

Building global capacity to increase transparency in the forest sector (CBIT-Forest)

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10071

Countries

Global

Project Name

Building global capacity to increase transparency in the forest sector (CBIT-Forest)

Agenices

FAO

Date received by PM

7/10/2019

Review completed by PM

9/24/2019

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes the project is well aligned with what was presented at PIF.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, the project design as described in Table B is appropriate. We have a few clarifying questions however:

- The logical framework matrix targets 26 countries with enhanced transparency in forest-related data and 20 national institutions in targeted countries with enhanced capacity to respond to the enhanced transparency framework under Component 1. Please clarify how the targets under Component 1 were defined, and whether these countries have already been defined.
- Please provide additional clarifications on how Component 2 will specifically link the direct capacity-building of 6 countries to their national transparency efforts under the Paris Agreement.

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

Response 1:

The Mesoamerican (LAC), Central African (Africa) and Southeast (Asia) regions were chosen as targets for regional awareness raising and capacity-building meetings on the basis of a reporting capacity analysis carried out during the PPG phase (see also section 1.1.3.2 of the FAO/GEF prodoc). The 20 target institutions from those regions will be chosen during the project inception phase.

Response 2:

The capacity development will focus on strengthening **institutional arrangements** in the target counties (see section 1.1.3.2 of the FAO/GEF prodoc). The link with the national transparency efforts will be guaranteed through close collaboration with the forest-related stakeholders as well as UNFCCC and CBIT focal points and capacity-building need and gap assessment that will precede the implementation of these activities.

3. If this is a non-grant instrument, has a reflow calendar been presented in Annex D?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion Co-financing from FAO, including \$5 million grant and \$200,000 in-kind has been confirmed.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes, \$35,657 of the \$50,000 in PPG resources have been spent to date and the remaining \$14,343 have been committed.

Agency Response

Core indicators

7. Are there changes/ adjustments made in the core indicator targets indicated in Table E? Do they remain realistic?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Core Indicator 11 has a target number of beneficiaries of 160. Please provide clarification on how this number was approximated.

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

The number of direct beneficiaries has been estimated based on the number of participants from component 1 (40 participants) and component 2 (120 participants, number of workshops per region). At least 160 direct beneficiaries are expected.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself (can be copy-pasted from the project document, after the tables showing changes from PIF).

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself.

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

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

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself.

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself.

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself.

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

6. Is there further and better elaboration on the project's expected contribution to global environmental benefits or adaptation benefits?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself.

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself.

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

Project Map and Coordinates

Is there an accurate and confirmed geo-referenced information where the project intervention will take place?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

N/A

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes, however we ask that it is included in the Portal submission itself.

Information has been added to Portal submission. Comment cleared.

Agency Response Narrative in the CER template has been completed with the requested information.

Risks

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please provide additional information on the coordination of the project with ongoing initiatives in the 6 pilot countries it will work directly with, including any existing CBIT, NC and BUR projects in the proposal submission. Please also provide additional information on coordination with the CBIT-AFOLU project, in particular as it relates to the pilot countries each project is engaging and on ensuring information exchange and linkages to the products and tools each global project is developing to the countries the project will be working with and beyond through the platform.

Comments cleared.

Agency Response

FAO has interacted with the different key stakeholders in the past and will build on earlier experience on how to facilitate dialogue and link initiatives that are related to reporting process such as the Biennial Update Report and National Communications (see section 1.4.3.2 *lesson learnt* – component 2 of the FAO/GEF prodoc). In addition, during the CBIT-Forest project design, FAO has also considered both UNFCCC and Paris Agreement reporting related indicators for the 6 candidate pilot countries (see Annex VII of the FAO/GEF prodoc). Furthermore, CBIT focal points, where applicable, have been contacted and informed, in order to ensure that forest-related stakeholders are linked to transparency-related initiative such as the CBIT. In addition, UNEP, UNDP and Conservation International were consulted and informed about the CBIT-Forest project activities during the design phase and meetings with them were held during the third CBIT meeting in Rome. The coordination with the agencies took place as follows for the pilot countries: UNEP (Thailand, Laos, Honduras), UNDP (Guatemala, Cote d'Ivoire) and CI (Uganda).

The CBIT-Forest project will ensure proper coordination with key stakeholders and this process has started already during the PPG consultation phase (see also section 2.2 *Coordination with other initiatives* and *Annex II: Stakeholder Engagement Matrix* of the FAO/GEF prodoc).

The CBIT-Forest and CBIT-AFOLU projects will be complementary and FAO will ensure coordination among global projects via regular meetings, which already started to take place since the PPG of the CBIT-Forest.

In relation to pilot countries, FAO will ensure that products and tools developed by the global projects will be shared through the CBIT Coordination platform and FAO web sites (see section 1.4.3.3 *Communication* of the FAO/GEF prodoc).

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Please clarify how the project is aligned specifically with the 6 pilot countries' national priorities.

Comment cleared.

Agency Response

Based on the presence of FAO (country offices) in the candidate pilot countries and ongoing forest-related activities (such as REDD+ and Forest Monitoring projects), the CBIT-Forest project will be able to ensure alignment with national priorities (additional information is available in section 1.2.1. *Alignment to country needs and international policy context* of the FAO/GEF prodoc). In addition, during the consultation phase, regional and country FAO offices have supported addressing key needs and gaps from these countries.

Knowledge Management

Is the proposed “Knowledge Management Approach” for the project adequately elaborated with a timeline and a set of deliverables?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

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 PIF/Work Program Inclusion

MGV/JDS, September 13, 2018: We note that the project does not have Table F Project's target contributions to GEF-7 core indicators. This may be an issue with the portal template itself, but please try to add the relevant target under Core Indicator 11.

This has been addressed.

Agency Response

Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Yes.

Agency Response

Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

Council comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion Yes.

Agency Response

Calendar of expected reflows (if NGI is used)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

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

GEFSEC DECISION

RECOMMENDATION

Is CEO endorsement recommended? (applies only to projects and child projects)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

Not yet. Please clarify few questions above and please enter information from the project document directly onto the portal. In addition, if allowed, please click the CBIT marker in Part I: Project Information, and change the project duration to 24 (as it is meant to be months, not years).

All comments have been addressed. Minor data entry issues will have to be fixed by ITS (project duration and CBIT type of project). PM recommends CEO Endorsement.

Submission date is missing - please add. - This has been addressed. Comment cleared. PM recommends CEO Endorsement.

CEO Memo

This Global CBIT project aims to strengthen the institutional and technical capacities of developing countries on forest-related data collection, analysis and dissemination processes to meet the enhanced transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. Forest information represents a particular challenge for reporting, as forests are often located in remote areas and therefore collecting and updating forest information can become logistically challenging and expensive. National forest monitoring is a comprehensive process that includes systematic collection, analysis and dissemination of forest-related data and the derivation of information, usually from repeated inventories, of both remote sensing and ground data, that allow for the monitoring of change and trends over time. A well-established one will support forest-related decision-making at international, national and sub-national levels and provide data to assess forest-related emissions and removals to support the preparation of national GHG inventories.

The project consists of three components:

1. Supporting developing countries to strengthen their institutional capacity to exchange knowledge and raise awareness of the importance of forest-related data to respond to the enhanced transparency framework;

2. Supporting developing countries to strengthen their technical capacity on data collection, analysis and dissemination of forest-related data to respond to the enhanced transparency framework;

3. Sharing knowledge and improving coordination to respond to the enhanced transparency framework.

The project will engage high-level and technical government stakeholders involved in the forest sector to improve data collection, analysis and dissemination through awareness-raising and capacity-building activities, and upgrading specific products. Project interventions will accelerate and contribute to consistent and accurate forest-related data for improved global and national reporting efforts under the Paris Agreement, while involving a series of key stakeholders at the global and national levels. This project will leverage FAO's existing partners (Global Forest Observation Initiative, UNFCCC, IPCC), technical partnerships (Google, NASA, academia), its global Forest Resource Assessment National Correspondents network, as well as the CBIT Coordination Platform to collaborate with other GEF agencies.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		