



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

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------|-------------------------|
| GEF ID: | 9970 | | |
| Country/Region: | Cuba | | |
| Project Title: | Enhancing Cuba's institutional and technical capacities in the agriculture and land-use sectors for enhanced transparency under the Paris Agreement. | | |
| GEF Agency: | FAO | 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: | \$863,242 |
| Co-financing: | \$550,000 | Total Project Cost: | \$1,413,242 |
| PIF Approval: | | Council Approval/Expected: | |
| CEO Endorsement/Approval | | Expected Project Start Date: | |
| Program Manager: | Milena Vasquez | Agency Contact Person: | Jorge Fernández Esperón |

| 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/PM, January 24, 2018: The project is mostly aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions. A few issues have been identified below. MGV/JDS, May 29, 2018: The project is now more aligned with the CBIT Programming Directions. | |
| | 2. Is the project consistent with the | MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: Yes, 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 |
|-----------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | recipient country's national strategies and plans or reports and assessments under relevant conventions? | project is aligned with the "Tarea Vida" national state plan and Cuba's first NDC. | |
| Project Design | 3. Does the PIF sufficiently indicate the drivers ² of global environmental degradation, issues of sustainability, market transformation, scaling, and innovation? | <p>MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: Mostly, yes. Concerns with sustainability have been identified. Please see comments below.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, May 29, 2018: Yes, comment cleared.</p> | |
| | 4. Is the project designed with sound incremental reasoning? | <p>MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: Overall, the incremental reasoning for choosing one sector has to be strengthened given the identified gaps and needs beyond that sector. In addition, considering the narrow focus of the projects and associated activities, the budget may be too high. Please address below comments:</p> <p>a) It is not clear what the baseline for transparency in sectors other than agriculture and land-use are. While we understand that the project is focused on agriculture and land-use, please clarify the existing institutional structure and capacity for transparency in other sectors, and further explain the reasons for choosing agriculture and land-use as a priority to be addressed by this CBIT</p> | |

² Need not apply to LDCF/SCCF projects.

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>support (both in terms of mitigation and adaptation).</p> <p>For example, we note that the energy sector is the largest contributor to Cuba's GHG emissions - is transparency in the energy sector already relatively enhanced or will it be addressed through other programs? In addition, there are a number of other sectors/actions identified in Cuba's NDC on adaptation outside of agriculture and land-use.</p> <p>b) In the baseline scenario, the proposal notes that "there is no system available to integrate results from mitigation actions into the GHG inventory." Is this in reference to all sectors, and if so how does the country aim to address this need for the other sectors (mainly energy)?</p> <p>c) Also in the baseline scenario, the proposal notes that "institutional and technical obstacles still need to be overcome to consolidate preparation and presentation of a NC every 4 years," and that "there is no general basis for a MRV system at national level, which will be in place in 2018, within the framework of the TNC/BUR project." How will this project support that identified gap and</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>coordinate with UNDP on the work being carried out on the TNC and BUR? (This coordination has to be more specific and deliberate than currently included in p. 15)</p> <p>d) Further, please clarify how the project will coordinate and build upon the EU-funded technical assistance to improve data collection, analysis and dissemination of forest-related data. Please also clarify if the activities in this proposal include forests.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Thank you for your responses.</p> <p>a) Comment cleared. According to the PIF, there is no basis for a MRV system at the national level but it will be developed alongside the TNC/BUR project under CITMA and it is expected that sector-specific systems be developed for each sector. This project aims to develop the AFOLU sector's MRV system and lay the groundwork for a step-wise approach to carry out similar work for other sectors, given that a technical team under AFOLU has been identified.</p> <p>b) Comment not cleared. It refers to</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>all sectors, but there is no indication on how the country will address gaps in the other sectors.</p> <p>c) Comment not cleared. The effective relationship between the project outcomes (e.g. MRV activities) and the existing GEF-supported TNC/BUR work remains unclear. It is not clear how this project will maximize synergies between ministries—in particular CITMA and MINAG—so the project is indeed incremental and not redundant.</p> <p>d) Comment not cleared. The response clarified that this proposal includes forests. However, the assistance project is not mentioned under Coordination and there is no clarity as to whether specific activities will be complementary or coordinated. For example, it appears that at the least, the REDD+ assistance will include a needs assessment. In addition, it is not clear which stakeholders are involved in this initiative and their linkages with this proposal.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, May 29, 2018: All outstanding comments have been adequately addressed:</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>b) The country will use a step-wise approach starting with the AFOLU sector. The experience and lessons will be transferred to the other sectors.</p> <p>c) The relationship between the TNC/BUR project and the CBIT project has been clarified. The TNC/BUR project will be a precursor and design an overall basis for an MRV system, which will then be applied in the AFOLU sector with the support of the CBIT project. The CITMA will institutionalize the national MRV system in coordination with the "tarea Vida" policy and the established National Climate Change Group, an inter-ministerial coordination group, which includes MINAG as the institution responsible for the AFOLU sector.</p> <p>d) REDD+ support has been added to the coordination section. The technical assistance project will work with other stakeholders mainly and will focus on REDD+ readiness, including a needs assessment specific to having a forest monitoring system and implementing REDD+.</p> | |
| | 5. Are the components in Table B sound and sufficiently clear and appropriate | MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: Please consider marking Table F for s | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|---|--|-----------------|
| | to achieve project objectives and the GEBs? | <p>relevant indicator that corresponds to Corporate Result 6. Please also address below comments.</p> <p>a) The lack of funds is identified as a current institutional barrier. Please provide information on how the expected results of the project, in particular with regard to the institutional arrangements, will be sustainable and continue after the end of the project.</p> <p>b) Output 1.1.1 - How will this output coordinate with the work being carried out for the TNC and BUR?</p> <p>c) Output 1.1.2 - Please refer to activity (j) in the CBIT Programming Directions to guide Output 1.1.2, which details the expectations of capacity needs assessments for transparency.</p> <p>d) Component 3 - Thank you for including the relevant sources of guidelines and guidance that will support the different outputs of this component and FAO's relevance to all of them. However, the specific gaps and needs specific to Cuba and in consideration of the existing resources (human and financial) related to these three outputs (GHG inventory</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>preparation, MRV for AFOLU sector, and mitigation action impact quantification and reporting) have not been explained. Please clarify the incremental reasoning of these outputs, the expected reach of the capacity-building and peer exchange activities within the country, and how the project will aim to ensure this capacity is retained over the long term.</p> <p>e) Output 3.1.1 - This output is not eligible under the CBIT programming directions. Please remove or redefine.</p> <p>f) Output 3.1.2 - This output is not entirely eligible under the CBIT programming directions. The CBIT can provide support on "how to integrate knowledge from transparency initiatives into national policy and decision-making." Please redefine considering this nuance.</p> <p>g) Output 3.1.3 - Please further clarify the scope of this output. Will it help develop national indicators? Will it develop a national monitoring system? How will this be institutionalized?</p> <p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Thank you for marking Table F.</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>a) Page 12 of the PIF mentions that "...human resources co-financed by the government, will warranty a long term and sustainable process." We would need clarification that CBIT project funds will not be used to co-finance government staff.</p> <p>b) Comment not cleared. While the proposal states that coordination will be fundamental and will happen, it is not detailed how exactly, nor does it seem that there has been any preliminary discussion regarding this.</p> <p>c) Thank you for expanding. We note that this output is solely focused on a needs assessment for the AFOLU sector. We hope that this could be complemented for other sectors via other initiatives or work.</p> <p>d) Comment not cleared. Thank you for adding the information on Cuba's barriers and constraints in Table 2 as well as additional details on Component 2 and 3. We have remaining concerns. There is no source of the identified barriers and constraints (ie. national communications, a study, etc.). In addition, Outcome 2 makes reference to tracking of NDC in mitigation in</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|-----------------|-----------|--|-----------------|
| | | <p>the AFOLU sector, but Cuba's INDC does not have any mitigation contributions under the AFOLU sector. Finally, it is still not clear what the reach of these capacity-building activities and peer exchanges would be (which institutions/experts will it include?).</p> <p>e) Comment cleared.</p> <p>f) Comment cleared.</p> <p>g) Comment cleared.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, May 29, 2018: all outstanding comments have been adequately addressed:</p> <p>a) Agency confirmed that no resources from the CBIT will be used to finance government staff per policies.</p> <p>b) Coordination is explained more fully. It will mainly be addressed via inter-ministerial the National Climate Change Group.</p> <p>c) Efforts for how the country will address transparency under other sectors have been added, in part this work will be complemented by the</p> | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|----------------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | | <p>work under the TNC/BUR project.</p> <p>d) Further details have been included in the PIF, including on the barriers identified. The current NDC includes a mitigation action that involves the AFOLU sector through the development of new renewable energy generation that includes woody biomass. In addition, Cuba intends to enhance the ambition of its NDC, considering the greatest potential for mitigation in the country are in the energy and AFOLU sectors.</p> | |
| | 6. Are socio-economic aspects, including relevant gender elements, indigenous people, and CSOs considered? | MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: Yes. The project will include the CSO, National Association of Small Farmers as well as relevant business groups. The project will incorporate gender in line with the Gender Equality Action Plan. | |
| 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? | MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF. At the time of this review, there are still enough resources to support this project. | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The focal area allocation? | MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF. At the time of this review, there are still enough resources to support this project. | |

PIF Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
|------------------------|--|---|-----------------|
| | <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)? | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focal area set-aside? | <p>MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: This project is requesting resources from the CBIT TF. At the time of this review, there are still enough resources to support this project.</p> | |
| Recommendations | <p>8. Is the PIF being recommended for clearance and PPG (if additional amount beyond the norm) justified?</p> | <p>MGV/PM, January 24, 2018: Not at this time. Please see comments above. In addition, please avoid making direct reference to projects that have not yet been approved, in this case the global CBIT proposal on forests (see p. 12).</p> <p>MGV/JDS, March 29, 2018: Thank you for the resubmission and clarifying some of our initial comments. However, at this time we do not recommend this project for CBIT support in GEF-6 and suggest further consultations with the GEF Secretariat in GEF-7.</p> <p>MGV/JDS, May 29, 2018: At the request of the GEF OFP in Cuba, the Agency further refined the PIF and addressed remaining technical comments. PM recommends PIF technical clearance. A final decision on clearing, however, will be made based on availability of resources in</p> | |

| PIF Review | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment | Agency Response |
| | | the CBIT Trust Fund by June 2018. | |
| Review Date | Review | January 24, 2018 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | March 29, 2018 | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | May 29, 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 | | |

CEO endorsement Review

| Review Criteria | Questions | Secretariat Comment at CEO Endorsement | Response to Secretariat comments |
|-------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| | 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 | | |
| | • GEF Council | | |
| | • Convention Secretariat | | |
| | 12. Is CEO endorsement recommended? | | |

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 |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|
| Recommendation | | | |
| Review Date | Review | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |
| | Additional Review (as necessary) | | |