



Strengthening national capacity for implementing the enhanced transparency framework in Belize.

Review CEO Approval and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11651

Countries

Belize

Project Name

Strengthening national capacity for implementing the enhanced transparency framework in Belize.

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/12/2024

Review completed by PM

7/1/2024

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

MSP

CEO Approval Request

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 5/15/2024: Yes, the project information table is correctly filled. 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 5/15/2024: Yes, the Rio Markers for CCM are correctly selected. Cleared.

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 results?

b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project, is well written and is it within the max. of 250 words?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 5/15/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

3. Project Description Overview

a) Is the project objective presented as a concise statement and clear?

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 appropriately funded?

- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?
e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10%? If above 10%, is the justification acceptable?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 7/1/2024: Noted. Cleared.

EBF 5/15/2024:

1. Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 focus on "access", while Outcome 3 targets the "use" of the National Transparency Management System. If Component 3 is meant to address "Barrier 3: Belize does not consistently integrate its climate change information into National Policy Making processes" it would be recommendable to adjust these Outputs and perhaps the Outcome, as appropriate, so they go beyond access or use of the National Transparency Management System and target the integration of climate change information into national policy-making processes. We encourage you to reconsider the log frame for Component 3 and make the necessary adjustments in the other sections of the project, inter alia, project description, and project results framework.

Agency Response Wording on Barrier 3 clarified to better reflect the issues currently experienced in Belize ? that there is not a working system/ information available to inform UNFCCC reporting and undertaking national planning. Outcome 3 wording has been updated to align with this. The outcomes and outputs are now consistent with trying to address this barrier.

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

EBF 7/1/2024: Cleared.

EBF 5/15/2024:

1. Table 4 identifies three projects supported by ICAT and specifies that phases 2 and 3 are under implementation. However, in the text (i.e., NDC Tracking Module chapter and Barrier 1), only phase 2 is mentioned. Please review and address.

Agency ResponseText reviewed and amended. Reference to ICAT Phase 3 now added under Barrier 1. As Phase 3 relates to climate finance tracking, reference has been added under the Support Needed and Received Module chapter.

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 thrust and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust solution and listing the key assumptions underlying these?**
- 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 are 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 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 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

EBF 7/1/2024:

1. Cleared

2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared

EBF 5/15/2024:

1. Please clarify if the Transparency Management System platform will be built separately from the existing MRV systems (e.g., MRV platform for NDC tracking, <https://cc.edata.bz/>) or if it will build on the existing platforms and consolidate them into a centralized system.
2. Similar to our previous comment, Table 4 identifies three projects supported by ICAT and specifies that phases 2 and 3 are under implementation. However, in the text (e.g., text before Table 7), only phase 2 is mentioned. Please review and address.
3. In line with our comment to Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 and Outcome 3 in the project description overview. Please ensure any adjustments are also reflected in this section.
4. Please clarify if gender considerations are considered as part of M&E activities in Table 17.

Agency Response

1. The Transparency Management System seeks to build on and consolidate the existing MRV platforms, it will not be a new separate system. This is described under Output 1.2 ?The Transparency Management System platform will integrate other existing climate change related MRV platforms?.

2. ICAT Phase 3 added to text above.

3. Outcome 3 wording updates are reflected in this section.

4. Yes, several M&E activities, such as the Inception Report, Half Yearly Progress Reports, Project Implementation Reviews and Terminal Reviews will all contain a review of progress against the gender indicators. Wording has been clarified within Component 4 section.

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

EBF 5/15/2024: Table 19 is very insightful! Cleared.

Agency Response

5.3 Core indicators

- a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)?
- b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core 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 RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

Agency Response

5.4 Risks

- a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there any omission?
- b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?
- c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately screened and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

Agency Response

- 5.5 NGI Only: Is there a justification of financial structure and use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

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 LDCF/SCCF strategy?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

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 RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

Agency Response

7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

Agency Response

7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/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 RequestN/A

Agency Response

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestN/A

Agency Response

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Cleared.

Agency Response

8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)

a) Is PPG reimbursement requested and if so, is it within the eligible cap of USD 50,000?

b) 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 RequestEBF 5/15/2024: PPG reimbursement is requested with the eligible cap of \$50,000, and the status of utilization of the PPG is provided in Annex D. Cleared.

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 RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Yes, the sources of funds table match with the OFP's LOE.

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

EBF 7/1/2024: The letter of co-finance has been uploaded to the documents section. Cleared.

EBF 5/15/2024: We couldn't find the letter of co-finance of the Ministry of Sustainable Development, Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management. Please provide it.

Agency ResponseThe letter is attached to the resubmission.

Annex B: Endorsements

8.5 a) 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 RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Yes, the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP. The OFP name and position are correct. Cleared.

Agency ResponseAn email from Focal Point is attached confirming agreement with footnote.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement RequestEBF 5/15/2024: Yes. Cleared.

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

EBF 7/1/2024: A letter on behalf of the OFP with a no objection to the footnote cited in the previous comment has been uploaded to the documents section of the project. Cleared.

EBF 5/15/2024: The letter of endorsement is missing the footnote that conditions the selection of the executing partner to the following: ?Subject to the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Implementing Agency, as appropriate.? Please ask the OFP to

accept this footnote via email and upload this communication in the documents section in the portal or provide a new LoE using the right template.

Agency Response

8.6 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project before the PIF submission?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Annex C: Project Results Framework

8.7 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

EBF 7/1/2024:

1. A mention has been included in the agency project document as part of the means of verification "Achievement of Gender Indicators G0, G3, G4, G5 and G8 in Gender Action Plan (Table 26)." Cleared
2. Output-level indicators are contained in the agency project document. Cleared.
3. Cleared
4. Cleared
5. Cleared

EBF 5/15/2024:

1. [On gender] Please integrate in the Results Framework, as relevant, the gender indicators developed in the Gender Action Plan, and ensure that the activities and deliverables in the GAP are budgeted.
2. [General comment] The agency project document provides indicators of the Outcome and Output levels. If possible, please include them in the portal form to facilitate review.
3. The indicator for Output 1.3 consists of "(#) proposals formalizing the transparency management system". The term proposals can be a bit vague. We suggest you review and adjust this indicator.
4. We suggest you reconsider the indicator for Output 1.4 to be more specific instead of focusing on the number of sessions, e.g. number of participants (disaggregated by gender).

5. In line with our comment to Outputs 3.1 and 3.2 and Outcome 3 in the project description overview. Please ensure any adjustments are also reflected in this section.

Agency Response

- Reference to the gender indicators have been incorporated into the Project Results Framework where relevant. The gender expert's main role is to manage and deliver the Gender Action Plan, so these activities and deliverables are budgeted for under their role.
- Wording for Output 1.3 indicator updated to be less vague.
- The Output 1.4 indicator has been changed to number of participants. We assumed 45 participants across the three components for our costing, so this indicator is aligned with the budget.
- Wording changes to Outcome 3 have been reflected in this section.

Annex E: Project map and coordinates

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 5/15/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex F: Environmental and Social Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.9 Have safeguard screening document and/or other ESS document(s) attached and been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request EBF 5/15/2024: Yes. Cleared.

Agency Response

Annex G: GEF Budget template

8.10 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 7/1/2024:

1. Detailed Terms of Reference are provided in the agency project document.
Cleared.
2. Cleared.

EBF 5/15/2024:

1. The Chief Technical Advisor and Junior Tech/ Admin Support use resources from the project components and PMC. Please provide more detailed Terms of Reference for the Junior Tech/ Admin Support, indicating what deliverables or activities this person will contribute to related to the project components.
2. Please charge 100% of office supplies and junior tech/admin support staff to PMC.

Agency Response

Junior tech/admin support ToRs were updated.

100% office supplies have been charged to PMC.

Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.11 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to take a decision on the following selection 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 N/A

Agency Response

Additional Annexes

9. GEFSEC DECISION

9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation Is the project recommended for approval

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

EBF 7/1/2024: The PM recommends the project for further processing.

EBF 5/15/2024: Address the comments and highlight your changes **in yellow** to ease revision.

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

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

9.3 Review Dates

**1SMSP CEO
Approval**

**Response to Secretariat
comments**

First Review	5/15/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/1/2024
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	
Additional Review (as necessary)	