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

GEF ID:	**10042**		
Country/Region:	**Macedonia**		
Project Title:	**Strengthening Institutional and Technical Macedonian Capacities to Enhance Transparency in the Framework of the Paris Agreement**		
GEF Agency:	**UNDP**	GEF Agency Project ID:	**6323 (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:	**$1,320,000**
Co-financing:	**$1,410,000**	Total Project Cost:	**$2,730,000**
PIF Approval:		Council Approval/Expected:	
CEO Endorsement/Approval		Expected Project Start Date:	
Program Manager:	**Milena Vasquez**	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]	MGV, April 5, 2018: The project is mostly aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions. See comments below.	
	2. Is the project consistent with the recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions?	MGV, April 5, 2018: Yes. The FYR of Macedonia ratified the Paris Agreement on 9 January 2018. The project is consistent with its NDC, national communications and BURs, and the Law on Environment. The	

[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
		project also considers relevant legislation given its status as a candidate country for EU membership. Please clarify the following: a) We note that as of 5 March 2018, Macedonia submitted its SBUR to the UNFCCC (need to update reference made on p. 5). We also note that Macedonia has already submitted a request to the GEF to support the development of the BUR3 and 4NC. Further, there is only a brief mention of the International Consultation and Analysis process the country underwent with its FBUR. Please clarify and expand on relevant information. b) Please also clarify the status of the "National System for an Inventory of GHG emissiosns" mentioned under legislative and regulatory framework. c) The National Plan for Climate Change is also briefly mentioned under legislative and regulatory framework. Please clarify the timeline and alignment with the NDC process. d) Please consider adding a few more details under Part 6, Consistency with National Priorities including the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		INDC. MGV, May 22, 2018: All comments have been addressed. a) Reference to SBUR updated and information on the ICA process for the FBUR added. Differences in scope of work carried out by the SBUR and remaining gaps aimed to be addressed by the CBIT project have been clarified. Comment cleared. b) Status and scope of the National System for an Inventory of GHG Emissions has been clarified and information on the Law and Strategy on Climate Change with support from the EU has been added. This CBIT project will be complementary to that support. c) The National Plan for Climate Change is embedded in the INDC. Comment cleared. d) Part 6 has been updated. Comment cleared.	
Project Design	3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers[2] of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability,	MGV, April 5, 2018: Please address comments below:	

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

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
	market transformation, scaling, and innovation?	a) There is very little in Section 1 about the impacts of climate change for Macedonia and associated drivers for action on mitigation and adaptation. Please add some relevant information. b) Sustainability in the project is addressed by activities focused on carrying out financing roadmaps for future support; however, it is not clear what would happen to the systems developed and capacities built with the project if there is no long-term political and institutional support. From the proposal, it is hard to understand what the domestic support is for the creation and continued budgetary support of the proposed new unit at MOEPP, national networks, training plans, etc.; although we believe it its likely there, especially given the EU accession process. Please make sure that this is more apparent throughout the document. MGV, May 22, 2018:All comments have been addressed. a) Information about impacts of climate change for Macedonia as well as largest emitting sectors has been added. Comment cleared.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		b) Long-term national and international support, particularly from EU accession funds, has been clarified. Comment cleared.	
	4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning?	MGV, April 5, 2018: A number of barriers are outlined. However, there is not enough information on the specifics of the baseline to fully assess the incremental reasoning of the project components. Please address comments below: a) Please include findings from participating in the ICA process for the FBUR (or make explicit reference to it when applicable). b) Please clarify the existing institutional arrangements and capacities that have enabled Macedonia to complete its 2 BURs and 3 National Communications to date. Please also discuss how it is envisioned that this project would coordinate with and enhance the project to support its NC and BUR. Also include specifics under Part 5, Coordination. c) Please elaborate on the existing capacities, tools and databases in the country to better understand the barriers identified such as lack of	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		coordination and capacity to conduct transparency activities. Please elaborate with respect to priority sectors identified in the NDC, support received, as well as different parts of the MRV system, including inventories, activity data, emission factors, QA/QC, etc. d) Please clarify the relevance of barrier 4 on p. 7 to responding to the transparency requirements of the Paris Agreement under Article 13. MGV, May 22, 2018: All comments have been addressed. a) Findings from ICA process for the FBUR have been added, including clarifications on which gaps this project will address specifically. Comment cleared. b) Existing institutional capacities have been clarified. The new Department of Climate Change at MOEPP is undergoing systematization. Coordination with NC4/TBUR project has been clarified. UNDP will implement both projects in a combined implementation unit and MOEPP will execute both projects. Comment cleared.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		c) Additional information on existing capacities, tools and databases as well as barriers has been added. Incremental reasoning has been clarified. Comment cleared. d) Agency cited Article 11, which states that capacity-building activities should be "participatory, cross-cutting, and gender-responsive," and argued that fully integrating gender considerations necessitates sustained institutional capacity to mainstream gender. Comment cleared.	
	5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate to achieve project objectives and the GEBs?	MGV, April 5, 2018: Please see comments below: Component 1 a) The incremental reasoning for creating a unit at MOEPP to oversee MRV issues is not yet clear. It is also not yet clear if this is something supported by the government and if there are plans to ensure its sustainability. The fact that there is an activity focused on finding the necessary funding to support it including possibly from external resources (which should not be necessary), is worrying. Please clarify the reasoning behind this output and how it can be implemented with domestic support building on existing	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		capacities and arrangements. b) The first and second activities under Output 1.1 do not seem aligned with the rest of the activities and the outcome of the component. Please clarify if there are not better aligned with Component 2 or 3. c) Are there any existing analysis of climate change-related capacity at different agencies that may inform Output 1.2, including through work on national communications? d) What will the training programs under Output 1.2. for capacity strengthening in sectoral ministries and other government agencies focus on? Who will it be for? e) Will Output 1.3 also consider the potential need for MOUs or other arrangements to enhance the communication and exchange of information, reporting, etc. between Ministries/agencies beyond the creation of networks of practitioners? Are these responsibilities already defined by legislation? Component 2 a) Please provide clarification on the baseline scenario for Output 2.1. given Macedonia's recent publication of its SBUR and 3NC. Have the necessary MRV tools and templates not yet been identified through the	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		processes above, including the ICA? b) Further, this is the first time that AFOLU is mentioned as a priority. Enhancing reporting on AFOLU was not raised as a barrier. Please clarify. c) Also, adaptation measures are not yet identified in Macedonia's INDC and it is understood that Macedonia is barely initiating a funding request for support for the NAP process. Please clarify focus on adaptation. d) As presented, Output 2.3 is not aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions. Please refine and clarify how this component would enhance the capacity of meeting the transparency requirements of Article 13 of the Paris Agreement and is aligned to the CBIT Programming Directions or remove. Component 3 a) Output 3.1. Will the environmental information system only measure progress on transparency or also on mitigation actions, adaptation and support received? (the phrase "transparency-related" is confusing here) b) Output 3.1. How will the MRV system for each of the mitigation measures align with the work carried out by the BURs, including the development of indicators?	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		c) Output 3.2. Please clarify and resolve any overlapping activities between this output and Outputs 2.1 and 2.2. d) How will Output 3.3. coordinate with the work under the project to support the fourth NC and third BUR? Component 4 a) As presented, we do not believe this component is aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions or respond to capacity needs to respond to the transparency requirements under Article 13 of the Paris Agreement. Furthermore, we expect all projects to apply the GEF Policy on Gender Mainstreaming and respond to the GEF's Gender Equality Action Plan. MGV, May 22, 2018: Please address a few outstanding comments below. Component 1 a) The unit is necessary to respond to the growing transparency commitments and has government support. Comment cleared. b) Activities has been rearranged for clarity. Comment cleared. c) It seems this comment was misunderstood. The comment was to inquire whether the first activity	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		under Output 1.2 was really needed given that these analysis have already been carried out. d) Additional information on the proposed training programs has been added. Comment cleared. e) The Law and Strategy on Climate Action will provide the legal and regulatory underpinning for data exchange. The networks of practitioners will thus complement this, also for areas were data provision in voluntary. Comment cleared. Component 2 a) Clarification on the needs for MRV tools and templates has been added. Comment cleared. b) AFOLU is a priority for the government for capacity-building. It will be addressed along with other sectors, including energy. Comment cleared. c) Adaptation is a growing priority for the government. Work under the NAP will inform the MRV system regarding adaptation. Comment cleared. d) Output 2.3 has been refined to align with the CBIT Programming Directions and it is now focused on integrating transparency into policies and legislation in line with the NDC.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		Comment cleared. e) Output 2.4 - Consider adding a reference to the Global Coordination Platform under dissemination of research and training modules in this output, in addition of the link to the GSP. Component 3 a) Comment cleared. The Environmental information system will measure progress on transparency and on mitigation and adaptation actions, and support received. b) Work under the BUR and any other policies for the development of indicators will be coordinated. Comment cleared. c) Comment cleared. Outputs 2.1 and 2.2 focus on building capacity for data collection and analysis, while Output 3.1 will focus on integrating the transparency system. d) Comment cleared. Component 4 a) The stand-alone component has been removed and instead specific outputs have been integrated into the other components to ensure that gender is mainstreamed and the necessary institutional capacity to do so is built.	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		However, we note that there are still a few references to Component 4 throughout the document. Kindly review and edit as necessary (p. 10, 14, 17, etc.) MGV, May 31, 2018: All comments have been addressed. Component 1 c) Activity is still needed as assessment of other sectoral ministries has not been carried out. Comment cleared. Component 2 e) Output 2.4 -Reference to the Global Coordination Platform has been added. Comment cleared. Component 4 a) References to Component 4 have been removed. Comment cleared.	
	6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered?	MGV, April 5, 2018: Yes, the project includes relevant gender elements and will include civil society organizations.	
Availability of Resources	7. Is the proposed Grant (including the Agency fee) within the resources available from (mark all that apply):		
	• The STAR allocation?	MGV, April 5, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT	

PIF Review			
Review Criteria	Questions	Secretariat Comment	Agency Response
		TF.	
	• The focal area allocation?	MGV, April 5, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
	• The LDCF under the principle of equitable access		
	• The SCCF (Adaptation or Technology Transfer)?		
	• Focal area set-aside?	MGV, April 5, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF.	
Recommendations	8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?	MGV, April 5, 2018: Please address comments above. Also, we note that the GEF agency certification is missing. MGV, May 22, 2018: Please address minor comments above. MGV, May 31, 2018: All comments have been addressed. PM recommends CEO PIF Approval.	
Review Date	Review	April 05, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 22, 2018	
	Additional Review (as necessary)	May 31, 2018	

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 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.