



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

GEF ID:	<b>10014</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Jamaica</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Strengthening Jamaica's Capacity to meet transparency requirements under the Paris Agreement</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>IADB</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:		Project Grant:	<b>\$1,300,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$159,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,459,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Milena Vasquez</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>gerard Alleng</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, March 29, 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?	MGV, March 29, 2018: Yes, Jamaica ratified the Paris Agreement on 10 Apr 2017. The project is aligned with its NDC, Climate Change Policy Framework and the National Energy Policy 2009-2030.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	MGV, March 29, 2018: Please	

<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>address comments below:</p> <p>a) One of the challenges raised is that there is no funding to support regular and continuous inventory preparation. How will this challenge be addressed through this project or outside of it to ensure sustainability?</p> <p>MGV, May 18, 2018: a) Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>MGV, March 29, 2018: A number of barriers and constraints to meeting the requirements of Article 13 are identified. Please address the following comments:</p> <p>a) Please make explicit reference to the capacity-building needs raised by the ICA process both in the baseline scenario and incremental reasoning (how they will be addressed by the project) sections.</p> <p>b) Please explain how the Outputs 1.1.2 and 1.1.3 are incremental to the assessments of institutional arrangements included as part of the TNC and 2BUR project.</p> <p>c) It is not clear if section 1.2.4 refers to existing plans and activities to build a transparency framework or to the CBIT proposal itself. Please</p>	

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>clarify. d) Please describe under the section Coordination how the project will benefit from and dovetail with other donor funded ETF/MRV projects (in-country, regional, global).</p> <p>MGV, May 18, 2018: a) Reference to the needs identified via the ICA process have been added. Comment cleared. b) The scope of these assessments has been clarified and they are incremental. Comment cleared. c) This has been clarified. Comment cleared. d) This has been clarified. Comment cleared.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>MGV, March 29, 2018: Please address comments below:</p> <p>Component 1 a) Output 1.1.1. How will the project institutionalize the National Transparency Working Group? Will it require a legal mandate?</p> <p>Component 2 a) Please clarify the scope of the harmonized sectoral methodologies and tools envisioned. What sectors, information, data will be included? b) Output 2.1.1. How will the project institutionalize data supply</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>agreements? Will it seek to develop MOUs with relevant ministries/stakeholders?</p> <p>c) Output 2.1.2. Further, please provide more details on the existing information and arrangements. For example, are there existing indicators and definitions for data on adaptation, mitigation and climate finance? Are there existing quality assurance Q/A and quality compliance Q/C systems?</p> <p>d) Output 2.2.1. Please clarify is the use of distributed ledger technology will be explored under this output. Please also provide additional details on existing knowledge for the application of this technology to the tracking of mitigation targets. If the technology proves to be technically viable; how will the country aim to support the application of it after the project, financially and institutionally?</p> <p>Component 3</p> <p>a) How will the Centralised National Climate Knowledge Platform be sustained after the project ends?</p> <p>b) Please clarify how the project will actually promote the use of information in the platform to inform decision-making (linkage between GHGs and other information with sectoral policy, etc). Also, clarify</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>what decision-making it refers to.            c) Please also add sharing knowledge with the Global Coordination Platform under this component.            d) Please clarify the scope of capacity building envisioned under Output 3.1.3 and how will the project ensure the sustainability of the capacity built.</p> <p>MGV, May 18, 2018:            Component 1            a) Comment cleared. A legal mandate may be explored. The project will take advantage of the newly constructed Climate Change Advisory Board.</p> <p>Component 2            a) The scope of methodologies and tools has been clarified.            b) MOUs may be used and will take advantage of the existing focal point network. Comment cleared.            c) Comment cleared. Existing arrangement have been clarified.            d) Comment cleared for now. By CEO Endorsement we will expect to see a cleared vision for how exactly distributed ledger technology will be piloted in Jamaica with this project.</p> <p>Component 3            a) Comment cleared for now. By CEO Endorsement please provide a</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		sustainability strategy. b) Comment cleared. c) Sharing with the Global Coordination Platform has been added. Comment cleared. d) The scope of capacity building has been explained somewhat. By CEO Endorsement, please provide more details on the scope and recipients of the different capacity building activities.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, March 29, 2018: The project will involve the participation of civil society and academia, including the Jamaica Environment Trust, the Caribbean Youth Environment Network and the University of the West Indies- Mona Campus (Climate Studies Group). The project takes into account gender equality, including by developing a gender responsive results based framework.	
<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, March 29, 2018: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>	MGV, March 29, 2018: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or</li> </ul>		

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	Technology Transfer)?		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>	MGV, March 29, 2018: N/A. This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MGV, March 29, 2018: Please address comments above. In addition please fix the following on the PIF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Table A cofinancing is only listed in the total row; please add above.</li> <li>- Table D under Country/Regional Global should say "Jamaica" not Headquarters</li> <li>- Please fill out Table F with the appropriate indicator under (6) for one country</li> </ul> <p>MGV, May 18, 2018: All comments have been addressed and the below edits have been made. PM recommends CEO PIF Approval.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	March 29, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 18, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

## CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
<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 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		
<b>Recommendation</b>	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
<b>Review Date</b>	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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.