

“Assisting non-LDCs Developing Countries with Country-driven processes to advance national adaptation plans (NAPs)” – CEO Endorsement review comments and response matrix

Question in Review Sheet	Comment from reviewer to the Request for CEO Endorsement	Response from UNDP/UNEP
<p>Question 6: Is (are) the baseline project(s), including problem(s) that the baseline project(s) seek/s to address, sufficiently described and based on sound data and assumptions?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR.</p> <p>The Request for CEO Endorsement as well as the UNDP and UNEP project documents provide a clear and concise description of the baseline situation and problems that the proposed project would address. A comprehensive summary of consultations is also attached to the submission.</p> <p>With respect to components 1 and 2, however, it is not entirely clear what the dynamic baseline scenarios are for the coming years: given the many initiatives and programs underway and planned “national, bilateral and multi-lateral” what progress could be expected in absence of the proposed project?</p> <p>Further to the above, it is noted that the amount co-financing has declined substantially, and the number of co-financing sources remains the same notwithstanding the efforts made to build a strong partnership for the implementation of the proposed project.</p> <p>In line with the SCCF mandate to "serve as a catalyst to leverage additional resources from bilateral and other multilateral sources", additional co-financing partnerships could be explored, and the Request for CEO Endorsement could clarify how the project would</p>	<p>i) In the context of global support programmes it is important to recognize that whatever baseline scenario is noted at the inception of a project, is subject to change quickly and dramatically. In the case of this project, the list of initiatives listed as “baseline” in this proposal are by no means exhaustive to the present or near-future baseline scenario. Under-way initiatives from development partners, donors, multilateral funds, NGOs, etc., will continue to modify the space of ongoing support for developing country Parties to advance their NAP processes (or similar themes, such as: improving country systems to better absorb climate change finance; climate change tracking and coding in national and subnational budgets, CPEIRs, integrating climate risks, scenarios and opportunities in development plans at the national and subnational levels, etc.). Further, as the Green Climate Fund (GCF) continues to progress in its full operationalization, further support to eligible countries on “readiness” activities can also be expected, which are clearly in line with development of NAPs (for climate change adaptation finance eligibility, at least). It is for this reason that, during the implementation of this programme UNDP and UNEP will ensure that proactive efforts and robust mechanisms are in place to enhance coordination with ongoing and new-coming initiatives. This coordination must involve, inter alia, the following steps: stocktaking of the ongoing and new-coming initiatives and their expected outcomes; identifying entry points for synergies and collaboration; and, where appropriate establish solid partnerships to provide a seamless, consistent, and congruent support to countries under the different pillars (components) of the SCCF programme. This information has been added to the Section 2.3.1.1 in the UNDP prodoc, Section 2.6 of the UNEP prodoc, and Section A.4 in the CEO Endorsement.</p> <p>ii) In line with SCCF’s mandate and considering that it is</p>

	<p>leverage resources during implementation.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Please (i) clarify the dynamic baseline scenario on which the proposed project would build, particularly as it relates to components 1 and 2; and (ii) explore additional co-financing partnerships in line with the SCCF's mandate; and (iii) clarify how the project would leverage the contributions of countries and other partners during implementation.</p>	<p>meant to be a catalytic fund, additional co-financing has been sought, for a total amount of \$23 million, from two UNDP-led baseline initiatives: “<i>Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)</i>” (\$8 million from International Climate Initiative (ICI), funded by BMUB)); and “<i>The Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership</i>” (\$15 million from the Govt of Japan). Both baseline initiatives had been considered during PPG; co-financing funds were pending to materialize.</p> <p>The project’s components 1 and 3 will build on such initiatives, as follows: <i>The Japan-Caribbean Climate Change Partnership</i> project provides policy support and capacity building to support countries to commence a process of advancing energy security and integrating medium- to long-term planning for adaptation to climate change within, or aligned with, current development planning and budgeting processes. In this regard, lessons from this support can be fed into the activities under Component 1, so that SCCF support in the Caribbean is aligned and complimentary, as well as serving as a platform for replication in other regions, as appropriate. Moreover, SCCF project will highly benefit from the regional partnerships promoted and achieved by this Japanese-funded programme, especially as it relates to climate technology innovation and diffusion. In regards to outcome 3: efforts to formalize private sector investments in climate change adaptation and development of public-private partnerships through the Japan-Caribbean project, will be shared through forums, bringing together representatives of Government, private sector, regional and international organizations. This is critical to address the need for more experiences of how countries could engage the private sector to more effectively adapt to climate change. As these experiences would benefit NAP formulation and implementation in the Caribbean, there are opportunities for South-South Cooperation by further sharing this information to other regions.</p> <p>The SCCF programme will benefit from the ICI partnership</p>
--	---	--

		<p>of the project, “<i>Supporting developing countries to integrate the agricultural sectors into National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)</i>” in several contexts: i) applying best practices and lessons of developing NAP roadmaps for the agriculture sector to replicate NAPs in other sectors; ii) build on the technical expertise being mobilized by the ICI programme: SCCF will benefit from a cadre of professionals in the fields of science, technology, and economics of adaptation, etc.; and iii) capitalize on regional and global knowledge exchange activities planned under the ICI programme.</p> <p>With regards to Component 2, the training package to be developed will be based on gaps identified in the stocktaking phase. In consultation with GSP partners, existing toolkits (including the ones already mentioned under Component 2) will be identified so as to ensure no duplication takes place. The Technical Advisory Group will be one means of ensuring that other initiatives in place are captured and integrated as the toolkits are formulated.</p> <p>c) UNDP and UNEP recognize that the SCCF-funded programme will operate in a time where, regardless of this programme, countries are likely to escalate and improve their ongoing efforts towards low-emission and climate resilient development plans, policies and programmes at national and sub-national levels. Some eligible countries under the SCCF-funded programme may therefore count with sufficient capacities to make significant contributions (in-kind, in the form of technical assistance, or as additional finance) to the SCCF interventions aimed at progressing their NAPs. Current and future initiatives from partners mentioned above may also account for significant contributions to the SCCF-funded activities in a given country. All this should be taken into account when establishing the afore-mentioned coordinating mechanism so that, to the extent possible, the additionality of this SCCF programme is maintained in spite of an unavoidable dynamic baseline scenario (current and future). This information has been added to the Section 2.3.1.1 in the UNDP prodoc, Section 2.6 of the UNEP prodoc, and Section A.4 of the CEO Endorsement Request.</p>
--	--	--

<p>Question 7: Are the components, outcomes, and outputs in the project framework (table B) clear, sound and appropriately detailed?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 and 8. RECOMMENDED ACION: Upon addressing the recommendations in section 6 and 8, please adjust the project framework as appropriate.</p>	<p>The following concerns have now been clarified under Sections 6 and 8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additionality of the SCCF programme given a dynamic present and future baseline scenario; - Additional co-financing which will support one-on-one country support under Outcome 1 has been identified to ensure robust tailored support to requesting countries. Relevant outputs under the baseline initiatives will also serve to supplement South-South support, under Outcome 3. - Justification for a larger allocation of the overall budget towards Component 2 has been provided. - Additional details on the process of requesting support from the programme, under Outcome 1 have been provided. <p>Having addressed the above concerns, it is not deemed necessary to alter the project’s logframe. Co-financing figures per component have been revised accordingly in the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>
<p>Question 8: a) Are global environmental/ adaptation benefits identified? B) is the description of the incremental / additional reasoning sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Section 6 above. Given the need to further clarify the baseline scenario, the additional reasoning cannot be fully assessed at this stage. With respect to Component 1, the proposed project sets a target to provide tailored support to 20 countries to advance their NAP processes. In contrast, Component 2 would train technicians from at least 105 countries. Based on past experience, it would seem important to explain very clearly in Section A.1 of the Request for CEO Endorsement how countries would apply and be selected for tailored support under</p>	<p>i) Request for support: In the context of one-on-one support expected under Component 1, the UNDP-overseen component will focus on in-country support. Assistance will be provided to countries based on demand, and will consider country priorities representing different stages of the NAP process. During the inception phase of the project, UNDP and UNEP will announce a “call for technical assistance” from eligible countries to this programme¹. Requests will be tracked in an online repository and made available online in the project’s website. Capitalizing on the successful and long-standing partnership that UNDP and UNEP have built for supporting NAPs (amongst UN Agencies, NGOs, bilateral donors, etc.), each request will be reviewed in collaboration with the partners, so that the appropriate expertise and support are identified and delivered in a timely and cost-effective manner. This information is now capture under Section A.1 of the Request for CEO Endorsement and also in the project documents.</p>

¹ As stated above, developing countries, which are not least developed countries (LDCs) under the list of Non-Annex 1 parties to the UNFCCC.

	<p>Component 1. In this context, it would also be important to clarify how countries' domestic resources and capabilities would be leveraged. Given the likely cost of offering meaningful, tailored assistance to 20 countries, it is also not clear why the largest allocation of resources would be made towards Component 2 rather than Component 1.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in Section 6, please (i) clarify “ in Section A.1 of the Request for CEO Endorsement “ how countries would apply and be selected for tailored support under Component 1; and (ii) justify the proposed allocation of SCCF resources across project components, given the targets associated with each outcome.</p>	<p>Further, as recognized under Section 6, some of the countries that request support may have initiated a NAP, or NAP-related activities. At the time that a request is received from a particular country, UNDP, UNEP and partners will request information on NAP progress so as to gauge for the support that will be additional to what is already being done on the ground.</p> <p>(ii) Allocation of SCCF resources: The allocation of a large proportion of the project funding to Component 2 is based on the lessons learned during implementation of the NAP GSP for LDCs, in particular concerning the costs associated with organising and hosting tailored workshops for sub-regions with multiple participants per country. The rationale for this allocation is described below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Firstly, the cost of organising and hosting these workshops had been underestimated in the original budget for the NAP GSP for LDCs. This jeopardised the achievement of the outcomes and outputs related to capacity building through training on tools/guidelines for advancing the NAP process. Based on these findings, the allocation of funds for workshops in the SCCF-financed project was increased to ensure that adequate resources are available under this component to achieve project targets. • Secondly, the project will organise and host workshops that are geographically or thematically tailored to ensure that the content is of direct relevance to the technicians being trained. During PPG consultations, the need for an approach to providing support that is tailored to specific socio-economic and climatic contexts was stressed by many of the stakeholders. To this end, ten workshops were budgeted for with fewer participating countries (~11) than originally envisaged as opposed to fewer workshops with more participating countries. While the latter approach would perhaps support economies of scale, such workshops would not be able to focus as intensely on sub-regional concerns or specific themes. The need for such specialisation of themes necessitated a larger proportion of the budget
--	---	--

		<p>being allocated in order to host a greater number of workshops.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thirdly, to promote an integrated approach to adaptation planning across all sectors, it was proposed that each attending country include a representative from the ministries of planning and/or finance in addition to key sectoral ministries e.g. environment, agriculture, water. Workshops were therefore budgeted accordingly to allow a greater number of representatives from each attending country. • Lastly, the decision was made to reallocate funds from Component 3 to Component 2 – vis-à-vis the original PIF allocations – to cover the additional costs of the workshops. Given that the support under Component 3 will largely take place through online media, these interventions have a relatively fixed cost regardless of the number of countries targeted. Moreover, such interventions are inherently cost-effective and thus require a smaller allocation of funds. Consequently, the reallocation of funds from Component 3 to Component 2 would be unlikely to jeopardise the achievement of targets under the former, while greatly improving the scope of the proposed interventions under the latter.”
<p>Question 13. Comment on the project’s innovative aspects, sustainability, and potential for scaling up.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to Sections 6 and 8 above. Given the questions raised above, the innovative aspects and potential for sustainability and scaling up cannot be adequately assessed at this time.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please revisit and clarify, if necessary, the innovative aspects of the proposed project as well as the potential for sustainability and scaling up.</p>	<p>Upon addressing the recommendations for section 6 and 8, positive impacts on the project’s innovative aspects, sustainability and potential for scaling up from the inclusion of two additional UNDP-led baseline initiatives have been further clarified. In terms of innovation, it is anticipated that this project will pioneer in harnessing additional private sector incentives in adaptation, by ensuring that the NAP process enables the regulatory and policy environment in developing countries to allow for these incentives. For this reason, one-on-one support to countries in Component 1 will synergize with other UNDP-led projects which are already rolling out mechanisms for PPPs in terms of south-south technology transfer for adaptation, mitigation and enabling policy environments for these innovative approaches. The lessons learned from delivering one-on-one support will feed into the training package to be developed under Component 2, and further disseminated under</p>

		<p>Component 3 in order to ensure that lessons learned from NAP preparation and implementation, including from baseline projects, are captured throughout all project components. Additional lessons learned from baseline projects could help strengthen the delivery of case studies and specific tools and approaches that have worked for certain regions and can further be integrated into the overall training package and workshops to be developed under UNEP-led Component 2, as relevant. In terms of potential of scaling up, lessons learned will be more widely disseminated to non-LDCs through the development of appropriate web-based training materials, in a cost-effective way.</p> <p>In addition, in the course of the project UNEP and UNDP will ensure mechanisms are in place to track the dynamic baseline scenario in which various NAP-related projects and support are being developed and delivered through UN agencies, bilateral donors and countries themselves. These mechanisms are detailed in the answer to Section 6 in this review sheet as well as more clearly in text added to the Section 2.3.1.1 in the UNDP prodoc, Section 2.6 of the UNEP prodoc, and Section A.4 in the CEO Endorsement. In terms of scaling-up, it is expected that the interventions planned under the SCCF project will serve as a platform for additional resources (from countries' Governments or private sector bases or both, as well as from external actors and development partners, including the GCF) to be leveraged towards fulfilling NAPs, particularly NAP implementation. Coordination mechanisms put in place during the implementation of the SCCF project will serve to identify and catalyze partners to help scale up NAP implementation.</p>
<p>Question 15.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please revisit and clarify accordingly Section B.3 of the Request for CEO Endorsement.</p>	<p>Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, there is no significant change to cost-effectiveness of the project. Additional clarifying text has been added to Section B.3 regarding cost-effectiveness of interventions under Component 3 of the project.</p>
<p>Question 16.</p>	<p>NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above.</p>	<p>Please see answers for section 6 and 8. In function of additional US\$23 million of co-financing secured by two UNDP projects</p>

	RECOMMENDED ACTION: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component as necessary.	the co-financing amounts per project component have been changed in Table B of the CEO endorsement. Following the justification under Section 8, grant amounts between components have not been adjusted.
Question 17.	NOT CLEAR. Please refer to sections 6 and 8 above. Recommended Action: Upon addressing the recommendations in sections 6 and 8, please adjust the grant and co-financing amounts per component as necessary.	As detailed under sections 6 and 8 above, additional co-financing has been allocated to Components 1 and 3. This is reflected in the CEO Endorsement and in the project documents. Additional co-financing amounts to US \$23 Million from UNDP-led initiatives and two additional letters of co-financing have been included to both UNEP and UNDP project documents as annexes.
Question 26.	NOT YET. Please refer to sections 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 16 and 17.	These sections have been addressed.