



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

GEF ID:	9948		
Country/Region:	Madagascar		
Project Title:	Building and Strengthening Madagascar's National Capacity to Implement the Transparency Elements of the Paris Agreement		
GEF Agency:	CI	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:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,344,495
Co-financing:	\$620,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,964,495
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

PIF Review			
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>	DS, November 27, 2017: Yes. Project aligns with CBIT objectives.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS, November 27, 2017: Partly unclear. The project is consistent with the focus of the country's INDC, however, some questions remain:  (1) Madagascar has not submitted a	(1) Biennial Update Report (BUR) process has not yet started but there are plans to start the process early in 2018. The CBIT project will incorporate early lessons from the BUR process during the PPG phase. This has been clarified in Section 6 of the PIF (Page 15).

<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>BUR, but the government should be consulted whether there are any early lessons from the BUR process in the country, including potentially a capacity needs assessment;</p> <p>(2) While the findings of the Second National Communication are highlighted briefly in Section 6 (page 13), it seems that more details on the findings are needed and would be helpful in order to assess the potential effectiveness of the proposed CBIT project to address priority capacity needs that have already been identified.</p> <p>DS, January 31, 2018:            (1) Comment cleared.            (2) Findings from the Second/Third National Communication, as it relates to capacity constraints regarding climate action reporting and tracking, have been elaborated and this comment can be cleared, however, this would imply that no additional capacity building needs assessment is necessary given that the capacity constraints seem to be quite obvious. Please refer to Comment (1) under Question 4 below and remove Output 1.1.1 (capacity needs assessment) from Table B, as the assessment of</p>	<p>(2) Details of the Second National Communication are now included in Section 6, Page 15 and 16. In addition, information from the Third National Communication has been included in Section 6.</p> <p>CI-GEF Agency, 02/12/2018</p> <p>(2) Output 1.1.1 removed from the results framework (Table B) and funding for Component 1 reduced. Description of Outcome 1 updated (see Para 23).</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>institutional arrangements should be carried out during PPG phase and therefore funded from PPG and not from project grant funding.</p> <p>DS, February 14, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	DS, November 27, 2017: Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	<p>DS, November 27, 2017: Partly unclear.</p> <p>(1) Please provide explanation why an additional capacity needs assessment is foreseen under Component 1, in addition to an ongoing BUR process and an existing Second National Communication, which should have revealed capacity needs already; please consider removing the capacity needs assessment or carry out during PPG phase.</p> <p>(2) The description of the global environmental problems (Part II, Project Justification) focuses on climate change induced and other natural disasters and challenges, however, fails to discuss the capacity</p>	<p>(1) It is recognized that Madagascar has identified some capacity development needs within the second and third National Communications, such as the development of emission factors, use of models, and estimation of uncertainties. However, Madagascar still requires a detailed assessment of the institutional arrangements that could contribute to improving the issues related to the collection and use of data to estimate the GHG emissions and vulnerability to climate change. The project will therefore perform an assessment of the current institutional arrangements (during the PPG phase) in the identified sectors (under Output 1.1.1) to compliment available capacity needs assessments..</p> <p>As mentioned in the response to Question</p>

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

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>constraints which the country experiences in tracking progress on its NDC implementation, and to enhance ambition in its NDC. Given that CBIT intends to support capacity building, it is deemed essential to provide a project justification based off of capacity-related issues. For instance, what challenges has the country experienced in reporting under the UNFCCC/Paris Agreement, and how can CBIT help alleviate these constraints?</p> <p>As background information, please note that Paragraph 84 of the COP decision adopting the Paris Agreement decided to establish "a Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency in order to build institutional and technical capacity, both pre- and post-2020" that "will support developing country Parties, upon request, in meeting enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the Agreement in a timely manner." Specifically, each Party is required to provide the following information: (a) A national inventory report of anthropogenic emissions by sources and removals by sinks of greenhouse gases, prepared using good practice methodologies accepted by the IPCC and agreed</p>	<p>2, the BUR process has yet to be started.</p> <p>(2) We agree that the mention of challenges linked to the lack of capacity was missing. This information is now included Paras 15 and 16.</p> <p>(3) The history of climate change monitoring is now included in Para 18 of the PIF.</p> <p>The CBIT project will support the development of a national scale MRV system and accompanying data monitoring and management portal. See Para 30 of the PIF.</p> <p>CI-GEF Agency, 02/12/2018</p> <p>(1) We confirm that the assessment of the institutional arrangements will be done during the PPG phase. Component 1 has been reduced to reflect this change.</p> <p>(2) Project justification section updated to include further information on reporting and monitoring in the country. See Para 19 and 20.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>upon by the COP servicing as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement; (b) Information necessary to track progress made in implementing and achieving its NDC under Article 4. Each Party should also provide information related to climate change impacts and adaptation under Article 7, as appropriate.</p> <p>(3) Please provide a brief overview of the history of climate change monitoring in Madagascar, including key milestones, followed by a short description of the envisaged Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) system that could be supported, strengthened or put in place with CBIT support.</p> <p>DS, January 31, 2018:</p> <p>(1) Please refer to Comment 2 under Question 2 above and remove Output 1.1.1 (capacity needs assessment) from Table B, as the capacity constraints seem to be quite clear per the second/third National Communication. The envisaged assessment of institutional arrangements should be carried out during PPG phase and therefore</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>funded from PPG and not from project grant funding. Please reduce the total amount for Component 1 accordingly.</p> <p>(2) Paras 15 and 16 now highlight some of the more generic capacity building challenges, which provide for a good basis to further elaborate upon the needs for a CBIT project, however, the level of detail on capacity building needs is currently insufficient given that the main focus of this CBIT project is to alleviate capacity constraints, as opposed to supporting the implementation of the country's NDC investments. Please provide further details on climate activity tracking, reporting and monitoring in the country, in the section on "Project Justification", including on successes/milestones, existing systems, and capacity constraints. This can be done for instance by drawing upon existing analyses in line with what is currently provided in Section 6 on 'Consistency with National Priorities' regarding National Communications.</p> <p>(3) Comment cleared.</p> <p>DS, February 14, 2018:</p>	

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Comments cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>DS, November 27, 2017: Partly unclear. While the project overall seems clear and sound, some issues remain:</p> <p>(1) Please address comments under Question 4 above;</p> <p>(2) Information and data should not only be sourced from different ministries but also flow back and enable enhanced decision-making in ministries that are not directly responsible for climate change/environment. This could be made clearer in Table B and the project description;</p> <p>(3) Please explain whether the project would create a one-stop shop for data, for instance GHG data, as appropriate, at the national level, which could be fully digitized to draw on data and provide information in real-time, or what other measures the project would envisage to support with a view to long-term capacity in transparency, such as protocols for ministry staff that will ensure a seamless handover of responsibilities in the event of staff turnover;</p> <p>(4) Please strengthen the description</p>	<p>(1) Comments addressed under Question 4.</p> <p>(2) This has now been clarified in the description of Output 2.1.2 in Table B, and in the description of Outcome 2.1 in Para 24.</p> <p>(3) The goal will be to establish a one-stop shop for GHG data at the national level, and to make data from all sectors available in a centralized way on the web portal. The project will reinforce the capacity for relevant national agencies and stakeholders on transparency activities during the project. A Memorandum of Understanding with the entities concerned will be established in order to obtain the report on the amount of funding obtained and the emission reductions achieved. See Para 19.</p> <p>(4) Section 4, Table on Risks updated to include new risks and descriptions of risk mitigation measures.</p> <p>CI-GEF Agency, 02/12/2018</p> <p>(1)Output 1.1.1 removed and the description of Outcome 1.1 was updated (See Para 23).</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>of risks to project implementation and sustainability, including risk mitigation measures which the project would include, with a focus on for instance: (a) inertia on institutional buy-in; (b) coordination; (c) high-level political will; (d) data availability; (e) availability of skill sets; and (f) environmental/climate risks/hazards.</p> <p>DS, January 31, 2018:</p> <p>(1) Please refer to Comment 1 under Question 4 above, to remove Output 1.1.1</p> <p>(2) Output 2.1.2 in Table B and in the description in paragraph 24, now clarify that data/information will also be shared with ministries that are not directly responsible for climate change/environment. However, the description remains partially ambiguous in the sense that it does not provide any information on whether this will be one-time data sharing, or if a more long-term oriented system/mechanism will be put in place that is accessible by, and will benefit, all government entities who could make use of climate-</p>	<p>(2)The description of Outcome 2.1 was updated to reflect that the project will ensure that data/information is shared continuously (See Para 27).</p> <p>(4)Risk mitigation measures will be confirmed/updated during the PPG Phase.</p>

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>related data and information. The description could potentially be clarified further by ensuring that this data/information will become readily accessible on a continuous basis, for instance through a data/information sharing mechanism that is being put in place through this project, rather than relying on one-time or manually initiated data sharing by the NBCCC.</p> <p>(3) Comment cleared.</p> <p>(4) Comment cleared for PIF stage. At CEO endorsement stage, please confirm and update the risk mitigation measures.</p> <p>DS, February 14, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, November 27, 2017: Yes.	
<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>	DS, November 27, 2017: This project requests resources 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>		

<b>PIF Review</b>			
<b>Review Criteria</b>	<b>Questions</b>	<b>Secretariat Comment</b>	<b>Agency Response</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> <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?	<p>DS, November 27, 2017: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 2, 4 and 5, and submit revised PIF.</p> <p>DS, January 31, 2018: Not yet. Please address the remaining comments under Question 2, 4 and 5, and submit revised PIF.</p> <p>DS, February 14, 2018: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF clearance and PPG.</p>	
<b>Review Date</b>	Review	November 27, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	January 31, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	February 14, 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>

## 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?		

## 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?		
<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.