

Capacity-building for establishing an Integrated and Enhanced Transparency Framework for Climate actions and support measures

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10194

Countries

India

Project Name

Capacity-building for establishing an Integrated and Enhanced Transparency
Framework for Climate actions and support measures

Agencies

UNDP

Date received by PM

12/2/2020

Review completed by PM

Program Manager

Milena Vasquez

Focal Area

Climate Change

Project Type

FSP

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

4/27/2021: Yes the project remains aligned and there are no major changes from 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 CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2021: Overall Table B is clear. However, we note that there is no proportionality in funding the PMC (there is actually no PMC co-financing). Please increase the level of co-financing dedicated to the PMC to match the portion of GEF funding dedicated to co-financing (i.e. 5%).

Agency Response

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 4/27/2021: Yes, the MoEFCC will provide in-kind co-financing of \$1,000,000.

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 CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2021: 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 CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2021: Yes.

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 CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2021: The total amount of beneficiaries remain the same as at PIF, but the gender ratio has been adjusted. Explanation provided is adequate.

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

4/27/2021: Overall, we found this section to be slightly disorganized. It includes a lot of information that is relevant to other sections. Please revise to include a short elaboration on the global environmental problem and the root cause and barriers. Consider adding relevant sub-headings.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2021: Yes, there is an elaboration of the existing institutional and policy framework. However, the section is missing a description of baseline initiatives and support for India's MRV and transparency systems from other bilateral and multilateral sources. Please add.

Also the section titled Project Rationale should be moved to the Proposed Alternative Scenario.

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

4/27/2021: Please address comments below:

- Based on the current description it is not clear what the vision and purpose of the IT-enabled NICS is. Please clarify if NICS is envisioned as an enhanced NIMS or a completely different system. Comment on the rationale. We would suggest including a figure to clarify the roles, functionalities and linkages between NIMS, NICS and NCR. Describe how this will bring together all aspects of the ETF.

- We note the comprehensive approach that this proposal takes towards transparency. There are several technical elements to this proposal which feeds into an IT/MRV architecture. We would like clarity on how this will be managed and coordinated, implications for resourcing and sustainability once this project ends.

- We note the strong focus on training and capacity building in this CBIT project. We suggest that for each outcome/output which has such a training focus, it is clearly stated who the target stakeholder group for training is and clarify, where relevant, if there is an overlap with another outcome/output. This will help clarify how the core indicator targets will also be met.

Component 1

Outcome 1.1

- One of the goals is to "facilitate uninterrupted sharing of information between data providers and the assigned lead agencies." Please clarify who are the data providers and lead agencies in this context, i.e. do data providers include the private sector?

- We note the revival of the INCCA which is a unique aspect of India's proposed domestic MRV system. Please provide elaboration on how the INCCA will link and coordinate with the more formal institutional architecture. Will these experts be voluntary? What will be the authority and accountability of such a network? What is the vision and role of the secretariat?

-- Please clarify what is meant by focal points for state and sectoral activities.

Outcome 1.2:

- Please comment on how the NICS will integrate with the SOPs from Output 1.1.2.

- The description mentions "individual mitigation projects". Please comment on how this bottom-up approach will be conducted, including the impact on resourcing and coordination.

- Please provide additional details on the outputs under Outcome 1.2 specifically on coordination between the two, how the feedback from one might impact the other "office". Related to a point made above, it is not clear what is meant in this context by "develop the back office". Does this mean developing an IT tool? And would this be different from the workbooks mentioned in Output 1.2.1?

- Output 1.2.1: It is not clear what is meant by workbooks "do these refer to excel workbooks or a more sophisticated tool? Please clarify.

- Output 1.2.3: please provide additional details on how QC/QA will be conducted and how this output will draw on what has already been done in the previous outputs.

Component 2

- From Output 2.1.2 to 2.1.7 please comment on how QA/QC procedures may be incorporated .

- Output 2.2.1: please elaborate further on the idea of GHG auditors and activities under this. Also elaborate on what technical aspects of transparency will this cover.

- Output 2.2.3: please confirm which aspects of transparency this will cover, ie mitigation and adaptation or more. Also provide elaboration on how some of the technical work will be undertaken under this output considering that mitigation indicators and methodologies for NDC tracking tend to be more advanced than some of the other indicators. Will this output for separate technical working groups? And how will this coordinate with the INCCA.

Outcome 2.3 ? please elaborate on how the state agencies will be 'capacitated' to prepare and submit information. Comment specifically on how these will coordinate with data providers including private sector and other non-government agencies.

- Output 2.4.3 ? please clarify how the findings of this study will be fed into the capacity building and retention mechanism.

- Comment on how Outcome 2.4 will influence the activities under Outcome 2.1 (specifically on output 2.1.1 on capacity building workshops) and other training aspects of the CBIT project. Will this outcome be conducted prior to the other training aspects so that learnings from this outcome can bolster the training modalities of the other outputs?

Component 3

- Please clarify if the NCR is a new IT system or an integration of other systems. It is unclear from the current description if output 3.1.1 is an IT related task or has other aspects, and how this will link with some of the previous outputs related to NIMS and NICS. In this context, provide additional details on the activities, especially on 'Creation of an online information registry with information from NICS and NIMS including another relevant databases such as PAT.'

- Comment on what processes, and procedures will be put into place to provide the support needed to manage and keep information up to date in the NCR. Will this have a formal institutional arrangement, who will be responsible, and how will this bring together information under all the various streams of work under India's transparency agenda.

- Output 3.2.1 and Output 3.2.2 ? please provide additional details on what is envisioned under these activities and highlight how these are separate. For example clarify what is meant by methodologies for tracking climate flows and how these are different in the two outputs. Would this include the implementation of a budget tagging system for example? For output 3.2.2 ? since several Indian states are implementing CBTs and CPIERs comment on how the learnings from these will be incorporated in a national strategy or classification system. Elaborate and comment on capacity building activities including interlinkages with other outputs. To develop a strategy, and a roadmap for implementation, strong stakeholder engagement at various levels will be required (for eg, line ministries, state governments, banks etc.). Comment on the mechanisms that will be used for engagement to develop and implement the various activities listed in these outputs.

- Output 3.2.3 ? confirm that the reference is to the NCR and not NRC under proposed activities.

- Outcome 3.3: Confirm that GEF coordination platform means CBIT Global Coordination Platform.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2021: Yes, the project is aligned to the climate change focal area strategy.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2021: Yes the incremental reasoning is well elaborated.

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

4/27/2021: Yes.

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

4/27/2021: Yes.

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

4/27/2021: Yes, this is a national capacity-building project.

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

4/27/2021: Yes, stakeholders consulted are described and a stakeholder engagement plan is included.

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

4/27/2021: Yes, a gender analysis and action plan is provided. More details are annexed.

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

4/27/2021: Yes.

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

4/27/2021: These are well elaborated, although we note that several have been assessed as having a medium likelihood. This may require strengthening mitigation measures described.

Please add climate risks to table.

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

4/27/2021: Please make reference on how the project will coordinate with the most recent EA approved by the Council to support India's 4NC and 4BUR. Please also include reference to how India will contribute to and benefit from the CBIT Global Coordination Platform.

Agency Response

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

4/27/2021: Yes.

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

4/27/2021: Please include a knowledge management budget, key deliverables and timeline in this section.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2021: The ESS has assessed the project as having low risks.

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

4/27/2021: Yes, the M&E budgeted plan is presented.

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 CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2021: Yes.

Agency Response
Annexes

Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2021: Please fix budget so that it fits the window properly and it can be viewed entirely when printed/PDF. Also, please submit the updated Project Document.

Agency Response
Project Results Framework

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/27/2021: Thank you for including the relevant CBIT indicators.

Indicator 5 ? it is not clear what the difference, if any, exists between mid-term and terminal target. Please clarify.

To the extent possible, we would suggest using quantitative targets for easy tracking. For eg, for Indicator 6 we suggest placing a numerical value for the mid- and terminal targets. Similarly for other indicators, such as indicator 9, it would be good to clarify how many data providers is meant by all.

Agency Response
GEF Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Council comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2021: Responses to Council comments are included. However, the response to Germany's comment on the action plan and strategy underlying the roll-out of the NICS, as well as additional information about how the two components interact and complement each other, and about the relationship with the National Inventory Management System (NIMS) has not been well addressed. Please provide further clarification.

We also found the suggestion to include capacity building on scientific projections to not have been properly incorporated. Please consider adding more explicitly.

Agency Response
STAP comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Convention Secretariat comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
Other Agencies comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response
CSOs comments

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

Agency Response

Status of PPG utilization

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

Project maps and coordinates

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/27/2021: Yes

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

12/23/2020: Please resubmit and include the Checklist for CEO Endorsement Template duly filled out for this.

4/27/2021: Please address comments.

Review Dates

	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
First Review	12/23/2020	
Additional Review (as necessary)	4/27/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations