

# Capacity-building to establish an integrated and enhanced transparency framework in Uzbekistan to track the national climate actions and support measures received

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**

10772

**Countries**

Uzbekistan

**Project Name**

Capacity-building to establish an integrated and enhanced transparency framework in Uzbekistan to track the national climate actions and support measures received

**Agencies**

FAO

**Date received by PM**

4/14/2022

**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**

Namrata Rastogi

**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 CEO Endorsement Request**

4/28/22: The project generally remains aligned with the PIF and components remain the same. Changes have been made from the PIF to outcomes, outputs and targets and a full explanation has been provided. Please see related comment in alternative scenario section.

Please revise Sector as this is not an Enabling Activity.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

**Agency Response**

RE 28 Apr:

Thank you for the feedback. The sector has been changed to ?Mixed and Others?.

**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 4/28/22: Yes, this is appropriate.

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

4/28/2022: The FAO co-financing letter mentions that \$40,000 will be in grant. Please confirm, and update the table as needed.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

Table C has been updated accordingly.

**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

4/28/2022: The financing for Component 5 (M&E) seems high. Please consider reducing it.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

#### Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

Although there is no need for MTR for an MSP, as the CBIT initiative is new for the country and the region, we would like to keep the MTR budget, thus, it is difficult to reduce the M&E budget further.

#### 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 4/28/2022: Yes this has been provided. However, see comment below on PPG funds.

#### 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 4/28/2022: Yes, this has been provided and we note that the indicators have increased from the PIF stage.

#### 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

4/28/2022: Please check #44. It says Biennial Report - please clarify if this means the Biennial Update Report (please check the rest of the document as well and make edits as needed).

Please reduce the size of Figure 3 as it cannot be fully legible as presented in the current document.

5/31/2022: The figure that has been uploaded is not the correct one - this is figure 3 of the portal document on Organizational Structure. Please check and update the size of the figure in the portal document for better legibility.

6/7/2022: Figure 3 has been uploaded. Cleared.

#### Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

It means the Biennial Update Report (BUR) ? updated accordingly.

A separate file for Figure 3 has been uploaded.

RE 31 May:

We have uploaded the correct Figure 3 as a separate document.

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

#### Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/28/2022; Yes, this has been provided.

#### 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

4/28/2022: We note the explanation provided here from the changes made from the PIF. Please move this to the start of the alternative scenario section. Please address comments below:

1. We note that there are several elements related to building technical capacities. Please provide specific details on approaches that will be used to ensure that the training is not a one-off training, but instead will be anchored (such as ToT, placements of experts in relevant Ministries, collaborations with domestic institutions etc.). Please consider these options and make modifications to the budget as needed.

2. We note that several outcomes build institutional capacities. Please provide additional details and comment on how these are different and will build on each other. For example, how with the GHG Technical Inventory Group collaborate/engage with the Steering Committee?

3. #106 mentions that a document is being prepared in relation to the legal framework for the MRV system, and that the structure of the MRV system is being developed as per BUR. Since the BUR has been submitted, please update this information. Also clarify how this outcome 1.1 may build on this work (specifically output 1.1.3).

4. For output 1.1.3 please provide details on what the Steering Committee will aim to do, which sectors/ministries, and what level (technical, high-level etc.). Please clarify who the audience for the technical capacity building for Activity 1.1.3.3 is (ie Steering Committee or others?).

5. Output 1.1.4 - please provide further details on what is being envisioned for a coordination mechanism.

6. We note that there is tracking of support in Components 3 and 4. It seems that the former is for mitigation while the latter is for adaptation. Please clarify, and comment on how support will be tracked for cross-cutting initiatives.

5/31/2022: Please address remaining comment.

On #3 above - it is not clear what is meant by "internal MRV system is being developed as part of FBUR". Based on the information provided in the portal document and #65, please revise the language to reflect that the submitted BUR includes a proposed concept for an MRV system.

6/7/2022: Cleared.

## Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

We have moved the changes made from the PIF section accordingly.

1. Addressed in para 113, para 124, para 128, and para 130. There is no need to make modifications to the budget since it was presumed to include ToT.
2. 2. Addressed in para 123.
  3. Para 106 highlights that Uzbekistan has not yet adopted a legal act defining the national MRV system and its activities, whereas the structure of the internal MRV system is being developed as part of the First Biennial Update Report. Output 1.1, in particular Activity 1.1.3, focuses on the

strengthening of the ETF transition, on the processes necessary to operate the MRV system of the different sectors and explains the transition to ETF. Please, as per para 118-119.

4. Para 119 describes the aim and the audience of the ETF transition training. The question on level is addressed in the same para.

5. In para 120, we included that "Activity 1.1.4.1 Secretary of the Steering Committee suggests a coordination mechanism to operationalise the formulation of the ETF reports?". The suggestion will be jointly made by the relevant members based on the activities 1.1.1.2. "Gap analysis for MRV/transparency in relation to the ETF requirements; 1.1.1.3 "Workshops to discuss the findings of both the status and the gaps.

6. Component 3 focuses on adaptation, whereas Component 4 focuses on mitigation targets. The issue of the cross-cutting initiatives is addressed in para 137.

RE 31 May:

Paragraph #106 has been revised accordingly. Paragraph #65 describes the concept of the MRV that is currently missing in the country that was signalled in the BUR, and it was also mentioned in the BUR that the MRV development will be supported by the CBIT project.

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/28/2022: Yes this has been elaborated.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/28/2022: Yes, this has been 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

4/28/2022: 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

4/28/2022: It is not clear what the role of NDC partnership is in this context. Please clarify.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

Addressed accordingly by removing the unnecessary section.

**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

4/28/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

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

4/28/2022: A detailed report on stakeholders engaged during the design phase is missing. Please provide.

In the table, under role under potential role for project, consider adding the relevant Outcomes. For example, Private Sector- potential role, it is not clear what is meant by development of targets. Please clarify which Outcome this would relate to or revise as needed. Please ensure that this aligns with the Private Sector information provided below in the portal document. Similarly, In the table under NGOs, it is not clear which component the adaptation management system is referring to and consider their role for mitigation as well.

The SEP states that "this plan will build on any other work.... in regard to planning and impact assessment processes". Please provide details on what is being referenced here. It is not clear.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

The stakeholder engagement matrix has been uploaded as a separate document.

Addressed in Table 10.

The SEP statement is removed.

**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

4/28/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

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

4/28/2022: Please provide a brief description of which companies, associations etc. that this CBIT project will engage with from the private sector.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

### Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

Addressed in para 1.

## **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

4/28/2022: Yes, this has been elaborated upon and we note the mention of COVID risk. Please elaborate briefly on COVID-related opportunities that may arise.

5/31/2022: Cleared and noted that the Agency will identify opportunities related to COVID during implementation.

### Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

At this stage, we did not identify specific COVID-related opportunities, however, if anything arises during implementation, they will be reported in the PIR.

## **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

4/28/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

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

4/28/2022: Yes this has been provided.

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

4/28/2022: Please provide a budget, deliverables and timeline related to knowledge management. Additionally, mention how the project will collaborate with regional networks in Central Asia, and enable South-South learning and exchange.

5/31/2022: As per GEF guidelines, please provide specific KM deliverables, budget and a timeline related to KM.

6/7/2022: This is not cleared. The information provided in paragraph 3 is not sufficient. KM is a n important component of CBIT projects. Please provide, in table format, clear specific KM deliverables with a budget and timeline for each.

6/8/2022: This has been addressed. Cleared.

Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

Specific KM deliverables and timeline will be determined at the project inception phase once the National M&E and KM Officer, among other PMU members, comes on board. Associated KM budget is included in the budget table @ USD 35K.

The regional networks in Central Asia are addressed in para 2.

RE 31 May:

Addressed in paragraph #3 accordingly.

8 June

Addressed

#### **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

4/28/2022: Yes, this has been marked as low. Cleared.

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

4/28/2022: Please see comment above - the M&E budget seems high. Please consider reducing it.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

Although there is no need for MTR for an MSP, as the CBIT initiative is new for the country and the region, we would like to keep the MTR budget, thus, it is difficult to reduce the M&E budget further.

### **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

4/28/2022: Yes.

Agency Response

### **Annexes**

**Are all the required annexes attached and adequately responded to?**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/28/2022: As mentioned in the alternative scenario section, consider collaborations with domestic institution to retain technical capacity. If this is considered, modification to the budget will need to be made accordingly.

Please clarify what is meant by Ad Hoc trainings and provide details.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

The Column "National stakeholders" in the budget covers the budget for the local institutions.

The Ad Hoc trainings include the trainings that will cover the gaps and weaknesses identified during the project implementation that were not originally covered (Components 1, 2, 3, 4).

### **Project Results Framework**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request

4/28/2022: The project results framework provided is adequate and includes the CBIT indicators. However, it is not clear how/why the indicators in this framework is different from that in Table B. If those in Table B will be measured as well (which is what it seems), please include them here and ensure that these are aligned. For example, indicator 1.3 from Table B is not in the Project Results Framework.

5/31/2022: This has been clarified. Cleared.

## Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

The difference between indicators in the Annex A1 and the targets of Table B is the following:

The targets in Table B have a broader scope and refer to the Outcome level, whereas the indicators of Annex A1 refer to the Output level.

For example:

In Table B:

Component 1: Target - 1.3. Key bodies and initiatives supporting the roadmap for establishing an ETF in Uzbekistan

In Annex A1: Indicators - Number MOU and number of collaborating inter-ministerial agencies (agriculture, LULUCF, energy, waste, and transport) with formally established focal points (number of men and women: 25% women) - this indicator results in the achievement of the target. The word "indicator" in Table B has been replaced with "target" to streamline.

### **GEF Secretariat 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

**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

4/28/2022: We note that the total for amount spent and amount committed is less than the budgeted amount. Please provide the missing information in the table so that the entire \$50,000 requested for PPG is accounted for.

5/31/2022: Cleared.

Agency Response

RE 28 Apr:

The PPG table has been updated accordingly.

**Project maps and coordinates**

Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement Request 4/28/2022: Yes, this has been provided.

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

4/28/2022: Please address comments.

5/31/2022: Please address comments.

6/7/2022: Please address remaining comment.

6/8/2022: PM recommends technical clearance.

**Review Dates**

**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

**First Review**

**4/28/2022**



**Secretariat Comment at  
CEO Endorsement**

**Response to  
Secretariat  
comments**

<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>5/31/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>6/7/2022</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	

**CEO Recommendation**

**Brief reasoning for CEO Recommendations**