



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

GEF ID:	<b>9942</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Honduras</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Support in the design and implementation of the integrated monitoring system of climate change for Honduras</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	
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:	<b>\$20,000</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$1,050,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$150,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,200,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Milena Vasquez</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Geordie Colville</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, November 21, 2017: 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?	MGV, November 21, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with its Nationally Determined Contribution and The Climate Agenda of Honduras (April 2017).	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MGV, November 21, 2017: Yes, the	

<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)?

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	<p>drivers<sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>PIF identifies the main barriers that Honduras is facing including a lack of a consolidated monitoring system for climate change indicators to generate NDC reports, defined climate change indicators and associated operational guidelines, protocols and logistical arrangements for MRV of climate change data. Further, while there has been support for a monitoring system, there have been obstacles in its execution that this project aims to address.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>MGV, November 21, 2017: Please clarify the following: Output 1.1.1. a) How are the Third National Communication and first BUR being currently implemented? According to the PIF, the UGMCC would have the responsibility for those reports under the proposed integrated monitoring system. Are there any existing arrangements that can be built on? What is currently the role of the UGMCC and ONCC-DS for this work? Are there lessons learned from the current development of those reports that can inform work under this output? b) Please clarify the composition of the ONCC-DS - does it include</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>officials from other relevant ministries and/or secretariats according to the sectors identified in the NDC? If not, how is the project expecting to involve the relevant sectors under the NDC in this unified system?</p> <p>Output 1.1.2            a) There may be existing experiences, both within the country and in the region, regarding the development of NDC indicators. Please elaborate on existing efforts and specific gaps this output aims to build on, and on how it will incorporate best practices and lessons learned.            b) Please also clarify whether this output will be solely focused on developing indicators, and if so, whether Honduras is also considering other efforts or initiatives to strengthen QA/QC, GHG inventories, data collection and management, country-specific emission factors and activity data, and GHG projections and policy impact assessments.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3            a) From the PIF it appears that the UGMCC and the ONCC-DS already exists. Please clarify how their operation is currently supported or why the financial mechanism is</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>needed.</p> <p>b) In addition, please elaborate on the risk and risk management strategies of insufficient funds to support the operation of the integrated monitoring system, particularly in light of the upcoming national election. What is the likelihood that the system would not be supported by the national budget, and if so, how would the project adapt to achieve the proposed outputs?</p> <p>Output 1.1.4</p> <p>a) Please elaborate further on the scope of this output and how it builds on the previous three outputs to better understand the budget allocated to it, which currently seems high.</p> <p>Output 1.1.5</p> <p>a) Please provide more details on the expected scope and results of this capacity strengthening and information exchange program including potential recipients (including from where and in what capacity), sources and types of knowledge and training, any existing needs and gaps identified previously, etc.</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MGV/JDS, April 3, 2018: We have remaining comments. Please see below:</p> <p>Output 1.1.1            a) Comment not cleared. Please further clarify.</p> <p>We understand that the executing agency for the NC and BUR is the same as for this project. Even if the project is being implemented by a different agency and with the use of international consultants, we would expect a certain level of understanding from the national executing agency regarding the status of the project and how it is being implemented. For example, the GHG inventory is a key aspect of reporting under the Paris Agreement and thus should inform the work under this CBIT project. Has that project supported the SINGEI and what is the SINGEI's current status? If it does not yet exist, how (with what resources and where) will it be set up and how will it be integrated with the proposed integrated monitoring system? What is the existing role of the inter-institutional technical committee of climate change of Honduras? Are they involved in the work under the NC and BUR? Are there any existing arrangements that can support this</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>new system beyond lessons learned regarding the importance of the private sector and civil society?</p> <p>Mention of "uncoordinated roles and functions of different actors, lack of buy-in of data users/providers, and lack of an integrate climate data and information system into a single national reporting system" is made, yet it is not clear what the current institutional arrangements for the different aspects of the transparency framework are and how this output will address remaining gaps and needs. Will the system house and manage the inventory data or will the UGMCC request the SINGEI for the necessary data to complete future reports? What is the relationship between NDC indicators and the GHG inventory?</p> <p>b) Expected composition of ONCC-DS has been clarified. Comment cleared.</p> <p>Output 1.1.2            a) Comment cleared for now. By CEO Endorsement we expect a more thorough discussion of how explicitly these indicators are linked to the NDC, which for mitigation entails an overall GHG reduction target as well</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>as two sectoral targets (reforestation and fuelwood consumption), and any process to update the NDC in the future.</p> <p>b) Comment cleared.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3</p> <p>a) Comment not cleared. The operating status of both the UGMCC and ONCC-DS is still unclear. Will CBIT funds function as a catalyst towards their operability, or are they expected to "lift-off" regardless? What is the anticipated timeline of their ability to function as described in the project proposal? To be more specific, CBIT funds must be disbursed by 30 June 2023. Given the proposed 3 year project duration, will all of the necessary actors and systems be established in time to ensure project completion? What is the level of risk, if any?</p> <p>b) Comment not cleared. While it is explained that there is low risk that it will not be supported by the national budget, it is not clear then why it has not been supported before now. Please describe how the obstacles described on page 9 are expected to be overcome so that the project can move forward as proposed. This is</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>related to comment a) above.</p> <p>Output 1.1.4            a) Comment not cleared. Specifically we would like to know what climate change data MRV would be covered by the new integrated system. Does it include tracking of the NDC under both mitigation and adaptation? Does it include support needed and received? How will the system use and/or integrate existing databases and sources? Will the operating guidelines and protocols also involve the other ministries and stakeholders outside of the Secretariat (including those involved in the SNMB, MRV, SINGEI, SINIA, Sistema de mecanismo financiero nacional, Sistema de reporte presidencial)? Further, please elaborate on the expected hardware and software to be procured under this output (where will it be housed? who will be responsible for its maintenance and future sustainability? what data is expected to be stored?)</p> <p>Output 1.1.5            a) Comment cleared.</p> <p>MGV, June 1, 2018: All remaining comments have been adequately</p>	



## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>addressed.</p> <p>Output 1.1.1 a) Additional information on the existing capacities and institutional arrangements has been provided. Comment cleared.</p> <p>Output 1.1.3 a) Neither the UGMCC nor the ONCC-DC are operative. The CBIT support will function as a catalyst to get them operational. Comment cleared. b) Government support through the regulations accompanying the Climate Change Law of 2013 is ensured. Comment cleared.</p> <p>Output 1.1.4 a) The new integrated system would include tracking mitigation and adaptation actions in the NDC, as well as support needed and received. The platform aims to link to existing information from other systems. Software and hardware will be housed at both the UGMCC and ONCC-DS and will be their respective responsibilities. Comment cleared.</p>	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, November 21, 2017: See comments above on Output 1.1.4 and 1.1.5.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects,	MGV, November 21, 2017: No, while	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	<p>the PIF identifies that the project design would include the participation of CSOs and indigenous peoples, there is no additional information on how they will be engaged. Please clarify.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, April 3, 2018: Question was not addressed in the response sheet, but an additional box on indigenous peoples was added to the stakeholders table. There is no information on CSOs, however. Please clarify and by CEO Endorsement provide more details on engagement with and consideration of CSOs and indigenous peoples.</p> <p>MGV, June 1, 2018: Additional information on stakeholders was added plus further CSO involvement will be clarified at CEO Endorsement. Comment cleared.</p>	
<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, November 21, 2017: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund and not Honduras' STAR allocation.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	MGV, November 21, 2017: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund and not	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Honduras' STAR allocation.	
	<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>	MGV, November 21, 2017: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT Trust Fund and not Honduras' STAR allocation. There are sufficient resources in the CBIT Trust Fund to support this project.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MGV, November 21, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments in questions 4 and 6.</p> <p>Furthermore, Honduras will hold national elections this weekend. Please address whether this may have an impact on the project and reflect correspondingly under part 4 - Risks - "Lack of political support for the development of each output of this project".</p> <p>MGV/JDS, April 3, 2018: Thank you for your responses; however, we have some remaining questions. Finally, for the re-submission, it would help to highlight the changes and additions to facilitate our review.</p> <p>MGV, June 1, 2018: All comments</p>	

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
		have been adequately addressed. PM recommends CEO PIF Approval.	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	November 21, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 03, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 01, 2018	

<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?		
	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		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	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?		
<b>Agency Responses</b>	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF <sup>3</sup> stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<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.

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<b>Recommendation</b>			
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		