

Strengthen Viet Nam's capacities to manage data flows and report information adequately to fulfill the enhanced transparency framework of the Paris Agreement requirements

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10355

Countries

Viet Nam

Project Name

Strengthen Viet Nam's capacities to manage data flows and report information adequately to fulfill the enhanced transparency framework of the Paris Agreement requirements

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

5/14/2021

Review completed by PM

7/20/2021

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

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

Yes.

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 Yes. Please see the comment on co-financing.

Agency Response

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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

July 15, 2021: Comments cleared with increased PMC by available co-financing.

May 31, 2021: The co-financing from JICA may not be the whole project as indicated in the letter. ("one of the objectives of the project...") As such, it would be recommended to identify the relevant component of the project as far as possible and clarify the type of the co-financing. Parallel co-financing should indicate the project period that matches the period of this project. Also, co-financing ratio on PMCs is not as the same level to GEF financing ratio on PMCs as per the guidelines. Please address them.

Agency Response

July 9, 2021: Yes, agreed. The comments have been addressed in the updated Project Document (ProDoc and CEO ER) with updated in-kind co-financing figures from the Government, UNDP and JICA. The co-financing ratio on PMCs is now updated at 9.5%, which is relatively in line with the GEF financing ratio on PMCs. This is also taken into account that JICA in-kind co-financing accounts can only be used for supporting the technical components and cannot be allocated to PMC.

The updated co-financing letters by the Government, UNDP and JICA are attached to the revised ProDoc.

Co-financing figures are also updated to relevant sections of the ProDoc (page 2, 44 and 48) and CEO Endorsement Request with explanation that the reduced co-financing amount will not affect the achievement of the CBIT project's target.

The updated JICA co-financing is still higher than the original amount indicated in the PIF (US\$ 1,000,000). UNDP and Government in-kind co-financings have been increased as well.

Below are the updated co-financing figures.

Co-financing	Submitted ProDoc (US\$)	Updated ProDoc (US\$)
DCC-MONRE (in-kind)	100,000	150,000
JICA (in-kind)	3,251,200	1,551,300
UNDP	75,000	80,000
TOTAL	3,426,200	1,781,300

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 Yes.

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 Yes.

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 There is no change on the indicator and it is still realistic.

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

July 15, 2021: Comment cleared.

May 24, 2021: This section describes current status related to the ETF. However, please also include problems and barriers relating to ETF that will be addressed by this project.

Agency Response

July 9, 2021: Noted the comment. The global environmental/mitigation problems, including the root causes and barriers are already addressed in the Project document and have been included in the CEO ER under this section.

Related ETF problems and barriers that will be addressed by the project have been highlighted (in yellow) in the updated ProDoc (I. Development Challenge, page 9-11) and CEO ER. Key barriers and gaps to be addressed are:

- Lack of guidance and tools to operationalize the governance and institutional arrangements.
- Gaps regarding technical expertise and documentation.
- Lack of institutionalized system and guidance to track climate finance.
- Weakness in gender mainstreaming in MRV process.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 15, 2021: Comment cleared.

May 24, 2021: Yes. However, the information on other baseline projects (bilateral or multilateral) are missing. Please also add in this section.

Agency Response July 9, 2021: Agreed and information on other baseline projects are added to the Section I- Development Challenges of Prodoc (page 8-9) and the CEO Endorsement Request (Page 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

July 15, 2021: Comments cleared.

May 31, 2021: Largely yes. However, please address the below points.

1. Please update from the PIF stage how each activity/output helps the country meet MPGs requirements in particular mandatory requirements for BTR1 (e.g. a time gap between the inventory year and the reporting year, time series of the GHG inventory,

IPCC guidelines/methodologies, institutional arrangements etc.), where relevant. Please clarify if there is any remaining gap that will be addressed outside this project.

2. Outcome 1: Please clarify if each output covers all sectors, and if not, please provide justifications on that.

3. Output 1.3: Please explain if which sectors are covered and how such sectors will be prioritized and clarify any linkages between the GHG inventory and the tools being developed there.

4. Outcome 2: It would be useful to assess the existing capacities within the Finance Ministry and the line ministries prior to start the implementation. Please clarify why the agriculture sector has been chosen for domestic climate finance specifically under Output 2.1.1.

Agency Response

July 9, 2021: Noted the comments which have been addressed in the updated ProDoc and CEO ER.

1. Inputs how each activity/output help the country meet MPGs requirements have been added to relevant outcomes and outputs (highlighted in yellow) in Section III-1. Expected Results of the Prodoc and under proposed alternative scenario of the CEO ER

2. Outcome 1: Noted the comments and details are added in Component 1 of Section III-1- Expected Results of ProDoc (page 15-16) and in the CEO ER (page 19). It is designed that all sectors will be covered in all Outcomes of Component 1.

3. Output 1.3: Noted the comments and additional details are added in this Output 1.3. (page 19 of Prodoc and page 23 of CEO ER) Sectors are prioritized basing on those that are specified in the 2020 updated Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) of Viet Nam. The tool to monitor, centralize and report the required information on mitigation P&M could be developed as a module of the GHG inventory platform to propose a single national transparency web platform.

4. Outcome 2: Noted the comment and details are added to the section.

- The capacity assessment of the Ministry of Finance and line ministries will be undertaken as part of project activities during the first quarter of project implementation. Additional texts are updated in Output 2.1.1. (page 22 of Prodoc and page 26 of CEO ER). Regarding line ministries, capacity assessment of the Implementing Partner, who is Department of Climate Change under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) was already undertaken prior to the design of this project. Other ministries like Ministry of Planning and Investment (MPI), Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Ministry of Finance, etc. have been consulted during the PIF and PPG and are agencies who will participate in the project activities under the coordination of MONRE.

- Output 2.1.1.: Agriculture sector has been chosen based on the consultation and agreement with relevant agencies including MPI and MARD and is based on the share of climate spending of the sector and the inclusion of diverse sub-sector in the agricultural sector (text is added to Outcome 2.1, page 21 of Prodoc and page 25-26 of CEO ER).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

July 15, 2021: Comment cleared.

May 24, 2021: Please clarify co-financing contributions in this section.

Agency Response

July 9, 2021: Yes, agreed. The co-financing contribution is added to the CEO Endorsement Request- Section 5 -incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCE, SCCF, and co-financing of Part II- Project Justification.

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

Yes.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

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

Agency Response

Stakeholders

Does the project include detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase? Is there an adequate stakeholder engagement plan or equivalent documentation for the implementation phase, with information on Stakeholders who will be engaged, the means of engagement, and dissemination of information?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment

Has the gender analysis been completed? Did the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities? If so, does the project/program include gender-responsive activities, gender-sensitive indicators and expected results?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response
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
July 15, 2021: Comment cleared.

May 24, 2021: Yes, the description can be elaborated based on the stakeholder engagement plan including research institutions on top of the involvement of industrial emitters.

Agency Response July 9, 2021: Agreed and text is added to Section III- 4. Stakeholder engagement (page 30 of Prodoc).
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
July 15, 2021: Comment cleared.

May 24, 2021: Please also include risks that institutional knowledge and know-how will be diminished due to staff rotation. Please also include climate risks to this project as well as opportunities analysis of the COVID-19 pandemic, if any.

Agency Response
July 9, 2021: Noted the comments. Risk on dismissing of institutional knowledge and know-how due to staff rotation and climate risks are added to the Section III-3 Risks (page 28-29) and Annex 6, Risk Registry of the Prodoc and Section 5 ? Risks of CEO ER (page 36-37). The opportunities analysis of the COVID 19 pandemic is also added to Section II-3 Risks of the Prodoc (page 29-30).

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

Yes.

Agency Response

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

Yes.

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

Aug 22, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 26, 2021: Thank you for revisions. Please also provide a brief sentence regarding a communications plan/strategy (together with a budget allocation to implement it).

May 24, 2021: There are relevant descriptions including timelines and deliverables. However, please also include a plan to learn from relevant projects (past and ongoing), initiatives, evaluations and best practice during the implementation and how the KM Approach will contribute to the project's overall impact (sustainability and scale-up). The KM approach would also include details on processes to capture, assess and document and share, in a user-friendly manner, information, lessons, best practices, and expertise generated during implementation as well as plans for strategic communications of knowledge products.

Agency Response

August 2, 2021: Agreed. Preparation of project communication plan for the project is added to the Project Activities under Output 3.1.2 (ProDoc Page 23 and Page 61, CEO ER- Page 28) and to the overview of key knowledge products (CEO ER page 42). The budget for implementing the communications plan has already been included in the cost of the communication specialist under Components 1,2,3 (ProDoc page (46-51)).

July 9, 2021: Agreed and Knowledge management plan is added to the ProDoc under Section III - 7. Innovativeness, sustainability, and potential for scaling up (page 32-33) and the CEO Endorsement Request- under ?Key Knowledge Products and Timeline for Delivery (page 43-44).

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

July 15, 2021: Comment cleared.

May 24, 2021: The justification to be exempted from Social and Environmental Screening Procedure (SESP) screening is provided under Annex 5 of ProDoc. Please choose the risk classification.

Agency Response July 9, 2021: The justification for the exemption from Social and Environmental Screening will be added in portal with low classification mark.

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

July 15, 2021: Comment cleared.

May 24, 2021: Yes. Please include in the table who will be responsible for each activity including the terminal evaluation.

Agency Response

July 9, 2021: Noted the comment. The M&E table under section V.- Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Plan of the Prodoc (page 39-40) and under section 9 ? Monitoring and Evaluation of the CEO ER (page 46) was updated with project staff or UNDP staff or external consultants who will be responsible for each M&E activity including the terminal evaluation.

The Responsible party for the international consultants and national consultants budget lines to be dedicated for Terminal Evaluation is changed to UNDP under Component 3 of Section VIII- Total Budget and Work-plan (page 47) of the Prodoc and in the GEF Budget template.

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

Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Aug 22, 2021: Comment cleared.

July 26, 2021: Thank you for the revision. On the budget table, please either specify or remove contingency/unexpected expenses from the project budget (or reallocate to another budget).

May 31, 2021: Yes. In terms of the project budget plan on the ProDoc, Project Manager seems to have duties on Components as well while it is not clear if the ToR specifies the duties as per the stipulation of the guidelines below.

If project staff are charged to both PMC and project components (i.e. not only to PMC), clear Terms of Reference describing unique outputs linked to the respective components are required at the time of CEO Endorsement/Approval, for review by the Secretariat.

Agency Response

August 2, 2021: Agreed, the Misc. (contingency/ unexpected expenses) was removed. Budget line for travel under the PMC is added. The Mics. budget was re-allocated to other budget lines under the PMC (ProDoc, Page 47-48)

July 9, 2021: Yes, the project manager is expected to technically contribute to the delivery of Components also. Technical contribution by the Project Manager is added to the Tasks, Inputs and Outputs in the TOR of the Project Manager under the Annex 9 of the Prodoc: Overview of Project Staff and Technical Consultancies (page 101-102).

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes

Agency Response

Does the termsheet in Annex F provide finalized financial terms and conditions? Does the termsheet and financial structure address concerns raised at PIF stage and that were pending to be resolved ahead of CEO endorsement? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Do the Reflow Table Annex G and the Trustee Excel Sheet for reflows provide accurate reflow expectations of the project submitted? Assumptions for Reflows can be submitted to explain expected reflows. (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Did the agency Annex H provided with information to assess the Agency Capacity to generate and manage reflows? (For NGI Only)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Aug 22: The remaining comments have been addressed.

July 26, 2021: The previous comments cleared. Please address the two comments above.

May 31, 2021: Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	5/31/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/26/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations