

Strengthening capacity in the Energy, Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land-use Sectors for Enhanced Transparency in the Implementation and Monitoring of Vanuatu's Nationally Determined Contribution

Review PIF and Make a recommendation

Basic project information

GEF ID

10761

Countries

Vanuatu

Project Name

Strengthening capacity in the Energy, Agriculture, Forestry, and other Land-use Sectors for Enhanced Transparency in the Implementation and Monitoring of Vanuatu's Nationally Determined Contribution

Agencies

FAO

Date received by PM

2/16/2021

Review completed by PM

7/9/2021

Program Manager

Namrata Rastogi

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

3/31/2021: While we understand the project has a strong component on adaptation, we ask that you change the Rio Marker for Climate Change Adaptation to 1 as we are tracking these in this way for CBIT projects.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Table B is sufficiently clear.

7/6/2021: We appreciate the inclusion of loss and damage as part of the modalities, procedures and guidelines (MPGs) under Information related to climate change impacts and adaptation under Article 7 of the Paris Agreement. However, it seems to have been added last minute and not properly integrated in line with the MPGs. Please ensure it is aligned with the MPGs.

7/9/2021: Cleared

Agency Response

7/8/2021

- Thanks for the comment. As per the "Modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement" the activities are aligned with the MPGs and rephrased to reflect the same. Please see table B

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

3/31/2021: Co-financing from the FCPF and the UNDP Climate Action Enhancement Package is listed; however, the PIF does not elaborate on the background of this co-financing and how these resources will support the implementation of this CBIT project. Please elaborate in response to this comment and in the PIF itself (i.e. Section 2.7). We note that these amounts would be expected to be confirmed by CEO endorsement.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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 3/31/2021: The project is requesting a total of \$1.3 million from the CBIT set-aside. At this time the originally allocated \$55 million have been expended; however, resources from the CCM set-aside can be utilized while ensuring that Convention obligations are being met.

Agency Response

The STAR allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The focal area allocation?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The LDCF under the principle of equitable access?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion N/A

Agency Response

Focal area set-aside?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 3/31/2021: Yes, see above.

Agency Response
Impact Program Incentive?

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion 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 3/31/2021: 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 3/31/2021: Please provide a brief explanation for how the number of direct beneficiaries was estimated in the space provided below the the Core Indicators table.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: As this project is not a NAPA or a NAP, please remove these two keywords (although we understand how it is related to them). Likewise for the CCM sectors: renewable energy, energy efficiency and AFOLU.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Under this section, please add a description of the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed relating to technical and institutional capacity for transparency in climate change mitigation (including GHG inventories) and adaptation. We note that this is detailed under section 2.9.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/31/2021: Please address comments below:

- Section 2.1 could be further streamlined, in particular the information regarding Vanuatu's national development context is not necessary at this stage nor in this section (while we understand it can be part of the implementing agency's Project Document).

- Please provide additional details as to the ongoing work under the TNC and first BUR under Section 2.2 with regards to the institutional arrangements for their implementation, timelines for completion and submission, and existing technical capacities and/or under development (which IPCC guidelines are being used? are emission factors all default ones? is a QA/QC system being established? etc.)

- If possible, update Section 2.4 with the information from the most recently submitted NDC (we understand it happened after this PIF was submitted).

- Please clarify what the existing Environment Management Information System (EMIS) consists of and how (if at all) it is related/connected to the MRV tool for Energy

Sector and the MRV Tool for NERM 2016-2030. What is the state and use of these tools? This would help clarify the alternative scenario.

- Table 8 in section 2.9 is unclear and not very helpful in this section. The column titled "ETF requirements" does not make reference to the MPGs of the ETF but rather a general list of desired outcomes. This table (revised) could instead be placed under the section "incremental reasoning" after the alternative scenario has been described.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Please address comments below:

- On Component 1 - How will this component ensure that the institutional arrangements created are sustainable and properly internalized? Are there other outcomes beyond reporting to the UNFCCC that would provide benefits to the national government and thus encourage support for these systems in the long run.

- Will indicators developed under Activity 1.1.2.2 and 1.1.3.3. aim to capture all mitigation actions in the updated NDC? How about under adaptation, considering the many different sectors prioritized? How will this build on the existing systems?

- Please elaborate on how the projects activities on the AFOLU sector will link to the REDD+ work specifically.

- Regarding the focus on climate finance - will that cover both domestic and international sources of finance? Will it focus on public sector finance or also from the private sector?

- We note there is no discussion on assessing technology, finance and capacity-building support needed, which is one of the elements of the ETF.

- Under Component 2, please clarify which system the MRV system(s) would build upon and how it will link to the existing EMIS.

- Considering the focus on energy and AFOLU, please clarify if this system would include GHG inventories for the other IPCC sectors (IPPU and Waste) or if these would be incorporated later. Likewise for the different prioritized adaptation sectors. If such is

the case, please consider a project activity focused on developing a plan for the gradual build out of the system.

- Consider how the project will support Vanuatu to increase transparency over time. For example, regarding emission factors - during project development, how will the project prioritize the development of these, and for those which it cannot develop, ensure that a plan for gradual improvement through future resources could be implemented.

- For both components, please consider modalities for training that would help build institutional knowledge sustainably such as training of trainers modules, identifying a national/regional institution or university to partner with for training curricula, providing career growth/incentive for highly trained individuals etc.

7/6/2021: Comments above cleared.

Under component 1, we note that paragraph 92 mentions "The proposed institutional mechanism will operate continuously focusing on national communications, and biennial update reports" however, the focus of the ETF is on biennial transparency reports as BURs will no longer be required. Please amend.

See comment above on loss and damage.

7/9/2021: Cleared

Agency Response

8/7/2021

-Thanks for the comment and observation. Paragraph 92 has been rephrased to indicate alignment with the biennial transparency reports (BTR)

On loss and damage - As per the ?Modalities, procedures and guidelines for the transparency framework for action and support referred to in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement? the activities are aligned with the MPGs and rephrased to reflect the same. Please see table B and para 90 and 93.

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/31/2021: Yes, the project is well aligned to 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

3/31/2021: See comment above about Table 8. It would be better placed in this section.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Yes.

Agency Response

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/31/2021: Please strengthen this section with specific information relating to each of the three (innovation, sustainability and scaling up) goals. Also, consider the role that Vanuatu plays as a SIDS and a recent graduate of LDC and the lessons they may be able to share with other comparable countries.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: 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

3/31/2021: Since Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities were not part of the validation workshop, please remove the "Yes" next to them.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Yes.

7/16/2021: Please address comment below:

• While the information provided in the PIF is sufficient, it is noted that the submission is referring to GEF's 2015 Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP). This reference is outdated and the project should rather review, comply and reference GEF's Policy on Gender Equality, 2017 (https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/EN_GEF.C.53.04_Gender_Policy.pdf) and the GEF Guidance on Gender, 2018 (<https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/publications/GEF%20Guidance%20on%20Gender.pdf>). Please revise and review additional guidance from the GEF.

7/20/2021: The comment has been addressed.

Agency Response

RE 16 July:

Thank you for the feedback. Based on the review comment, the gender-responsive results-based indicators will be developed based on the GEF Policy on Gender Equality (2017), the Guidance to advance Gender equality in GEF Projects and Programs (2018), and the GEF Gender Implementation Strategy (2018). This revision is shown in yellow colour in paragraph 106.

Private Sector Engagement

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

Secretariat Comment at PIF/Work Program Inclusion

3/31/2021: Thank you for the descriptions provided. Please consider including any private sector entities from the AFOLU sector that may be involved in this project as well.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Please add a summary of the climate-screening in the table. Please also consider Please consider including high staff turnover as a risk.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Please add a description for coordination with the CBIT Global Platform and the two global FAO CBIT projects as relevant.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Please add how the project is aligned with Vanuatu's NDC.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

Agency Response -Thanks for the comment. The alignment with Vanuatu's NDC is added in paragraph 117.

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

3/31/2021: 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

3/31/2021: An ESS is provided. Please summarize the findings (assessed as low risk) and measures to be taken in this section.

7/6/2021: Cleared.

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

3/31/2021: Yes, the OFP has endorsed this project.

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

3/31/2021: Please address comments.

7/6/2021: Please address remaining comments. Also, please remove the highlighting in final resubmission and ensure formatting is consistent throughout.

7/9/2021: PM recommends technical clearance.

7/16/2021: Please address remaining comment, highlighted in yellow.

7/20/2021: 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

Review Dates

	PIF Review	Agency Response
First Review	4/1/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/6/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/9/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/16/2021	
Additional Review (as necessary)	7/20/2021	

PIF Recommendation to CEO

Brief reasoning for recommendations to CEO for PIF Approval