

Malawi Climate Transparency Framework

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10149

Countries

Malawi

Project Name

Malawi Climate Transparency Framework

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

7/14/2020

Review completed by PM

11/12/2020

Program Manager

Pascal Martinez

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

23 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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

23 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

January 8, 2021

We have taken the opportunity of this review sheet to update the CBIT Malawi CEO Endorsement Document in line with the latest GEF guidance on M&E. As such, M&E has been segregated as a separate line in Table B. The US\$ 48,000 budgeted for M&E include the costs of the Inception Workshop and the Terminal Evaluation, which were previously distributed across Components 1, 2 and 3. As a consequence, all the amounts

in Table B have been adjusted (refer to yellow highlights in the PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document uploaded in the ?Documents? tab of the GEF Portal).

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

23 July 2020:

Yes, a letter from the EAD is provided confirming the in-kind co-financing of \$150,000. 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

23 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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

23 July 2020:

Yes, out of a total budget of \$50,000, \$30,000 have been spent and \$20,000 are committed. Cleared.

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

23 July 2020:

There is an improvement in terms of number of beneficiaries and it remains realistic. The project will benefit to 150 beneficiaries (50-50 gender representation) and indirectly help the country meet its climate change mitigation and adaptation objectives. Cleared.

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

23 July 2020:

1. The problems including root causes and barriers that need to be addressed focus on climate change and country's emission targets and there is no information about the current problems related to the country's climate information system and institutional disposition to implement the ETF. Please present also the specific problems, including root causes and barriers, this project will need to address to build capacity on transparency and implement the ETF. Important information on that regard is provided in the baseline scenario, notably under the paragraph 33 "Barriers and gaps that need to be addressed" and could usefully be placed and structured here, adding the institutional aspects.

2. Please also check the unit: are 29,000 MtCO₂e and 42,000 MtCO₂e the current and future levels of emission in Malawi?

16 October 2020:

1 and 2. Thank you for the amendments and correction. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020

1. The barriers and gaps have been placed under section 1) *Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed* and additional information has been provided (p. 11-13).

2. The unit has been corrected to Gg CO₂e (p. 11), as per Malawi's NDC.

General note to the GEF reviewer: all edits made to the CEO Endorsement Request following this review have been highlighted in yellow in the PDF version of the document uploaded on the GEF Portal.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23 July 2020:

There is a good description of the national baseline scenario. In addition, please indicate the relevant Global CBIT projects this proposal will be able to usefully liaise with: not only the Global Coordination Platform but also the global AFOLU and Forest CBIT projects led by FAO. The GCF project presented in paragraph 41 could also be positioned in this section as it relates to the baseline scenario .

16 October 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020

The Global CBIT projects led by FAO have been included in section 2. Baseline scenario, as well as the GCF initiative and the Global Coordination Platform (p. 17-18).

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

23 July 2020:

1. The name of component 2 is slightly different in table B and in the alternative scenario. The same applies for the output 2.3. Please adjust accordingly.
2. The output 2.1 is the establishment of a data management platform. Shouldn't this platform be also included in the list of deliverables under this output in addition to the mentioned reports and workshops?
3. To achieve the output 3.3, please also consider the CBIT global projects focused on AFOLU and Forests sectors led by FAO.

16 October 2020:

1, 2 and 3. Thank you for the adjustments and complementary information. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020

1. The names of component 2 and output 2.3 have been adjusted along the document to ensure consistency.
2. Under output 2.1, Deliverable 2.1.3. has been reworded to "An online data management platform to support the national MRV system established with a report on its operationalization" (p. 23).
3. The text under output 3.3 has been amended to include the potential contribution of the CBIT global projects focused on AFOLU and Forests led by FAO (p. 26).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23 July 2020:

The description is very succinct. Please elaborate further, particularly on how the project align with the 3 objectives of the CBIT.

16 October 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020

Further clarification on the project's strategy to promote the improvement of transparency over time has been added under 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies (p.26-27).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

23 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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

23 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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

24 July 2020:

Regarding the potential for scaling up, please also consider the CBIT global projects focused on AFOLU and Forests.

16 October 2020:

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020

Section 7) Innovativeness, sustainability and potential for scaling up has been amended to include mentioning to the CBIT global projects focused on AFOLU and Forests led by FAO (p. 30).

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

24 July 2020:

As a CBIT project, it spans the whole country. Cleared.

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

24 July 2020:

There is indeed important information on the engagement of the relevant identified stakeholders. Nevertheless, the rationale of and the difference between the two tables provided in this section is unclear: the first table doesn't have any title and the second one is "table 1". In addition, these tables have also different columns. Please precise how the identified stakeholders have been consulted (the current description is very

succinct and general) and clarify and homogenize the information provided through the tables.

16 October 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020

Section 2. Stakeholders has been restructured to ensure clarity and further information has been provided (p. 30-38).

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

24 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

January 8, 2021

Section 3. *Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment?* has been updated and further information has been provided based on findings obtained at PPG stage (p. 39-41). These edits are highlighted in yellow in the PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document uploaded in the 'Documents' tab of the GEF Portal.

In addition, a sex-disaggregated attendance sheet of the national stakeholders that participated in the consultation workshops undertaken during PPG stage has been uploaded on the 'Documents' tab of the GEF Portal as a supporting document, revealing that over 65% of participants were women.

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

24 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

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

24 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

10 November 2020:

A Covid-19 risk and opportunity analysis has been included in the Risks section. The edits / additions are highlighted in yellow in the PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document uploaded on the ?Documents? section of the GEF Portal.

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

24 July 2020:

Yes, but again, please consider also liaising with the AFOLU and Forests CBIT global projects.

16 October 2020:

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020:

The text under section 6) Coordination has been amended to mention the potential synergies with the CBIT global projects focused on AFOLU and Forests led by FAO (p. 45).

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

24 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

24 July 2020:

The budget and timeline of the key deliverables of the knowledge management approach remains vague. Please clarify.

16 October 2020:

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

October 9, 2020:

The budget and timeline of the key deliverables related to the knowledge management approach have been clarified under section 8. Knowledge Management (p. 47).

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

24 July 2020:

A UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note is provided and the overall risk is assessed as low. Cleared.

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

24 July 2020:

Yes, Cleared.

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

24 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

24 July 2020:

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

January 8, 2021

We have taken the opportunity of this review sheet to update the CBIT Malawi CEO Endorsement Document in line with the latest GEF guidance on budgeting. As such, *the project budget in ?ANNEX F: Project Budget Table?* of the GEF Portal has now been displayed in the GEF format.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

24 July 2020:

Yes, a project result framework is provided. Cleared.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

24 July 2020:

Yes, the status of PPG utilization is presented in annex C. Cleared.

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

24 July 2020:

The project spans the whole country. Cleared.

Agency Response

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 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

24 July 2020:

Not yet. Please address the comments above.

16 October 2020:

Not yet. Unfortunately, considering the continuing and evolving crisis due to the COVID-19 pandemic, a specific consideration on this issue needs to be added at this stage. The pandemic can indeed affect important elements of the project implementation. Under the Risks section, please add a brief risk analysis of the possible impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the project implementation and results. Also, please consider eventual opportunities this project can provide to enhance the resilience of the beneficiaries against possible future pandemics. For further clarification, we advice to refer to the note "Project Design and Review Considerations in Response to the COVID-19 Crisis and the Mitigation of Future Pandemics" shared by GEF Secretariat with the GEF Agencies on September 14. The Agency may also wish to contact directly the GEF Program Manager of this project.

17 November 2020:

Thank you for addressing the comment related to the COVID pandemic situation. Nevertheless, we also saw that some clarification were still needed on gender equality (please apology for not having raised this issue in the previous reviews):

The project includes a fairly good gender action plan, but there is little evidence that a gender analysis has been carried out. It states that "During stakeholders consultations at PPG stage, a majority of women participants was observed in the workshops" but does not elaborate further on their particular barriers/interests etc. It also seems that the section on gender has not really been updated as it references GEF's old Gender action plan and also, for example, mention that "a gender responsive results- based framework will be developed during the PPG design phase" and that "Institutions to be consulted on gender engagement will include"? The CEO approval should be able to provide some additional information on gender considerations based on its stakeholder consultations. Please update the section on gender and provide some additional findings based on the stakeholder consultations.

January 15, 2021:

Thank your for addressing the remaining comment. The project is now recommended for CEO approval.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	7/24/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	10/16/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/11/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	11/17/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	1/15/2021	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations

