

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

**Review PIF 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

**Agenices**

UNDP

**Date received by PM**

7/11/2019

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Milena Vasquez

**Focal Area**

Climate Change

**Project Type**

MSP

## **PIF**

### **Part I – Project Information**

#### **Focal area elements**

**1. Is the project/program aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements in Table A, as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?**

#### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT programming directions.

### **Agency Response**

Indicative project/program description summary

2. Are the components in Table B and as described in the PIF sound, appropriate, and sufficiently clear to achieve the project/program objectives and the core indicators?

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

### **Agency Response**

Co-financing

3. Are the indicative expected amounts, sources and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines, with a description on how the breakdown of co-financing was identified and meets the definition of investment mobilized?

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, in-kind co-financing of \$100,000 from the government is listed as recurrent expenditures.

### **Agency Response**

GEF Resource Availability

4. Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Please select CBIT under Table D's Programming of Funds to ensure that the project is funded by the CBIT set-aside.

12/27/2019: Comment cleared.

**Agency Response** UNDP, 21/11/19: CBIT- has been selected under Programming of Funds, p.4

**The STAR allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

This project aims to be funded by the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

This project aims to be funded by the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

**The LDCF under the principle of equitable access**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

**The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes. This project aims to be funded by the CBIT set-aside. At the time of this review there are sufficient resources to support it.

**Agency Response**

Impact Program Incentive?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

N/A

**Agency Response**

Project Preparation Grant

**5. Is PPG requested in Table E within the allowable cap? Has an exception (e.g. for regional projects) been sufficiently substantiated? (not applicable to PFD)**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

A PPG of \$50,000 is requested and is within norm. However Please make sure CBIT is selected under Programming of Funds.

12/27/2019: Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response**

UNDP, 21/11/19: CBIT- has been selected under Programing of Funds, p.4

#### **Core indicators**

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the correspondent Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, core indicator 11 is identified. In addition, please note that by CEO Endorsement we will expect the CBIT indicators to be provided as well.

12/27/2019: Comment cleared.

### **Agency Response** UNDP, 21/11/19: Noted.

#### **Project/Program taxonomy**

7. Is the project/ program properly tagged with the appropriate keywords as requested in Table G?

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

### **Agency Response**

#### **Part II – Project Justification**

1. Has the project/program described the global environmental / adaptation problems, including the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed?

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

### Agency Response

2. Is the baseline scenario or any associated baseline projects appropriately described?

#### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

The proposal outlines a very strong baseline scenario for transparency under the Paris Agreement, including a strong institutionalization, the design of climate change information system, the consolidation and development of GHG inventories up to 2010, GHG baselines and projections, and accompanying protocols, indicators for adaptation in several sectors, climate budget tagging, etc.

However, we did not find that the outline of needs and gaps, taking into account this baseline, was very clear. Please expand, particularly as it relates to point 4) in that section and the enhanced transparency framework, which is the only one relevant to the CBIT project. This will help better frame the alternative scenario, which at the moment seems to overlap with these baseline efforts, masking the incremental reasoning of the activities proposed.

12/27/2019: Comment cleared.

### Agency Response

UNDP, 21/11/19:

Secretariat Comment	Response
However, we did not find that the outline of needs and gaps, taking into account this baseline, was very clear. Please expand, particularly as it relates to point 4) in that section and the enhanced transparency framework, which is the only one relevant to the CBIT project. This will help better frame the alternative scenario, which at the moment seems to overlap with these baseline efforts, masking the incremental reasoning of the activities proposed.	See highlighted yellow new text in section <b>d) National Initiatives on Transparency and ongoing or recently completed actions to accomplish NDC</b> (p. 9) and section <b>e) Needs and Gaps</b> (p.10, and 11).

3. Does the proposed alternative scenario describe the expected outcomes and components of the project/program?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Outcome 1.1:

Please clarify how this builds upon the work under TNC and BUR 1 and the LEDs-USAID project (1.1.1-1.1.4).

Please clarify how the academic sector will be involved. Is the idea to develop GHG inventory training programs?

Please also clarify if the SNICC will be building on something existing or if it would be completely new. Please also clarify what "implementing SNICC in 4 mitigation sectors means." Is it referring to 4 sectors of the inventory that will be included or mitigation actions tracking in 4 sectors? If the latter, please clarify how that would help Guatemala report on its NDC which is economy wide.

Outcome 1.2 - Please clarify how these efforts, which are sectorally focused, will be scaled up to support tracking and reporting on its NDC which is economy wide.

Outcome 1.3 - Please clarify the sector of focus. In the Output it describes 4 sectors (forest and ecosystem, health, infrastructure, and water resources) while under Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up, it mentions 2 adaptation sectors will be included in the SNICC.

Outcome 1.4 - Please clarify how Output 1.4.1 is different from what is done at BUR and the baseline budget tagging system.

12/27/2019: Comments cleared.

**Agency Response**

UNDP, 21/11/19:

Secretariat Comment	Response
---------------------	----------



Outcome 1.1:

Please clarify how this builds upon the work under TNC and BUR 1 and the LEDs-USAID project (1.1.1-1.1.4).

Please clarify how the academic sector will be involved. Is the idea to develop GHG inventory training programs?

Please also clarify if the SNICC will be building on something existing or if it would be completely new. Please also clarify what "implementing SNICC in 4 mitigation sectors means." Is it referring to 4 sectors of the inventory that will be included or mitigation actions tracking in 4 sectors? If the latter, please clarify how that would help Guatemala report on its NDC which is economy wide.

Output 1.1.1 the existing five sectoral mitigation commissions used by LEDs USAID and TNC – 1BUR project will be used by the CBIT-GEF project to formalize strategic alliances between academic sector and MARN to institutionalize capacity building programs on GHG inventories. (see new text in Output 1.1.1 (p. 11-12))

Output 1.1.2. Based on the GHG inventories protocols developed by LED USAID and adopted the TNC-1BUR project, the CBIT-GEF project design Inventory data collection and exchange methodology and update the inter-institutional arrangements to facilitate information exchange. See new text in 1.1.2 (p.12),

Output 1.1.3. as country has not started any effort in this regard, this project will develop the proposed activities. See Output 1.1.3 (p.12)

Output 1.1.4. experiences and lessons learned derived from methodology improvements of livestock data, organic and synthetic nitrogen fertilizer and transport subsector will be considered to develop the proposed activities in this output. See new text in 1.1.4 (p.12).

As the academic sector is one NCCC members, this project will use NCCC governance platform to promote strategic alliances between government and academia to design and implement GHG inventory capacity building program. It is expected to establish a cooperation agreement between the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MARN) and the academic sector to strength GHG inventory training initiatives. See new text in Output 1.1.1 (p. 11-12)

SNICC has been recently launched with the support of the World Bank and IDB REDD+ project. The implementation of the SNICC in the 4 mitigation sectors comprises the standardization and digitalization of source of data per mitigation sector and sources of GHG emissions, users access provision, and comparison and trends analytical GHG emissions report per mitigation sector. See new text in Output 1.1.5 (p. 12-13)

Additional text has been also added to clarify the abovementioned new texts. See additional texts in section (d. of the baseline scenario p.9) and section (b. Coordination with GEF-financed projects and related initiatives p. 23-24).

<p>Outcome 1.2 - Please clarify how these efforts, which are sectorally focused, will be scaled up to support tracking and reporting on its NDC which is economy wide.</p>	<p>The design and implementation of the system to monitor the NDC mitigation component will contribute to support the institutionalization of the actions plans of the mitigation sectoral technical commissions promoting their low emissions work approach. The system will also help to review and update their economic low emission mitigation options prioritized in the National Low Emissions Development Strategy which in turn will facilitate tracking and reporting process on NDC. See new text added in the corresponding outputs of the outcome 2, output 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3 (p.13)</p>
<p>Outcome 1.3 - Please clarify the sector of focus. In the Output it describes 4 sectors (forest and ecosystem, health, infrastructure, and water resources) while under Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up, it mentions 2 adaptation sectors will be included in the SNICC.</p>	<p>The adaptation sectors of focus are 2: 1) water resources, 2) forest resources, ecosystems and protected areas. See added text in the output 1.3.2 (p.14)</p>
<p>Outcome 1.4 - Please clarify how Output 1.4.1 is different from what is done at BUR and the baseline budget tagging system.</p>	<p>The TNC and 1BUR project will develop the assessment of constraints, and gaps and related needs for financial support received. On the other side, this GEF-CBIT proposal will complement such analysis by carrying out the assessment of constraints, and gaps and related needs for financial support provided. Information on needs of both assessments will be considered to adjust, when appropriate, the transparency climate finance reporting mechanisms, domestic expenditure tagging criteria and methodologies of the report of support received and provided. See added text in output 1.4.1 (p. 14)</p>

**4. Is the project/program aligned with focal area and/or Impact Program strategies?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT programming directions.

**Agency Response**

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

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

This section needs more clarity on the vision for a holistic MRV system in Guatemala and how specifically this proposal would help Guatemala get there (along the other relevant initiatives) to make the incremental reasoning clearer.

12/27/2019: Comment cleared.

## Agency Response

UNDP, 21/11/19:

Secretariat Comment	Response
This section needs more clarity on the vision for a holistic MRV system in Guatemala and how specifically this proposal would help Guatemala get there (along the other relevant initiatives) to make the incremental reasoning clearer.	See adjusted text in the 5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions to the baseline section p. 16 – 17.

**6. Are the project's/program's indicative targeted contributions to global environmental benefits (measured through core indicators) reasonable and achievable? Or for adaptation benefits?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

## Agency Response

**7. Is there potential for innovation, sustainability and scaling up in this project?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

## Agency Response

**Project/Program Map and Coordinates**

**Is there a preliminary geo-reference to the project's/program's intended location?**

### Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A this project is a national capacity-building project.

### **Agency Response**

**Stakeholders**

**Does the PIF/PFD include indicative information on Stakeholders engagement to date? If not, is the justification provided appropriate? Does the PIF/PFD include information about the proposed means of future engagement?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment**

**Is the articulation of gender context and indicative information on the importance and need to promote gender equality and the empowerment of women, adequate?**

### **Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

### **Agency Response**

**Private Sector Engagement**

**Is the case made for private sector engagement consistent with the proposed approach?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Risks**

**Does the project/program consider potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, that might prevent the project objectives from being achieved or may be resulting from project/program implementation, and propose measures that address these risks to be further developed during the project design?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Coordination**

**Is the institutional arrangement for project/program coordination including management, monitoring and evaluation outlined? Is there a description of possible coordination with relevant GEF-financed projects/programs and other bilateral/multilateral initiatives in the project/program area?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

**Consistency with National Priorities**

**Has the project/program cited alignment with any of the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?**

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, this project is consistent with Guatemala's INDC and its national climate change plans and regulations.

**Agency Response**

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “knowledge management (KM) approach” in line with GEF requirements to foster learning and sharing from relevant projects/programs, initiatives and evaluations; and contribute to the project’s/program’s overall impact and sustainability?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes.

**Agency Response**

Part III – Country Endorsements

Has the project/program been endorsed by the country’s GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF data base?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Yes, Guatemala's OFP Eng. Carlos Walberto Ramos Salguero has endorsed the project.

**Agency Response**

Termsheet, reflow table and agency capacity in NGI Projects

Does the project provide sufficient detail in Annex A (indicative termsheet) to take a decision on the following selection criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments. Does the project provide a detailed reflow table in Annex B to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments. After reading the questionnaire in Annex C, is the Partner Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion  
Agency Response**

**GEFSEC DECISION**

**RECOMMENDATION**

Is the PIF/PFD recommended for technical clearance? Is the PPG (if requested) being recommended for clearance?

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

Please address comments above.

12/27/2019: All comments cleared. PM recommends PIF technical clearance.

**ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

**Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**Review Dates**

**PIF Review**

**Agency Response**

<b>First Review</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>		

**PIF Recommendation to CEO**

**Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval**

undefined