



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

GEF ID:	9814		
Country/Region:	Uganda		
Project Title:	Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Uganda to comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement		
GEF Agency:	CI	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:	\$1,100,000
Co-financing:	\$450,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,550,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Orissa Samaroo

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	DS, April 7, 2017: Yes. Project aligns with CBIT objectives.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	DS, April 7, 2017: Yes. However, please reference the country's National Communications under the UNFCCC in Section 6 on 'Consistency with National Priorities', as well as the how the project will help the country track progress	Comment addressed in paragraph 25 and 26

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
		<p>regarding its Nationally Determined Contribution under the Paris Agreement. Please clarify when the previous National Communication was submitted and what the status of the preparation of the next one is. The country also accessed funding for Biennial Update Report (BUR), which is related to CBIT support; please provide an explanation of how the government intends to use CBIT funding in relation to the National Communication and BUR support.</p> <p>DS, April 28, 2017: Comment cleared. Project will help Uganda track its NDC by improving its GHG inventory and data management system. It will also help alleviate the capacity constraints put forward in the country's most recent National Communication.</p>	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	<p>DS, April 7, 2017: Yes. However, in Section 4 on 'Risks', as it relates to the identified political risks and governance related risks (first row in the table), please add a mitigation measure that relates to Comment (3) under Question 5 below. By including enhanced inter-ministerial coordination, chances that the project will suffer from political</p>	Addressed in Risk Table, starting on Page 14

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		and governance issues should be reduced. DS, April 28, 2017: Comment cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	DS, April 7, 2017: Yes.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>DS, April 7, 2017:</p> <p>Partly unclear. While the project overall seems worthwhile pursuing, and the project framework is clear and sound, some issues remain:</p> <p>(1) Please include a clearer description of how the project will help the country track progress regarding the implementation of its NDC under the Paris Agreement;</p> <p>(2) Related to (1) above, please ensure that the project could help the country improve its ambition on GHG emission reductions over time, by looping back data and information gained through enhanced MRV capacity into policy and decision-making processes, including for instance as it relates to information as to where the most cost-efficient GHG mitigation options exist, among others;</p> <p>(3) In Component 1, please include</p>	<p>Addressed in paragraph 13</p> <p>Addressed in paragraph 14</p> <p>Addressed and integrated in table B Output 1.1.5; and in paragraph 12</p> <p>Addressed in table B Output 3.1.1. and paragraphs 13 and 14</p> <p>Addressed: estimates removed</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>some form of inter-ministerial coordination or committee, which will help ensure that established capacity is more sustainable in the long term by avoiding that changes in one ministry would undo or negatively impact the established/strengthened capacity resulting from this project; inter-ministerial coordination will also ensure that project results and NDC tracking information is higher up on the agenda of other ministries, which might be helpful in raising awareness on potential GHG mitigation options in those ministries; this could be integrated in Output 1.1.5 for instance, or a separate output created.</p> <p>(4) Under Component 2 or 3, please include a reference to the CBIT Global Coordination Platform, to ensure that information is being fed back into the platform. While this reference has been made in the body of the document, it could be more explicitly stated also in Table B.</p> <p>(5) In the table on Global Environmental Benefits, please remove the GHG emission reduction estimates, or alternatively, explain in the document how GHG emission reductions would be achieved as part</p>	

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>of this project. GHG emission reduction estimates should only be included if the mitigation effect occurs through the enhancement of GHG emission estimations/projections and better policy alignment based on more accurate/timely characterization of emissions and emission reduction potential, which are directly attributable to CBIT.</p> <p>DS, April 28, 2017: (1) Comment cleared. (2) Comment cleared. (3) Comment cleared. (4) Comment cleared at PIF stage. At CEO Endorsement stage, please clarify that information to be fed back into the Global Coordination Platform includes information regarding the project implementation, and any lessons learned from the project, as applicable. (5) Comment cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, April 7, 2017: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The STAR allocation? 	DS, April 7, 2017:	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		This project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The focal area allocation? 		
	<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)? Focal area set-aside? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	<p>DS, April 7, 2017: Not yet. Please incorporate comments under Questions 2, 3 and 5, and submitted revised PIF.</p> <p>DS, April 28, 2017: Comments cleared. Program Manager recommends CEO approval.</p>	
Review Date	Review	April 07, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	April 28, 2017	
	Additional Review (as necessary)		

CEO endorsement Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments

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 with indicators and targets?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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.