

# Building The Bahamas capacity in transparency for climate change mitigation and adaptation

**Review PIF and Make a recommendation**

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10427

**Countries**

Bahamas

**Project Name**

Building The Bahamas capacity in transparency for climate change mitigation and adaptation

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

1/1/2020

**Review completed by PM**

6/26/2020

**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

1/13/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the climate change focal area strategy.

#### 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**

1/13/2020: The project is comprehensive on its scope as described in Table B per its outputs; however, it is hard to understand how the GEF amount requested will be divided among the different areas. We would suggest the project breaks down the single project component and outcome in order to allocate the resources further by type of work.

6/10/2020: Additional information on how resources would be split by the different outputs has been clarified. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 The project's structure, with one component and four outputs, is designed to allow for a streamlined monitoring and evaluation process of the project. UNEP, as the implementing agency of numerous CBIT projects, believes this design to be an efficient way to manage the project and allow for comparisons across projects.

However, we understand the need to better understand the distribution of resources. While the division of resources between outputs is illustrated in Part I - B. "Indicative Project description summary", the planned way of realizing these outputs has now been specified in the document under each output (see Part II - 1a.c. "The proposed alternative scenario with a brief description of expected outcomes and components of the project"), thus providing further detail on the planned use of resources. In addition, the budget has been decreased.

**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**

1/13/2020: Yes. This project does not required co-financing. Co-financing of \$238,333 in-kind from the government is listed.

6/10/2020: Co-financing now adds to \$338,333 in-kind from government sources.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 Please note that the co-finance level is now USD 338,333.

**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**

1/13/2020: The resources requested for this project appear too high when compared to other projects in the region. Further, there is not enough clarity in the project description to assess how resources have been allocated. Please consider reducing the GEF grant amount and per the comment above, providing more detail in the breakdown of resources.

6/10/2020: Resources have been reduced to be more in line with other projects in the region. Breakdown resources by output components also appears to be in line with other projects. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 The Bahamas has a unique geography in the region, as it is a nation spread over hundreds of islands, whereof 30 are inhabited. This has a strong impact on the costs of the project, both in terms of workshops costs for capacity building, but also for indicator development. This geographic fact is an important factor on why the resources requested are higher in this project than for other national projects in the region.

Nonetheless, upon consultation with the country the budget has been reduced to reflect budgets of other national projects in the region. Furthermore, details under each output have been expanded in order to explain more clearly what each activity will entail. We have included the type of resources needed, and specified the workshops and other details that will help explain how the budget has been allocated. A new letter of endorsement, corresponding to the changed budget, has been uploaded to the portal.

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

The focal area allocation?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: This project is currently requesting a total of \$1,933,770 from the CBIT set-aside.

6/10/2020: This project is requesting a total of \$1,537,599 from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 As noted previously, the budget has now been reduced.

**Impact Program Incentive?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**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**

1/13/2020: Yes, the PPG 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**

1/13/2020: A target for Indicator 11 has been provided. Please clarify how this estimate was determined.

6/10/2020: Additional explanation for Indicator 11 has been provided. Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

4/28/2020 This estimate considers the definition of direct beneficiaries provided in the Guidelines on Core Indicators and Sub-Indicators. Under this project, there are 13 different national institutions listed as stakeholders; training sessions are planned under four different activities:

- 2.4 Related to the GHG inventory
- 3.5 Related to data necessary for NDC tracking
- 4.2 Related to the input of data into models for scenario building
- 4.3 Related to use of scenario building and projects for decision-making.

There will at least be two training sessions for each activity. Each training session will have around twenty participants. While there will be some overlap between activities, it is plausible that there will be at least 12 new individuals trained for each session. For example, while the activities on GHG inventory targets mainly public stakeholders, the trainings under 4.2 and 4.3 include private stakeholders as well, and a wider array of public actors. This amounts to an estimate of around 100 people trained through the project, whereof 50% will be women.

This information has been included in the PIF.

### **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**

1/13/2020: Yes, the project is properly tagged.

### **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**

1/13/2020: The global environmental problems, including root causes and barriers described are too general in scope and not directly relevant to this project. Please edit down and focus on climate change.

6/11/2020: This section has been improved. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 The section has been narrowed down and now focuses on climate change in the Bahamas.

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: The baseline scenario is also a little too general in scope and includes information not directly relevant. Please edit down and focus on the baseline scenario relevant for climate reporting and transparency. Further, additional details on the baseline scenario that is relevant is needed, including on the National Climate Change Committee, and on the Third National Communication and First BUR project under implementation.

6/11/2020: The baseline scenario has been revised. Comment cleared. By CEO endorsement, we expect additional details from the work carried out in the Third National Communication and First BUR.

#### **Agency Response**

4/28/2020 The section has been revised to focus on climate reporting and transparency. Additional information on the Third National Communication and the first BUR has been added into the baseline section and it was clarified how this project will build on the results of these previous / on-going efforts.

6/16/2020 The comment is well noted and it will be taken into consideration during CEO endorsement request preparation phase.

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



### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: Overall, the proposed alternative scenario is comprehensive, but it is hard to assess with the information provided in the two previous sections. For example, it mentions it will establish an inter ministerial climate change coordination unit, but there has been no justification provided for this determination. The PIF does not currently present an assessment of barriers and gaps for meeting the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework under the Paris Agreement, based on its existing arrangements and systems as well as experience with reporting under the Convention (and any other reporting that is relevant).

6/11/2020: Information on this section has been clarified in addition to the two previous sections. Please address remaining comments below:

Output 2: Please comment on how this output will coordinate with the inventory preparation under the BUR/TNC project, including to what extent 2006 guidelines are expected to be applied and training may be provided to avoid duplication. While the specific area of inventory improvement will be determined during project preparation, we recommend 2.2. to include the development of a roadmap of improvements, prioritized by impact to the inventory, recognizing that not all aspects will be improved with this project, so as to inform future investments in this area.

Output 3: Please add coordination with the CCMRVH under this output as it relates to potential relevant training opportunities during the project's implementation and consider how CBIT resources can be used to complement (for example, supporting additional people to participate, focusing on areas not covered, carrying out more in depth training of a topic introduced by the Hub's online materials, etc.).

6/26/2020: Above comments have been addressed.

### **Agency Response**

4/28/2020 The information on the current gaps and barriers has been elaborated in sections 1 and 3 (the alternative scenario). Further information has also been added to justify different project outputs. In regards to the "interministerial climate change coordination unit", its institutional anchoring has been clarified as a project management unit, rather than as a new entity. The project will use the existing institutional arrangements and bodies, such as the National Climate Change Committee (NCCC) building and strengthening these.

6/16/2020

Output 2: Activities under output 2 will be carried out in coordination with activities of the first BUR/TNC project. UNEP is the implementing agency for both projects and the CBIT project executing agency (BEST) is also the executing agencies for the Third NC and the First BUR. Moreover, it is foreseen that a representative from the steering group of the TNC will participate in the Steering Committee of this project to further facilitate coordination. This will avoid duplication of activities for the inventory preparation such as trainings. During project development, a review of all BUR/TNC activities will be undertaken and the

CBIT project will be developed to ensure coherence and build synergies with the BUR/TNC project. As noted under the description of output 2, the output will ensure that the Bahamas uses 2006 guidelines, in accordance with the Katowice MPGs. The development of a roadmap of improvements was added under activity 2.2 as suggested.

Output 3: Text was added under output 3 (p 19), to ensure coordination with the CCMRVH. Both UNEP and UNEP DTU are partners to the CCMRVH project, and will work to ensure coordination and coherence between the CCMRVH and this proposed GEF project. UNEP sits on the Steering Committee of the project. As noted in new text in the PIF, during project development an analysis will be undertaken to ensure coordination, build synergies and avoid duplication with the CCMRVH's activities. As the CCMRVH's support is limited to €3m for 12 countries, focus could include drawing on this limited support and expanding it to build capacity of a larger and broader group of national stakeholders.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: Yes, the project is aligned with the climate change focal area.

**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**

1/13/2020: Based on above comments, this section could be strengthened to be more specific.

6/11/2020: This section has been strengthened. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 This section has been strengthened to reflect the specifics added in previous sections of the PIF, as mentioned above.

**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**

1/13/2020: Per the comment above, we would like to see an explanation for how this number was estimated/how it is expected it will be refined by CEO endorsement.

6/11/2020: Comment cleared see above.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 See explanation above in Part I, question 6.

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: Based on above comments, this section could be strengthened.

6/11/2020: Comment cleared for now. We recommend additional thinking on innovation and sustainability during project preparation, particularly on how the project can respond to the complex geography of the Bahamas with regards to building capacity across the country, as well as with regards to data collection and indicator monitoring. This may require technological innovations this project could potentially support or test.

**Agency Response**

4/28/2020 This section has been updated.

6/16/2020 The comment is well noted and it will be taken into consideration during CEO endorsement request preparation phase.

**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**

1/13/2020: This is a national 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**

1/13/2020: Please confirm if indeed indigenous peoples participated in consultations, as they are not listed in the table. If not, please remove the Yes. Same comment for civil society organizations.

6/11/2020: Selections have been corrected and information clarified regarding carried out and expected consultations. However, we note that neither CSOs nor the private sector have been included in the stakeholder table. Please add them (considering that additional information can be developed and added by CEO endorsement).

6/26/2020: CSOs and private sector have been added to stakeholder table. Comment cleared.

7/6/2020: Please provide additional descriptions of any consultations conducted during project development. Considering that the National Climate Change Committee under the BEST Commission comprises of representatives from Ministries, Departments, Agencies, NGOs, and the Private Sector, this section should include additional information on these stakeholders - consider changing the selections in this section if that is the case. Further, the OFP's LOE confirms that the project was discussed with relevant stakeholders, including the global environmental convention focal points.

7/14/2020: Comment cleared.

## **Agency Response**

4/28/2020 The ticks have been placed as appropriately, and an explanation has been provided.

6/16/2020 CSOs and Private sector have been added in the stakeholder table and additional information will be provided by CEO Endorsement.

7/10/2020 Additional information is added to the section as suggested.

#### **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**

1/13/2020: Please review the selected choices in this section. Will the project close gender gaps in access to and control over natural resources? What socio-economic benefits or services will the project produce for women?

Please also note that by CEO endorsement, we will expect a gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment that identifies and describes any gender differences, gender differentiated impacts and risks, and opportunities to address gender gaps and promote the empowerment of women that may be relevant to the proposed activity, and any corresponding gender-responsive measures.

6/11/2020: The selection has been updated. Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** 4/28/2020 The ticks to boxes have been adjusted, and the response to these has been expanded in detail. We take note of the comment on the need to undertake a gender analysis by CEO endorsement.

#### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

1/13/2020: Yes.

#### **Agency Response**

**Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**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**

1/13/2020: Please assess and incorporate climate change risks.

6/11/2020: Climate change risks have been added. This comment cleared.

Per the **GEF Policy on Environmental and Social Safeguards**, at PIF, agencies should provide indicative information regarding any Environmental and Social Risks and potential Impacts associated with the proposed project or program; and any measures to address such risks and impacts. Please provide early screening results (e.g. the completed UNEP “Social and Environmental Screening Template), or provide some indicative information on environmental and social risks and, if possible, preliminary overall risk classification of the project as well as the types and risk classification address identified risks and potential impacts.

6/26/2020: ESERN was completed and uploaded. The project has been assessed to have a low risk. Comment cleared.

1.

**Agency Response**

4/28/2020 The major risk posed by climate change for the project, namely hurricanes, has been incorporated and mitigation measures provided.

6/16/2020 UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note (ESERN) was uploaded in the portal as a separate document.

**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**

1/13/2020: Yes, the project will be executed by the Bahamas Environment, Science and Technology Commission, which is also currently executing the TNC and BUR project, with which it will coordinate.

We note that the Greenhouse Gas Management Institute just launched a Caribbean Cooperative MRV Hub for English-speaking countries in the region. Please comment on coordination with this initiative.

6/11/2020: Additional information on the CCMRVH has been added. Comment cleared. By CEO Endorsement we expect additional information on the coordination/synergies with both.

**Agency Response**

4/28/2020 The details about the Greenhouse Gas Management Institute have been added, and coordination and synergies with the Caribbean Cooperative MRV Hub have been highlighted.

6/16/2020 This is well noted and additional information will be provided by CEO Endorsement.

**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**

1/13/2020: Yes, the project is consistent with national strategies and plans.

**Agency Response**

**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**

1/13/2020: Yes.

**Agency Response**

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

6/26/2020: This comment was addressed above. Cleared.

**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**

1/13/2020: Yes, Ms. Rochelle Newbold has endorsed this project.

6/10/2020: An updated LOE has been provided reflecting the change in resources requested.

7/6/2020: Apologies but we just realized that the source of funding on the LOE is incorrect. It should say GEF TF not CBIT as the project is being funded by the climate change set-aside for CBIT, not the CBIT Trust Fund.



7/14/2020: Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

Note that due to the changed project budget a new letter of endorsement has been provided.

7/10/2020 The LoE was revised and uploaded in 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**

1/13/2020: Not yet. Please address comments.

6/11/2020: Please address remaining comments.

6/26/2020: PM recommends technical clearance.

7/6/2020: Please address the two additional comments highlighted in the review sheet on the LOE and stakeholder engagement.

7/14/2020: A new LOE has been submitted and stakeholder engagement further clarified. PM recommends technical clearance.

#### **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**

	<b>PIF Review</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

#### **PIF Recommendation to CEO**

### **Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

This CBIT project aims to build the capacity of The Bahamas to meet the reporting requirements of the enhanced transparency framework of the Paris Agreement, which it ratified in 2016. While as a SIDS, the country enjoys flexibility under the enhanced transparency framework, The Bahamas intends to build its capacity to report to the best extent possible. The Bahamas is currently developing its Third National Communication and first Biennial Update Report to the UNFCCC. This process will address some of the gaps which are identified in the SNC, and this project will further coordinate with those activities.

The project consists of four outputs:

1. Institutional arrangements established and strengthened to coordinate and manage transparency activities in the Bahamas;
2. Technical support, training and tools are provided to the Bahamas, enabling it to submit transparent, consistent, comparable, complete and accurate GHG inventories;
3. Technical support, training and tools are provided to the Bahamas, enabling it to track its NDC implementation in a transparent manner;
4. Technical support, training and tools are provided to the Bahamas which enables them to incorporate climate analysis into decision-making.

The CBIT project will help The Bahamas to provide a more holistic and comprehensive report on its mitigation and adaptation actions, technology transfer, technical support and climate finance flows, especially for the coming BTRs. With the GEF intervention, The Bahamas will have a more coordinated transparency system that will provide a full account of the country's contribution to its NDC and global targets. This includes the GHG inventory, where different aspects of the data will be improved, the NDC tracking for both mitigation and adaptation, as well as climate finance spending. The project will also develop processes which integrate the generated information into decision-making processes, enabling better scenario building and projection of climate effects. The project will use these generated scenarios and projections and build the capacity of both private and public actors to incorporate these into decision-making processes, enabling more informed decisions.

The project will further coordinate with the the Caribbean Cooperative MRV Hub (CCMRVH) which is assisting the English-speaking countries in the Caribbean region to efficiently develop GHG inventories, mitigation projections, and track their NDCs.