



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

GEF ID:	<b>9675</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>Global (Global)</b>		
Project Title:	<b>CBIT Global Coordination Platform</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNEP and UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>1512 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>Capacity-building Initiative for Transparency</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-6 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):		<b>CBIT-1;</b>	
Anticipated Financing PPG:		Project Grant:	<b>\$1,000,000</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$400,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$1,400,000</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Dustin Schinn</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Geordie Colville</b>

PIF Review			
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>	MGV/RM November 4, 2016: Yes. The project is aligned with the Capacity Building for Transparency Initiative (CBIT).	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project is a global project to assist CBIT coordination.	
<b>Project Design</b>	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers <sup>2</sup> of global environmental	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project is in its first stage and can	

<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.

## PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	be scaled up for wider implementation and will address countries' capacity needs for transparency.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes, the project will allow countries to meet their commitments under the Paris Agreement. It will coordinate with other existing initiatives.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Gender and CSOs are considered.	
<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>	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: N/A. Resources will come from the CBIT trust fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The focal area allocation?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The LDCF under the principle of equitable access</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Focal area set-aside?</li> </ul>		
<b>Recommendations</b>	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV/RM, November 4, 2016: Yes. PM Recommends CEO Approval. By CEO Endorsement, please ensure that the coordination platform is open to	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		inputs from other related national projects and initiatives.	
Review Date	Review	November 04, 2016	
	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?		
	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?		
<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		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

<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.

## CEO endorsement Review

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