

Viet Nam: Preparation of the First Biennial Transparency Report to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10963

Countries

Viet Nam

Project Name

Viet Nam: Preparation of the First Biennial Transparency Report to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

4/6/2022

Review completed by PM

4/7/2022

Program Manager

Satoshi Yoshida

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

EA

Expedited Enabling Activity req (CEO) □

Part 1: Project Information

Focal area elements

Is the enabling activity aligned with the relevant GEF focal area elements as indicated in Table A and as defined by the GEF 7 Programming Directions?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Yes.

Agency Response

Project description summary

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 10: Comments cleared.

April 6, 2022: While Table B is not clear in terms of project activities as there is only one output on the preparation for BTR1, Part II C specifies activities under the output. It would be recommended to have decomposed outputs/outcomes in the table B for better clarity (for the future projects).

On the output 1.1.2, "a GEF funding proposal for subsequent BTR prepared" should be "the preparation for subsequent BTRs" in line with the result of "Final qualitative assessment on human and institutional capacities for NCs and BTRs reporting." The

assessment should focus on BTRs as this is a BTR project while NC can be included if NC/BTR combined reporting is expected in the country.

Agency Response

05/10/2022

We agreed with the GEF Sec management that we will submit a simplified log frame for enabling activities since the details are captured in the core of the document and attached budget. We hope that this is acceptable since it is our preference to keep the log frame simplified and concise.

The texts on output 1.1.2 revised as suggested.

Co-financing

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 No co-financing is expected.

Agency Response

GEF Resource Availability

Is the proposed GEF financing in Table D (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Are they within the resources available from:

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Is the financing presented adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Part 2: Enabling Activity Justification

Background and Context.

Are the achievements of previously implemented enabling activities cited since the country(ies) became a party to the Convention?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Goals, Objectives, and Activities.

Is the project framework sufficiently described?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

May 10: Comments cleared.

April 6, 2022: Yes.

1. On the section C, please provide the below information on National GHG inventory.

Recalculation of past inventories

IPCC guidelines applications (including refinement)

Methodologies used on each sector

Coverages on sectors and gases

2. Please move institutional framework to section C.

Agency Response

05/10/2022

Institutional framework moved from section B to C as suggested.

The information on GHG inventory has been updated in Section C as follows: -

The national GHG inventory under the BTR1 project will cover four sectors, namely: Energy, IPPU, AFOLU and Waste sectors. The four gases to be covered include Co₂, CH₄, N₂O and HFCs. The data collection for national GHG inventory under BTR1 will be carried for the year 2021 and 2022. The GHG inventory will cover reference years for the Viet Nam's NDC (year 2014) and a consistent annual time series from year 2020 to 2022.

Viet Nam will undertake recalculation of past inventories for the year 2014 and 2016 using the IPCC 2019 refinement, because these reported years were calculated following the 2006 IPCC guidelines. The 2006 IPCC guidelines and the 2019 refinement of the IPCC guidelines will be used in the estimation of the national emissions per sector and per gas. Viet Nam uses both tiers 1, 2 and 3 across the GHG inventory as follows: -

-
- Energy sector: Tier 2 for CH₄ fugitive emission from coal mining and Tier 1 for other sub sectors.
- IPPU sector: Tier 1.
- AFOLU: Tier 2 for rice cultivation and manure management, Tier 3 for forest land and Tier 1 for other sub sectors.
- Waste sector: Tier 2 for solid waste disposal and Tier for other sub sectors.

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 Expected stakeholders are listed.

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 Gender considerations in the project are provided.

Agency Response

Monitoring and Evaluation.

Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request M&E budget is not required for EA projects. Co-financing information may not be relevant to this project as there is no co-financing expected.

Agency Response

05/10/2022

Even though co-financing for this project is voluntary, the Government of Viet Nam, through the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (MONRE) has indicated its interest/plan to make an in-kind contribution of up to US\$ 44,000 through its support on overhead related costs and some aspects of technical work in the preparation of the BTR. This in-kind/voluntary contribution from the Government of Viet Nam towards the project will be reported annually to UNEP when realized as explained in the section on cost effectiveness.

Cost Effectiveness.

Is the project cost effective?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Cost Ranges

If there was a deviation in the cost range, was this explained?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request The cost is within the maximum costing for a stand-alone BTR.

Agency Response

Part III. Endorsement/Approval by OFP

Country endorsement

Has the project been endorsed by the country's GEF Operational Focal Point and has the name and position been checked against the GEF database?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request Yes.

Agency Response

Response to Comments

Are all the comments adequately responded to? (only as applicable)

GEF Secretariat Comment

Agency Response

Other Agencies 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
CSOs comments

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO Endorsement/approval recommended?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request April 6, 2022: Please address the comments above.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	4/6/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)	5/10/2022	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations