



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

GEF ID:	10026		
Country/Region:	Togo		
Project Title:	Togo Climate Transparency Framework		
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:	\$50,000	Project Grant:	\$1,010,267
Co-financing:	\$1,167,000	Total Project Cost:	\$2,177,267
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	Dustin Schinn	Agency Contact Person:	Ruth Coutto

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 20, 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 20, 2018: Yes. Project clearly aligns with Togo's INDC and addresses the capacity constraints outlined in the country's BUR/NC.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental	DS/JDS, March 20, 2018: Partly unclear. Please consider	A risk related to lack of sustainability as well the risk level and the mitigation

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>degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation?</p>	<p>including a risk category for lack of sustainability of results after project completion, along with proposed risk mitigation measures, in the section on project risks. Also, please consider and elaborate on ways in which this project can be scaled via knowledge sharing and coordination with Togo's regional GHG capacity building/MRV activities, as well as similar work with other donors.</p> <p>DS/JDS, June 4, 2018: Comment cleared.</p>	<p>measures have been included in Table 3.</p> <p>Ways in which the project can be scaled have been developed under section 2.1.f. They include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Revise and strengthened institutional arrangements; data agreements; <input type="checkbox"/> Web platform development for data collection owned by government; <input type="checkbox"/> Trainings activities targeted at government officials not consultants <input type="checkbox"/> Sensitization activities on importance of institutionalizing transparency activities <input type="checkbox"/> Agreement protocols between relevant stakeholders of the transparency framework. <input type="checkbox"/> Collaboration with the Regional Collaboration Center – Lomé; West Africa south-south network
	<p>4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?</p>	<p>DS/JDS, March 20, 2018: Partly unclear. While the project is overall sound and clear, please briefly describe whether Togo also receives support from other multilateral or bilateral donors for enhancing transparency under the Paris Agreement, and if so, how the proposed project complements any other ongoing or planned initiatives.</p> <p>For example, how will this project interact/inform work associated with the Regional Collaboration Centre</p>	<p>Interaction between the project and the regional center has been addressed in the question above. Details are provided in section 1.2.f.</p> <p>During the project PPG phase synergies between outputs of the two projects will be further elaborated.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Lomé and Togo's participation in the West African South-South Network on Measurement, Reporting and Verification (MRV) and Transparency? Are there any outputs from existing projects that can be incorporated into this project?</p> <p>DS/JDS, June 4, 2018: Comment cleared at PIF stage. Please provide further details on synergies and to avoid overlap with other multilateral and bilateral support at CEO endorsement stage.</p>	
	<p>5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?</p>	<p>DS/JDS, March 20, 2018: Partly unclear. The project overall is sound and clear, however, some questions/issues remain:</p> <p>(1) In Table B, please include the deliverables for each Output in order to enhance clarity of the table. The deliverables are already included in the main body of the document, however, Table B would benefit from enhanced clarity.</p> <p>(2) While Togo already has a National Committee on Climate Change, it is unclear how the project will interlink and support all relevant ministries/stakeholders in accessing data and information related to</p>	<p>All deliverables are included in the Table B</p> <p>At the end of the alternative scenario section (page 19), further explanations have been provided on how this project will link with and support all relevant stakeholders to access and use data and information generated through this CBIT project.</p> <p>Based on discussions with both ANGE and Directorate of Environment, outputs 1.1 and 1.4 have been identified to include these two issues as deliverables at respectively pages 17 and 18/19 in the alternative and in the table. The budget of this component has been increased using the amount dedicated to the vehicle,</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>climate change (GHG data, etc) from the project platform, as opposed to only contributing data. By allowing easy and continuous access to project data and information on GHG emissions the project could feed back information into policy and decision making in peripheral decision-making bodies that may otherwise not include climate-related issues in their decision-making processes. Please consider including such provisions, accordingly.</p> <p>(3) Related to (2) above, please explain how the project will address Togo's priority needs for GHG inventories which are currently outlined on page 7 of the PIF, including specifically "Establishment of a mechanism of agreements between the structures holding activity data and the body responsible for preparing GHG inventories", and "Sensitization of decision-making bodies on the importance of strengthening sustainable institutional capacity to fulfill the commitments made vis-a-vis the UNFCCC". It seems that these two priority needs could benefit from dedicated activities/deliverables.</p> <p>(4) Please adjust resource figures in</p>	<p>which is removed. The overall cost of the PIF remains the same.</p> <p>The figures in table have been rounded down.</p> <p>The all-terrain vehicle has been removed and funds redistributed to outputs 1.1 and 1.4.</p>

PIF Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>Table B so that no decimals are included (i.e. round to the full dollar).</p> <p>(5) Annex I lists equipment needed to implement the project, which includes the purchase of a 4X4 all-terrain vehicle. Please remove this equipment purchase given that existing vehicles may be utilized for this project.</p> <p>DS/JDS, June 4, 2018: Comments cleared.</p>	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	DS, March 20, 2018: 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, March 20, 2018: 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)? 		
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	DS, March 20, 2018: Not yet. Please address comments under Question 3, 4 and 5, and submit revised version along with response	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		<p>matrix.</p> <p>DS, June 4, 2018: Yes. Program Manager recommends PIF clearance and PPG. The agency is requested to provide further details on synergies with other multilateral and bilateral support at CEO endorsement stage, and to avoid overlap with such initiatives.</p>	
Review Date	Review	March 20, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	June 04, 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?		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	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?		
	10. Does the project have descriptions of a knowledge management plan?		
Agency Responses	11. Has the Agency adequately responded to comments at the		

CEO endorsement Review

Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement	Response to Secretariat comments
	PIF ³ stage from:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEFSEC 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • STAP 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GEF Council 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.