

Implementing Ecuador's Climate Transparency System

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10818

Countries

Ecuador

Project Name

Implementing Ecuador's Climate Transparency System

Agencies

UNEP

Date received by PM

5/18/2021

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

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

6/16/2021: Yes, it is well aligned.

Agency Response

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 6/16/2021: Yes, table B is clear and resources are properly allocated.

Agency Response

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 6/16/2021: Yes, 1,080,057 in-kind from the government is identified.

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 6/16/2021: Yes

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 6/16/2021: N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 6/16/2021: N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 6/16/2021: N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 6/16/2021: N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 6/16/2021: While the indicative allocation of \$55 million for CBIT under GEF-7 has been expended, additional set-aside resources have been made available to continue to support CBIT projects as a priority.

Agency Response

Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 6/16/2021: 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 6/16/2021: Yes a PPG of \$50,000 is requested and within the allowable cap.

Agency Response

Core indicators

6. Are the identified core indicators in Table F calculated using the methodology included in the corresponding Guidelines? (GEF/C.54/11/Rev.01)

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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 6/16/2021: Yes.

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 6/16/2021: The root causes and barriers are well described.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021: Yes, the baseline scenario is very clearly presented.

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

6/16/2021: The alternative scenario is very well elaborated and builds on a strong baseline scenario to fill in identified gaps and needs to meet the ETF requirements.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021: Yes, the project is aligned with the CCM strategy.

Agency Response

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

6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response
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
6/16/2021: Yes.

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
6/16/2021: The project was prepared mainly consulting the Ministry of Environment and Water only, but the PIF justifies the approach considering that 1) other stakeholders' perceptions are taken into account through basing the project on documents developed with their inputs and 2) stakeholder participation is planned for the project preparation phase. The project includes information for future engagement with stakeholders.

Agency Response
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
6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response
Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

6/16/2021: Yes. We note the reference to a possibility of an organization providing execution support will be identified in the CEO Endorsement request preparation phase, but understand this will not be the GEF agency, UNEP in this case.

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

6/16/2021: Yes.

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

6/16/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

6/16/2021: Yes.

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

6/16/2021: Yes.

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

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

6/16/2021: The PIF is well elaborated. PM recommends technical clearance.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Additional recommendations to be considered by Agency at the time of CEO endorsement/approval.

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

6/16/2021: Minor comments to be addressed by CEO endorsement or to be sent along with PPO comments:

- Please change the CCM Rio Marker to 2.
- Add theory of change depiction.
- Please review deliverable numbering under Alternative Scenario, output 1.2 and output 2.2.
- Select "yes" under gender-sensitive indicators.

By CEO endorsement:

- Provide additional details on key CSO and private sector stakeholders.
- Provide more detailed information on coordination with other initiatives and support including from ICAT and NDC Support Programme.

Review Dates

PIF Review

Agency Response

First Review	6/16/2021	
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