



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

GEF ID:	<b>9675</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global (Global)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>CBIT Global Coordination Platform</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP and UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>1512 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CBIT-1;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$400,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,400,000</b>
PIF Approval:	<b>November 04, 2016</b>	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Dustin Schinn</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Yamil Bonduki</b>

<b>PIF Review</b>			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
<b>Project Consistency</b>	1. Is the project aligned with the relevant GEF strategic objectives and results framework? <sup>1</sup>	MGV/RM November 4, 2016: Yes. The project is aligned with the Capacity Building for Transparency Initiative (CBIT).	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project is a global project to assist CBIT coordination.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project is in its first stage and can	

<sup>1</sup> 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)?

<sup>2</sup> Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	be scaled up for wider implementation and will address countries' capacity needs for transparency.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project will allow countries to meet their commitments under the Paris Agreement. It will coordinate with other existing initiatives.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Gender and CSOs are considered.	
<b>Availability of Resources</b>	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The STAR allocation?</li> </ul>	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: N/A. Resources will come from the CBIT trust fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>			
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes. PM Recommends CEO Approval. By CEO Endorsement, please ensure that the coordination platform is open to	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		inputs from other related national projects and initiatives.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	November 04, 2016	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<b>CEO endorsement Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>Project Design and Financing</b>	1. If there are any changes from that presented in the PIF, have justifications been provided?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: The proposal very much aligns with the proposed approach at PIF approval stage. We welcome the timely preparation of CEO Endorsement Request and believe the proposed approach is based on sound and clear technical reasoning.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: The project structure is overall sound and clear, however, a few issues could benefit from further refinement, including:	(1) Sharing of knowledge and resources on the enhanced transparency framework of the Paris Agreement is at the core of this project. As such, we see this project primarily benefiting recipients in terms of the resources that will be made available through the platform.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Overall</p> <p>(1) More broadly, the platform needs to primarily benefit recipients, as a useful resources for developing countries. However, in addition, the website can collect information that is useful for coordination across different initiatives and donors at the same time. The website could have a "project database" that could be sorted by country. In order for the website to be up to date and useful in a timely and continuous fashion, the GCP staff will need to have capacity to edit and curate content and perhaps even suggest suitable text for countries that they can approve, rather than expecting recipients to write everything. In addition, of course, those CBIT projects that have allocated budget for sharing of lessons learned etc would be expected to contribute more proactively to the GCP website.</p> <p>(2) Related to the above, the CBIT Programming Directions clearly states that the CBIT was established "to support developing country Parties, upon request, in meeting enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the Agreement." Further, the global coordination platform "will engage</p>	<p>Additionally, two of the outputs of this project (1.3. and 1.4.) aim at collecting data on national CBIT projects, other transparency initiatives, and country efforts on transparency. With the gathering of this information, we believe that the possibility of creating a comprehensive project database and coordination between different transparency initiatives will be strengthened. A template of the project database, with some exemplary data, is provided in Annex O.</p> <p>The GCP staff will ensure that the information in different components of the platform is complete and updated at all times and will, when necessary, collect data to complete the information required in the country profiles. Under output 1.3, additional text has been inserted detailing how the platform will automatically send requests to focal points of countries and focal points of implementing agencies, prompting them to give an update on the implementation of CBIT projects, and share lessons learnt through the platform – Page 13. Country teams, will be guided by the GCP staff, in collaboration with the IAs, when filling in any requested information in the website. A corresponding activity in Output 1.3 reads as follows: - 1.3.2 'Provide guidance to countries on the use of self-reporting tool' - in page 13</p> <p>(2) References to donors were checked</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>countries, the GEF Partner Agencies, and other relevant entities and institutions with related programming activities to enhance partnership of national, multilateral, and bilaterally-supported capacity-building initiatives." Thus, while developed country Parties and other Parties that provide support should report on this information under Article 13, the CBIT was not established to support that mechanism. As such, we would rather see references made to countries, GEF Agencies and other relevant entities and institutions rather than donors throughout the document. In addition, along these lines the text on page 7 needs to be edited with regards to "the lack of a platform for Parties to disclose information related to capacity building support provided," and "The platform will also provide clarity on support provided and received by relevant individual Parties...and thereby be a key tool to inform the "global stocktakes." Similar references are made on page 8. Please review and revise accordingly.</p> <p>(3) On Page 6, please clarify whether "National Action Plan" means National Adaptation Plan and change wording as needed;</p>	<p>throughout the document and substituted, in context, by references to entities, institutions and initiatives. It is now clearer that the focus of the platform is to support developing countries and in particular, countries with CBIT projects. The project database (Annex O) will be used to gather information on all existing CBIT projects for use by GEF Partner Agencies, and other relevant entities and institutions working on transparency and MRV related initiatives. GEF IAs will also be requested to support the GCP staff in obtaining information on CBIT country-level information as indicated in output 1.3 page 12. The text on page 7 and 8 have been edited accordingly</p> <p>(3) The wording has been corrected to National Adaptation Plan. (see page 7 para 1)</p> <p>(4) A provision for this has been included on page 9, under the second para of the proposed alternative scenarios, stating that: "the project will retain enough flexibility to integrate evolving guidance on the Modalities, Procedures, and Guidelines for the implementation of the Paris Agreement." (see page 9)</p> <p>Since The GEF is part of the Steering Committee (as depicted in Annex H), a permanent link with the platform is ensured, which allows for the provision of guidance as necessary, with the consequent adjustment in the Global Coordination Platform's approach.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>(4) As regard the Global Coordination Platform overall, it will be important to maintain flexibility to be responsive to, and integrate, evolving COP guidance related to the Modalities, Procedures and Guidelines under the Paris Agreement, and as it relates to NDCs. Similarly, the GEF receives guidance from the COP and the Global Coordination Platform will need to be flexible to adjust its approach based on any evolving guidance the GEF receives. A link between the GEF and the platform on a more permanent basis is hence deemed essential. Please include a provision to this effect.</p> <p>(5) On Page 23, in the organigram, please include a box flowing out of GEF CBIT to national level projects. National level projects (by all GEF implementing agencies who are involved in CBIT implementation) would then have a separate box in the organigram, connected to both GEF CBIT (upstream) and CBIT Global Coordination Platform (downstream), running in parallel to the connection between GEF CBIT and CBIT GCP. This way, it would become clearer that GEF CBIT directly interacts with</p>	<p>(5) The organigram has been edited accordingly. A clarification has been provided on the UNDP role: - i.e. that UNDP is tasked with the development of a road map for Phase II of the CBIT Global Coordination Platform (see page 25).</p> <p>(6) References to transparency and to MRV have been checked for consistency, and their meaning clarified in context. For example, the text in page 7 para 4 has been edited and changed to: "The primary problem this project will address is hence the lack of a global coordination platform for information sharing and knowledge management on the enhanced transparency framework, as defined by the article 13 of the Paris Agreement."</p> <p>(7) Explicit references to MRV Group of Friends and to other partners or institutions have been removed. We have retained references to other transparency initiatives, without particularizing any, throughout the text.</p> <p>(8) Project output 1.4 has been edited and references to information on donor support removed. In line with that, project outcome 1. has been edited to: "Enhanced coordination and best practice sharing for transparency practitioners through the establishment of a web-based coordination platform". References to self-reporting by donors have also been</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>and approves national-level implementation projects, instead of the GCP approving them.</p> <p>(6) When discussing transparency it may be useful to specify the enhanced transparency framework as defined in Article 13 of the Paris Agreement – not just transparency or MRV in general. For example, on page 7, it states "The primary problem this project will address is hence the lack of a global transparency coordination among development partners, information sharing and knowledge management in the area of MRV."</p> <p>(7) Regarding the references made to the "MRV group of friends," since it is an informally organized group and there is no formal link between the CBIT, the CBIT Global Coordination Platform and the "MRV groups of friends.", it may be best to limit references to engagement with it as with other partners working in relevant initiatives or institutions for coordination and knowledge-sharing.</p> <p>(8) Outcome 1</p> <p>(8a) Building on overall comments, please remove outputs on information on donor support, including on self-</p>	<p>removed. We have therefore changed the indicator in Annex A on 'donors using the platform to make funding decisions' to 'Number of entities and institutions using the platform to enhance partnerships' (see page 30)</p> <p>(8b) Figure 1 has been edited and changed accordingly (see page 11)</p> <p>(8c) The reference to Facilitative Sharing of Views in the context of information exchange has been removed. The Global Coordination Platform will not only include links to the UNFCCC website and resources, but it will also consult the UNFCCC Secretariat and its constituted bodies during the project implementation. This is included in output 1.1 pg. 10; &amp; Output 1.2 pg. 12.</p> <p>(8d) This indicator on institutional capacity for transparency has been added in the Self-assessment tool as described under output 1.2 in page 11. Data collected through the self-assessment tool will inform the Indicators in the tracking tool. The tracking tool has been updated – to the new CBIT tracking tool named "Tracking tool for GEF6 CBIT Projects" (appended as Annex J).</p> <p>(8e) The focus of the transparency snapshot is not the financial amounts associated with transparency initiatives. Rather, the snapshot will present transparency initiatives/efforts as well as new guidance, methodologies on</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>reporting. Please make sure this is removed from the Results Framework as well. Instead, suggest to include information on relevant initiatives/partnerships.</p> <p>(8b) There is no mechanism for the platform to handle support requests, so please do not include this option on the website (as illustrated in Fig 1).</p> <p>(8c) Please clarify the inclusion of the Facilitative Sharing of Views as one source of information exchange, as we do not believe it is relevant for the web-platform. Please ensure there is no overlap with the UNFCCC website and resources—just linkages where relevant.</p> <p>(8d) In addition to indicator 10 from the GEF tracking tool, please consider the indicator <b>QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT OF INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY FOR TRANSPARENCY RELATED ACTIVITIES</b> from the CBIT Programming Directions document.</p> <p>(8e) The transparency snapshot idea is interesting but it could have unforeseen political impacts if it is presented disaggregated by countries.</p>	<p>transparency related work. CBIT success story will also be featured here. There will not be any information on financial amounts displayed in the website, as this information will not be collected - refer to the attached data/information collection tools as appended in Annex O &amp; Annex P.</p> <p>(8f) Included a provision for webinars that explore how practitioners can best use the knowledge exchange module of the platform, and webinars that will draw on sharing lessons learned by countries", (see Output 1.4 page 13 and output 1.5 page 14).</p> <p>(9) All the materials presented at the workshops will be available in the platform's module on emerging practices, methodologies, and guidance. A survey questionnaire to assess usability, usefulness, and user acceptance of the online platform will be administered during the workshops (see Output 2.2 page 16).</p> <p>(10) The initial version of the self-assessment tool is appended as Annex P. The tool will be further developed to ensure its relevance throughout the project duration.</p> <p>(11) More detailed information on stakeholders in A.3. added (see page 20-21).</p> <p>(12) A link to the Gender Responsive National Communications Toolkit is included in page 22. The toolkit is also appended as Annex Q.</p>

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		<p>Please make sure it is presented very generally in terms of transparency initiatives/efforts and with no associated financial amounts.</p> <p>(8f) Consider using other learning modules in addition to the peer exchange forum, such as webinars and webcasts of country presentations.</p> <p>(9) Outcome 2: Please ensure that material presented during workshops is fed-back to the online platform, as well as to use the workshops as an opportunity of assess the user-friendliness and usefulness of the online platform.</p> <p>(10) Outcome 3: Please provide the self-assessment tool as an Annex.</p> <p>(11) Stakeholders: Please provide additional details on the specific stakeholders and partners the project is working with. Please ensure reference is made to other GEF Implementing Agencies and countries with national CBIT projects. Please also include other initiatives/organizations that are relevant (such as ICAT, etc.).</p>	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		(12) Gender: Please submit the Gender Toolkit for NCs and BUR as an Annex.  MGV/DS, August 1, 2017: Comments cleared.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: Yes.	
	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)	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: Yes.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: Yes.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: See comment (8d) under Question 2 above.  MGV/DS, August 1, 2017: Comment cleared.	
	7. <i>Only for Non-Grant Instrument:</i> Has a reflow calendar been presented?	N/A	
	8. Is the project coordinated with other related initiatives and national/regional plans in the	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: See comments under Question 2 above.	

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	country or in the region?	MGV/DS, August 1, 2017: Comment cleared.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: Knowledge management is at the heart of the proposed project.	
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: Yes.	
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	MGV/DS, June 1, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 2 above and submit revised CEO Endorsement Request.  MGV/DS, August 1, 2017: All comments cleared. The Program Managers recommend the project for CEO Approval.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	June 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 01, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

<sup>3</sup> 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.