



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

GEF ID:	10004		
Country/Region:	Morocco		
Project Title:	Developing an integrated transparency framework for NDC planning and monitoring		
GEF Agency:	UNDP	GEF Agency Project ID:	6212 (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:	\$30,000	Project Grant:	\$1,500,000
Co-financing:	\$300,000	Total Project Cost:	\$1,800,000
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	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	DS, March 5, 2018: 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, March 5, 2018: Yes.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	DS, March 5, 2018: Partly unclear. The majority of the project outputs aim to establish	Morocco relied on external consultants to elaborate past National Communications, GHG Inventories and its first BUR.

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
	<p>market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>guidelines in one way or another, while seemingly disregarding risk of non-adoption of these guidelines. Please explain in more detail how the project will build long-term capacity that can help Morocco meet the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement by using in-house expertise and capacity. Please include a risk category in the project risk table, to account for potential risk of non-adoption of guidelines at the national and sub-national levels, along with potential risk mitigation measures.</p> <p>DS, June 1, 2018: Comment cleared.</p>	<p>Being aware of the new transparency challenges imposed by the BURs and the need to rely on a sustainable and institutionalized system -rather than on the limited approach based on external consultants- Morocco undertook recently the efforts to institutionalize the preparation of its future GHG inventories.</p> <p>To ensure the success of such process, in-house expertise and capacities have been developed since 2014 on a continuous basis through all the involved sectors (energy, transport, forestry, agriculture, waste management and industry). All these sectors have showed engagement and ownership by nominating at least two in-house inventory experts that are now actively involved in the elaboration of the 2nd BUR and FNC.</p> <p>Further, the new platform 4C dedicated for building capacities of relevant actors from different sectors (public, economic, research, civil society, local authorities, etc.) is playing a major role in creating the necessary coordination and driving forward the momentum.</p> <p>On another hand, Moroccan institutions are fully aware of future challenges regarding the reporting requirements on their specific contributions to the NDC and the need of a robust and transparent</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>MRV system. This is stemming from an ongoing institutional process regarding the preparation of an Implementation Road Map of the Moroccan NDC. All involved sectors and institutions demonstrate their wiliness to take more MRV responsibilities, beyond the GHG inventory, as long as their in-house resources are sufficiently trained and capacitated.</p> <p>Moreover, the wiliness of the Moroccan government to create enabling environments, such as the regulatory framework of the GHG-NIS, is a guarantee of success and highlights the possibility of expanding such regulatory framework to a more comprehensive MRV system.</p> <p>Thus, CBIT will further build on those initial national initiatives by setting the necessary long-term MRV capacities that can allow Morocco to be sustainable in conformity with the enhanced transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement. Capacities will be built through i) the design and adoption of adequate institutional arrangements to ensure a long-term engagement and effective response of all stakeholders, 2) the development of MRV protocols, tools and guidelines based on the best available practices and national circumstances,</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>which validation will go through a consultative approach to ensure an inclusive adoption of all relevant stakeholders and 3) deployment of trainings to national staff who will be responsible for the future implementation of Morocco's MRV framework.</p> <p>A new risk category to account for potential risk of non-adoption of guidelines was added in the PIF in Part II – Section 4 – Risks.</p>
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>DS, March 5, 2018: Partly unclear. Please provide a more elaborate description of the ICAT support for climate transparency in the country and how CBIT support intends to complement other sources.</p> <p>DS, June 1, 2018: Comment cleared at PIF stage. Please ensure effective coordination with ICAT during PPG phase and elaborate on coordination at CEO endorsement (approval) stage of the CBIT project.</p>	<p>As indicated in Table 1, ICAT is focusing its supports on the subnational region of Souss-Massa, whereas the CBIT project will focus its support on two other subnational regions (Outcome 1.2 The NDC governance framework is piloted in two subnational regions). These two subnational regions will be defined during the PPG.</p> <p>Considering that the ICAT project started implementation in February 2018 and will last over a 12 months period, lessons learned and experience sharing will be ensured with the CBIT project. Since implementation of the ICAT and CBIT projects will be ensured by the SSSD, coordination, feedbacks and synergies between these two projects will be highly facilitated.</p> <p>See modifications in Part I - Section B</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			and Part II – Section 4 of the PIF.
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	<p>DS, March 5, 2018: Partly unclear. Please consider the following issues/questions:</p> <p>(1) The project seems to focus on guidelines at various levels, first and foremost; please explain the reasoning behind this approach, in light of Morocco's existing capacity needs; in addition, please explain for each output that is associated with a guideline, what specific function these guidelines will have in enabling the country to meet the enhanced transparency requirement of the Paris Agreement.</p> <p>(2) While a modular reporting system could be a practical and reasonable approach to creating a more holistic climate reporting system at a later stage, the question arises why a holistic climate reporting system would not be created from the outset, given the amount of resources requested for this project; please consider for the project to create a complete, holistic reporting system; if helpful, please consider including a project activity that would enable peer-to-peer learning from other developing countries with advanced reporting systems, to kickstart the</p>	<p>(1) The project concept presented in the PIF is the result of a participatory process engaged with an inter-ministerial committee presently in charge of the FNC and 2e BUR. Two workshops were organized so far to identify transparency capacity building needs and to discuss and adopt the project concept accordingly.</p> <p>In this perspective, the MRV guidelines and procedures proposed at the national level (Output 1.1.2), which will be tested and adapted at two pilot subnational regions (Output 1.2.2), are expected to provide general means and guidance to operationalize the designed and adopted legal and institutional framework (Output 1.1.1). These guidelines will consider eventually outcomes or decisions of COP24 on transparency modalities, guidelines and procedures.</p> <p>Whereas methodologies and tools to plan mitigation actions (Output 2.2.1) and templates and guidance to track and report on GHG mitigation actions (Output 2.2.2) are expected to be technical and sector specific to build needed institutional capacities on both planning and tracking of mitigation actions, as well as their impacts on sustainable development co-benefits in line with the NSDD. These capacities are needed for</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>MRV system development.</p> <p>(3) Please consider including a link to the CBIT Global Coordination Platform, to share lessons learned about project implementation and climate MRV more generally.</p> <p>DS, June 1, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	<p>each line ministry leading migration actions in its sector (e.g.; energy, waste management, industry, forestry, agriculture, etc.) to allow the country sustain planning and tracking of future NDCs cycles.</p> <p>Regarding MRV of support, and considering the need to build specific capacities both at public and private institutions (mainly from financial institutions), the corresponding guidelines and data collection templates to track support (Output 2.3.1) will be instrumental in allowing national authorities to monitor support received, based on the specific national circumstances.</p> <p>In overall, guidelines are instrumental to give national institutions and experts the practical means to nationally measure and report on GHG emissions, mitigation actions and support needed and received. The effective implementation of these guidelines will be supported through specific tools, methodologies and trainings.</p> <p>By using guidelines, tools and methodologies elaborated and adapted to the Moroccan national context, and adopted under appropriate institutional and legal frameworks, national capacities will be built sustainably to meet the</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			<p>transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement.</p> <p>(2) At the PIF design stage, several discussions were held on whether developing from scratch a more general, less sector specific, holistic MRV system or rather focusing first on a pragmatic, modular approach.</p> <p>At the end, the latter was chosen as the modular approach is considered to ensure that specific design and capacity building activities target specific beneficiaries' groups. For instance, MRV of mitigation actions will involve planners and policy makers from key NDC sectors (energy, agriculture, forestry, etc.) whereas MRV of support will involve key public (e.g., Ministry of Economy and Finance, Central Bank, Capital Market Authority, etc.) and private entities (e.g, Professional Association of Moroccan Banks, Moroccan Federation of Insurance Companies and Reinsurance, Stock Exchange, etc.).</p> <p>Still, it is view of Morocco that the successful implementation of component 1 and component 2 will de facto support the establishment of a complete enhanced transparency system by project's end, whose results will be further reflected in future BURs.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
			(3) A new Output 1.1.3 added in the PIF to ensure peer-to-peer learning from other developing countries and sharing lessons learned through the CBIT Global Coordination Platform
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, March 5, 2018: Please follow the GEF Gender Equality Action Plan (GEAP) and reference the latter in the section on gender. DS, June 1, 2018: Comment cleared.	The PIF has been edited accordingly
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	DS, March 5, 2018: The project requests funding from the CBIT Trust Fund.	
	• The focal area allocation?		
	• 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?	DS, March 5, 2018: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 3, 4, 5 and 6, and submit revised version along with response matrix. DS, June 1, 2018: Comments cleared. Program Manager	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		recommends PIF clearance and PPG. The agency is requested to ensure effective coordination with ICAT during PPG phase and elaborate on the coordination at CEO endorsement (approval) stage of the CBIT project.	
Review Date	Review	March 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 01, 2018	
	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?		

CEO endorsement Review

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

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
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council • Convention Secretariat 		
Recommendation	12. Is CEO endorsement recommended?		
Review Date	Review		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		
	Additional Review (as necessary)		