



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

GEF ID:	9864		
Country/Region:	Global		
Project Title:	Global Capacity-building Towards Enhanced Transparency in the AFOLU Sector (CBIT-AFOLU)		
GEF Agency:	FAO	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:	\$1,776,484
Co-financing:	\$3,000,000	Total Project Cost:	\$4,776,484
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Milena Vasquez	Agency Contact Person:	Martial Bernoux

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/PM, July 19, 2017: Yes, the project is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: The project is aligned with the Enhanced Transparency Framework of the Paris Agreement. In addition, once the 10 pilot countries the project will work in are selected, the Agency will ensure that the project activities are consistent with their national	

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
		priorities. Please include this information at the time of CEO Endorsement.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: Yes.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: Yes, the global project will provide incremental value to the national level CBIT projects with AFOLU sector-specific knowledge, tools and methodologies. In addition, this project will assess existing tools and methodologies and adapt them to national needs so as to enhance their accessibility to help countries meet the requirements of the enhanced transparency framework.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: Please address the following comments: 1. We found that the word "products" in the project title is slightly confusing. Would you please remove it, so it reads "Global capacity-building towards enhanced transparency in the AFOLU sector"? 2. Please spell out the acronym ETF in Table B. 3. Please ensure that the 10 pilot countries selected by the project have	

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>not received CBIT funding through national-level projects. Also ensure that the selected indicators for the country selection include alignment with their NDC.</p> <p>4. Under Component 1 and 2, in addition to integrating lessons learned from the selected country pilots into the global tool set, please ensure that these in turn will be shared with the GEF to inform CBIT efforts during GEF-6 and GEF-7 and to enable the GEF to better track progress of the project's implementation.</p> <p>5. Under Component 3, suggest to focus on collaborative approaches rather than win-win with regards to the linkage between this global project and the Global Coordination Platform, as this global project is an integral components of the whole CBIT.</p> <p>MGV/PM, August 8, 2017:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Cleared. 2. Cleared. 3. Cleared. 4. Cleared 5. Cleared. 	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: Yes. The project incorporates gender and CSO elements.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources		

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The STAR allocation? 	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: NA. The project utilizes resources from the CBIT TF and is within the resources available.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: NA. The project utilizes resources from the CBIT TF.	
	<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)? 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Focal area set-aside? 	MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: NA. The project utilizes resources from the CBIT TF. The CBIT TF has sufficient resources for this project.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>MGV/PM, July 19, 2017: Please address minor comments on Boxes 2 and 5.</p> <p>MGV/PM, August 8, 2017: All comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO PIF Clearance.</p>	
Review Date	Review	July 19, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	August 08, 2017	
	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 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		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

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.