**Pre-Investment Screening Committee (PISC) – COUNTRY OFFICE SUBMISSION AND Assessment for Climate change enabling activities and CAPACITY BUILDING INITIATIVES FOR TRANSPARENCY (CBIT PROJECTS)**

**Country:**

**Targeted source of funds (if identified):**

**Project name:**

**Project grant**:

**Proposed implementing Partner:**

**Date CO Submission is received:**

**Project Description:**

**A / PISC review of CO submission**

| **Criteria** | **CO Submission Description** | **ASSESSMENT** |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **PISC rating** | **PISC comments (as needed)** |
| ***1. Strategic considerations*** |
| Government ownership/ leadership and alignment to mid/long-term strategies and to existing portfolio & initiatives (such as VF financed and/or bilateral financed projects, and/or linkages with CBIT, Climate Promise, EAs, NAP, REDD+ etc.)  |  | High / Medium / Low |  |
| Contribution to NDC implementation  |  | Yes / No |  |
| Co-financing potential[[1]](#footnote-2)  |  | High / Medium / Low |  |
| Gender and safeguards ‘check’ |  | Conducted / Not conducted | Assess whether or not the project should be exempt from SESP. Assess if budget is reserved to conduct Gender Analysis.  |
| Risk Context: 1. What implementation challenges do you foresee?
2. What oversight challenges do you foresee?
3. What specific measures will need to be considered to the project implementation arrangements to manage the implementation challenges listed above?
4. If there are security issues in the country, this is a risk for UNDP. How will these risks be mitigated for project and County Office personnel?
5. Is there a chance that project funds could end up with in-country groups/beneficiaries that donors might consider ‘terrorists’? What measures will be put in place to ensure due diligence and AML/CFT screening during design and implementation?
6. Are there any reputational risks to UNDP in implementing the project?
7. Could the project involve or support high risk sectors (such as mining, waste management, or aquaculture including from co-financing)?
8. Does the government(s) have any known ongoing or upcoming work that could be seen as inconsistent with this project’s objective?
9. Does the country(ies) have any significant differences with international standards including UN conventions/principles/declarations related to:
	1. Human rights
	2. Labour standards (e.g. Child labour)
	3. Indigenous peoples’ rights
	4. Women’s rights
	5. LGBTQ+ rights
	6. Corruption/fraud/AMLCFT
 |  |  |  |
| Proposed Implementation Modality, Project Governance Structure and set-up. Governance arrangements for the project have been agreed and are in line with latest POPP guidance[[2]](#footnote-3) Note: include Implementing PartnerResponsible Party(ies)Oversight* 1st level oversight:
* 2nd level oversight:
* 3rd level oversight:
 |  | Yes/ No  |  |
| ***2. Capacity and Risk management considerations***  |
| CO oversight capacity in terms of individuals’ workload: EFP, Programme Officer, Financial and Administrative Staff***Human resources capacities at Project Development and Design Stage:****1. Resources to procure at least 1 technical consultant to develop proposal (preferably, 1 full-time technical consultant + 1 part-time admin consultant)**2.Workload issues, i.e amount of time dedicated by UNDP CO staff to oversee project design.* ***Capacities during Project Oversight:****1. operational capacity of the CO* *a. risks identified in the audit**b. procurement capacity for DIM/support to NIM projects, i.e. number of projects/procurement cases under each procurement staff assigned to support this project and average processing time of procurement cases* *2. workload issues, i.e. number of projects under the oversight of the EFP, Programme Officer, Financial and Admin Staff. Individual expected to oversee this initiative should not directly supervise/ oversee more than 10 projects before taking on this initiative* *3. delivery issues in previous CC EAs* |  | Assessed / Not assessed |  |
| CO Procurement capacity (for projects that are DIM or support to NIM): assess number of projects under each procurement staff to be assigned to support this project  |  |  |  |
| IP capacity (HACT and PCAT are low risk) IP capacity[[3]](#footnote-4) (including capacity on gender and safeguards):* HACT/PCAT assessment results[[4]](#footnote-5)
* Prior experience with the proposed IP
* If capacity gaps/shortfalls have been identified, what risk mitigation measures can/have been or will be put in place?
* Has an alternative IP been considered (e.g. UN Agency, CSO/NGO, etc.)
* If execution support is required by the IP (based on identified capacity shortfalls identified), which 3rd party entities have been considered to provide the support and are there any other alternatives that may be considered
* If UNDP is required to perform a role in execution (as a last resort and based on clearly identified justification): (i) how will UNDP ensure institutional separation of the oversight and execution functions and what are the proposed governance arrangements (ii) will costs for UNDP execution be fully covered in the project budget?

*PCAT: Please undertake PCAT for the proposed IP and confirm risk rating and necessary measures/budget to manage risks identified, as well as any additional assessments required.**HACT: Please confirm date of the last HACT for the proposed IP, its validity and rating.****IP Capacities during Project Development and Implementation:****1.Technical capacity: at least 1 technical-level officer assigned to advise this project development and implementation.2. Operational capacity of the IP* *a. risks identified in PCAT/HACT or NIM audit.**b. procurement capacity for full- NIM projects confirmed by the Procurement Assessment of PCAT.**3. delivery issues in previous CC EAs or other VF projects implemented by the IP.* |  | Assessed / Not assessed |  |
| Risks as raised by the GEF Audit 2020 |  | Considered / Not considered |  |
| Exclusionary Criteria triggered (see below\*\*) |  | None/Yes [#] | [to be verified by the NCE MPSU and PA] |
| ***3. Budget/costing and HR considerations (level of investment required throughout the whole project cycle)*** |
| CO commitment of appropriate budget and HR resources to project development (at least 20% of the EFP or Programme Officer and 20% of administrative associate staff at the CO needed to oversee development and implementation of this project (please explain separately for project development and oversight stages)Budget for consultants for project development/design: *at least 1 technical consultant to develop proposal (preferably, 1 full-time technical consultant + 1 part-time admin consultant)* |  | Yes / No |  |
| Government commitment of resources to project development and implementation (at least 1 technical-level officer assigned to advise this project development and implementation) |  | Considered / Not considered |  |
| ***4. Confirmation of NCE team resources (to be confirmed by PTA during PISC)*** |
| Availability of human resources in NCE team to support the request based on a workload analysis |  | Yes / No |  |

\*\*Exclusionary criteria\*\*:

* More than 80% of active projects have requested extension in the past 2 years
* Cumulative Vertical Fund portfolio delivery is less than 60% in the past 2 years
* 1 or more active SECU cases or fraud/ misuse of funds cases in VF portfolio
* Previous NCs, BURs submissions to UNFCCC have been delayed for more than 6 months
* More than 50% of VF portfolio in the country has delayed MTRs or TEs (more than 3 months)

**B / Summary of PISC assessment**

**PISC meeting date:**

**Members of PISC:**

**CO representative presenting proposal:**

**PISC recommendation**

|  |
| --- |
| **Proposal supported** |
|  | Proposal supported: *The PISC will submit the programming recommendation to the BPPS-NCE Executive Coordinator for final decision* | If request is accepted: The GEF audit checklist should be prepared by the CO, checked for compliance and quality by the RTA, signed off by the PTA, before submission of the PIF package to the GEFSEC. |
| **Proposal not supported at this stage** |
|  | Proposal requires minor changes: *Revise and resubmit for another review by the PTA and submission to the BPPS NCE Executive Coordinator for final decision when cleared by PTA* | Areas requiring revision prior to resubmission to PTA:Recommended scenario for Task Team formation:Indicate full-fledged integrated programming or stand-alone project developmentConditions/issues to be considered during PIF development (if applicable):If request is accepted: The GEF audit checklist should be prepared by the CO, checked for compliance and quality by the RTA, signed off by the PTA, before submission of the PIF package to the GEFSEC. |
|  | Proposal requires major changes: *Revise and resubmit for another review by the PISC (PISC will be reconvened)* | Areas requiring revision prior to submission to PISC: |
| **Proposal not supported** |
|  | Proposal falls well short of requirements: *Do not continue*  | Reasons for PISC recommendation: |

| **Tentative work plan for project formulation and inception: (to be filled by the CO)** |
| --- |
| **Week** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** | **21** | **22** | **23** | **24+** |
| EA request 1st draft |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ProDoc 1st draft |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| GEF checklist  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *RTA/PA review (+ 2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| EA request 2nd draft |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ProDoc 2nd draft |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| GEF checklist  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *RTA/PA review (+ 2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| EA request final |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ProDoc final |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| GEF checklist  |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *GEF checklist signature* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *RTA/PTA clearance (+ 2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *Financial clearance (+ 2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *Submission to the GEFSec* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| GEF Review Sheet (+ 2-4 weeks) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Response to the GEF Sec comments (+ 2 weeks) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *RTA/PTA clearance and Resubmission to the GEFSec (+1-2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| GEF CEO Approval (+ 6-8 weeks) |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| LPAC |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| LPAC minutes and ProDoc finalized for DoA clearance |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *RTA/PTA technical clearance of the ProDoc (1-2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| *Financial clearance of the ProDoc (1-2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| DoA clearance *(1 week)* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *DoA sent to the CO (1-2 weeks)* |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| ProDoc signature/ Project Start date |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Key project staff recruited |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Gender Analysis and Action Plan |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Inception Workshop |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Inception Report |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

1. For EA projects, co-financing is not required (please see [GEF Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy](https://www.thegef.org/council-meeting-documents/guidelines-project-and-program-cycle-policy-2020-update)), however please take into consideration that at least in-kind co-financing from participating Government is encouraged. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. *The GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards Policy establishes the responsibilities of the GEF Agency (UNDP) to oversee Executing Entity (Implementing Partner in UNDP terminology) and ensure the latter have adequate capacities and controls in place. The GEF Agency Fee Policy explicitly precludes the merging or crossing over of the implementing functions of the GEF Agency and the execution functions undertaken by Executing Entity/Implementing Partner. Execution support to GEF projects (with or without GEF funding) can only be approved under exceptional circumstances where a clear and well-founded rationale for UNDP to perform certain execution functions is provided based on:*

***a)*** *an assessment of available capacities at the level of the IP (PCAT/HACT);* ***b)*** *a clear request from the partnering government to seek execution support services, and;* ***c)*** *an assessment of potential alternative arrangements for execution support other than by UNDP.* [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. IP Capacity evaluation not required for DIM projects. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Previous HACT assessments may also be used for the PISC - (I.e. if needed, can include HACT/PCAT results, if available, from other interventions/projects). [↑](#footnote-ref-5)