

Climate Transparency Global Support Programme III (Climate Transparency-GSP III)

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

11880

Countries

Global

Project Name

Climate Transparency Global Support Programme III (Climate Transparency-GSP III)

Agencies

UNEP, UNDP

Date received by PM

3/6/2025

Review completed by PM

3/17/2025

Program Manager

Esteban Bermudez Forn

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

GEF-8 PROJECT IDENTIFICATION FORM (PIF) REVIEW SHEET

1. General Project Information / Eligibility

a) Does the project meet the criteria for eligibility for GEF funding?

b) Is the General Project Information table correctly populated?

Secretariat's Comments 03/20/2025: The Agency fee for the grant is 9.5% of the GEF Project Grant. The PPG Agency Fee is 9.5% of the PPG Amount. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

2. Project Summary

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?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. The project summary has +250 words, but it incorporates other changes requested throughout the project document. Cleared.
2. Cleared.

03/20/2025:

1. The Project Summary goes beyond 250 words. Please try to reduce it to the extent possible.
2. Kindly indicate an estimation of the expected number of people benefitting from GEF-financed investments (Core Indicator 11) disaggregated by gender in the summary section.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) The Project Summary section has been reduced as suggested.

2) Core Indicator 11 included in the Summary section. ?Currently at PIF stage: 1500 (750 women and 750 men). These numbers will be confirmed at PPG.?

3 Indicative Project Overview

3.1 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?

Secretariat's Comments 03/20/2025: The project objective as well as its components, outcomes, and outputs are aligned with the Theory of Change. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

3.2 Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and monitoring and evaluation included within the project components and appropriately funded?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared

03/20/2025:

1. If possible, please include explicit gender considerations for Outputs 1.3, 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, emphasizing the representation of gender experts and aiming to reach the project's gender targets / indicators in terms of capacity building, when appropriate. Please amend as applicable.
2. Please include knowledge management explicit references within the relevant output(s) as part of the project structure, as applicable. Please amend as appropriate.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) The text in Section B. Project Description has been amended for components 1 and 2 to provide further information on gender considerations (p. 17-19). PIF text indicates that ?gender mainstreaming will be fostered through workshops on gender-responsive transparency frameworks and use of the Gender Responsive Biennial Transparency Reports Toolkit. In addition, women are targeted as 50 percent of beneficiaries in project capacity-building activities (as per core indicator 11: number of direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender). A gender expert will provide further guidance during the PPG phase.

2) Please refer to Output 1.3 description (p. 17).

3.3 a) Are the components adequately funded?

b) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?

c) Is the PMC equal to or below 5% of the total GEF grant for FSPs or 10% for MSPs? If the requested PMC is above the caps, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments 03/20/2025: The project components are adequately funded. In addition, the PMC is below 5% (4.76%) of the total GEF grant and the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC are 4.76% and 15% respectively. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

4 Project Outline

A. Project Rationale

4.1 SITUATION ANALYSIS

a) is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key contextual drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective?

b) Are the key barriers and enablers identified?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Cleared
4. Cleared

03/20/2025:

1. Table 1 lists four global projects implemented by FAO. However, the writing is not clear. Please adjust the writing to make this more explicit and emphasize that two of these projects are under implementation.
2. Please include the regional CBIT project GEF ID 11675 in Table 1 under "Regional GEF-funded CBIT projects".

3. Please include (1) the Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment of China (FECO) and (2) the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) as part of the key stakeholders listed as "Other GEF implementing agencies". FECO and IADB implement ongoing projects related to transparency and financed by the GEF.
4. Regarding Barrier 1, it would be insightful to understand the limitations faced by the current CBIT-GSP phase II in deploying the Climate Transparency Platform. Please mention the status of the current Climate Transparency Platform, its accomplishments, and the areas that need further efforts to ensure phase III complements and incorporates lessons learned from phase II.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) Table 1 has been amended to enhance clarity.
- 2) The CBIT project GEF ID 11675 has been included in Table 1 under "Regional GEF-funded CBIT projects".
- 3) Addressed in the section "Key stakeholders", with the inclusion of the the Foreign Environmental Cooperation Center of the Ministry of Ecology and Environment of China (FECO). IADB had already been listed, and the acronym has now been spelled out (p. 14).
- 4) The text on Barrier 1 has been amended to include current limitations and lessons learned from the initial phase of the Platform, as well as next steps for improvement (p. 12-13).

4.2 JUSTIFICATION FOR PROJECT

- a) Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?
- b) Does it ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers?
- c) 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?
- d) are the relevant stakeholders and their roles adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments 03/20/2025: This section explicitly explains the baseline, considering the achievements of past and current CBIT-GSP projects, drawing from their lessons learned applicable to the current project proposal. It also illustrates other baseline initiatives of GEF- and non-GEF funded nature expressing their scope and synergies with the

current CBIT-GSP III project, as well as the key barriers, the problem tree, expected stakeholders and socioeconomic benefits of the project intervention. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5 B. Project Description

5.1 THEORY OF CHANGE

a) Is there a concise theory of change that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements will contribute to the objective, the expected causal pathways, and the key assumptions underlying these?

b) Are the key outputs of each component defined (where possible)?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. Cleared
2. Cleared
3. Noted. Cleared
4. Noted. Cleared
5. Noted. Cleared
6. Cleared

03/20/2025:

1. [GENERAL] The project outline mentions that "[...] it will be primarily executed through virtual means [...]". Please clarify in the Project Description section how this will be achieved and specify if there are any specific activities that will take place in person.
2. For Output 1.2, kindly explain how the project will address the following weakness identified in the Mid-Term Review of the CBIT-GSP II: *"CBIT-GSP II puts considerable efforts into promoting coordination among support providers, but the ownership and use of the Climate Transparency Platform by support providers is uneven, as they partly perceive the platform as a CBIT-GSP II project website rather than a shared platform."*
3. For output 2.1, kindly indicate if additional networks (particularly for SIDS and LDCs) are expected to be created as part of the CBIT-GSP III or what would be the mechanism for the distinctive engagement with these groups of countries, considering their particular circumstances and reporting flexibility provisions.
4. In addition, kindly briefly confirm if considerations of regional distribution of academic institutions / partners will be taken into account when selecting such

partners. Moreover, please express if MOUs with such partners will be expected to be signed to ensure engagement and sustainability of support. Please clarify accordingly.

5. For output 2.2 please indicate if the interaction with stakeholders outside of the CBIT-GSP will only take place in an in-person modality at the Global Transparency Forum. It is encouraged that the interaction with complementary initiatives, including but not limited to the CBIT AFOLU+ and CBIT Forest2 projects to be developed in a more continuous way in virtual and in-person formats in order to guarantee their additionality in terms of topics covered and countries benefitting. Kindly clarify accordingly the modalities of support of this output.
6. For Output 2.3, please indicate what mechanism would be used to guarantee that the targeted support to be provided to countries is not only additional to the support provided by CBIT projects at the national level, but also by other support providers. Please concisely express accordingly.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) The text under 'Global problem, system elements, drivers and trends' has been edited for clarification. Moreover, please refer to output 2.1, which clarifies that training through the Transparency Networks will be provided in different formats such as through in-person global training events/workshops on transparency; regional and country group training; cross-regional trainings for SIDS / LDCs; training of trainers' courses, in collaboration with universities, academic institutions, NGOs, regional entities and transparency partners. In addition, peer exchange will be organized in various modalities, including in-person and virtual workshops and webinars for peer-to-peer learning through the transparency networks. Output 2.2 will complement these developments by facilitating not only online interactions and events between stakeholders but also in-person annual meetings of the Global Transparency Forum.
- 2) Addressed in the description of updated Output 1.3 (p. 17).
- 3) The decision regarding the creation of additional networks for SIDS and LDCs as part of Climate Transparency - GSP III, as well as the specific mechanism for engaging with these groups of countries, will be determined during the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) phase, as further clarified in the description of output 2.1 (p. 18-19).
- 4) The most appropriate means of engagement will be assessed and confirmed during PPG phase, which has been reflected under output 2.1 (p. 18-19).
- 5) CBIT-GSP already engages with complimentary initiatives in various ways, including webinars, regional trainings, and in-country support, which will continue and enhance under the proposed project. Examples and further clarification have been provided under output 2.2 (p. 19).

6)The text under output 2.3 has been amended to provide further clarification (p. 19).

5.2 INCREMENTAL/ADDITIONAL COST REASONING

Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

5.3 IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

a) Is the institutional setting, including potential executing partners, outlined and a rationale provided?

b) Comments to proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception).

c) is there a description of potential coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project area

d) are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. UNEP-CCC and UNDP have been removed as executing partners at this stage.
Cleared.

03/20/2025:

1. We take note that UNEP and UNDP expect to play an execution role of the project. Normally, this should not be included at PIF stage. Instead, once assessed during the PPG phase, the agencies would request for dual-execution role subject to GEF managerial approval. Please remove UNEP and UNDP from executing the project at PIF stage. Also adjust your answer to the specific question on the execution role as

shown in the screenshot below.

Coordination and Cooperation with Ongoing Initiatives and Project.

Does the GEF Agency expect to play an execution role on this project? ☒ Yes

If so, please describe that role here. Also, please add a short explanation to describe cooperation with ongoing initiatives and projects, including potential for co-location and/or sharing of expertise/staffing

UNEP and UNDP will be the GEF Implementing Agencies (IAs) and accountable to the GEF for the implementation of this project. UNEP will serve as the lead agency of the project, including for the submission and communication with the GEF Secretariat. The roles of the two agencies in project coordination and project components and outputs will be determined at PPG stage.

For UNDP, UNDP BPPS Vertical Funds Compliance and Oversight Unit assumes full responsibility and accountability for oversight and quality assurance of this Project and ensures its timely implementation in compliance with the GEF-specific requirements and UNDP's Programme and Operations Policies and Procedures (POPP), its Financial Regulations and Rules and Internal Control Framework. UNDP Climate Hub will be responsible for executing the project. A strict firewall will be maintained between the delivery of project oversight and quality assurance performed by UNDP and project execution undertaken by UNDP.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

1) The text under section 'Coordination' has been amended accordingly (p. 21-22).

5.4 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 indicative targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators)/adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025: We encourage you to reconsider the duration of the project during the PPG, we recommend a longer duration. Hence, we also recommend revisiting the core indicators during the PPG. Cleared.

03/20/2025: For the CBIT-GSP IIB project (GEFID 10088), the MTR reflects and achievement of 5,699 people (2,899 women) benefitting from the project under Core Indicator 11. Kindly justify why the CBIT-GSP III has a lower target of people benefitting from the project than the CBIT-GSP II. If possible, we encourage you to review and increase this target.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

1) The lower target for the Climate Transparency-GSP III project compared to CBIT-GSP IIB is primarily due to the shorter duration of the program. While CBIT-GSP II had a longer implementation timeline, allowing for a broader reach and more beneficiaries, Climate Transparency-GSP III will be working within a more condensed timeframe. As a result, the target number of people benefiting from the project has been adjusted accordingly. The final target will be consulted and confirmed during PPG phase.

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

5.6 RISKS

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category?

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 at this stage and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. Cleared

03/20/2025:

1. Please provide a brief description of the explanation of risk for the Overall Risk Rating, which is currently empty.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

1) The text under section 'Risks' has been amended accordingly, based on SRIF and estimated overall risk rating (p. 24).

5.7 Qualitative assessment

a) Does the project intend to be well integrated, durable, and transformative?

b) Is there potential for innovation and scaling-up?

c) Will the project contribute to an improved alignment of national policies (policy coherence)?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025: Cleared.

03/20/2025: Please provide a brief description of potential for scale up and sustainability of the project along with the innovativeness aspects that have been described in the PIF.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

1) The text under section ?Innovativeness? has been amended to include potential for scale up and sustainability (p. 21).

6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities

6.1 Is the project adequately aligned with focal area and integrated program strategies and objectives, and/or adaptation priorities?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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's Comments03/20/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

7 D. Policy Requirements

7.1 Is the Policy Requirements section completed?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025: Information in the private sector sub section has been filled in. Cleared.

03/20/2025: Kindly fill in the private sector sub section of the Policy Requirements section.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) The text in the private sector sub-section has been amended, with further information provided on its engagement in the description of outputs 1.4 and 2.1. (p. 17-19).

7.2 Is a list of stakeholders consulted during PIF development, including dates of these consultations, provided?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. The preliminary Stakeholder Engagement Plan has been amended. Cleared.

03/20/2025:

1. Please elaborate further on planned consultations with relevant CSOs and NGOs at sub-regional, regional, and international, in project development and their indicative roles, as well as projects activities to engage these in project implementation as related to project component 1 and 2.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) Kindly refer to Attachment 3 ? Preliminary Stakeholder Engagement Plan, which has been amended.

8 Annexes

Annex A: Financing Tables

8.1 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's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area allocation?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

SCCF A (SIDS)?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Focal Area Set Aside?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.2 Is the PPG requested within the allowable cap (per size of project)? If requested, has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: The PPG is within the allowable cap for the project size, cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.3 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?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: Indicative co-finance from UNEP, UNDP, and UNEP-CCC adds up \$ 1 million from recurrent expenditure in-kind sources. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex B: Endorsements

8.4 Has the project been endorsed by the country? (ies) GEF OFP and has the OFP at the time of PIF submission name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: The project will primarily be executed through virtual means and no in-country activities are mentioned. Therefore, no Letter of Endorsement is presented. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

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

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: The project will primarily be executed through virtual means and no in-country activities are mentioned. Therefore, no Letter of Endorsement is presented. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: The project will primarily be executed through virtual means and no in-country activities are mentioned. Therefore, no Letter of Endorsement is presented. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

8.5 For NGI projects (which may not require LoEs), has the Agency informed the OFP(s) of the project to be submitted?

Secretariat's CommentsN/A

Agency's Comments

Annex C: Project Location

8.6 Is there preliminary georeferenced information and a map of the project's intended location?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: The project will primarily be executed through virtual means and no in-country activities are mentioned. Therefore, no project location has been provided.

Agency's Comments

Annex D: Safeguards Screen and Rating

8.7 If there are safeguard screening documents or other ESS documents prepared, have these been uploaded to the GEF Portal?

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: The ESS document has been uploaded, and the overall project risk has been classified as Low. Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex E: Rio Markers

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

Secretariat's Comments03/20/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex F: Taxonomy Worksheet

8.9 Is the project properly tagged with the appropriate keywords?

Secretariat's Comments 03/20/2025: Cleared.

Agency's Comments

Annex G: NGI Relevant Annexes

8.10 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. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. Is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

Secretariat's Comments N/A

Agency's Comments

9 GEFSEC Decision

9.1 Is the PIF and PPG (if requested) recommended for technical clearance?

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025: The PM recommends the project for further processing.

03/20/2025: Please address the comments in the review, highlight them in yellow, and resubmit.

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) Comments have been addressed, and changes in the document were highlighted in yellow.

9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval

Secretariat's Comments

04/15/2025:

1. We encourage you to reconsider the duration of the project during the PPG, we recommend a longer duration.
2. In line with the previous comment, we also recommend revisiting core indicator 11 during the PPG.

03/20/2025:

1. On gender, 1) Please ensure to include relevant gender-specific indicators in the RF;
2) In the development of the Gender Action Plan, please include specific budget lines, as appropriate and plans for monitoring and reporting on the GAP. Under M&E, please reflect those reports submitted (MTR and TE) include gender-specific results and progress in the implementation of the gender action

Agency's Comments

04/11/2025

- 1) To be considered at PPG stage.

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	3/20/2025	4/11/2025
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/15/2025	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		