

Strengthening National Institutions in Haiti to meet the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10318

Countries

Haiti

Project Name

Strengthening National Institutions in Haiti to meet the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/17/2020

Review completed by PM

7/14/2021

Program Manager

Namrata Rastogi

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

6/17/2021: Please update the expected implementation start data to align with the extension request. Please change the Rio Markers for CCM to 2.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

- Dates revised: Expected Implementation Start: 15 January 2022 and Expected Completion Date: 14 January 2026

- Rio Markers for CCM updated to 2 in the GEF portal, CEO ER and Prodoc

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

6/17/2021: Please address the following:

The Project Objective states "To establish a national Measuring, Reporting, and Validation system to track GHG emissions and the impact of mitigation actions, as well as indicators as part of the M&E systems on adaptation. These systems will serve to track the NDC according to the requirements of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement on Climate Change." Please replace Validation with Verification.

We note that there is no co-financing assigned to component 1. Please confirm.

Under 1.1.2 - "stakeholders, including Universities, trained on cross- sectoral framework, data collection, QA/QC, and analysis for the national GHG inventory?" seems to have cut-off information. Please clarify.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

- Validation corrected to Verification in the Project Objective
- Co-financing has been revised and added to component 1
- We confirm that there is cut-off information. Apologies for the mistakes done when uploading the CEO ER in the GEF Portal. The description of the output is 1.2.1 Relevant stakeholders, including Universities, trained on cross-sectoral framework, data collection, QA/QC, and analysis for the national GHG inventory.

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

6/17/2021: We note that the co-financing from UNDP does not specify the type of co-financing while in Table C this amount is listed as grant.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response UNDP co-financing letter has been revised to specify the type of co-financing (grant) and new version is attached to documents in the GEF portal
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 6/17/2021: 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 6/17/2021: 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
6/17/2021: Yes. However, an explanation on the target below the table is missing.
Please add a short narrative on how 153 direct beneficiaries were estimated.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response Narrative added (page 5 of the CEO ER and page 154 of ProDoc/Annex 12: GEF Core indicators).

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

6/17/2021: Please review the accuracy in this section.

For example, "The Paris Agreement also emphasizes that Annex I countries must make financial commitments facilitating the transfer of technology to Non-annex I countries, and they must lead the way by taking concrete actions to reduce GHG emissions. Furthermore, both financial support and capacity building need to be provided to Non-annex I countries to implement effectively the measures related to the Paris Agreement and those included in their NDCs." is not factually correct as the countries are not categorized under the Paris Agreement as they were under the Convention. Likewise on the description of the transparency framework, certain elements are optional, further there are flexibility provisions. Parties under the Paris Agreement do not have to submit a national communication.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

The sentence has been changed to: *In accordance with the principle of common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities set out in the Convention, developed country Parties are to provide financial resources to assist developing country Parties in implementing the objectives of the UNFCCC. The Paris Agreement reaffirms the obligations of developed countries, while for the first time also encouraging voluntary contributions by other Parties. Developed country Parties should also continue to take the lead in mobilizing climate finance from a wide variety of sources, instruments and channels, noting the significant role of public funds, through a variety of actions, including supporting country-driven strategies, and taking into account the needs and priorities of developing country Parties. Such mobilization of climate finance should represent a progression beyond previous efforts. It is important for all governments and stakeholders to understand and assess the financial needs of developing countries, as well as to understand how these financial resources can be mobilized. Provision of resources should also aim to achieve a balance between adaptation and mitigation. Overall, efforts under the Paris Agreement are guided by its aim of making finance flows consistent with a pathway towards low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development. Assessing progress in provision and mobilization of support is also part of the global stock-take under the Agreement. The Paris Agreement also places emphasis on the transparency and enhanced predictability of financial support.* Page 8 of CEO ER and page 9 of ProDoc.

The description of reporting requirements under the ETF has been corrected in pages 8 and 9 of CEO ER and page 9 of ProDoc.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021: Please address comments below:

-The description mentions a stock-taking exercise with the TNC. Please provide a timeline of when this process will begin and end so it is clear how feasible it is for this CBIT project to build on the TNC. Comment on if this project will build on the BUR

process as well, and if so, how. In this context, the project mentions that the BUR and TNC have been delayed due to political reasons. Comment on where they are in the process.

- Please provide information on what sectors are specifically included in the national inventory, what QA/QC processes may be in place, and how data is currently collected from the various line ministries for the inventory (i.e. are there any processes in place or are these ad-hoc requests, etc.) and if there are any IT systems that are currently in place.

- Provide brief description of the processes that were undertaken for the compilation of previous and undergoing reporting requirements (NCs, BUR).

- We note that some of this information is provided in the ProDoc but it needs to be included in the portal doc as well. Also, provide some details on Haiti as a LDC, and how it may have engaged through LDC Expert Group and others for example.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

- Many thanks for spotting this out. Haiti plan to finalize the TNC and BUR1 by 2022. The text has been revised on pages 12 and 13 of CEO ER and pages 10, 13-14 of ProDoc.

- TNC and BUR1 are at 25% of completion and should be finalized by end of 2022.

- Key sectors including Agriculture, Energy and Waste are specifically included in the national inventory. (Reference: This information is added in the PRODOC in page 14 and Table 1/ page 15)

- The preparation of the national GHG inventory is currently done through ad-hoc requests, task-specific short-term contracted consultants/ studies, weak IT system and lack of a formalized QA/QC plan.

This project will ensure the implementation of the QA/QC plan and activities (Reference **Output 1.2.5.- PRODOC page 33**)

More information on the process and MRV current situation have been added in pages 13 and 14 of the CEO ER and pages 13-16 of ProDoc.

- Information on engagement with LEG has been added on page 12 of CEO ER and page 13 of ProDoc.

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

6/17/2021: Please address comments below:

- The first figure under Component 1 is duplicated. Please remove the second layer.

- Right below the figure, the text begins ?track the NDC in terms of GHG emissions reduction and reaching the mitigation target.? This is incomplete. Please revise.

- Overall the formatting of this section could be changed to improve the readability.

Component 1

Output 1.2.1:

- Clarify what is meant by cross-sectoral framework in this context and what does it include.
- We note that the capacity building and training will be carried out by external consultants. However, we encourage Haiti to consider including elements that will help institutionalize the capacities within the country. Comment on this aspect and what considerations will be included to avoid staff turnover etc. Consider including innovative ideas such as a technical international expert seconded to the Ministry for a year and working alongside Haitian experts, use of Training of Trainers module, or identifying academic institutes that could help retain the training and knowledge in the country.
- Elaborate on what is meant by ?Integrate the compilation of the GHG inventory in the new national framework and train all actors including data providers, inventory compilers, national coordinator, experts from the different institutions and universities.?

Output 1.2.2:

- It seems from the description that there is an overlap between the scope of this output and the previous one (ie training and capacity building on IPCC 2006 guidelines). Please clarify the difference between the two clearly.

Output 1.2.3:

- Refers to a tool and an online information system. It seems like these are being used inter-changeably. If so, please use one terminology or clarify what the two separate deliverables are.
- In proposed activities, and the description mentions the use of excel and access but then also states that this would be online. Please clarify what is being envisioned, and if this is a step-wise approach, provide additional details. In this context, please revise the proposed activities so that it is in sequence, and note that some bullets are not activities but descriptions. Please revise accordingly.
- The proposed activities do not mention acquiring hardware or software for an online system. Please clarify if this will be needed and if yes, whether the cost has been factored into the budget.
- Comment on how the EIS will be linked to this system.

Output 1.2.4:

- it is not clear from the description of this output how it is different from some of the others above. We note a significant overlap with Output 1.1.1 which will establish MOUs for data exchange, training outputs covered in Output 1.2.1 and 1.2.2. Output 1.2.3 will establish an online system which from its description seems to be the central data collection repository. Please provide additional details on how this output is different, what it aims to do, and how it will build on some of these elements of the other related outputs. Output 1.1.2 also discussed a roadmap which seems to have overlap with the multi-year workplan mentioned in this output.

Output 1.2.5:

- Comment on how this output links with 1.2.1, especially on how these will build on each other and the sequencing of these outputs.

- Clarify what is envisioned by ?To ensure an organized archiving method of all the relevant documents, tools, and results, the National Committee on Climate Change will operate as the centralized institution that will coordinate and perform this task. It will be responsible for archiving all relevant information for the GHG emission inventories of the country which will further enable Ministries and institutions to bring meaningful policy insights and assist mitigation tracking and accounting improvements over time.? This overlaps with the Output 1.2.3 on online system meant for archiving, analyzing and reporting. Will this output set up a separate institution? Please clarify providing additional details.

Output 1.2.6

- Provide additional details on ?Develop a report and national guidelines, including international requirements and national circumstances to centralize relevant information for regular updates. This report will be based on work completed under outcomes 1.1 to 1.3 to comply with the highest standards as presented in Decision 18/CMA.1. This will change the current situation under which work on the TNC and BUR1 are written by external consultants on a project basis.? For example, what is meant by centralizing information ? will this use the online system, or will it be a different system? Clarify how a report will help provide regular updates. Also provide clarity on how this will change the current processes in place, does it call for additional training ? if so how does this interact with the above outputs, and provide details on the full process for this activity.

Output 1.3.1:

- As mentioned above, comment on how training and capacities will be made sustainable, improved over time and address staff turnover.

Output 1.3.2

- Comment on if this output will have any linkages with the online system mentioned in Output 1.2.3.

Output 1.3.3

-We welcome the inclusion of ?Update the NDC with more robust and transparent assumptions where necessary, allowing the international community to trust the NDC and finance the PAMs.? Provide additional detail on this ? such as how often do you envision undertaking this activity ? is this ongoing or on an ad hoc basis, how does this link with the projections methodology in Output 1.3.2, will there be an established coordinating mechanism among various line ministries, such as a technical taskforce, to undertake this.

Component 2

We note the focus on developing the technical guidelines, indicators and methodologies for a M&E system for adaptation in this component. We recommend considering some additional elements that may enable more value from these more technical discussions: consider adding a stocktaking exercise at the start of this component which could include a stakeholder consultation process. This would determine a common understanding of what a M&E system should look like for adaptation and its purpose (will it inform decision making etc.), existing frameworks that this M&E system can build on, etc. It could also identify barriers such as data availability for tracking adaptation, lack of coordination mechanisms etc. This step would help ensure that all stakeholders are on the same page in terms of what is needed from the technical aspects of this component.

Output 2.1.3

Confirm that these trainings will focus on the priority sectors.

7/14/2021: Answers below have clarified our comments. Cleared.

Agency Response

- Copy-paste issue in figure for Component 1 and text below are corrected.
- The formatting in the GEF portal improved. In the Review mode, all text and figures seem to be readable, formatted and display fine. The CEO ER in MS Word (with changes highlighted) is annexed to the GEF Portal for ease of the review if needed.

Output 1.2.1.

- Cross-sectoral aspects are the parts of the GHG inventory applicable to all sectors/the whole inventory. They have been completed in the activities. The word framework changed to aspects (page 21 of CEO ER and page 27 of the ProDoc).

- National experts involved in the coordination of the GHG inventory compilation will support international consultants in the preparation and delivery of innovative didactic materials and the trainings with the aim to progressively implement a training of trainers approach, a transfer of knowledge and a capacity retention mechanism (page 21 of CEO ER and page 27 of the ProDoc).

- National framework has been replaced by the national inventory system to better fit with the GHG inventories terminology (page 21 of CEO ER and page 27 of the ProDoc).

Output 1.2.2:

- Output 1.2.1. will train all actors involved in the national inventory system based on the institutional arrangements developed under outcome 1.1. on cross-sectoral aspects of the GHG inventory from planning to reporting of the GHG inventory while output 1.2.2. will train the national sectoral inventory compilers to elaborate a good quality GHG inventory in their respective sectors.

National sectoral experts involved in the GHG inventory compilation will support international consultants in the preparation and delivery of innovative didactic materials and the trainings with the aim to progressively implement a training of trainers approach, a transfer of knowledge and a capacity retention mechanism (page 22 of CEO ER and page 28 of the ProDoc).

Output 1.2.3:

- The online information system is a tool for the country based on excel and access database which form the software and hardware and whose costing is included in the budget. The term 'online information system' is now used instead of tool and additional explanations including an illustration on how it will be developed added (pages 22-24 of CEO ER and pages 28-30 of ProDoc).

- The EIS is currently under development and includes useful indicators on vulnerabilities and adaptation as well as climate data which will be linked to the online information system. Proposed activities have been also revised and put it in sequence.

- Servers and software for supporting the MRV system will be acquired. It is confirmed that the cost has been factored into the budget (line 6)

Output 1.2.4:

- This output will build on the other outputs as follows: output 1.1.1. formalizes the required arrangements with the data providers and the role of the MoE as lead entity and NCCC as coordinator and QA entity of the GHG inventory. Output 1.2.1. provides training on data quality requirements, data approaches and gap-filling techniques. Output 1.2.3. will develop the online information system and Output 1.2.4. will develop the surveys for data providers, assess the quality and availability of the data developing the associated improvement plan and use the data collected to develop the excels and GHG inventory database to include in the online information platform and will test data provision through the online platform.

(Pages 24-25 of the CEO ER and pages 30-31 of ProDoc)

Output 1.2.5:

- In output 1.2.1. training on QA/QC and other important functions of the national inventory system such as archiving will be provided. In output 1.2.3 automatic QC will be incorporated but it is not possible to automatise the whole QC/QA process as it is based on expert judgement and knowledge. For ensuring the best possible quality of

GHG inventories Haiti is in need of a QA/QC plan (for which roles will be formalized under output 1.1.1.) and a manual of QA/QC procedures (IPCC Guidelines only provides a limited number of generic checks). The online information platform (output 1.2.3.) will store raw data, metadata and the GHG inventory but will not contain all so important documentation of the GHG inventory such as the QA/QC plan, manual, findings, recommendations, expert judgement documentation, improvement plan and NIR) so an archiving system is needed. This output 1.2.5. will develop QA/QC plan and manual for the national GHG inventory and implement the archiving system of the country for all documentation.

(Page 26 of the CEO ER and pages 31-32 of ProDoc)

- This output will not set-up a separate institution.

Output 1.2.6

- The Modalities, Procedures and Guidelines (MPGs) adopted, as part of the Katowice climate package (decision 18/CMA.1), provide the rules for the implementation of the ETF under the Paris Agreement. Decision 18/CMA.1, para. 12(a), requested the SBSTA to develop, for consideration and adoption at CMA 3, and pursuant to the MPGs Common Reporting Tables (CRT) for the electronic reporting of the information in the NIRs of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of GHGs. The GHG inventory presented in the CRTs should be accompanied by a NIR (which is being called national document report NDC under the ETF current negotiations and NIR will be the CRTs with the NDR). Section II of the MPGs contains guidance for National inventory reports (NIR) of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases (GHGs). The elaboration of the NIR in Haiti is done on ad-hoc studies performed by external consultants hired for the preparation of the National Communications. By developing national guidelines (a NIR structure with descriptions of the reporting requirements from MPGs and the institutions responsible for their update and QC/QA) will allow the sustainability of NIR elaboration and reporting and will enhance its quality. Based on the training provided and the tools developed for elaborating the GHG estimates according to the future CRT, this output will develop a report structure and national guidelines (what to report, who, how and when), including international requirements (MPGs and other reporting requirements such as the eventual CRTs agreed at the COP) and national circumstances (use and justification of flexibility provisions) to centralize and standardise relevant information of the NIR for regular updates. This will change the current situation under which work on the TNC and BUR1 are written by external consultants on a project basis when studies are relaunched from scratch from information available in the national institutions. This output will test the coordination of the information in a centralized fashion by applying the national guidelines developed in collaboration with the National Committee on Climate Change during preparation of a NIR.

(pages 26 and 27 of the CEO ER and page 32 of ProDoc).

Output 1.3.1:

- These activities will be undertaken by international experts with the support of the most appropriate national experts or academia to ensure a training of trainers? approach and a capacity retention mechanism. Innovative didactic materials will have to be delivered as well (page 28 of the CEO ER and page 33 of ProDoc).

Output 1.3.2

- Information on the NDC (targets, progress, implementation plan, mitigation actions) will be available in the national online information system and the GHG inventory included in the national information system will form the basis to develop the sectoral

guidelines for projections but the assessments and the tracking of the NDC will not need to be done with the help of an information system as the assessments will develop or use own tools. (page 28 of the CEO ER and page 34 of ProDoc).

Output 1.3.3

- Output 1.1.1. will formalize the roles and mandates of the institutions responsible to track and update the NDC with the assessment of policies they implement under the coordination of the NCCC. NDC tracking will be done biannually and the update every five years.
(page 29 of the CEO ER and page 34 of ProDoc).

Component 2

Stakeholder consultations will be organized by the NCCC to determine a common understanding of what a M&E system should be for adaptation in Haiti, existing frameworks that the M&E system can build on, its use and purpose as well as to identify barriers such as data availability for tracking adaptation, lack of coordination mechanisms, overlaps in mandates and capacity building needs, and agree on solutions. (page 31 of the CEO ER and page 35 of ProDoc).

Output 2.1.3

The trainings will focus on the priority sectors including Agriculture, Energy and Waste (page 32 of the CEO ER and page 37 of ProDoc).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021: Yes

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/17/2021: Yes

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

6/17/2021: 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

6/17/2021: 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

6/17/2021: Country map is provided in the annex. Project is national in scope and focuses on capacity-building.

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

6/17/2021: 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

6/17/2021: 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

6/17/2021: Yes

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

6/17/2021: Please include climate change related risks.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

7/21/2021: Please add Political and Governance risk given the recent developments in Haiti.

7/27/2021: The comment has been addressed. Technically cleared.

Agency Response

Climate risks have been added (page 44 of CEO ER and page 48 of ProDoc.

7/27/2021:

Recent assassination of the President of Haiti might lead to delays in electoral process and turmoil in the country that might result in additional turnover in the government staff, thus delays in the project inception and implementation process. In terms of mitigation:

- Regular meetings with counterparts will be held to reduce risks of discontinuity and increase effectiveness of project oversight and monitoring
- Sensitization activities will be organized with all relevant actors involved in the project
- A high level of ownership of the project by the technical directorates concerned will be achieved in order to reduce the impact of political instability on the implementation of the project
- Continuous update on the progress and engagement with a broad range of stakeholders throughout the project inception and implementation process will further minimise impacts of any political changes on the project

This information has been added to the following sections:

1. Risks section in the CEO Endorsement Request, p.40
2. Risks section in the ProDoc, p.47
3. Annex 5: UNDP Atlas Risk Register in the ProDoc, p. 107

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

6/17/2021: 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

6/17/2021: Provide information in a table or bullets for each the relevant strategies/plans/reports and how it aligns with the project such as NDCs, NAPs, BUR, TNA, etc.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

Please see pages 51 - 53 of the CEO ER and pages 12-13 and 41-45 of the ProDoc.

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

6/18/2021: The KM approach is missing from the portal doc. Please describe the KM approach and include a budget, timeline and specific knowledge and learning outputs/deliverables. We recommend including whether the project will learn from relevant projects, initiatives, evaluations and how. Explain also how the KM Approach will contribute to the project's overall impact and 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; plans for strategic communications; and knowledge outputs to be produced and shared with stakeholders. Comment on the role of KM with Haiti as a LDC and the role it may play in disbursing its learnings to other LDCs.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

7/21/2021: A comprehensive communication plan/strategy to disseminate project results is missing from this section. Please elaborate on this element as part of the project's KM approach, along with a budget to support its implementation.

7/27/2021: The comment has been addressed. Technically cleared.

Agency Response

KM approach and learning sharing have been added. Budget, timeline and specific knowledge and learning outputs/deliverables are included in the section.

(pages 52 and 53 of CEO ER and page 23 of ProDoc).

7/27/2021:

The communication plan/strategy for dissemination of project results has been added as an Annex 17 to the ProDoc.

Comment has been addressed under Knowledge Management section in the CEO ER on page 53 and in the ProDoc on page 23

Key knowledge management products table has been revised with estimated budget.

Knowledge management will be a key component of the project through the COMPONENT 3 called Project learning, exchange of good practices and M&E with a budget of 90,500 USD, and additional 10,000 USD of cash co-financing. Additional products for knowledge management and dissemination will also be delivered through activities under Component 1 and 2 as summarized in the table below.

Key Knowledge Products		Timeline/Budget
Project Component 1: <i>Developing policies and technical capacities on national MRV for GHG emissions inventory and mitigation actions</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Roadmap to strengthen the national institutions to meet enhanced transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement ? Sectoral Training modules for GHG inventories developed and/or adapted on Energy, Industrial Processes and Product Use, AFOLU and Waste ? Sectoral and QA/QC procedures documented ? Sectoral guidelines to ensure progress tracking of the NDC ? Workshop reports for the capacity building exercises developed under component 1 	Work plans: Y1-Y4 Roadmap: Y1 Documentation: Y1-Y4 Capacity building: Y1-Y4 Budget: 18,000 USD over 4 years
Project Component 2: <i>Enhancing technical capacities to support the M&E system on adaptation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? M&E Guidelines on Adaptation and procedures including indicators developed for priority sectors ? Workshop reports for the capacity building exercises developed under component 2 	Work plans: Y1-Y4 Documentation: Y2 Capacity building: Y1-Y4 Budget: 20,000 USD over 4 years

<p>Project component 3: <i>Project learning, exchange of good practices and M&E</i></p>	<p>? Inception report, Project Implementation Reports, Mid-term Evaluation, Terminal evaluation,</p> <p>? A comprehensive communication plan/strategy to disseminate project results</p> <p>? Good practices and Lessons learnt from the CBIT Haiti</p> <p>? Reports on training participation by gender and gender mainstreaming in other activities.</p>	<p><i>M&E reports:</i> see Section 9 of the CEO endorsement request and Section 6 of the accompanying UNDP ProDoc</p> <p>Communication and dissemination plan : Q1 Y1</p> <p>Lessons Learnt: Y3-Y4</p> <p>Capacity building: Y1-Y4</p> <p>Budget : 90,500 USD (+10,000 USD of co-financing) over 4 years</p> <p>Note: This amount includes US\$ 47,500 for M&E activities</p>
--	--	---

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

6/18/2021: Explanation is provided for the project's exemption from SESP screening.

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

6/18/2021: Taking into account the project's duration of 4 years, consider incorporating a mid-term evaluation as well.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response MTR Included into the M&E plan and budget (pages 55 and 57 of CEO ER and pages 65-66 of ProDoc).

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

6/18/2021: Yes

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/18/2021: Please make sure the tables are formatted in the Portal so that they can be printed without getting cut off. Regarding the budget, please separate the M&E costs and place into the right column so that it matches the M&E budget.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

7/21/2021: Please address comments below:

1. In the budget table, please specify what Other Operation Costs-Miscellaneous expenses cover? Generally we do not allow GEF fund to cover unspecified miscellaneous expenses.

2. M&E budget in the budget table totals \$42,700 while the budgeted M&E plan in the section of the portal entry indicates \$45,700. Please indicate the correct amount and ensure that they match.

7/27/2021: The comment has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

- Formatting amended. Under the Review mode all text and tables are readable without cut off information.

- M&E cost in the GEF budget table separated.

7/27/2021:

1. Miscellaneous cost revised to 72500 ? Supplies (Supplies and stationary cost for dissemination of results, workshops and capacity building activities)
2. The GEF budget will cover US\$ 42,700 from M&E cost for MTR and TE. The cost of Inception workshop (US\$ 3,000) is budgeted and expected to be covered by UNDP cash co-financing. Explanatory note added to the M&E table in the CEO ER and ProDoc.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/18/2021: You may want to revise Indicator 3 considering the timing and transition to BTR (not likely for Haiti to prepare a second BUR). Indicator 10 could be further improved so have a quantitative target. Indicator 11: end of project target ? clarify what is meant by all sectors.

7/14/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response - Indicators 3, 10 and 11 have been revised (pages 59-60 of the ProDoc)

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 6/18/2021: Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 6/18/2021: 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

N/A

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 N/A

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 N/A

Agency Response

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this.

6/18/2021: Please address comments.

7/14/2021: Comments have been addressed. PM recommends technical clearance.

7/21/2021: Please address remaining comments highlighted in yellow.

7/27/2021: Remaining comments have been addressed. PM recommends technical clearance.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/23/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/18/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/14/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

7/21/2021

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

7/27/2021

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations