

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

Namrata Rastogi

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%).

9/13/2021: This has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response 21 June, 2021: Co-Financing for PMC adjusted. Co-financing for activity 2.1.2. has been decreased from 150,000 USD to 100,000 USD and 50,000 USD co-financing allocated to the PMC (pages 2 and 7 of CEO ER and pages 139-140 of ProDoc).

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.

9/13/2021: This has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

21 June, 2021: The section has been reorganized and restructured including sub-headings (pages 12-21 of CEO ER and 44-49 of the ProDoc). Information has been moved to the baseline scenario section (pages 34 ? 35 of CEO ER).

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.

9/13/2021: This has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

21 June, 2021: Support for India's MRV and transparency systems from other bilateral and multilateral sources has been added to this section, updated and extended (pages 36 ? 42 of CEO ER and pages 98 ? 108 of the ProDoc)

Section titled Project Rationale has been moved to the Proposed Alternative Scenario (pages 43 -44 and 74 ? 77 of CEO ER).

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.

9/13/2021: We note the detailed explanations provided for several of these comments however there are a few remaining. Please address these comments below:

1. Outcome 1.1: Please add the information provided on INCCA below in the portal document and the CEO ER. This is currently missing.

2. Output 2.3: Please clarify if the training to be provided (as per the revised language) is for "developing arrangement and agreements with key stakeholders". It seems like there is a typo and this should be separate from the training. Please confirm and revise accordingly.

9/24/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

21 June, 2021: Vision, purpose and rationale of the NICS have been clarified. NIMS are the current institutional arrangements and estimates/workbooks of the GHG inventory, and it will be integrated in NICS which will cover mitigation actions and adaptation measures of the NDC for monitoring and update as well as climate finance information. Several figures have been added to clarify the roles, functionalities and linkages between NIMS, NICS and NCR and a description of how the proposed IT-platform will help to meet all ETF reporting requirements have been reiterated (pages 47 ? 50, 69-71 of CEO ER and pages 70 ? 74 of the ProDoc).

- Description of how IT/MRV architecture will be coordinated and managed has been added (pages 74 ? 75 of the CEO ER and page 57 of ProDoc).

Implications for resourcing and sustainability once this project ends have been described (page 76-77 of CEO ER and page 57 of ProDoc).

- Targeted stakeholders? groups for training and synergies between the different capacity building activities have been added (pages 103 ? 107 of CEO ER and pages 62 ? 66 of ProDoc).

Component 1

Outcome 1.1

- Lead agencies are the sectoral and state focal points who will be designated according to current legal framework, roles and responsibilities. They will coordinate their corresponding activities and will be involved in NICS. Data providers are the holders of activity data relevant for GHG inventory compilation including private sector and institutions/agencies involved in implementation and monitoring of mitigation and adaptation policies and measures at both national and subnational levels. They will be designated and their participation in transparency activities formalized under output 1.1.1. An additional activity on ?Mapping of key data providers including private sector and proposals on lead agencies at sectoral and states level for GHG inventory preparation, NDC policies and measures reporting and monitoring and financial support tracking? has been added to this output for further clarity (page 51 of CEO ER and page 74 of ProDoc).

- Capacity retention has always been challenging in India, as can be seen from INCCA, where the mandate was only one-time preparation of inventory and vulnerability assessment. It has failed to publish any publication since 2010 due to a lack of formalised mandate, training, resources and funding.

The informal but evolving Indian Network of Climate Change Assessment (INCCA) involved in the monitoring and validation of national reports previously submitted to the UNFCCC will be reactivated and the project will help to formalize its set up so it will make part of the formal architecture with specific roles and responsibilities. It will be up to India to fix a budget under the regular tasks of INCCA institutions or as a part of QA activities under the national transparency framework. The membership will be based on the recommendation of National Steering Committee NSC. PMU can act as INCCA Secretariat. This way INCCA will be revived and will be able to sustain itself. INCCA may be headed by a Chair and two co-chairs on rotation / election basis.

Outcome 1.2:

Definition of SOP has been added in a footnote as "A standard operating procedure (SOP) is a set of step-by-step instructions used in a system to help stakeholders carry out routine operations". As indicated in page 55 development and training on standard operating procedures (SOPs) will be provided to the lead representation from each focal point. The SOPs will adhere to the best practices prescribed by the UNFCCC and will govern the reporting of information in NICS. SOPs will provide instructions to the lead agencies of sectoral and states focal points on how to compile, check, treat and report the information in NICS (page 52 of CEO ER and page 76 of ProDoc).

Baseline situation shows numerous MRVs implemented at individual project/policy/measure/programme level so CBIT project aims at streamlining and integrating existing MRVs. Current reporting of policies and measures by Annex I Parties in the BRs and mitigation actions by non-Annex I Parties in the BURs can be done by individual or by a group of PAMs or actions so the word individual used here was meant to fit with both current situation in India and UNFCCC reporting requirements. The approach to be applied will always be bottom up to come up with comprehensive assessments.

The front-end is what users (sectoral and states focal points) see and interact with (user interface). The back-end is part of the application that is hidden from the user but is responsible for data processing, storing the data, and mathematical operations as illustrated under outcome 1.2. Existing workbooks are the working files of inventory compilers and assessments. The wording workbooks to be developed has been used to mean formats and templates with the information to be included in NICS (Pages 53-54 of CEO ER and page 77 of ProDoc).

Output 1.2.3 will develop the consultation interfaces. QA/QC plan and procedures for GHG inventory, NDC tracking, etc, are one of the steps of the integrated MRV. QC is done during information compilation and QA by experts not involved in the elaboration of the reports and is part of the 4NC/4BUR project. The system will allow to consult this information for QA/QC purposes and some automatic QC checks will be included during development.

This activity has been added in page 55 of CEO ER and page 79 of ProDoc.

Component 2

In order not to duplicate the work performed under the 4NC/4BUR project, Output 2.1.2 to 2.1.7 focus on training and capacity building aiming to implement the improvements plans derived from the application of QA/QC procedures, key category analysis and uncertainty analysis undertaken during inventory compilation under the 4NC/4BUR project.

Output 2.2.1: A reputed institution will be designated to host the training and capacity building activities with the list of UNFCCC trained experts. Exams and certificates

could be delivered for the additional trained experts. This should facilitate their participation in transparency activities (GHG inventory compilation, assessments?) directly or as reviewers/QA experts of GHG inventory and BTRs before submission to the UNFCCC. They will also be allowed to participate in the delivery of trainings and capacity building activities. Under this output didactic training materials and e-learning courses will be developed and a certification scheme for the different thematic areas of BTRs (GHG inventory; mitigation assessments including projections; impacts, vulnerability and adaptation analysis; NDC tracking; climate finance tracking; MRV) will be implemented (page 63 of CEO ER and page 88 of ProDoc).

Output 2.2.3: All aspects of NDC will be covered (both mitigation and adaptation). Indicators will depend on the mitigation and adaptation actions implemented or planned by the country and in all cases they will be impact indicators. INCCA will continue to be in charge of the monitoring of the national reports preparation and will play the role of the QA entity but its role will be formalized in previous outputs. So it is foreseen that INCCA will participate in the monitoring of the update of the NDC and in QA activities of the information reported on NDC tracking in the BTRs before submission to the UNFCCC. Two activities have been added to develop guidelines to assess co-benefits and training on climate projections, vulnerability analysis, emissions projections and updating the NDC (page 89 of CEO ER and page 90 of ProDoc).

Outcome 2.3 ? States will be trained to implement MRV of SAPCC through appropriate data collection systems and develop arrangements and agreements with the key stakeholders for transparency activities (page 66 of CEO ER and page 91 of ProDoc).

Output 2.4.3 ? This study will explore the processes through which institutions in other countries with similar national circumstances obtain, strengthen and maintain their capabilities to set and achieve their own transparency objectives and good quality reporting over time and will assess its potential for replicability in India (page 68 of CEO ER and page 92 of ProDoc).

Outcome 2.4: The CBIT project will start with the establishment of the capacity baseline, current gaps and review of case studies to identify best practices, success stories and lessons learned in order to design a strategy to address the gaps as well as tailor and use lessons learned and best practices for India's specific situation to successfully implement a capacity retention mechanism since the beginning of the project. In particular, the approach proposed on training the trainers and formalise it through a reputed institution will be assessed and the capacity building activities of the CBIT project designed accordingly (page 66-67 of CEO ER and page 91 of ProDoc).

Component 3

Output 3.1.1

It has been reiterated that the new NCR will be available online in the public domain and a figure added to increase clarity (page 68 - 70 of the CEO ER and pages 93-94 of ProDoc).

As NCR will be linked to NICS (which integrates NIMS as well) and NICS will be updated biannually, NCR will be updated biannually as well. As indicated in the CEO

ER, NCR will be managed by MoEFCC who could provide the responsibility to host the whole transparency system to a reputed institution.

Output 3.2.1 and Output 3.2.2

As indicated in the main conclusions from the consultation process and stakeholder's engagement plan presented in pages 198 ? 210 of the ProDoc document, Department of Economic Affairs (DEA) is one of the three Departments of Ministry of Finance which tenders expert advice on important issues of economic policy. The Division monitors economic developments, domestic and external and advises on policy measures relating to macro management including agriculture, industry and infrastructure sectors of the economy. The Department has a Climate Change Finance cell. DEA has good quality information and knowledge on climate finance from multilateral funds such as GCF and adaptation fund but there is a need for a national definition and methodology to identify, classify and measure climate finance. There is capacity at the Ministry of Finance to monitor all climate finance flows in the country in the future but there are capacity building needs at the Ministries and States on identifying and reporting climate change expenditure to the Climate finance cell. Implementing a climate finance inter-institutional architecture with standard operational procedures and strategy as well as methods to measure the support needed would be very useful for India. By developing a climate finance strategy, India can better position itself to rapidly mobilize and scale up climate finance. An inter-institutional climate finance architecture will be needed to implement the strategy as well as a methodology to identify and classify the climate finance flows in the country. The goal of outcome 3.2. is to ensure that climate finance can be effectively accessed, mobilized, and scaled up to contribute to achieving climate goals and ensure the financial sustainability of the key institutions participating in the ETF. The objective is to make the scaling up of climate finance predictable and clear and to provide opportunities for attracting climate-friendly investment, to increase in adaptation action and the capacity to cope with the consequences of climate change; to increase mitigation action and the capacity to mitigate GHG emissions and to strengthen institutional capacity to effectively implement climate action and their mandates under the ETF. The CBIT project engagement and specific roles of DEA are to track climate finance flows, domestically and internationally (multilateral, bilateral, regional and hybrid) ? responsible for climate finance MRV component of NICS; lead the development of definitions and methodologies on climate finance and provide data/information related to climate finance flows for national reporting process. Output 3.2.1 will develop an inter-institutional architecture on climate finance and the procedures for its operation as well as a climate finance strategy for India with a roadmap for its implementation with the related capacity building activities of all institutions agencies receiving and using climate finance in India and Output 3.2.2 will focus on measuring climate finance flows by developing a standard methodology to identify, classify and measure climate finance in India and a methodology to assess the financial needs of the NDC with the related capacity building activities.

This clarification has been reiterated in page 70-71 of CEO ER and page 95 of ProDoc.

The methodology to track climate finance flows could include a budget tagging system for example, CPEIRs, Rio Markers? and will map current situation in India, it will be up to the country to choose the best methodology proposed by the climate finance experts in charge of the implementation of these outputs. Please be aware that a climate finance strategy is not the same as a classification system or a tagging methodology.

Output 3.2.3

Reference is to the NCR and not NRC, typo corrected.

Outcome 3.3

GEF coordination platform means CBIT Global Coordination Platform, typo corrected.

9/14/2021: Many thanks for your comments from 13 September 2021. The answers are below:

Information on INCCA has been included under outcome 1.1 in page 52 of CEO ER and page 75 of ProDoc.

We confirm it is a typo as arrangements and agreements will be developed under component 1. The typo has been corrected in the training to be provided under output 2.3 in first paragraph of page 68 of CEO ER and page 91 of ProDoc.

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.

9/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

21 June, 2021: Mitigation measures have been strengthened (pages 90 ? 93 of CEO ER and pages 113 ? 117 of ProDoc).

Climate risks have been added (page 92-93 of CEO ER and page 116-117 of ProDoc).

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.

9/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

21 June, 2021: A table has been added to show coordination with GEF support for 4NC and BUR4 (pages 36 ? 41 of CEO ER and pages 98 ? 103 of ProDoc).

How India will contribute to and benefit from the CBIT Global Coordination Platform has been added (page 42 of CEO ER and page 103 of 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 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.

9/13/2021: This has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response 21 June, 2021: Budget, key deliverables and timeline have been added to this section (pages 102 ? 110 of CEO ER and pages 62 ? 69 of ProDoc).

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.

9/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response 21 June 2021: The budget is fixed and will be placed to fit the window properly during re-submission. The updated Project Document will be submitted along with other annexes.

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.

9/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

21 June, 2021:

The Project Results Framework has been revised and include more quantitative and tangible indicators and targets. Some indicators under the same Outcome have been merged to allow easier tracking (page 115-118 of CEO ER and page 125-128 pf ProDoc).

A draft legal framework has been included in mid-term target and its adoption as terminal target in Indicator 5 (page 115 of CEO ER and page 125 of ProDoc).

Indicator 6 has been merged with indicator 5 as procedures will be done in parallel to the development of the legal framework and will be adopted together (page 115 of CEO ER and page 125 of ProDoc).

The previous Indicator 9 (now Indicator 8) has been revised and includes a pilot test of NICS with the GHG inventory of the 4NC/BUR4 project for the IPPU sector at mid-term and the GHG inventory of the first BTR of India for all sectors at terminal target (page 116 of CEO ER and page 126 of ProDoc).

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.

9/13/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

21 June, 2021: Additional information on NICS, NIMS and NCR has been added (pages 20, 35, 47-54, 60 ? 73 of CEO ER and pages 48, 55, 70 - 83, 88-89, 92-93, 96-105 of ProDoc).

Capacity building on projections has been reiterated in several sections (pages 65 and 102-106 of CEO ER and pages 62 ? 66 and 90 of ProDoc).

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.

9/13/2021: Annex C (Status of PPG Utilization) in the FSP CEO Endorsement Document is incomplete. Please fix and align with the portal table.

9/24/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response **9/14/2021**: PPG utilization table in CEO ER is updated and aligned with the portal table.

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.

9/13/2021: Please address remaining comments.

9/24/2021: PM recommends technical clearance.

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)	9/13/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)		
Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO Recommendation

Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations