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

GEF ID:	**10028**		
Country/Region:	**Georgia**		
Project Title:	**Integrated Transparency Framework for Implementation of the Paris Agreement**		
GEF Agency:	**UNEP**	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:	**$30,000**	Project Grant:	**$1,000,000**
Co-financing:	**$137,340**	Total Project Cost:	**$1,137,340**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Akio Takemoto**	Agency Contact Person:	**Geordie Colville**

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 Georgia's national strategies and others including its NDC and National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP).	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental	AT/JDS March 15, 2018: Not sufficiently.	May 2018:

[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
	degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	1) PART II 1.: Please provide nationally-specific information in detail that is relevant to the drivers of global environmental degradation. 2) PART II, 3.: Title of "Outcome 1. Georgia uses the Municipal Development Coordination Platform(MDCP)...." should be replaced by "Component 1: Strengthening vertical integration process in Georgia..." to keep coherence of the structure of section 3. 3) PART II, 3. Component 1 (after the above comment is reflected): Please specify how this project will strengthen the vertical integration of GHG inventory results and MRV processes all the way from the local to national level per the description of output 1.1 to 1.5, by utilizing outputs in Component 2. 4) PART II, 3. Component 3, Output 3.1 and 3.2: We suggest incorporating existing guidance to produce output 3.1 and output 3.2 at the project design stage. For example, among others, WRI's Policy and Action Standard and its Mitigation Goals Standard may be useful frameworks.	1) Thanks for your observation. Section II.1 was further elaborated following this recommendation. Please refer to Page 5 of the PIF. 2) The title was amended. Please, see part II. 3, page 9 3) The measurement activities of GHG emissions and mitigation effect at local level will rely on the country specific emission factors and multiple benefit criteria determined nationally by the second component of the project. In addition, the reporting modalities will be complementary with the nationally determined reporting format developed for the transparency system in Georgia by the second component of CBIT project. Those modalities, procedures and guidelines will serve as tools to create synergies between local and national climate activities. As stated in the description of Component 1 and 2 (page 10-11). 4) This was considered and included in the PIF document. Please refer to part II. 3. Page 14

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		AT May 31, 2018: Comments cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	AT/JDS March 15, 2018: Not completely. 1) PART II, 3. Component 2 and 4.: Please provide justification of sound incremental reasoning for Component 2: National GHG inventory system, by referring to the Enabling Activity project "Development of Georgia's 4NC and 2BUR to the UNFCC" (UNDP-GEF, ID: 9655) which incorporates GHG inventory component. 2) PART II, 4.: Please elaborate in more specific terms how the project will enhance Georgia's MRV systems in an incremental and measurable way (some of this is stated under the Innovation section). 3) PART II, 6.: Under Sustainability, please clarify how the project will account for sustainability at the local/municipal level given the vertical structure of Georgia's MDCP. AT May 31, 2018: Comments cleared.	May 2018: 1) The reference to the project which was only added in the coordination part, is also included now in the baseline too. One of the added values of the CBIT project compared to component 2 of project 9655 will be the adoption of clear QA/QC procedures to be used systematically, as well as specific enhancements for sectors such as IPPU, agriculture and waste as described in page 11. A more detailed description of CBIT and BUR complementarities and incremental reasoning will be added during the Project Preparation Phase based on the status of the 4NC and 2BUR when developing the CEO endorsement request. 2) A paragraph addressing this comment was added in part II, section 4 (page 15). 3) A paragraph addressing this comment was added in part II Sustainability section (page 17).

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	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: Not yet. 1) The description of Component 2 in Table B should be modified in line with all Project Outputs 2.1-2.6 (it largely reflects activities related to F-gases). 2) Given that 40 percent of the project's proposed budget is directed towards Component 2, please provide justification of focusing activities on F-gases, which is considered to be a non-key category (1-5 percent of total emissions). If applicable, please refer to other on-going projects (i.e., UNDP-GEF, ID: 9655) for the above justification. AT May 31, 2018: Comments cleared.	May 2018: 1) Component 2 title was amended accordingly. Please, see table B, component 2 "Georgia's National greenhouse gas (GHG) Inventory system and HFC data management system are aligned to the enhanced transparency framework (ETF)", page 2. 2) Team of Technical Experts identified the improvement of the F-gases estimation as a capacity building need as per the Summary Report. Furthermore, in accordance to the First BUR the 2F category of consumption of Halocarbons and Sulfur Hexafluoride (Refrigeration and Air Conditioning Equipment) are considered as a key source-category by either level or trend assessment (table 8.2 p.145-146 of 1st BUR). Additionally, the 2006 guideline offers different methodologies for estimation of HFC actual consumptions which will be tested during the 2nd BUR and identified challenges will be addressed by the CBIT project. Methodology for the data collection, reporting and enforcement on emissions of HFCs and PFCs is not going to be developed under the project of preparation of 4th NC and 2nd BUR. This will be covered by this CBIT project in order to address the higher tier

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			methods for estimation of emissions.
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	AT/JDS March 15, 2018: Yes.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR 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 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 yet, please address comments stated in boxes 3, 4 and 5. AT May 31, 2018: Comments cleared. The program manager recommends the PIF for clearance.	
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 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		

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