

Preparation of India's first Biennial Transparency Report (BTR)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10914

Countries

India

Project Name

Preparation of India's first Biennial Transparency Report (BTR)

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/30/2021

Review completed by PM

2/23/2022

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO) □

Part 1: Project Information

Focal area elements

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 14, 2022: Thank you for the revision. Comments cleared.

March 1, 2022: Please revise the start date of implementation considering 4 week review for the council. Please add component to each outcome (i.e. 6 components) or separate KM and M&E outcomes from Component 1 (i.e. 2 components), and revise relevant sections on the portal and ProDoc accordingly.

Feb 22, 2022: Previous comments cleared.

Jan 18, 2021: Largely yes, as components cover relevant elements stipulated in the MPGs, in particular mandatory elements.

As all components are the same, please make them unified (one line) and allocate sub-numbers on outcomes and outputs accordingly or differentiate components reflecting each outcome and output.

Please also add the executing entity on the portal entry as it is blank.

Agency Response

March 11, 2022: Project start and end dates are revised accordingly. The BTR finalization + KM outcome (Outcome 2.1) and the M&E outcome (Outcome 2.2) are separated with their existing outputs.

21 February 2022: Components have been unified and sub-numbers for outcomes and outputs have been allocated accordingly.

Executing Entity has been added on the portal.

Co-financing

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Feb 22, 2022: Comment cleared.

Jan 18, 2021: Yes, in-kind co-financing amounted \$300,000 is confirmed by the government. While there is no floor for the co-financing, the ratio is less than the project 10493 (1:1) on NC/BUR. As such, please clarify the rationale on this including synergies among relevant projects.

Agency Response 21 February 2022: Co-financing is not required for Enabling Activities. The Government of India has decided to provide in-kind co-financing in the form of staff time, office space and provision of utilities to support the implementation of the FNC-FBUR (Fourth National Communication and Fourth Biennial Update Report), BTR1, and CBIT projects. The three projects will be implemented by the same Executing Entity (Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change) in close coordination to ensure that results and deliverables are complete and built on each other. This will also allow the BTR1 project to capitalize on the higher co-financing amount committed for the FNC-FBUR and CBIT projects. Synergies and linkages among the projects have been explained in detail under section D of the Enabling Activity Request form. A seemingly low co-financing has been committed by the Government of India for this project, because it feels that the ongoing TNC (Third National Communication) project and other forthcoming GEF financed projects namely CBIT and FNC-FBUR will enhance the capacity of the country significantly to fulfil the reporting requirements to UNFCCC. The enhanced capacity would lead to an increase in the efficiency of the delivery of activities under the BTR1 project. Further, preliminary data from TNC project shows that the in-kind co-finance by India is usually much higher than committed in writing. For example, during the MTR of the TNC project, it was observed by the Reviewers that based on the reporting of a few agencies and some estimates by the PMU, against an expenditure of GEF Trust Funds of US\$ 4,564,937/-, the total co-finance received by the project was about US\$11.6 million. Accordingly, the initially lower commitment of co-finance for BTR1 project may

not be the correct yardstick to measure the country's commitment The realization of the exact co-financing contribution will be reported during PIRs and the Terminal Evaluation.

GEF Resource Availability

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from:

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, the project will build upon the outcomes of past and ongoing enabling activities as well as the CBIT project.

Agency Response

Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification

Background and Context.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes. The outputs are in line with the reporting requirements by the MPGs and the BTR follows the common tabular format adopted at COP26. Activities support the transitioning to the BTR supported by CBIT project, including GHG inventories (2000-2022) complying with other requirements by the MPGs.

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 Yes.

Agency Response

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 Yes, more details are included in the ProDoc.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Feb 22, 2022: The discrepancy on the budget table on who will manage the terminal evaluation has been addressed. Comment cleared.

Jan 18, 2021: Yes. Please confirm that the TE will be entirely conducted by the executing entity.

Agency Response 21 February 2022: According to the GEF Evaluation Policy, GEF Agencies are responsible to ensure the conduct of required Terminal Evaluations of GEF-supported projects within their portfolio. The Terminal Evaluation of this project will be completed by external evaluators, who will be independent from the organizations that were involved in designing, executing or advising on the project to be evaluated. Following, the "Guidance for conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-Supported GEF-Financed Projects"[1]¹, the costs associated with conducting the terminal evaluation will be commissioned by UNDP. The GEF budget template and Section IX of the project document (Total Budget and Workplan) have been revised to reflect this (UNDP has been indicated as ATLAS implementing agent for the TE related budget line). The Project Team will be responsible for providing the TE team with project information and assist with TE logistics.

[1] http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/documents/GEF/TE_GuidanceforUNDP-supportedGEF-financedProjects.pdf

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes, in terms of the coordination with other transparency related activities, including NC/BUR and CBIT projects as described in the CER and ProDoc.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Set aside portion is within the maximum costing of BTR.

Agency Response

Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

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

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response

Other Agencies 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

CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

March 14, 2022: Comments cleared. PM recommends the project for technical clearance.

March 1, 2022: Previous comments cleared. Please address two comments on Box 2.

Jan 18, 2021: Please address comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	1/18/2022	2/21/2022
Additional Review (as necessary)	2/22/2022	3/14/2022

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

3/14/2022

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations