

# Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Zimbabwe to conform to the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10429

**Countries**

Zimbabwe

**Project Name**

Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Zimbabwe to conform to the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement

**Agencies**

UNEP

**Date received by PM**

5/17/2021

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**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

**May 27, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

##### **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

**May 27, 2021:**

As in the PIF, please break down the budget into the different outcomes and be more specific on the different expected outcomes which will enable the project to meet its objective.

**June 15, 2021:**

In the Portal entry of the CEO endorsement, the budget of each output was not indicated. It is now, thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

We would like to clarify that the CBIT Zimbabwe CEO Endorsement Document follows the exact same structure as the GEF-approved PIF. In this instance, the project is structure around one (1) single Component, one (1) single expected Outcome and four (4) Outputs. As such, you will find that the budget is also broken down across those 4 outputs (refer to the PDF version of the CEO Endorsement Document).

**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

**May 27, 2021:**

Yes, co-financing of \$355,600 in-kind from the Ministry of Finance and Economic Development has been confirmed. Please write the full name "Ministry of Finance and Economic Development" in table C.

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

The full name of the "Ministry of Finance and Economic Development" has been included in table C as the name of the co-financier.

*General note to the GEF reviewer: all edits made to the CEO Endorsement Request following this review have been highlighted in yellow in the PDF version of the document uploaded in the ?Documents? tab of 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

**May 27, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**May 27, 2021:**

Yes. Out of a total budget of \$50,000, \$20,151 are spent and \$9,000 committed. Please clarify what is expected to be done with the outstanding balance.

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

We would like to clarify that the planned PPG budget was affected by COVID-19 pandemic. Indeed, since traveling and in-person meetings were not allowed due to in-country restrictions, part of the budget allocated for these meetings and all of the budget allocated for traveling was not used (consultations were essentially done remotely).

In accordance with the GEF policy on this matter, if at CEO approval there is a balance of unspent PPG fund, Agencies can continue to undertake preparation activities with these PPG funds up to one year of CEO approval date.

As such, during the project's inception phase, the Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry (the Executing Agency) will consult with UNEP (the

Implementing Agency) to decide for which type of complementary preparation activity(ies) the leftover PPG funds could be used, to further inform and support the CBIT project. If these leftover funds are not used for preparatory activities within one year of CEO approval, they will be returned to the GEF, as per the standard practice.

#### **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

**May 27, 2021:**

Number of direct beneficiaries is unchanged from PIF. Adequate explanation for estimate has been provided. Cleared.

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

**May 28, 2021:**

The description provides a good overview of the climate change problems and the country's engagements in the UNFCCC agenda. Nevertheless, the presentation is very limited regarding the problems, drivers and barriers specifically related to the improvement of the transparency framework as established in the Paris Agreement. Please elaborate further on this aspect which allows to highlight the needs the project will address (Please note that relevant information can be found in the next section under the baseline scenario and moved under this first section on the problems that need to be addressed: from: "Summary of gaps and improvements needed").

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

The relevant information requested concerning the problems, gaps and barriers specifically related to the improvement of the transparency framework has now been provided in section 1. *Global environmental and/or adaptation problems, root causes and barriers that need to be addressed* (p 7-9).

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**May 28, 2021:**

1. Please provide the theory of change of the project.
2. Please check the typos such as "FIGURE 2: Organogram...), To that end this this output...

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the complement and amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

1. The project's Theory of Change has been included at the end of section 3. *Alternative scenario* (p. 44-45).

2. A complete spell check and correction has been undertaken.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**May 27, 2021:**

There is no specific location as the project interventions are at country level. Cleared.

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

**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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

**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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  
**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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  
**May 28, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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  
**May 28, 2021:**

1. Please use the same name for the entity acting as executing agency. Sometimes it is the MECTHI (in the beginning of the Portal Entry and in the budget), sometimes it is the CCMD.
2. UNEP will execute one activity in the budget: the terminal evaluation. Considering the GEF Agency should not execute any part of the project, please remove this expense or justify it. Such exception to GEF policy can be considered only if there is no other

solution, either with a government agency or a third party to execute that role. As a mode of practice, we require that the GEF Agency demonstrate that these avenues have been exhausted as to possible execution arrangements and then and only then do we consider the GEF Agency as a possible executor on an exceptional basis.

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment and justification on the terminal evaluation. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

1. The document was revised to ensure consistency, since the Ministry of Environment, Climate, Tourism and Hospitality Industry (MECTHI) is the Executing Agency for the project. Clarification was provided that CCMD is a department within MECTHI.

2. It is a standard practice for GEF Implementing Agencies to carry out the Mid-Term Evaluation and Terminal Evaluation of the projects they are overseeing. Please refer to Article 61 of the GEF Evaluation Policy dated June 2019 (page 25):

#### Evaluation Units

**61. Agencies ensure the conduct of required terminal evaluations of GEF-supported projects and programs in their portfolio.** Depending on the Agency's institutional structure as well as internal rules and procedures, two scenarios exist: (1) the evaluation unit conducts project terminal evaluations, and (2) the evaluation unit validates the evaluations managed by operational units. Agencies are responsible for the terminal evaluation of the child projects they directly implement in a program. In addition, the Lead Agency will be responsible for submitting the terminal evaluation for the program. Consistent with the GEF Project and Program Cycle Policy, any project and program evaluations must be shared with the IEO.

In this instance, UNEP's independent Evaluation Office carries out the evaluations for the GEF projects implemented by UNEP, and uses a portion of the GEF funding for this purpose.

#### 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

**June 2, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

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  
**June 2, 2021:**

Thank you for the description. Please add the timeline of the deliverables in the table provided.

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the complement. Cleared.

Agency Response  
**June 10, 2021:**

The timeline of knowledge-related deliverables has now been included in *TABLE 13: Knowledge Management Plan*(p. 83).

**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  
**June 2, 2021:**

Yes, the UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note is uploaded and the overall risk is assessed as low. Cleared.

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

**June 2, 2021:**

Please copy the Annex J in the Portal Entry under the Monitoring and Evaluation section.

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the amendment. Cleared.

Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

The M&E table from Annex J has been pasted in section 9. *Monitoring and Evaluation* of the GEF Portal field.

**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

**June 2, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Annexes**

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**June 2, 2021:**

Yes, cleared.

Agency Response

**Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**June 2, 2021:**

The project includes key results such as the Draft Climate Change Bill and implementation strategy document, institutional arrangements, Climate Transparency Portal... Nevertheless this is not reflected in the result framework. Please complete the Project Results Framework with the concrete main expected results.

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

Agency Response

**June 10, 2021:**

Based on previous guidance received from the GEF, it is our understanding that the Project Results Framework (Annex A) is meant to monitor / measure the project achievements and/or behavior change induced by the project's intervention at the Objective and Outcome levels ? not at the Output level. On the other hand, elements such as the Draft Climate Change Bill and Implementation Strategy document (deliverable 1.1.5), the Institutional Arrangements (deliverable 1.1.3), the Climate Transparency Portal (deliverable 1.3.2), are simply ?deliverables? contributing to the different project Outputs ? and as such, their delivery will already be tracked / monitored through the project Workplan (Annex L).

**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

**May 27, 2021:**

Yes cleared.

Agency Response

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**May 27, 2021:**

There is no specific location as the project interventions are at country level. Cleared.

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  
**June 2, 2021:**

Not yet. Please address the comments raised above.

**June 15, 2021:**

Thank you for addressing the comments. The project is now recommended for CEO approval.

**Review Dates**

	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	6/2/2021	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	6/16/2021	

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**Additional Review  
(as necessary)**

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**