GEF-6 GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL-SIZED/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS
THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUND

GEF ID:	**9986**		
Country/Region:	**Bangladesh**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening Capacity for Monitoring Environmental Emissions under the Paris Agreement in Bangladesh**		
GEF Agency:	**FAO**	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	**Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency**	GEF Focal Area (s):	
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		**CBIT-1; CBIT-1;**	
Anticipated Financing PPG:	**$50,000**	Project Grant:	**$863,242**
Co-financing:	**$1,000,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$1,863,242**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Akio Takemoto**	Agency Contact Person:	**Sue Lautze**

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
Project Consistency	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework?[1]	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT programming directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: Yes, the project is aligned with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement and consistent with a part of Bangladesh's NDC (in the AFOLU and MSW). The project will also coordinate with the GEF-funded	

[1] For BD projects: has the project explicitly articulated which Aichi Target(s) the project will help achieve and are SMART indicators identified, that will be used to track the project's contribution toward achieving the Aichi Target(s)?

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		project to prepare its Third National Communication.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: Not yet, the PIF indicates that agriculture, MSW and improper land-use management are key drivers of increase of GHG emissions. However, we don't know how much the AFOLU and MSW sectors are prioritized in the whole climate change policy in Bangladesh. Please clarify this point by providing data on the contribution of AFOLU and MSW sectors in the National GHG emissions. Regarding innovation, there are some other tools the project could benefit from in order to increase capacity for monitoring and data collection. For example, we suggest to include the use of the Open Foris/Collect Earth tool developed by FAO. AT/MRS May 29, 2018: Comments cleared.	New paragraphs (paragraph 12, 13) and a new data table (Table 3) about the AFOLU and MSW sectors contribution to the national GHG accounts have been added to show the priority of these two sectors in climate change policy, in particular, NDC of Bangladesh. Additional text on the suggested innovation to use open source tools like Open Foris, Collect Earth, SEPAL interoperable platform using Geonode has been added (Table B, Output 2.1.1 and paragraph 40).
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: Not yet, please address the following comments: 1) Please make sure the content of each section in the PIF responds adequately to the section title. For	(1) Additional text on the root causes and barriers has been added. A new paragraph 17 has been added to solely describe the root causes of lacking the ETF framework requirement. Table 6 listed the barriers and constraints in relation to ETF requirement (paragraph

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		example, under "Problem, root causes and barriers to be addressed" there is information missing on the root causes and barriers that need to be addressed in order to justify why Bangladesh is seeking funds to strengthen institutional and technical capacity in order to meet the requirements under the ETF of the Paris Agreement for the AFOLU and waste management sectors specifically. The information currently included under that section provides a lot of details on the sectors themselves that are not as relevant to the CBIT project proposal. Please focus on the reasoning for prioritizing these sectors and the existing barriers and capacity needs for transparency in those sectors. 2) As you mentioned in the proposal, there is an ongoing GEF funded project "Third National Communication to the UNFCCC" (UNDP-Bangladesh, GEF Project ID: 5189) that started in 2013. Since the Government of Bangladesh is expected to update the National GHG Inventory for the year 2007-2011 and develop a Database Management system for GHGs through this project, we are happy to see that there is a reference to it in the proposal.	17, 18 and Table 6). (2) Additional texts on the contribution of this project to build on the ongoing GEF funded project "Third National Communication to the UNFCCC" have been added. Please refer to paragraph 25. The project will build on the Third National Communication by improving data sharing, data accessibility, documentation, analysis archiving and developing a national database for GHG inventory and an information system interoperable with other national platforms. (3) Additional texts on the GHG emission data (paragraph 12 and Table 3 on GHG emission data) and scenarios on AFOLU and MSW sectors in comparison with other major sectors (paragraph 20 and Table 7 on scenarios) have been added utilizing the latest GHG inventory. A simple scenario analysis was conducted using projected population. More detailed scenario analysis will be conducted during PPG phase. (4) Additional explanation has been added about the integration of the outputs into the overall national GHG inventory system (paragraph 35). A more detailed explanation on the

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		3) Please provide detailed information on emission data and scenarios in the AFOLU and MSW sectors in comparison with other major sectors utilizing the latest GHG inventory data to provide more information on emission reduction potential in these sectors and support their identification as priority sectors under this CBIT proposal. 4) It is not clear how this project will integrate outputs of the project (AFOLU and MSW) into the overall national GHG inventory system of Bangladesh. Please clarify this point. AT/MRS May 29, 2018: Comments cleared.	integration of the project output to the national GHG inventory will be added during PPG phase based on needs and gaps analysis.
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: Not yet, please address following questions below: 1) Please make sure the project objective in Table B more accurately reflects the goals to be achieved through the project outcomes. Currently, it appears to be too narrowly focused on the reporting itself.	(1) The project objective statement in Table B has been re-arranged to reflect the project outcomes more accurately (Table B, Project Objective). (2) Additional text on the investment and technology transfer at local universities has been added (paragraph 40). Details on technology transfer mechanism will be added during PPG phase based on needs and gaps analysis.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		2) In the project document, there is information about how the project will facilitate the investment and technology transfer for new and updated equipment at local universities and labs for MRV. This is not very clear on table B or in the descriptions of the components. 3) Component 1 a) There linkage between Outcome 1.1 and Output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2 is not clear. Please clarify if Outcome 1.1 is focused on the AFOLU and waste sectors only. In addition, will the coordination and road map under Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 cover other sectors? Please clarify. b) Output 1.1.3 and 1.1.4: Please specify how the project will aim to establish and strengthen a collaboration and coordination mechanism among national entities involving AFOLU, transportation, industry, energy, and waste sectors. In order to achieve this, the project must involve all relevant Ministries and Agencies, local governments, and representatives from the private sector and CSOs. Please clarify and add the relevant stakeholders to Table 8 including Power, Transport and Industry.	3) Component 1 a) The text has been modified to clarify about the outcome 1.1, and Output 1.1.1 and 1.1.2. Similarly, the text related with Outputs 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 has been modified to clarify the coordination and road map(Table B and paragraph 36, 37). b) and c) This project aims at AFOLU and waste sector. So, the Output 1.1.3 has been modified to "Established collaboration and coordination mechanism among national entities involving AFOLU and waste sector for data sharing" and the 1.1.4 has been modified to "National ETF monitoring and reporting road map prepared and adopted involving AFOLU and waste sector". Accordingly Table 10 contains the stakeholders information on AFOLU and waste sectors. A more detailed collaboration mechanism and coordination mechanism will be developed during the PPG phase based on the needs and gaps analysis. d) The goal statement of the project and the Component 1 and 2 have been re-arranged to show the possible support of the project to the NDC (Table B and paragraph 35 - 37). 4) Component 2: Additional text has been added to show

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		c) Output 1.2.1: Please further clarify how the project aims to strengthen this coordination mechanism. d) In order to further enhance transparency, this project could support the Government of Bangladesh to update its NDC by setting quantified emission reduction targets in the AFOLU and MSW sectors in the future (relevant to activities (a) and (g) under the CBIT Programming Directions). Please consider incorporating this outcome into the component and the overall goal of the project. 4) Component 2: Project outcome 2.1: This outcome should build on outputs from ongoing or previous projects such as the "Third National Communication to the UNFCCC" (UNDP-Bangladesh, GEF Project ID: 5189). Please specify how it will do so. 5) Component 3: a) It is not very clear what the project is trying to achieve in terms of the linkages between the outcomes and the outputs delivered with the intervention of the project. In the description of this component	how the ongoing initiative will be integrated into this project (paragraph 39). More detailed integration of existing or previous project will be added during the PPG phase. 5) Component 3: a) The text has been modified to clarify the focus on NDC adaptation priorities of individual and institutional capacity building, biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and ecosystem based adaptation including forestry co-management (paragraph 42 - 44). Table 8 has also been modified to focus more specifically on adaptation priorities most relevant to this project. With respect to budget, this allocation is based upon projected costs associated with stocktaking exercise, relevant M&E systems, setting up adaptation MIS and knowledge management systems and building country specific capacity to monitor, report and aggregate information from numerous relevant adaptation programs at a national level. These activities involve investments in capacity building for indicator development, knowledge system management and coordination as well as investments in hardware for database management and connectivity. The budget allocated is considered to be realistic for this purpose.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		(42,43,44) there is not enough information available in order to understand which NDC adaptation priorities (from table 3) will be prioritized to address in this project. Further, this clarification is needed to properly assess the appropriateness of the budget allocated to this component. b) We note that Outcome 3.1 "Monitoring and reporting of support received by the country" does not seem to match the Outputs and their descriptions. Please clarify if the component will focus on transparency of support or of adaptation actions and modify correspondingly. If you intend to achieve this outcome, you also need to modify these outputs accordingly. AT/MRS May 29, 2018: Comments cleared.	b) The title of the Component 3 has been modified to "Strengthened capacity to monitor and report the adaptation activities in support of the NDC", and accordingly Outcome 3.1 has been modified to "Monitoring and reporting progress of adaptation actions" (Table B and paragraph 42 - 44).
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: Yes, socio-economic aspects including gender are included in this project.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: This project is requesting resources from	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		the CBIT TF and there are still enough resources to support this project.	
	• The focal area allocation?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: This project is requesting resources from CBIT TF and there are still enough resources to support this project.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	AT/MRS February 1, 2018: Not yet, please address comments stated in box 3, 4 and 5. AT/MRS May 29, 2018: Comments cleared. The project manager recommend the PIF for clearance.	
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
Project Design and Financing	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?		
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?		
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?		
	4. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change, and describes sufficient risk response measures? (e.g., measures to enhance climate resilience)		
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?		
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?		
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* Has a reflow calendar been presented?		
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the country or in the region?		
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

[3] If it is a child project under a program, assess if the components of the child project align with the program criteria set for selection of child projects.