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

GEF ID:	**10029**		
Country/Region:	**Serbia**		
Project Title:	**Establishing Transparency Framework for the Republic of Serbia**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**6211 (UNDP)**
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:		Project Grant:	**$1,100,000**
Co-financing:	**$100,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$1,200,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Akio Takemoto**	Agency Contact Person:	**Damiano Borgogno**

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]	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: Yes, this project is aligned with Programming Directions for CBIT.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: Yes, this project is consistent with Serbia's national strategies and others including its NDC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: Not sufficiently.	Nationally-specific information have been added in the context of drivers of global environmental degradation

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	PART II 1.1): Please provide nationally-specific information in detail that is relevant to the drivers of global environmental degradation. (Please describe the problems, root causes, and barriers that need to be addressed in Serbia in detail.) AT/JDS, May 7, 2018: Comment cleared.	(please see pg. 6-7), describing the problems, root causes and main barriers vis-à-vis climate related challenges and new transparency framework.
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: Not completely. PART II, 1. 4): Please provide justification of sound incremental reasoning for National GHG inventory development, defining climate change mitigation and adaptation measures, as well as basis for MRV system in detail by referring to outputs of EU IPA assisted projects and on-going GEF Enabling Activity project "2BUR and 3NC for Serbia under the UNFCCC" (UNDP-GEF, ID: 9733). PART II, 1. 5) Global environmental benefits: Taking into account the objective of CBIT, which supports developing country Parties in meeting enhanced transparency requirements as defined in Article 13 of the "Paris Agreements", we would like to suggest integrating and revising the	Additional information and justification of incremental reasoning for the GHG inventory development have been quoted (please see pg. 22, 23, 29, 30, 31), as well as for the defining climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in the context of the future MRV system. This also refers to the comment on interaction and roles of complimentary projects supporting ETF in Serbia (i.e., EU IPA, 2BUR and 3NC and CBIT). Inserted text explains in more details how the GHG inventory should be improved (in terms of applying advanced methodologies and sectors/gasses to be covered) and in which way such improvement will affect the quality and accuracy of the CCM and CCA planning, monitoring and reporting vis-à-vis the requirements of the new and enhanced transparency framework for Serbia. In fact, all the amended information was based on the recommendations of the EU IPA funded

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		1st and 2nd sentence into the following; "CBIT project will significantly assist Serbia to fulfill its commitments under the UNFCCC and Paris Agreement that incorporate its efforts towards EU accession process." PART II, 5. Coordination: Please clearly specify the interaction and roles of complimentary projects supporting ETF in Serbia (i.e., EU IPA, 2BUR and 3NC, and this project) in this section. AT/JDS, May 7, 2018: Comments cleared.	projects. Also, additional explanation on linkages with the 2BuR and 3NC have been provided, focusing on synergy and complementarity for the purpose of maximum utilization of available resources. CBIT project will build upon the results of the 2BuR and 3NC project, making the best use and upgrade of the data and information produced, in the context of the establishment of sustainable MRV system that can support transparency framework in Serbia. The 1st and 2nd sentences have been integrated and revised as per the suggestion on PART II, 1.5) on "Global Environmental Benefits";
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: Mostly. Table B, Component 1: We suggest changing the title of Project Component 1 to "Strengthening national transparency capacities for tracking NDC progress from mitigation activities", and revising other parts in the PIF accordingly. AT/JDS, May 7, 2018: Comment cleared.	The title of Project Component 1has been changed to "Strengthening national transparency capacities for tracking NDC progress from mitigation activities", and other parts in the PIF were revised accordingly;
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: Mostly. PART II, 2. Stakeholders, Table: Please clarify if there is a gender	New part of the stakeholders' table regarding gender and gender oriented organizations and institutions has been added. This also includes the explanation

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		group among the CSOs to be engaged in this project. AT/JDS, May 7, 2018: Comment cleared.	how the gender-climate issues will be better integrated within the project activities and results.
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?		
	• The focal area allocation?	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF and there are still enough resources to support this project.	
	• 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?	AT/JDS, March 15, 2018: Not this time. Please address comments stated in Box 3, Box 4, Box 5 and Box 6. The proposed project has a timeline of 48 months. Please justify as this length of time is higher than expected and may conflict with a CBIT trust fund deadline of June 30, 2023 AT/JDS, May 7, 2018: Comments	Project timeline was modified to 36 months.

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		cleared. PM recommends CEO approval.	
Review Date	Review		
	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. *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?		
	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?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the PIF[3] stage from:		
	• GEFSEC		
	• STAP		
	• GEF Council		
	• Convention Secretariat		
	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		

[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
Recommendation			
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		