



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

GEF ID:	10002		
Country/Region:	Swaziland		
Project Title:	Capacity Building for Enhanced Transparency in Climate Change Monitoring, Reporting and Verification		
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:	\$35,000	Project Grant:	\$1,000,000
Co-financing:	\$270,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,270,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	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	DS, March 1, 2018: 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, March 1, 2018: Yes. Project aligns with the country's INDC, and addresses the capacity constraints identified in the National Communications.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the	DS, March 1, 2018:	Thank you for your comment. Further

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
	drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	Partly unclear. Please provide more information on the proposed approach to retaining capacity in the country beyond project completion, in particular as it relates to Output 1.1.7 (Training delivered on the MRV system). DS, March 16, 2018: Comment cleared.	information has been added to the description of Output 1.1.7 to explain that the training will be in cooperation with national research institutions, and that the objective of this training is to ensure that knowledge is retained by national experts and that the national experts are then able to train future generations.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	DS, March 1, 2018: Yes. Project addresses previously identified capacity constraints.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	DS, March 1, 2018: Partly unclear. While the project is overall designed in a sound and clear fashion, some questions remain: (1) Please address comment on sustainability of project results beyond the duration of the project (see above); (2) Please clarify why a strategy document is envisaged to be produced as part of this project, to mainstream NDCs into the National Climate Change Policy. Having both an NDC and a National Climate Change Policy seems to eliminate the need for an additional document, as the NDC and the National Climate Change Policy	The Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan is not new. We see a need to update the current Strategy because it is not up-to-date and is not in line with the NDC. The role of the Strategy should be to link the National Policy and the NDC. As such, we have added clarification to the description of Output 1.1.3 to explain the need for this activity. We have also updated the title of the Output to improve transparency.

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>should be intrinsically linked. Please clarify whether the project seeks to put in place a mechanism that links these two more permanently, if this is not existing yet?</p> <p>(3) Please remove "cross-cutting capacity" from Table D, as this is a CBIT project.</p> <p>DS, March 16, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, March 1, 2018: Yes. Project implements GEF GEAP.	
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? 	DS, March 1, 2018: This project seeks resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? 		
	<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)? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	DS, March 1, 2018: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 3 and 5.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		DS, March 16, 2018: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends PIF clearance and PPG.	
Review Date	Review	March 01, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 16, 2018	
	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		

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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF ³ stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

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.

CEO endorsement Review

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