
- b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request
EBF 5/22/2023: Cleared.

EBF 5/10/2023: The Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADES) appears (as highlighted in the screen capture below) as implementing agency in the stakeholders table. Please use the appropriate GEF terminology and change the word "Implementing" for "Executing".

Stakeholder	Role in the project	Means of Engagement
Governmental Institutions		
Ministry of the Environment and Sustainable Development (MADES)	Implementing agency, overall coordination, GHG inventory and mitigation lead.	Focal point
Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)	Provision of AD for the GHG inventory	Interinstitutional meetings and workshops
Ministry of Industry and Commerce (MIC)	Provision of AD for the GHG inventory	Interinstitutional meetings and workshops
Ministry of Public Health and Social Welfare (MSPBS)	Relevant data for improving the information to be reported in the Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation chapter.	Interinstitutional meetings and workshops

Agency Response

The requested text has been adjusted in the EA document.

3. Project Description Overview

- a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?
- 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 budgeted for?
- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
- e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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 focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?
- b) Is there a description of how the GEF 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 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 FSP/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 design and 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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome 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

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

a) Are climate and other main risks relevant to the project identified and adequately described (e.g. including these related to work in fragile locations and/or countries)? Are mitigation measures outlined and realistic? Is there any omission?

b) Are the key risks that might affect implementation and adequately rated?

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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 the LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

7.4 Have required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, they have been attached. The overall project risk is categorized as low risk.

Agency Response

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 N/A

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

Agency Response

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 5/10/2023: Yes, this is in line with the [information note GEF/C.62/Inf.15](#).

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) 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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:

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 5/10/2023: Yes, the project has been endorsed by the GEF OFP of Paraguay and the endorsed amounts are consistent with the amounts in the Portal.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

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

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.6 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

Agency Response

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.8 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 5/22/2023: Cleared.

EBF 5/10/2023: Please include the terms of reference of the project's staff describing the specific deliverables to the respective components from where their salary will be paid.

Agency Response

The ToRs are available in Annex 7 of the ProDoc and indicate the distribution between the technical components. (The ToR annex is also separately uploaded in the Portal's document section)

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following 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

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1.GEFSEC Recommendation

Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 5/22/2023: The PMs recommend the clearance for CEO Approval.

EBF 5/10/2023: Please address the comments above.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

N/A

9.3 Review Dates

	CEO Approval	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/10/2023	5/19/2023
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/22/2023	

**CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

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