

Strengthening Guatemala's transparency framework through capacity building to implement the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10305

Countries

Guatemala

Project Name

Strengthening Guatemala's transparency framework through capacity building to implement the Paris Agreement

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

3/14/2021

Review completed by PM

5/31/2021

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

4/12/2021: Yes, the project remains aligned and changes from PIF are well explained. However, we note there is reference made to changes in the PMC from \$130,000 at PIF to \$148,480, yet in Table B and the project budget it is \$136,363. Please clarify or revise as needed.

5/31/3031: Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

Amount was updated. Please see: Page 7, item 5. The correct project Management Cost is \$ 136,363.

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

4/12/2021: We note in table D that there is no proportionality in co-financing for the PMC. However, we note that the listed co-financing is from UNDP to support implementation and not execution. While co-financing is not required for CBIT projects, it is worth noting that we would expect some in-kind co-financing from the participating government agencies as they will be dedicating staff time and resources to the project.

6/4/3031: Co-financing from the government has been added. We note that PMC co-financing is still zero--we would suggest that some of the co-financing be allocated to PMC in order to have proportionality (i.e. 10% of co-financing, or \$30,000 instead of zero).

6/9/2021: Cleared

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources will dedicate staff time, 2 technicians (50%) and 3 technicians (25%) to assist for five years in the project implementation, coordination with various government agencies, and providing follow up and monitoring. The ministry will also provide office space for the project management unit. A co-financing letter signed by MARN is included in the PRODOC. The co-financing amount is \$ 200,000.

Co-financing information was updated in table A (Focal/Non-Focal Area Elements) and B, (Project Description Summary) in (Page 1-4), Table C (Confirmed Sources of Co-Financing for The Project), (Page 5), Project justification (Page 7, item 6.), and section 5: incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline, the GEFTF, LDCF, SCCF, and co-financing: (Page 20).

It was also updated in PRODOC: please see :co-financiers, (Page 2), Confirmed Co-financing (Page 36 and 37), table 7: Summary of funds including co-financing (Page 40). Co-financing letter was included. Please see page 144.

Response 9 June:

Co-financing was updated. The percentage was adjusted in the project components. 10% i.e. USD 30,000 is allocated to PMC. 10 Please see:

CEO ER: Table B.PROJECT DESCRIPTION SUMMARY.

PRODOC: No change was necessary since co-financing is presented as per-year amounts and not per-outcome amounts.

Date of Expected Implementation Start is updated to November 30, 2021 (see please CEO ER: Part I, Project information, Page 1 and PRODOC: Planned start date, Page 1.

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

4/12/2021: As stated above, while co-financing is not required for CBIT projects, it is worth noting that we would expect some in-kind co-financing from the participating government agencies as they will be dedicating staff time and resources to the project, and possibly the chosen executing agency. Please comment.

5/31/3031: Letter for new co-financing from the government has been provided. Cleared.

Agency Response
Response 21 May 2021

As per agency response in comment # 2.

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 4/12/2021: 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 4/12/2021: 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
4/12/2021: Please provide an explanation on the target for Core Indicator 11, Direct beneficiaries, below the table where the space is provided.

5/31/3031: Cleared.

Agency Response
Response 21 May 2021

Explanation was included below Core Indicators table (page 6). Core Indicator 11: Is the number of Direct project beneficiaries as co-benefit of GEF investment. It is the number of people, disaggregated by sex, disaggregated by institution, that have received training, that produce or are users of the MRV system. These technicians will comprise the Mitigation (140 persons) and Adaptation (80 persons) sectors.

In PRODOC it is described in page 27, Table 2, Results Framework, Indicator 1.

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
4/12/2021: Yes, the root causes and barriers are well elaborated.

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

4/12/2021: Yes, the baseline scenario is well described.

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

4/12/2021: Please see comments below:

- We note there are references made to future BURs and NC instead of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement and the BTRs. Please review.
- We note the prioritization of Agriculture and IPPU sectors after consultation with MARN. Since Guatemala is already working on the AFOLU sector through various initiatives (FAO-MARN specifically relates to output 1.1.2 listed below, and GCF etc.) please clarify how this project will build on work already being done through existing initiatives/what gaps have yet to be filled.
- Output 1.2.3: since this includes the private sector, we recommend making the following clarification in this output title: Capacities in the public, **private** and academic sectors for monitoring and evaluation of mitigation actions are strengthened in two prioritized sector.
- Output 1.3.2 and 1.3.3: Clarify if and how the adaptation STC will play a role in these outputs.
- Output 1.5.2: we note that this output is focused developing a national strategy to be adopted by the STCs. Please comment on how this strategy (or this output 1.5 in general) will enable strategic decision making, especially on NDCs and longer-term projections.

5/31/3031: Comments above have been cleared.

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

Comment: We note there are references made to future BURs and NC instead of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement and the BTRs. Please review.

BURs and NC have been replaced by 'transparency framework under the Paris Agreement and the biennial transparency reports (BTRs)' as these documents will be a requirement from 2024 onwards. (Page 15, output 1.1.6)

It was also replaced in PRODOC, (Page 14, output 1.1.6)

Comment: We note the prioritization of Agriculture and IPPU sectors after consultation with MARN. Since Guatemala is already working on the AFOLU sector through various initiatives (FAO-MARN specifically relates to output 1.1.2 listed below, and GCF etc.) please clarify how this project will build on work already being done through existing initiatives/what gaps have yet to be filled.

Text was added to paragraph before description of outcome 1 (see highlighted text)? Starting in 2021, the country will have the support of FAO through a regional CBIT project, but this is specifically and only for the FOLU sector, which is why for the present project MARN prioritizes also Agriculture (Page 14).

Same text was added to PRODOC: (Sector prioritization, Page 13)

In addition, the MRV System will include a repository within the IT platform which allows information management. It will include a repository for available information (GHG data such as emission Factors, Activity Data and methodologies) for all sectors, including FOLU. Some other activities such as Methodology for information gathering for preparing of GHG inventories, includes all sectors, also FOLU. In addition, other methodologies will be updated, when appropriate, particularly in those sectors where other projects/initiatives have achieved results related to these topics. explained in output 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.6, Page 15.

Same text was added to PRODOC: (explained in output 1.1.4, 1.1.5, 1.1.6, Page 14,).

Comment: Output 1.2.3: since this includes the private sector, we recommend making the following clarification in this output title: Capacities in the public, private and academic sectors for monitoring and evaluation of mitigation actions are strengthened in two prioritized sector.

The private sector was included. output 1.2.3, Page 16,

Same text was added to PRODOC: in output 1.2.3, Page 15.

Comment: Output 1.3.2 and 1.3.3: Clarify if and how the adaptation STC will play a role in these outputs.

Please check clarification in Output 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 (Page 17). Yes, STC will participate during the establishment/update of reference values for the baseline. These commissions play an important role in generating, providing, and endorsing sectoral metrics, indicators, and methodologies. A strengthening program that includes STC will be implemented through a Diploma-course that will include a combination of classroom based, virtual and practical training sessions.

Same text was added to PRODOC: in Output 1.3.2 and 1.3.3 Page 16.

Comment: Output 1.5.2: we note that this output is focused developing a national strategy to be adopted by the STCs. Please comment on how this strategy (or this output 1.5 in general) will enable strategic decision making, especially on NDCs and longer-term projections.

Text was added to outcome 1.5. (Page 18) explaining that Climate change Sectoral Technical Commissions play a key role in Information management, institutional arrangements and decision making. Full and effective participation of government, (MARN, MAGA, MEM, INAB, CONAP and MSPAS), private and academic institutions will raise awareness at the technical and political level about the importance of monitoring, reporting and verification of the country's progress in actions to comply with the NDC. A legal mechanism based on the mandates of governmental institutions and the national legal framework for the NDC will define responsibilities of the Sectoral Technical Commissions in implementing the MRV. The strategy will describe the MRV System, its governance structure, according to national circumstances, and how National Climate Change Information System SNICC will inform decision-making in the design and implementation of public policies, programs and projects in support of the implementation of the NDC.

Same text was added to PRODOC: in outcome 1.5, Page 17.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/12/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/12/2021: 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

4/12/2021: Yes, but see comment above on missing explanation for direct beneficiaries.

5/31/3031: Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

As per agency response in comment # 7: Core indicators

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

4/12/2021: 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

4/12/2021: 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

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

4/12/2021: Yes the stakeholder engagement plan is quite complete.

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

4/12/2021: Yes, the gender analysis and action plan is well elaborated.

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

4/12/2021: 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

4/12/2021: Please include risks due to climate change, and those due to staff turnover. Please add risks and opportunities related to COVID pandemic.

5/31/3031: Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

Included. Please see CEO Endorsement Request, page (27 and 28)

In PRODOC, please see page 22. Risks were also included in annex 6, UNDP Risk Registry (Page 75 and 76, items 2,3, and 4).

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

4/12/2021: We note that the language used in this section is not in line with GEF definitions. Please review to identify CATIE as the executing agency, while UNDP is the implementing agency.

5/31/3031: Cleared.

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

Executing agency is used instead of implementing partner along the CEO endorsement.

It is important to note that executing agencies are named as implementing partners in UNDP ProDoc terminology.

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

4/12/2021: 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

4/12/2021: No. Please provide additional details on the KM approach, including associated deliverables and budget (we believe this information is detailed in the ProDoc). Also consider adding how the project is incorporating lessons learned from other initiatives and processes, for example the work to prepare indicators for some of the prioritized adaptation sectors.

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

Please see page 33 and 34 in CEO Endorsement Request.

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

4/12/2021: The project has been screened and found exempt from this assessment as it is only focused on capacity-building.

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

Justification for the SESP exemption- has been added in PRODOC Annex 5, page 73.

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

4/12/2021: Yes.

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

4/12/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/12/2021: Budget: While we understand the M&E has been assigned to Component 2, in the budget table there is a separate column for M&E activities. Please fill out in that one, and leave Component 2 empty. Also, when project is resubmitted please try to have budget fit into page (so it can be fully read when printed/viewed as PDF).

Agency Response

Response 21 May 2021

M&E budget has been assigned to column for M&E activities.

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/12/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

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 4/12/2021: Yes

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/12/2021: 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
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

4/12/2021: Please address comments above.

6/4/2021: Please address comment on co-financing for PMC. Please also adjust **Expected Implementation Start date** under Part 1 so that monitoring reports are accurate.

6/9/2021: Cleared. PM recommends CEO approval.

Review Dates

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

First Review

4/12/2021

**Secretariat Comment at
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to
Secretariat
comments**

Additional Review (as necessary)	5/31/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/4/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	6/9/2021
Additional Review (as necessary)	

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations