



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

GEF ID:	9835		
Country/Region:	Chile		
Project Title:	Strengthening Chile's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) Transparency Framework		
GEF Agency:	UNEP	GEF Agency Project ID:	
Type of Trust Fund:	Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency	GEF Focal Area (s):	Climate Change
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	CBIT-1;		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	\$30,000	Project Grant:	\$1,232,000
Co-financing:	\$870,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,102,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	Geordie Colville

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	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with CBIT objectives	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes. Chile ratified the Paris Agreement on February 10, 2017. Its NDC includes a carbon intensity target of 30% below 2007 levels by 2030, increasing to 35% conditional. In the LULUCF sector, Chile is committed to restoration and reforestation targets.	

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
		Further, the CBIT project is consistent with Chile's FBUR and SBUR and its National Action Plan on Climate Change, among others.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, the PIF identifies key gaps in Chile's transparency framework, including a need for an integrated platform for climate change information, additional capacities for GHG projections to support development of long-term goals, adaptation indicators, institutional capacity for collecting, processing and reporting information, including public climate expenditures.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, this project builds upon and coordinates with efforts carried out or currently under way such as the Mitigation Options to Face Climate Change, Low Emission Capacity Building, TNC, SBUR, and Partnership for Market Readiness, as well as support from Information Matters, EUROCLIMA, International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, the Carbon-Budget Framework for Chile, and NDC Partnership.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes. The project consists of 2 components: 1. Strengthening of Chile's	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	Transparency framework for mitigation and adaptation actions. 2. Institutionalization of the public climate expenditures.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes. With regards to gender, the project will engage with key stakeholders such as the gender focal point for the UNFCCC and CSOs. It also aims to organize a gender workshop during PPG phase.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	MGV, May 21, 2017: NA. The project requests resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 	MGV, May 21, 2017: NA	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The LDCF under the principle of equitable access 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, the PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	May 21, 2017	
	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. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> 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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
	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.