

# Strengthening Trinidad and Tobago's capacity in transparency for climate change mitigation and adaptation

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10596

**Countries**

Trinidad and Tobago

**Project Name**

Strengthening Trinidad and Tobago's capacity in transparency for climate change mitigation and adaptation

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

5/4/2021

**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**

6/11/2021: Yes, changes from PIF have been properly explained. Please change the Rio Marker for Mitigation to 2.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

##### **Agency Response**

2021/06/14

The Rio Marker was changed in the portal and the document as suggested.

##### **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 6/11/2021: Yes, Table B is clear.

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

•6/11/2021: Yes, co-financing of \$385,672 has been confirmed from the Ministry of Planning and Development and the Environmental Management Authority. Co-financing has been proportionally assigned to PMC.

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 6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: PPG table is included in Annex C. It appears that no amount has been spent to date, although \$25,000 has been committed. Please confirm.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

## Agency Response

6/14/2021

The information has been updated as of June 14th. The amount reported as spent to date is \$2,999,70. \$25,000 remains as committed to date. The latter amount is for a consultancy contract for work to undertake the PPG process and deliver the CEO document. Payment will be made once the CEO is approved; thus it remains committed at this point in time.

### 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 6/11/2021: Yes

## 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

6/11/2021: Yes it is 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

6/11/2021: The baseline scenario is very well elaborated. Please clarify plans for updating the NDC, including whether adaptation will be included in the future. In addition, add information if relevant on Trinidad and Tobago's experiences developing NAPs and NAPAs.

Please also provide additional clarifications on:

- What are the current systems or arrangements in place that have been used for BUR and NCs.
- Which sectors and institutions/ministries are currently part of the MRV system?

- If an IT system exists for inventory/MRV systems, and the QA/QC processes that may have been undertaken through previous reporting processes?

7/1/2021: Cleared.

## Agency Response

2021/06/14

? Trinidad and Tobago intends to share a first draft of an NDC update before COP 26. The NDC update will focus on revalidation of the NDC baselines as greater accuracy of existing data will help identify opportunities for mitigation ambition. Trinidad and Tobago is aware of the importance for the country to track and report on adaptation and aims to include adaptation in its NDCs in the future. However, the country does not plan to include adaptation in the next NDC update (2021), as it is also aware of the importance of having capacities and tools to effectively track NDC progress against the set targets. As the country will initiate this capacity building through this CBIT project (2021-2024) the inclusion of adaptation targets in the NDCs will be considered starting from future NDC updates. Text was added to page 16 to clarify.

? While Trinidad and Tobago has not developed a NAPA, the country is currently developing a small first National Adaptation Plan (NAP). The NAP is a part of the activities of the GEF project: "Capacity Development for Improved Management of Multilateral Environmental Agreements for Global Environmental Benefits", Ministry of Planning and Development, GEF, USD 1,200,000, with UNDP as Implementing Agency. The NAP itself has a budget of approximately USD 20,000. Through the NAP, the country will identify its medium- and long-term adaptation needs to integrate into national decision-making and develop and implement strategies and programmes to address those needs. Differently from other countries' NAPs, Trinidad and Tobago's NAP is limited to a preliminary attempt (approx. 150 pages) to compile all existing climate vulnerability information available in one place and develop a strategic framework to identify high-level actions and objectives, and to guide future work on adaptation. T&T's NAP is part of efforts of that GEF project to help the country visualize how to comply with the Paris agreement and the UNFCCC in the future. The NAP project does not include any additional activities, such as capacity building or climate information generation. The NAP also identifies seven objectives for future work to be undertaken on adaptation, which the CBIT will move forward on. The country plans to finalise a first draft by July 2021. Text was added to pages 15, 16, 30, 31, 33 and to the outputs descriptions (36, 40-44) to clarify.

? Text was added to pages 16 and 17, in the section "Current reporting to the UNFCCC" to clarify on the current institutional arrangements in place that have been used for the BUR and NCs. Pages 19 to 22 describe the current systems in place that have been used to support the development of information for the BUR and NCs.

? Sectors and institutions/ministries which are currently part of the MRV system are now indicated on pages 22. On page 23 are indicated the ministries/sectors which participated in the MRV system pilot project. Additional related information was also provided on page 20.

? The MRV system developed with the support of the LECB project, which the CBIT will build on, includes a Knowledge Management System (KMS) (IT system) for emissions data collection and management and for producing reports. Text has been added to pages 20, 21 and 22 to explain this, and also to page 37. QA/QC processes for data processed through the KMS was used for the first time in the recently completed (January 2021) MRV system pilot project for the inventory under the TNC/BUR project. That project included the development of guidelines for QA/QC as well as training. The CBIT project will take this work on the KMS, including the QA/QC process EMA has used for the pilot project, as a point of departure and build on it to increase it in scope and quality (D1.6, D1.7).

**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

6/11/2021: Please clarify the following:

- Regarding Output 2: please clarify if any work will also address the need to report support received, in addition to support needed. We note that some CBIT projects have focused on implementing budget tagging guidelines among other approaches to better track finance going towards mitigation and adaptation actions.

- Regarding Output 3: please clarify the scope of this output. The description and deliverables 1-4 seem to focus on the adaptation sectors, specifically on standardizing, implementing and using guidelines for climate assessments, projections and scenarios. However, usually assessments, projections etc. can be fairly complex modeling exercises that require specific technical expertise, extensive data collection, and are conducted on an ad-hoc, as need basis rather than on a continuous basis. It is unclear what would be involved in these deliverables, and also the focus specifically only on the adaptation sectors (especially when related to projections).

It would be useful to understand the expected impact of this output with regards to which specific/concrete plans or future policies will integrate the information developed, including future NDCs and associated plans (D3.3)

Please clarify if any deliverable for mitigation sectors address activities beyond training- for example developments of guidelines and ensuring the sustainability of capacity developed.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

## Agency Response

6/14/2021

? Output 2. Thank you for your comment. The project activities related to track financial flows are focused on tracking support received. Deliverable 1.6 wording was revised to highlight the inclusion of activities on support received tracking. Text was added to page 36 to make clearer.

? Output 3. The scope of this output has now been adjusted to focus also on mitigation. The text was revised to better explain the baseline and the barriers addressed by the output and the focus of the output has been slightly shifted to better address the barriers identified. With the recent changes made, Output 3 will now enable T&T stakeholders to use climate information, projections and scenarios for both mitigation and adaptation planning processes and decision-making. Please refer to pages 11, 17 and the output 3 description for further details. Activities will:

1) Generate climate information for adaptation (D 3.1, D 3.2): The country lacks adequate information to inform the Adaptation Communications and to inform national adaptation planning.

2) Generate guidelines and standardized process (D 3.3) to use climate information for adaptation and mitigation planning. This activity was revised to include mitigation. While T&T has the capacity to generate climate information for mitigation and has done it under the TNC/BUR and for the CRS development (page 11, 18), it lacks capacities and guidelines to use such information for national mitigation planning. The guidelines for adaptation will instruct on how to use the information generate by the CBIT, TNC and TAEP in national adaptation planning.

3) Subsequently, trainings (D 3.4, D 3.5) will be provided to UWI staff and to national relevant stakeholders to use the guidelines to integrate climate change mitigation and adaptation information in national planning.

? Beside generating climate adaptation information to inform future reporting such as Adaptation Communications and BTR, Output 3 will allow national decision makers to integrate climate change mitigation and adaptation information in national planning. This refers to long-term national planning processes such as the national development plans, the NDCs and any related implementation plan, the Climate Change Policy (which has the provision to be revised every 5 years), and any national or sectoral resilience development plan. In the third year of the project, guidelines on standardizing, implementing and using climate assessments, projections and scenarios on (i) the agriculture, water resources and health sectors into adaptation national planning; and on (ii) GHG emissions for relevant emitting sectors into mitigation national planning will be submitted to relevant Ministries for endorsement. Progresses against this achievement are measured by Indicator 1.2 which has associated targets (9 Ministries will endorse them: Ministry of Agriculture, Land and Fisheries, Ministry of Health,

Ministry of Public Utilities, Ministry of Energy and Energy Industries, Ministry of Planning and Development, Ministry of Trade and Industry, Ministry of Works and Transport, and Ministry of Rural Development and Local Government, Ministry of Tourism ) and risks to be monitored and managed during project implementation. Text was added at page 42-43 to clarify.

? As mentioned above, the scope of Output 3 scope was revised to include additional activities on mitigation: guidelines to developed will also now focus on mitigation (D 3.3). On ensuring the sustainability of capacity developed related to mitigation, a capacity building system (D1.8) will be designed under Output 1 in partnership with the University of West Indies (UWI), to create a long-term sustainable mechanism to build T&T stakeholders? capacities. Text was added to page 38 to further clarify.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/11/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/11/2021: Yes, this is well elaborated.

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

6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: Yes this is very 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

6/11/2021: Yes, if available, additional information on the specific private sector stakeholders expected to participate or from which specific sectors would be useful.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

2021/06/14

Thank you for your comment. Text was added to pages 53 and 66-67 to provide additional information on specific private sector stakeholders and on which sectors they pertain to.

**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

6/11/2021: This is well elaborated.

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

6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: Please elaborate on the existing Knowledge Management System, hosted and maintained by EMA that this project will expand.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

2021/06/14

The KMS and its current functionalities are now described on pages 19-20, with section 8 noting that information on this can be found on these pages.

**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

6/11/2021: Yes. It has been assessed as low.

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

6/11/2021: Please add the Table from the ProDoc on M&E budget to the Portal submission.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

2021/06/14

The Table from the ProDoc on M&E budget was added to the Portal submission as requested.

**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

6/11/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

6/11/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 6/11/2021: It is not clear why the mid-term targets for some of the indicators is 0. Please clarify.

You may want to consider strengthening or adding some indicators in the project results framework, for example, for output 3 - # of guidelines developed for each sector to enable continuous decision making; and for output 2 ? adoption of institutional arrangements proposed to the Cabinet.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

2021/06/14

? Thank you for your comment. The mid-term targets were revised to ensure a more efficient monitoring of project activities. As indicators 1.3 and 1.9 measures results of the training workshops planned in the third year of the project, the mid-term target is zero for such indicators.

? Output 3: The proposed indicator was added and the related target and associated risk defined.

? Output 2: Under output 2, the institutional arrangements are developed with the aim for them to be approved by the Cabinet and later adopted by the Ministry of Planning and Development. Although the country aims to quickly adopt the arrangements proposed by the CBIT project, the process of adoption may occur after the project completion: it is beyond the control of the CBIT project and subject to political prioritization. In this context, we added indicator 1.7 to capture this process. To ensure that the adoption step proceeds as smoothly as possible, budget was allocated for the project experts and staff to provide technical assistance to support the adoption process (D 2.3, D 2.6).

#### **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

6/11/2021: Yes. See comment above regarding amounts spent to date which appears to be \$0.

7/1/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

6/14/2021

The information has been updated as of June 14th. The amount reported as spent to date is \$2,999,70. \$25,000 remains as committed to date. The latter amount is for a consultancy contract for work to undertake the PPG process and deliver the CEO document. Payment will be made once the CEO is approved; thus it remains committed at this point in time.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 6/11/2021: 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

6/11/2021: Overall the endorsement request is very well elaborated. We just have a few minor technical comments.

7/1/2021: PM recommends technical clearance.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>First Review</b>	<b>6/11/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>7/1/2021</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**