

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

Review PIF 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**

1/1/2020

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Pascal Martinez

**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**

**February 6, 2020**

The improvement of transparency over time is one of the 3 objectives of the CBIT. Nevertheless it doesn't seem to be clearly considered in the proposal. Please clarify and complete accordingly to fully align with the CBIT Programming Directions.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

Further clarification on the project's strategy to promote the improvement of transparency over time has been added under 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies (p.18-19).

*Note: To facilitate the review process, all changes have been highlight in yellow in the text of the PDF version of the proposal, which has been uploaded to the portal along with this re-submission.*

## **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**

**February 6, 2020**

It isn't clear how this project will contribute to a longer term plan/vision for transparency in the country allowing the improvement of transparency over time. The output 4 indeed mentions alignment with activities to assist transparency over time but this output is about how to integrate climate data and projections into decision-making processes, not transparency. Please explain and eventually complete as needed.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

Further clarification on how Output 4 will contribute to the improvement of transparency over time has been added under 3) The proposed alternative scenario (p,17) as well as 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies (p.18-19).

### **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**

February 6, 2020

This project does not required co-financing. Co-financing of \$355,600 in-kind from the government is well noted. Cleared.

## **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**

February 6, 2020

The resources requested for this project appear high when compared with other CBIT projects. Please consider reducing the GEF grant amount or explain and justify clearly why the project cost is relatively high.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for considering the synergies with other initiatives which allows a resources optimization and budget reduction. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

The proposed budget has been reduced to US\$ 1,210,000 of GEF project financing, thus requesting a total of US\$ 1,324,950 from the CBIT set-aside, including the Agency Fee and the PPG amount. The Letter of Endorsement has been updated accordingly by the GEF OFP.

Such change has considered the synergies and building blocks being delivered under other initiatives, notably on Zimbabwe's Low Emission Development Strategy (LEDS). Particularly, tools, methodologies, trainings and peer-exchange to comply with the MPGs for the ETF – including the development of country-specific emission factors, an online climate transparency portal, MRV for NAMAs – as well as the development of a National Climate Change Communication Strategy are considered to be strategic for improving the national transparency framework.

**The STAR allocation?**

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

N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

### **Agency Response**

**The focal area allocation?**

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

N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

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

N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

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

N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT set-aside.

**Agency Response**

Focal area set-aside?

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

**February 6, 2020**

The project is requesting a total of \$1,686,300 from the CBIT set-aside, which is relatively high when compared with other CBIT projects. An adjustment or clear justification is needed.

**June 25, 2020**

The revised budget is now \$ 1,379,700 from the CBIT set-aside, including the Agency Fee and the PPG, which is more in line with other similar projects. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

The proposed budget has been reduced to a total of US\$ 1,324,950 from the CBIT set-aside, including the Agency Fee and the PPG amount, considering synergies and building blocks being delivered under other initiatives, notably on Zimbabwe's LEDS. Particularly, tools, methodologies, trainings and peer-exchange to comply with the MPGs for the ETF – including the development of country-specific emission factors, an online climate transparency portal, MRV for NAMAs – as well as the development of a National Climate Change Communication Strategy are considered to be strategic for improving the national transparency framework.

The Letter of Endorsement has been updated accordingly by the GEF OFP.

**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**

**February 6, 2020**

Yes, the PPG is within the allowable cap. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

**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**

**February 6, 2020**

The project is expected to benefit to 80 direct beneficiaries. Please clarify who the beneficiaries are and how this estimate was determined.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

Further clarifications have been provided on beneficiaries beneath the table in section “F. Project’s Target Contributions to GEF 7 Core Indicators” (p. 3).

**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**

**February 6, 2020**

Yes, the project is properly tagged.



## **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**

February 7, 2020

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

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

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

February 7, 2020

Yes, cleared.

## **Agency Response**

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

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

February 7, 2020

Yes. Nevertheless, some further clarification on how the project will assist the transparency over time is needed in the description of the alternative scenario.

June 25, 2020

Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

Further clarification on how the project will assist in the improvement of transparency over time has been added under 3) The proposed alternative scenario (p. 14-18) as well as 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies (p.18-19).

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

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

February 7, 2020

Yes, with the only reserve about the transparency over time already mentioned above.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification and additional inputs. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

Further clarification on how the project will assist in the improvement of transparency over time has been added under 3) The proposed alternative scenario (p. 14-18) as well as 4) Alignment with GEF focal area and/or Impact Program strategies (p.18-19).

**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**

February 7, 2020

The description is generic about what the project is expected to achieve but it doesn't clearly explain what will be its contributions from the existing baseline which contains some similar objectives (MRV, capacity building, GHG accounting...). Please clarify how the project activities are complementary and build on the baseline, and particularly on the four related ongoing projects described in the baseline scenario, to avoid duplication of efforts and ensure the best use of CBIT resources to maximize the benefits of the proposal.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification and detailed complements. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

Further information on how the project will contribute to the existing baseline has been added under 5) Incremental/additional cost reasoning and expected contributions from the baseline (p.19-21).

**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**

**February 7, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

### **Agency Response**

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

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

**February 7, 2020**

1. The National Communications point out the "insufficient financial resources to cover all the key sectors the country should be reporting on". How this challenge will be addressed to enhance the potential for sustainability in this project? Please clarify.

2. As regard to the potential for scaling-up, the description says that "this project will provide important information for future ones". It is not clear what this means in terms of scaling-up. Please explain.

**June 25, 2020**

1 and 2. Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

1. Further clarification has been provided under 7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up (p. 22).

2. Further clarification has been provided under 7) Innovation, sustainability and potential for scaling up (p. 22-23).

### **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**

**February 7, 2020**

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

### **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**

**February 7, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

**June 26, 2020**

During the project identification phase, CSOs and private sector have been consulted but there is no further information about these consultations. Please provide a description of any consultations conducted during project development (including institutions, CSOs and private sector). (Please apology for not having identify this lack of information during the previous review)

**July 10, 2020**

Thank you for the additional information. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

UNEP: July 7, 2020

Further information on the consultations has been provided under section “2. Stakeholders” (p. 23-25). Refer to text highlighted in yellow in the PDF version of the updated PIF.

**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**

**February 7, 2020**

Yes, cleared. Please also note that by CEO endorsement, we will expect a gender analysis or equivalent socio-economic assessment that identifies and describes any gender differences, gender differentiated impacts and risks, and opportunities to address gender gaps and promote the empowerment of women that may be relevant to the proposed activity, and any corresponding gender-responsive measures.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

### **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

This will be covered by the PPG, as per text added in 3. Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment (p. 26)

### **Private Sector Engagement**

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

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

**February 7, 2020**

The description is very short, relying on the existence of the Business Council for Sustainable Development in Zimbabwe which will be a link with businesses and industries. Please explain further the composition of the Business Council and its links with the ETF, and ensure that all the relevant stakeholders of the private sector have been taken into account.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

The composition of the Business Council for Sustainable Development Zimbabwe (BCSDZ) has been further detailed in Section 4. Private sector engagement, as well as their role in providing information for the elaboration of NCs, GHG Inventories and the MRV system as a whole (p. 27). Further information has also been provided in the stakeholders table under 2. Stakeholders (p. 24-25)

## **Risks to Achieving Project Objectives**

**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**

**February 7, 2020**

1. The description identify the risk of Inadequate participation of all stakeholders and partners and mitigate that risk with the involvement of the institutions. Please explain how this risk can be mitigated with the private sector too.
2. In addition, please assess and incorporate the data availability and climate change risks.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the additional inputs. Cleared.

## **Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

1. Mitigation measures for the risk of Inadequate participation of the private sector have been added to the table under 5. Risks (p.28).

2. Climate change risks and those related to data availability have been considered in the risks table and rated as moderate. Mitigation measures are described in the table under 5. Risks (p.28).

#### **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**

**February 7, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

#### **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**

**February 7, 2020**

Yes, cleared.

#### **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**

**February 7, 2020**

The knowledge management approach is partially described, mentioning that the project will learn from other countries and work with the CBIT global platform. Please, explain also how the knowledge generated by the project will be managed to contribute to the project impact and sustainability.

**June 25, 2020**

Thank you for the clarification. Cleared.

**Agency Response**

June 16, 2020

Further information has been provided under 8. Knowledge Management (p. 31-32).

**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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion**

**July 10, 2020**

A UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review Note has been uploaded and the overall risk is assessed as "low". Cleared.

**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**

**February 6, 2020**

Yes, GEF OFP Mr. Tanyaradzwa Mundoga has endorsed this project. Cleared.

**June 26, 2020**

A new Letter of Endorsement has been provided taking into account the new project cost. Nevertheless, the PPG amount is missing in the financing table provided in the Letter of Endorsement. Please provide a Letter of Endorsement including the complete financing figures including the PPG.

**July 10, 2020**

Thank you for providing a new and complete Letter of Endorsement. Cleared.

#### **Agency Response**

Since the requested budget has been reduced compared to the previous submission, the Letter of Endorsement has been updated accordingly by the GEF OFP.

UNEP: July 7, 2020

An updated Letter of Endorsement has been provided by the GEF OFP with the complete financial figures, including the PPG amount.

**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**

N/A

**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**

**February 7, 2020**

Not yet. Please address the above comments. To facilitate the review process, please also highlight in yellow the changes in the text of the proposal.

**June 26, 2020**

Not yet. Please provide a new Letter of Endorsement including the PPG and complete the description of the consultations that were conducted with the different stakeholders.

**July 10, 2020**

Thank you for addressing the last comments. The PIF and PPG are now recommended for 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
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval

Cover Memo

Context and expected results

Zimbabwe signed the Paris Agreement in 2015 and submitted its first NDC in 2017, pledging to reduce energy related emissions by 33% per capita by 2030. The priority sectors as highlighted in the NDC are energy and agriculture. According to Zimbabwe's Third National Communication to the UNFCCC (2016), the energy sector, at almost 50%, is the largest contributor to GHG emissions, followed by agriculture, at slightly above 40%. It is expected that emissions from agriculture will continue to increase because of increased food demand and prioritization of maize, meat and dairy production.

The National Communication also cites major constraints in GHG inventory compilation as data-related barriers and human capacity shortcomings. It emphasizes a need to coordinate the creation of an inventory database system covering all aspects of the inventory; from activity data to emission factors, and institutionalization of continuous research into improvements in the databases. The report also highlights the need to strengthen capacity by conducting training of personnel in the collection and management of GHG and related data, including data interpretation, storage and updating of databases.

#### The project objectives and components:

This CBIT project aims to strengthen Zimbabwe's capacity to collect and process climate change data into useful information for policy-making and reporting to the UNFCCC so that the country complies with the requirements of the transparency framework under the Paris Agreement.

To achieve its objectives, the project will focus on the following outcome and outputs:

Outcome: Zimbabwe improves its Monitoring, Reporting and Verification (MRV) system and institutional capacity to comply with the Enhanced Transparency Framework.

- Output 1. National institutions strengthened to coordinate, manage and implement climate transparency activities;
- Output 2. Technical support, training and tools provided to the country to submit transparent, consistent, comparable, complete and accurate greenhouse gas (GHG) inventories;
- Output 3. Technical support, training and tools provided to the country to track Nationally Determined Contributions (Mitigation/Adaptation) and support needed and received;
- Output 4. Technical support, training and tools provided to the country to use climate analysis in decision-making.

The project will articulate with relevant existing institutional developments such as the National Climate Policy (NCP) and with projects funded by UNDP, Switzerland and the GCF.

#### Co-financing:

The Government of Zimbabwe will provide an additional contribution of 355,600 as in-kind support.

