



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

|  |   |                              |                       |
|--|---|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| GEF ID:                                    | <b>9895</b>   |                              |                       |
| Country/Region:                            | <b>Belarus</b>  |                              |                       |
| Project Title:                             | <b>Capacity Building for Emissions Trading and strengthened MRV</b> |                              |                       |
| GEF Agency:                                | <b>UNDP</b>   | GEF Agency Project ID:       | <b>6161 (UNDP)</b>    |
| Type of Trust Fund:                        | <b>GEF Trust Fund</b>   | GEF Focal Area (s):          | <b>Climate Change</b> |
| GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s): | <b>CCM-3 Program 5;</b>   |                              |                       |
| Anticipated Financing PPG:                 | <b>\$50,000</b>   | Project Grant:               | <b>\$840,000</b>      |
| Co-financing:                              | <b>\$4,000,000</b>  | Total Project Cost:          | <b>\$4,840,000</b>    |
| PIF Approval:                              |   | Council Approval/Expected:   |                       |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval                   |   | Expected Project Start Date: |                       |
| Program Manager:                           | <b>Ming Yang</b>  | Agency Contact Person:       | <b>John O'Brien</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>                                       | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>Yes, it is aligned with CCM-3 Program 5: To integrate findings of convention obligations enabling activities into national planning processes and mitigation contributions. |                 |
|                            | 2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>Yes, it is consistent with the country's Nationally Determined Contributions to the UNFCCC.   |                 |
| <b>Project Design</b>      | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the  | 9/11/2017 MY:  |                 |

## PIF Review

| Review Criteria                  | Questions   | Secretariat Comment  | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|
|                                  | drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation? | Yes. It is stated on pages 5 and 6.  |                 |
|                                  | 4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?  | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>Yes. The country needs capacity building in emission trading and in GHG MRV. This MSP will strengthen the country in these areas. |                 |
|                                  | 5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?           | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>Yes. Table B lists detailed activities and targeted results under the MSP. They look sound and sufficiently clear.                |                 |
|                                  | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?                          | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>Yes. They are listed and explained on page 11.  |                 |
| <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>  | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>Yes.  |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>  | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>Yes.  |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>                                | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>N/A   |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>                                   | 9/11/2017 MY:<br>N/A   |                 |
|                                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>   | 9/11/2017 MY:  |                 |

<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.

| <b>PIF Review</b>      |   |  |                        |
|------------------------|---|--|------------------------|
| <b>Review Criteria</b> | <b>Questions</b>  | <b>Secretariat Comment</b>   | <b>Agency Response</b> |
|                        |   | N/A  |                        |
| <b>Recommendations</b> | 8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified? | <p>9/11/2017 MY:<br/>           Yes, the country needs to have MRV capacity for emission trading and the project is well designed. While developing the project, the Agency has well communicated with the GEF. The PM recommends PIF technical clearance.</p> <p>At the CEO ER stage, please add more cash or investment co-financing to the project. The targeted co-financing ratio is 1:7 for such a country in climate change focal area.</p> |                        |
| <b>Review Date</b>     | Review  | September 11, 2017   |                        |
|                        | 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> |
|                               |                  |   |   |

## 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.