

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

Edit and Submit CEO Endorsement

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

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

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.

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

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.

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 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.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

5. Is the financing presented in Table D adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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.

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
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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

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.

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

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

Benefits

Are the socioeconomic benefits at the national and local levels sufficiently described resulting from the project? Is there an elaboration on how these benefits translate in supporting the achievement of GEBs or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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.

Agency Response

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.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 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.

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)		

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review
(as necessary)**