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

GEF ID:	**9835**		
Country/Region:	**Chile**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening Chile's Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) Transparency Framework**		
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:	**$30,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,232,000**
Co-financing:	**$870,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,132,000**
PIF Approval:	**June 01, 2017**	Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Milena Vasquez**	Agency Contact Person:	**Ruth Coutto**

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]	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with CBIT objectives	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes. Chile ratified the Paris Agreement on February 10, 2017. Its NDC includes a carbon intensity target of 30% below 2007 levels by 2030, increasing to 35% conditional. In the LULUCF sector, Chile is committed to restoration and reforestation targets.	

[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
		Further, the CBIT project is consistent with Chile's FBUR and SBUR and its National Action Plan on Climate Change, among others.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, the PIF identifies key gaps in Chile's transparency framework, including a need for an integrated platform for climate change information, additional capacities for GHG projections to support development of long-term goals, adaptation indicators, institutional capacity for collecting, processing and reporting information, including public climate expenditures.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, this project builds upon and coordinates with efforts carried out or currently under way such as the Mitigation Options to Face Climate Change, Low Emission Capacity Building, TNC, SBUR, and Partnership for Market Readiness, as well as support from Information Matters, EUROCLIMA, International Partnership on Mitigation and MRV, the Carbon-Budget Framework for Chile, and NDC Partnership.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes. The project consists of 2 components: 1. Strengthening of Chile's	

[2] Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	GEBs?	Transparency framework for mitigation and adaptation actions. 2. Institutionalization of the public climate expenditures.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes. With regards to gender, the project will engage with key stakeholders such as the gender focal point for the UNFCCC and CSOs. It also aims to organize a gender workshop during PPG phase.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV, May 21, 2017: NA. The project requests resources from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV, May 21, 2017: NA	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, May 21, 2017: Yes, the PM recommends CEO PIF clearance.	
Review Date	Review	May 21, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	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?	MGV, January 18, 2018: There are no major changes from what was provided at PIF, except for a shorted project duration and a new output under Component 2 to reflect consultations and advice received during project preparation. These have been well justified. Comment cleared.	
	2. Is the project structure/ design appropriate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	MGV, January 18, 2018: Yes, the project structure and associated outcomes and outputs are designed with incremental reasoning to build upon Chile has achieved so far in terms of the development of its transparency capacity to meet requirements and obligations under the Convention. Comment cleared.	
	3. Is the financing adequate and does the project demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objective?	MGV, January 18, 2018: Not clear. a) We note that the Terms of Reference for the "Project Manager and Technical Expert" is expected to work from Panama. This does not seem to be cost efficient for a project based in Chile, considering travel costs. In addition, it is not clear what is the difference in roles between the "Program Manager and Technical Expert" and the "Technical Coordinator" (who would be based in	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Chile). Please justify and clarify. b) Furthermore, we note that in the consultancy activities, it outlines the following: "identify funding sources from donor countries, banks and other financing institutions to help leverage funding for revolving fund." There is no mention of a revolving fund in the project and we do not understand how this activity would support the outcomes of the project. Please clarify. c) Finally, we note that there is mention of a "Transparency Center of Excellence" which does not seem to exist yet ("will be placed in Panama, together with a number of strategic local partners") however, it is listed as a key source of technical support, as well as where the Program Manager would be based. Noting the OFP letter requesting technical support from this center through UNEP, it has come to our attention that a relatively large part of the budget would be going to this center directly instead of through competitive consultancies for specific tasks. Given the specific nature and resource availability of the CBIT, these arrangements do not appear to be fully consistent. The GEF	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
		Secretariat is available to discuss this further with UNEP. MGV, March 8, 2018: a) Project has been revised to only have one Project Manager based in Chile. Comment cleared. b) Reference to leveraging funding for a revolving fund has been removed. Comment cleared. c) The institutional arrangements have been modified and references to the Transparency Center of Excellence have been removed. However, budget allocated to technical support from ROLAC to the Ministry of Environment has been maintained. After discussions with UNEP, this technical support requested by Chile has been adequately justified. Comment cleared.	
	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)	MGV, January 18, 2018: Yes, the project takes into account potential major risks and described response measures adequately.	
	5. Is co-financing confirmed and evidence provided?	MGV, January 18, 2018: Yes, co-financing is confirmed and evidence is provided.	
	6. Are relevant tracking tools completed?	MGV, January 18, 2018: Yes.	

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	7. *Only for Non-Grant Instrument:* 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?	MGV, January 18, 2018: Yes, the project is coordinated with a number of national initiatives, including the Low Emissions Capacity Building Program Phase 2, Partnership for Market Readiness, and an Adaptation Fund project. In addition, the project will coordinate with the CBIT global coordination platform and share experiences within the region and globally.	
	9. Does the project include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?	MGV, January 18, 2018: Yes.	
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?	MGV, January 18, 2018: The project includes avenues through which it will learn from other relevant projects and initiatives as well as share experiences, including through coordination with the CBIT Global Coordination Platform.	
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		

[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
	• Convention Secretariat		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?	MGV, January 18, 2018: Please see comment in Box 3 above. The GEF Secretariat is available to discuss further with UNEP. MGV, March , 2018: All comments have been addressed. P.M. recommends CEO Endorsement.	
Review Date	Review	January 18, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	March 08, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		