



## GEF SECRETARIAT REVIEW FOR FULL/MEDIUM-SIZED PROJECTS\* THE GEF/LDCF/SCCF TRUST FUNDS

GEF ID:	<b>4673</b>		
Country/Region:	<b>India</b>		
Project Title:	<b>Preparation of Third National Communication (3NC) to the UNFCCC and Strengthening Institutional and Analytical Capacities on Climate Change</b>		
GEF Agency:	<b>UNDP</b>	GEF Agency Project ID:	<b>4603 (UNDP)</b>
Type of Trust Fund:	<b>GEF Trust Fund</b>	GEF Focal Area (s):	<b>Climate Change</b>
GEF-5 Focal Area/ LDCF/SCCF Objective (s):	<b>CCM-6; Project Mana;</b>		
Anticipated Financing PPG:	<b>\$0</b>	Project Grant:	<b>\$9,010,604</b>
Co-financing:	<b>\$26,240,000</b>	Total Project Cost:	<b>\$35,250,604</b>
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	<b>February 01, 2012</b>
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	<b>Rawleston Moore</b>	Agency Contact Person:	<b>Martin Krause</b>

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Eligibility	1. Is the participating country eligible?	India is eligible to receive resources, as India ratified the UNFCCC on 01 November 1993	
	2. Has the operational focal point endorsed the project?	An endorsement letter was received on the 22nd September 2011.	
Agency's Comparative Advantage	3. Is the Agency's comparative advantage for this project clearly described and supported?	The comparative advantage for this project is clearly described. UNDP has a comparative advantage for this type of project.	
	4. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is the GEF Agency capable of managing it?	N/A	

\*Some questions here are to be answered only at PIF or CEO endorsement. No need to provide response in gray cells.

<sup>1</sup> Work Program Inclusion (WPI) applies to FSPs only. Submission of FSP PIFs will simultaneously be considered for WPI.

FSP/MSP review template: updated 11-22-2010

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	5. Does the project fit into the Agency's program and staff capacity in the country?	Yes, the project fits into the Agency's capacity in the country.	
Resource Availability	6. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• the STAR allocation?	The resources are available from the STAR allocation of India	
	• the focal area allocation?		
	• the LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• the SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Nagoya Protocol Investment Fund		
Project Consistency	7. Is the project aligned with the focal /multifocal areas/ LDCF/SCCF/NPIF results framework?	The project is aligned with GEF CCM results framework. The project once successfully implemented will assist India to prepare its third national communications	
	8. Are the relevant GEF 5 focal/ multifocal areas/LDCF/SCCF/NPIF objectives identified?	The relevant GEF 5 focal area objective, CCM -6 support enabling activities and capacity building are identified.	
	9. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions, including NPFE, NAPA, NCSA, or NAP?	The project is consistent with India's national strategies on climate change. The project is in line with the National Action Plan on Climate Change. National communications are a requirement by the UNFCCC for developing countries	
	10. Does the proposal clearly articulate how the capacities developed, if any, will contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes?	The activities of the Third National Communication, will assist with the implementation of the National Action Plan on Climate Change in India	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Design	11. 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?	The project responds to a requirement which countries have, to prepare national communications to the UNFCCC. The project will build on previous national communications. It will provide a GHG Inventory for 2010 and trend analysis for the period 2000 to 2010. The project will strengthen and streamline the national institutional structure for long term National GHG inventory and the estimation of GHG emissions. The project will also provide improved climate change projections and an improved understanding of appropriate actions for addressing vulnerability to climate change at different sectors and regions. The project will also complete a technology needs assessment for different sectors in India.	
	12. Has the cost-effectiveness been sufficiently demonstrated, including the cost-effectiveness of the project design approach as compared to alternative approaches to achieve similar benefits?		
	13. Are the activities that will be financed using GEF/LDCF/SCCF funding based on incremental/ additional reasoning?	The project will assist in preparing the national communications for India and thus it is not necessary to demonstrate additional reasoning	
	14. Is the project framework sound and sufficiently clear?	There is a need for clarification on some issues of the project.  Component 4 involves a technology need assessment , while component 5 also contains activities which are part of a technology needs assessment i.e. a	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>report on the gap analysis and constraints pertaining to (a) access to technologies and technology transfer, and (b) financial assistance needed for technology transfer and capacity development. These activities should be in component 4 and not in component 5, so that there is one technology needs assessment set of activities which are all in the same component</p> <p>Component 7 contains activities related to the preparation of biennial reports. The GEF has received no guidance from the UNFCCC COP on the issue of biennial reports, and thus this component is currently not eligible to receive funding from the GEF. This component should be removed from the project.</p> <p>There appears to be some overlap on capacity issues , with component 5 and component 8. Component 5 proposed to analyze capacity building needs, and assess capacity building needs for research and implementation, while component 8 will strengthen analytical capacities at the district and state levels. Consideration should be given to merging these components and rationalizing the costs of these components.</p>	
	<p>15. Are the applied methodology and assumptions for the description of the incremental/additional benefits sound and appropriate?</p>	<p>The applied methodology for this project is appropriate.</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
	16. Is there a clear description of: a) the socio-economic benefits, including gender dimensions, to be delivered by the project, and b) how will the delivery of such benefits support the achievement of incremental/ additional benefits?	There is a description of the socio-economic benefits. The third national communications of India will address gender concerns by recommending the building of adaptation capacities of women to cope with the adverse impacts of climate change.	
	17. Is public participation, including CSOs and indigenous people, taken into consideration, their role identified and addressed properly?	By CEO Endorsement further details should be provided the role of public participation, in particular, civil society groups, and community based organizations.	
	18. Does the project take into account potential major risks, including the consequences of climate change and provides sufficient risk mitigation measures? (i.e., climate resilience)	The project takes into account potential risks and identifies possible mitigation measures.	
	19. Is the project consistent and properly coordinated with other related initiatives in the country or in the region?	The project is consistent with other related initiatives in India. The project will be coordinated with the National Action Plan on Climate Change India.	
	20. Is the project implementation/ execution arrangement adequate?	The project will be executed by the Ministry of Environment and Forest. There is also a national steering committee, on climate change. Further information should be provided on implementation and execution arrangements of the project at CEO Endorsement.	
	21. Is the project structure sufficiently close to what was presented at PIF, with clear justifications for changes?		
	22. If there is a non-grant instrument in the project, is there a reasonable calendar of reflows included?		

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
Project Financing	23. Is funding level for project management cost appropriate?	The project management costs are appropriate	
	24. Is the funding and co-financing per objective appropriate and adequate to achieve the expected outcomes and outputs?	The funding per objective is not appropriate. There needs to be a rationalization of costs for component 5 and 8. The resources allocated in component 6 need to significantly reduced. There should also be a reduction in the resources allocated to component 1.	
	25. At PIF: comment on the indicated cofinancing; At CEO endorsement: indicate if confirmed co-financing is provided.	The cofinance is appropriate.	
	26. Is the co-financing amount that the Agency is bringing to the project in line with its role?	The cofinance amount that the agency is bringing to the project is in line with its role.	
Project Monitoring and Evaluation	27. Have the appropriate Tracking Tools been included with information for all relevant indicators, as applicable?		
	28. Does the proposal include a budgeted M&E Plan that monitors and measures results with indicators and targets?		
Agency Responses	29. Has the Agency responded adequately to comments from:		
	• STAP?		
	• Convention Secretariat?		
	• Council comments? • Other GEF Agencies?		
<b>Secretariat Recommendation</b>			
Recommendation at PIF Stage	<b>30. Is PIF clearance/approval being recommended?</b>	The PIF is currently not being recommended for approval. Items in 14 and 24 need to be addressed.	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Update December 28th 2011</p> <p>The PIF is not recommended for clearance.</p> <p>The costs for component 1 (US\$430,936) are not justified. The second national communications project allocated US\$200,000 to complete the component of national circumstances , activites related to technology transfer, and steps taken to integrate climate change into climate change into relevant social, economic and development policies. Please reduce the cost of component 1 by at least 25%.</p> <p>Further information is requested on component 2. Component 2 includes an output of establishing a national inventory management system. One of the proposed outputs of the second national communications project for India was the development of National Inventory Management System to ensure the sustainability of the inventory process in India. Clarification is requested as the status of the proposed National Inventory Management System and the modules for quality assurance/quality control and uncertainty analysis, which were proposed outputs from the second national communications project proposal.</p> <p>The costs for component 5 (US\$</p>	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>671,818) are not justified and need to be reduced. In the previous submission the cost was US\$666,818. The report on the gap analysis and constraints pertaining to (a) access to technologies and technology transfer and (b) financial assistance needed for technology transfer and capacity development, is now part of component 4. While there is the inclusion of adaptation in section 5.2.1 this is not enough to justify the budget increase to US\$671,818.</p> <p>While it is recognised that there needs to be widespread distribution of the national communications, the cost of US\$ 403,720 this is not justified and will need to be reduced unless there is further clarification. For example does this involve translation of the national communications into local languages.</p> <p>There is no clear linkage with component 7 and decision 17/CP.8 . Decision 17/CP.8 paragraph 46 provides the basis for reporting on capacity building. Component 7 goes further than the current guidelines for national communications and it is unclear how this component links to the overall project of completing a national communications. It is thus recommended that this component be either deleted or limited to the first two outputs of component 7.</p>	



Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		<p>Given that guidance has been given to the GEF at UNFCCC COP 17 on biennial reports, a costed section on a biennial report for India could now be included in the project proposal for consideration.</p> <p>The project management costs need to be revisited in line with recent guidance from the GEF. For this project the project management cost should be 5% or below of the project costs.</p> <p>Information is also requested on the proposed date for the submission of the second national communications. While the PIF could be approved prior to the submission of the second national communications to the UNFCCC, the full project cannot be CEO endorsed unless the second national communications is submitted to the UNFCCC.</p> <p>Update January 25th 2012</p> <p>The project is recommended for PIF clearance. The requested changes have been made to the PIF.</p>	
	31. Items to consider at CEO endorsement/approval.	There are conditions attached to the CEO endorsement of this project. The second national communications of India must be submitted to the UNFCCC. It should be made clear that this project will prepare the biennial update report to be submitted in 2014, and the 3rd national communications	

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at PIF (PFD)/Work Program Inclusion <sup>1</sup>	Secretariat Comment At CEO Endorsement(FSP)/Approval (MSP)
		with biennial update report information to be submitted in 2016.	
Recommendation at CEO Endorsement/ Approval	32. At endorsement/approval, did Agency include the progress of PPG with clear information of commitment status of the PPG?		
	<b>33. Is CEO endorsement/approval being recommended?</b>		
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 28, 2011	
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		
	Additional review (as necessary)		

\* **This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments. Greyed areas in each section do not need comments.**

#### REQUEST FOR PPG APPROVAL

Review Criteria	Decision Points	Program Manager Comments
PPG Budget	1. Are the proposed activities for project preparation appropriate?	For this project , the GEF considers that many of the activities identified in the PPG proposal, can be done in the within the project itself. It is thus recommended to prepare the CEO Endorsement as soon as possible after the PIF is approved.
	2. Is itemized budget justified?	
Secretariat Recommendation	<b>3. Is PPG approval being recommended?</b>	The PPG is not recommended for clearance
	4. Other comments	
Review Date (s)	First review*	September 28, 2011
	Additional review (as necessary)	

\* This is the first time the Program Manager provides full comments for the project. Subsequent follow-up reviews should be recorded. For specific comments for each section, please insert a date after comments.