

# Building Urban Resilience to Climate Change and Transitioning to Green Economy in Somalia

Review CEO Endorsement and Make a recommendation

## Basic project information

**GEF ID**  
11564  
**Countries**  
Somalia  
**Project Name**  
Building Urban Resilience to Climate Change and Transitioning to Green Economy in Somalia  
**Agencies**  
UNDP  
**Date received by PM**  
6/18/2025  
**Review completed by PM**

**Program Manager**  
Ladu David Morris Lemi  
**Focal Area**  
Climate Change  
**Project Type**  
FSP

PIF  
CEO

Part I - General Project Information

**1. a) Is the Project Information table correctly filled, including specifying adequate executing partners?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Nov 21, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, Oct 22, 2025**

UNDP is the only executing entity. Please also include any other entity with execution role in the info table as described in the institutional arrangement section.

Agency Response

UNDP 20 Nov 2025

UNDP will have full responsibility for execution of the project (DIM execution as per UNDP Policies and Procedures). This will include direct execution of agreed outputs and all fiduciary, procurement; safeguards, oversight and quality assurance. Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MoECC/FGS) as Responsible Party (RP) to UNDP for designated non-fiduciary outputs; designated municipal entities may serve as RPs for site-level delivery, therefore, the Project Information table has been updated to reflect this consistent with C.7.

**b) Are the Rio Markers for CCM, CCA, BD and LD correctly selected, if applicable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**2. Project Summary.**

**a) Does the project summary concisely describe the problem to be addressed, the project objective and the strategies to deliver the GEBs or adaptation benefits and other key expected outcomes?**

**b) Does the summary capture the essence of the project and is it within the max. of 250 words?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) Yes

b) Yes

Agency Response

**3. Project Description Overview**

**a) Is the project objective statement concise, clear and measurable?**

**b) Are the components, outcomes, and outputs sound, appropriate and sufficiently clear to achieve the project objective and the core indicators per the stated Theory of Change?**

**c) Are gender dimensions, knowledge management, and M&E included within the project components and budgeted for?**

- d) Are the GEF Project Financing and Co-Financing contributions to PMC proportional?**  
**e) Is the PMC equal to or below 10% (for MSP) or 5% (for FSP)? If above, is the justification acceptable?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Oct 24, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

c) Under monitoring and evaluation, please ensure that gender-specific results, including on the implementation of the Gender Action Plan are monitored and reported on (PIRs, MTRs, TE).

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) No, there is currently no co-financing allocated for the PMC. The GEF guidelines require "proportionality" to the PMC between Co-financing and GEF resources.

e) Yes

Agency Response

**UNDP, 9 October 2025**

Gender dimensions, knowledge management and M&E are embedded within components and budgeted. The CEOER has been revised to: (i) commit explicitly to monitoring and reporting gender-specific results and implementation of the Gender Action Plan (GAP) in the PIRs, Mid-Term Review (MTR) and Terminal Evaluation (TE).

**UNDP, 31 July 2025**

UNDP has now confirmed USD\$500,000 in cash co-financing (see updated Annex A and accompanying commitment letter). Of this amount, USD\$125,000 is earmarked for PMU salaries, financial management, and audit costs, thereby ensuring co-financing is proportional to the GEF-funded PMC line of USD\$552,730 (~4.8% of the LDCF grant). The remaining UNDP cash and in-kind support will finance technical backstopping and knowledge management activities.

Consequently:

PMC remains below the 5% ceiling for FSPs (4.8% of the USD\$11.626 million LDCF grant).

Co-financing now contributes ~18% of total PMC costs (125k / 553k), satisfying the GEF policy requirement that PMC be co-financed on a proportional basis.

All budget tables (cover sheet, Annex A, Annex G) have been updated to reflect:

LDCF grant: USD?11,626,606

PMC (GEF): USD?552,730

PMC (co?finance, UNDP cash): USD?125,000

Total confirmed co?finance: USD?2,300,000

The proportionality narrative has been added to Section?B.4, and the UNDP cash?co?finance letter explicitly references its allocation to PMC and M&E functions.

#### 4. Project Outline

##### A. Project Rationale

a) Is the current situation (including global environmental problems, key drivers of environmental degradation, climate vulnerability) clearly and adequately described from a systems perspective and adequately addressed by the project design?

b) Have the role of stakeholders, incl. the private sector and local actors in the system been described and how they will contribute to GEBs and/or adaptation benefits and other project outcomes? Is the private sector seen mainly as a stakeholder or as financier?

c) If this is an NGI project, is there a description of how the project and its financial structure are addressing financial barriers?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) Yes

b) Although there is a table provided under "Stakeholders engagement", there is no exact clarity of what some of the listed entities will do. Additionally, it appears as if some of the information was copied from the PIF document as they still refer to future PPG stage. Please state clearly what each of the stakeholder identified will do in the project.

c) N/A

Agency Response

**UNDP, 31 July 2025**

The stakeholder section has fully redrafted to remove all residual PIF/PPG language and to provide activity?level clarity on each partner?s role and contribution to adaptation results and Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs). Key changes:

**Stakeholder Role Matrix inserted:**

Stakeholder	Role in implementation	Contribution to adaptation/GEBs	Financing role
<b>MoECC (Federal)</b>	Chairs Project Board; leads policy reform (Outcome?1)	Adoption of climate?resilient urban planning standards	In?kind staff + USD?0.5?M services
<b>Municipalities (Mogadishu, Bosaso, Garowe, Kismayo)</b>	Site selection, O&M of NbS infrastructure (Outcome?2)	Sustained flood?risk reduction for ~850?k residents	Land provision; O&M budget lines

<b>Private Banks (e.g., IBS Bank)</b>	Channel concessional line of credit / risk-sharing facility (Outcome?3)	Mobilise ??USD?2?M private capital for NbS MSMEs	Financier ? loan capital
<b>MSMEs &amp; Business Associations</b>	Deploy green building materials, drainage services, tree?nursery operations	Job creation; scaling NbS supply chain	Equity & working?capital investment
<b>CSOs / Women?s Groups</b>	Community mobilisation, gender?responsive monitoring, GRM interface	Increased women?s participation & safeguards oversight	Volunteer time / in?kind
<b>Universities (SIMAD, Somali Nat?l Univ.)</b>	Applied research & M&E support (Outcome?4)	Knowledge products; adaptation curricula	In?kind expertise
<b>UNDP</b>	Executive under DIM; fiduciary & procurement oversight; TA backstopping	Quality assurance; catalytic investment design	USD?0.8?M cash + TA

Private?sector positioning clarified (CEOER?Section B, Outcome?3): the private sector is treated as both stakeholder and financier. Banks provide the risk-sharing facility; MSMEs provide equity and co-invest in NbS pilot businesses. Targets: ??USD?2?million private finance leveraged; ??10 MSMEs supported.

All ?future PPG stage? phrases deleted. The narrative is now updated as per the progress at PPG phase.

Stakeholder Engagement Plan cross?referenced. The full SEP (Section?D.2 page 75, CEOER upload) now mirrors the matrix and includes consultation schedule, GRM, and budget.

## 5 B. Project Description

**5.1 a) Is there a concise theory of change (narrative and an optional schematic) that describes the project logic, including how the project design elements are contributing to the objective, the identified causal pathways, the focus and basis (including scientific) of the proposed solutions, how they provide a robust approach? Are underlying key assumptions listed?**

**b) Is there a description of how the GEF alternative will build on ongoing/previous investments (GEF and non-GEF), lessons and experiences in the country/region?**

**c) Are the project components (interventions and activities) described and proposed solutions and critical assumptions and risks properly justified? Is there an indication of why the project approach has been selected over other potential options?**

**d) Incremental/additional cost reasoning: Is the incremental/additional cost reasoning properly described as per the Guidelines provided in GEF/C.31/12? Has the baseline scenario and/or associated baseline projects been described? Is the project incremental reasoning provisioned (including the role of the GEF)? Are the global environmental benefits and/or adaptation benefits identified?**

**e) Other Benefits: Are the socioeconomic benefits resulting from the project at the national and local levels sufficiently described?**

**f) Is the financing presented in the annexed financing table adequate and demonstrate a cost-effective approach to meet the project objectives? Are items charged to the PMC reasonable according to the GEF guidelines?**

**g) How does the project design ensure resilience to future changes in the drivers and adaptive management needs and options (as applicable for this FSP/MSP)?**

**h) Are the relevant stakeholders (including women, private sector, CSO, e.g.) and their roles adequately described within the components?**

**i) Gender: Does the gender analysis identify any gender differences, gaps or opportunities linked to project/program objectives and activities and have these been taken up in component design and description/s?**

**j) Are the proposed elements to capture and disseminate knowledge and learning outputs and strategic communication adequately described?**

**k) Policy Coherence: Have any policies, regulations or subsidies been identified that could counteract the intended project outcomes and how will that be addressed?**

**l) Transformation and/or innovation: Is the project going to be transformative or innovative? Does it explain scaling up opportunities?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) Yes

b) No. Although there are several GEF projects and other donors projects in Somalia relevant to this project like Adaptation Fund "Green and Resilient Ecosystems for Somali Livelihoods (Hal-abuur)", there is no description of lessons learned from those projects that informed the designed of this projects. Please consider providing an analysis of how lessons learned from the previous or ongoing initiatives informed this project.

c) Yes

d) N/A

e) Yes

f) Yes

g)

h) Yes

i) Yes

j) Yes

k) No

l) Yes

Agency Response

**UNDP, 31 July 2025**

The design of this LDCF project explicitly draws on operational experience and formal lessons learned from five ongoing or recently approved climate?resilience initiatives in Somalia (GEF, Adaptation Fund, GCF and World Bank). A concise Lessons?to?Design Matrix has been inserted in the CEOER (p.?22) and summarised below to demonstrate how each lesson informed specific components of the GEF alternative.

<b>Programme (&amp; status)</b>	<b>Key documented lessons</b>	<b>How lesson is reflected in this GEF project</b>	<b>Component(s) affected</b>
---------------------------------	-------------------------------	--	------------------------------

<b>Adaptation?Fund / IFAD ?Hal?abuur ? Green &amp;?Resilient Ecosystems for Somali Livelihoods? (ongoing)</b>	<i>i) Youth? and MSME?led landscape restoration accelerates uptake of NbS; ii) early, formal integration of climate?resilience criteria into planning avoids retro?fitting costs.</i>	? MSME challenge?grant window (Outcome?3.2) targets youth? and women?led NbS service providers. ? Spatial?planning guidelines in Outcome?1.1 embed NbS standards at the concept?note stage for municipal CAPEX projects.	1?&?3
<b>UNDP/WMO ?Early Warnings for All? (EW4All) (ongoing)</b>	Accurate, co?produced hazard information increases community trust and maintenance of flood infrastructure.	Hydromet data from EW4All is integrated into the <i>risk?layer</i> used for NbS siting (Output?2.1) and into the city?level adaptation dashboards hosted on the KM portal (Outcome?4.1).	2?&?4
<b>World Bank ?Somalia Urban Resilience Project?II ? SURP?II? (ongoing)</b>	Municipal <i>Works Departments</i> can deliver climate?resilient roads/drainage when coupled with labour?intensive contracts that create IDP/youth jobs.	Project adopts SURP?II?s <i>labour?based procurement?+?cash?for?work</i> model for NbS construction packages, generating ??30?% local employment (Indicator?5).	2
<b>UNDP/MoEWR ?Climate?Resilient Rangelands? (GCF, appraisal)</b>	Integrated urban?rural water governance reduces migration?led urban fragility.	Outcome?1.2 creates federal?state water?security task?forces that extend rangeland water?governance protocols to peri?urban water?supply planning.	1
<b>UNDP/GEF ?Conserving Biodiversity &amp; Restoring Ecosystem Services? (pipeline)</b>	Aligning biodiversity buffers with urban master?plans secures peri?urban green belts and lowers urban heat?island effect.	NbS design standards (Output?2.2) adopt biodiversity corridors as part of ?sponge?city? zoning, co?located with planned conservation buffers.	2

Synthesis of cross?cutting lessons integrated into the Theory of Change (ToC):

Community? & Youth?centred NbS delivery ? MSME financing architecture (Outcome?3) and labour?intensive NbS works (Outcome?2).

Risk?informed spatial planning ? mandatory hazard overlays in city?level development plans (Outcome?1).

Multi?hazard early?warning data ? siting & O&M protocols for urban NbS (Outcomes?2 & 4).

Integrated water & biodiversity governance ? peri?urban green?belt zoning and federal?state water task?forces (Outcomes?1 & 2).

Detailed citations (evaluation reports, PIRs) have been foot?noted in the CEOER, and the KM component (Outcome?4) allocates resources to continue two?way learning with these programmes to ensure real?time adaptive management and to avoid duplication.

## 5.2 Institutional Arrangements and Coordination with Ongoing Initiatives and Project

**a) Are the institutional arrangements, including potential executing partners, outlined on regional, national/local levels and a rationale provided? Has an organogram and/or funds flow diagram been included?**

**b) Comment on proposed agency execution support (if agency expects to request exception). Is GEF in**

support of the request?

c) Is there a description of coordination and cooperation with ongoing GEF and non-GEF financed projects/programs (such as government and/or other bilateral/multilateral supported initiatives in the project area, e.g.).

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Dec 11, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, Dec 08, 2025**

Thanks for the revisions made to this section. However, we still have two points that need to be made clear as below.

A. As per our recent call, UNDP team explained that FCS in Somalia is the reason for seeking a dual role exception waiver and all issues related to the EA capacity were not justified as the capacity assessment sent to the GEF didn't any significant EA capacity and that was also clear from the OFP's explanation. Given that agreement, the institutional arrangement section needs to be edited to make sure that issues related to EA limited capacity are not included as part of the dual execution request and just focus on FCS.

B. We have made assumption that the sentence highlighted below meant to read "Somalia qualifies under these criteria as it is officially *"on the WB FY26 List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations"*. in order to avoid doubts, please revise for clarity.

Will the GEF Agency play an execution role on this project?

Yes

If so, please describe that role here and the justification.

UNDP Execution Role: In light of Somalia's complex institutional environment and limited capacities, the project will be executed under dual execution modality. This approach ensures robust fiduciary oversight, compliance with GEF standards, and risk mitigation in a fragile context. The recent GEF Council policy amendments (June 2025) have clarified that GEF Agencies may assume dual implementation/execution roles only in exceptional cases, such as in Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCS) and the limited capacity of national executing agencies. **Somalia qualifies under these criteria as it is officially.** Thus, consistent with Council guidance for fragile contexts, the project will be directly executed by UNDP in line with UNDP policies and procedures, UNDP is keen to ensure national ownership over results and impacts of the project, even in the context where the project is DIM Executed. For this reason, UNDP also proposes to engage a number of selected national government partners within the Government of Somalia (MoECC-FGS) (as responsible parties under UNDP policies and procedures) to execute, under the guidance and direction of UNDP, a limited set of agreed non-fiduciary outputs as a Responsible Party through Letters of Agreement (LoAs). To ensure the strict independence required by the GEF and in accordance with the UNDP Internal Control Framework, these execution services will be delivered independently from the GEF-specific fiduciary oversight and quality assurance services.

**GEFSEC, Nov 21, 2025**

We have taken note of the explanation below as of November 20th.

Please refer to the GEF guideline document in the link below from **page 52** ( EXCEPTIONS FOR A GEF AGENCY PROVIDING EXECUTION SERVICES) to **page 56**, and ensure to provide the necessary requirements in line with the guideline in order to get approval for the dual roles.

[https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2025-10/GEF\\_C.70\\_Inf.18\\_Guidelines\\_Project\\_Program\\_Cycle\\_Policy.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2025-10/GEF_C.70_Inf.18_Guidelines_Project_Program_Cycle_Policy.pdf)

### **GEFSEC, Oct 24, 2025**

Thanks for updating the institutional arrangement section of the project.

Please note that the entire section needs to be rewritten by making sure that the original text describing the full execution mandate is replaced by the new arrangement where UNDP shall have a partial execution role. For example, the organogram still presents UNDP as the executing agency while the governmental institutions as supplier and everything is under UNDP (lower level of the organogram). Secondly, there is no correlation between the new institutional arrangement regarding execution as indicated in the meeting minutes and the project budget. If UNDP is only responsible for specific activities, it should only be responsible for those activities in the budget and the other executing entity be responsible for other activities. Additionally, please provide updated letter of support from the OFP clearly stating only those activities that the government is requesting UNDP's execution support in, but not all project activities.

Given that the requested Agency's dual role is due to identified capacity gaps, UNDP is hereby requested to provide a detailed capacity building plan for the government to ensure that those gaps are addressed during the project implementation period.

**General:** Its important to note that a country **NDA** in relation to environmental funds mechanisms refers to GCF and the focal points does not discuss about the GEF projects, unless doubles as the GEF OFP as well.

### **GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Thank you for the explanation given below. While I take note of the capacity assessment reports and the explanation pertaining to the FCS situation of Somalia, there are still contradictory statements in the project that does not warrant the full application of DIM for 100% self execution. For example, the project stated that, "The MOECC is the current GEF Focal Point and is staffed with qualified personnel with technical capacities to provide strategic guidance and plan for climate adaptation. The opportunity to improve the institutional capacity is increased by the presence of local universities which provide courses on natural resources management and adaptation and the relative peace attracting the diaspora with educational background in natural resources management". This statement means that there is local capacity to carry out project execution with exception of Procurement and Fiduciary capacity as indicated in the assessment report. Although Somalia is an FCS country, there is no indication in the project document that this project will be implemented in a local with active conflict, and even though the project was to be implemented in active conflict area, local partners with the local knowledge would be leading the implementation.

UNDP is therefore, encouraged to explore a different partnership approach/arrangement in the implementation of this project that **ONLY** give UNDP a partial dual execution roles on Procurement and Fiduciary services like Financial Management, including Payroll Management and recruitment of International Consultants.

The statement in page 68 of the CEO Endorsement document that "The GEF OFP, UNDP and the GEF have agreed for UNDP to fully execute the project under the DIM modality..." is incorrect as the GEF strongly discourages full self execution of its projects by the GEF Agencies.

### **GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) Although the other institutions have been highlighted in the arrangement, the project implementation remains 100% under UNDP. Under "Stakeholders Engagement " section, CASE International is named as the executing entity with UNDP and the MoECC providing oversight, but this has not been mentioned in the institutional arrangement.

The following statement seem contradicting "UNDP is accountable to the GEF for the implementation of this project. This include overseeing project execution undertaken by the Implementing Partner to ensure that the project is being carried out in accordance with UNDP and GEF policies and procedures.....". Who is the "implementing partner"? If there is another other than UNDP, please name the partner and provide more details about it.

Secondly, The project's rating on "execution capacity" has been rated as "Moderate", which does not support the need for the GEF Agency to take a full execution responsibility. Please consider restructuring the institutional arrangement to ensure that the GEF Agency's execution responsibility is only for specific activities the entity (MoECC) has no capacity.

b) The Agency has full (100%) execution role. Although I take note of the OFP's letter of support provided for this self execution request, the letter or the project document has not provided the specific reasons to support it. The request is also not aligned with the policy amendment by the GEF Council at its 69th meeting, which specify only certain activities of the project to be executed by the Agency. (See Annex III page

14. [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2025-05/EN\\_GEF\\_C.69.12\\_Policy%20Amendments%20to%20Streamline%20the%20GEF%20Project%20Cycle-May%202025.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2025-05/EN_GEF_C.69.12_Policy%20Amendments%20to%20Streamline%20the%20GEF%20Project%20Cycle-May%202025.pdf)). Hence, GEF is not in support of the request under the current institutional arrangement.

c) Yes. However, only cooperation with a GCF project was highlighted. There are several other GEF projects in Somalia as well as other donors' funded project. Consider highlighting them as well where necessary.

## Agency Response

### **UNDP, 11 December 2025:**

A. Addressed. The institutional arrangement text has been revised so that the sole basis for the Agency's dual execution request is Somalia's FCS context. References to "limited capacity of the national executing agency" as a justification have been removed. The paragraph now reads:

"The project applies dual execution due to Somalia's Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations (FCS) context."

In parallel, the project's risks analysis as highlighted in CEOER "C.9. Risks to Achieving Project Outcomes", HACT micro-assessment for MoECC, and the PCAT review, were used to design assurance and capacity building during implementation. While the overall institutional risk is [Moderate], both tools identify specific high-risk sub-categories that will be mitigated through LoA thresholds, spot checks, direct payment where warranted, audits, SOPs.

B. The sentence that previously ended abruptly now states:

"Somalia is included on the World Bank FY26 Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations (FCS) list, therefore meeting the criteria for the exception."

### **UNDP 03 December 2025**

We thank the reviewer for the guidance. We have reviewed the Guidelines on the Project and Program Cycle Policy (2025 Update), specifically pages 52-56 regarding exceptions for dual execution. We would like to reference our 31 July 2025 response that have provided that the project requests the Exception Waiver (c): Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations (FCS).

Below is the detailed adherence to the requirements (a), (b), and (c) as stipulated in the Guidelines, referencing the specific sections of the submitted CEOER where this information is provided.

- Requirement (a): Confirmation of the project country/ies appearing on the World Bank List of Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations.

Compliance: The CEOER explicitly states: "Somalia qualifies under internationally recognised Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations (FCS) lists... Somalia appears on the FY26 World Bank FCS list." According to the World Bank [FY26 FCS List](#), which categorizes Somalia under "Conflict" and "Institutional and Social Fragility", confirming eligibility for this waiver.

- Requirement (b): Analysis of the conflict and fragility context... and review of alternative entities.

Compliance: The CEOER (Section B.1 (Country Overview), Section C.7 (Institutional Arrangement), and Annex K) details the fragility context, noting that "prolonged civil conflict in Somalia has profoundly affected various resources... The lack of a central government and regulatory framework has resulted in the abandonment of traditional natural resource management". It further notes that fiduciary and operational risks in this setting require centralized procurement to maintain continuity under shifting security conditions.

- Requirement (Alternative Entities Analysis).

Compliance: The CEOER Annex K and Section C.7 on evaluated national counterparts state that: "Capacity assessments conducted on national counterparts have established clear risks that prevent funding from being transferred and managed by the proposed national government partners". Where, due to the specific fiduciary risks identified in the HACT micro-assessments, no alternative national entity currently possesses the required fiduciary rating for the full project scope in adherence with the GEF's policy on minimum fiduciary standards. Therefore currently both, the FCS context and the capacity assessments, currently prevents full National Execution (NIM).

- Requirement (c): Demonstration that the executing activities to be assumed by the Agency represent the minimum Agency execution coverage.

Compliance: As explained in Section C.7 and Annex K. The project adopts a Dual Execution Modality designed to limit, as possible, UNDP's role to fiduciary and procurement functions (risk mitigation) while delegating technical execution to the Government (MoECC) and local municipalities through different modalities of both direct execution and as responsible parties to UNDP through LoAs.

The CEOER explicitly mentions under "stakeholders engagement" sub-section that:

*Notwithstanding the direct execution by UNDP in line with UNDP policies and procedures, UNDP is keen to ensure national ownership over results and impacts of the project, even in the context where the project is DIM Executed. For this reason, UNDP also proposes to engage a number of selected national government partners within the Government of Somalia (MoECC-FGS) (as responsible parties under UNDP policies and procedures) to execute, under the guidance and direction of UNDP, a limited set of agreed non-fiduciary outputs as a Responsible Party through Letters of Agreement (LoAs). Under this arrangement, UNDP retains fiduciary management, procurement and safeguards responsibility, while MoECC and, where applicable, municipal entities execute specified outputs and technical delivery with verifiable milestones and activities that will be subject to oversight, risk-based quality assurance and audits in line with the HACT Framework.*

*Practically, this means that for the selected activities, UNDP will conduct procurement of works, goods and services and provide quality assurance and safeguards supervision, while MoECC will lead, under the guidance and supervision of UNDP, on agreed outputs in policy and institutional*

*strengthening, co-delivers planning and design, and collaborates on private-sector enablement, with municipalities assuming operations and maintenance commitments.?*

Section C.7 states that:

*?Consistent with GEF Secretariat guidance, the project applies dual execution modality. UNDP will have full responsibility for execution of the project (DIM execution as per UNDP Policies and Procedures). This will include direct execution of agreed outputs and all fiduciary, procurement; safeguards, oversight and quality assurance.*

*UNDP executes for fiduciary/procurement functions; Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MoECC/FGS), and designated municipal entities may serve as RPs for site-level delivery, executes designated outputs as Responsible Party (RP) to UNDP for designated non-fiduciary outputs; via letter of agreement with deliverables, verification, and audits agreed upfront. This preserves country ownership and capacity transfer in a fragile context without compromising fiduciary controls?.*

## **UNDP 20 November 2025**

The project will be executed directly by UNDP and UNDP will therefore have overall responsibility for execution of the activities in line with the fiduciary standards of UNDP and GEF.

Somalia qualifies under internationally recognised Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations (FCS) lists, which the GEF references in its guidance. Operating in an FCS context warrants a prudent modality that preserves delivery and fiduciary integrity while enabling state execution and capacity transfer. Somalia appears on the FY26 World Bank FCS list, which substantiates use of the policy exception and the risk-informed allocation of execution responsibilities.

In addition, capacity assessments conducted on national counterparts have established clear high risks that prevent funding from being transferred and managed by the proposed national government partners. As per UNDP policies and procedures, it is therefore determined that direct execution (DIM in UNDP terminology) is appropriate in these circumstances. A full justification and rationale for this arrangement is included in the project package, which aligns with the criteria for dual execution in fragile and crisis context in the entire territory of Somalia.

Notwithstanding the direct execution by UNDP in line with UNDP policies and procedures, UNDP is keen to ensure national ownership over results and impacts of the project, even in the context where the project is DIM Executed. For this reason, UNDP also proposes to engage a number of selected national government partners within the Government of Somalia (MoECC-FGS) (as responsible parties under UNDP policies and procedures) to execute, under the guidance and direction of UNDP, a limited set of agreed non-fiduciary outputs as a Responsible Party through Letters of Agreement (LoAs).

Under this arrangement, UNDP retains fiduciary management, procurement and safeguards responsibility, while MoECC and, where applicable, municipal entities execute specified outputs and technical delivery with verifiable milestones and activities that will be subject to oversight, risk-based quality assurance and audits in line with the HACT Framework.

Practically, this means that for the selected activities, UNDP will conduct procurement of works, goods and services and provide quality assurance and safeguards supervision, while MoECC will lead, under the guidance and supervision of UNDP, on agreed outputs in policy and institutional strengthening, co-delivers planning and design, and collaborates on private-sector enablement, with municipalities assuming operations and maintenance commitments.

A monthly technical coordination meeting co-convened by Government and UNDP reviews progress against the AWP, manages risks and unlocks decisions. This balances exceptional-case

agency execution (fiduciary/procurement) with country execution of technical outputs, meeting both the letter and spirit of GEF policy for high-risk contexts.

Based on the above, the project governance organogram cannot be changed as it responds to the UNDP policies and regulations of such implementation modality. While Government agencies are proposed to be engaged in the project implementation as responsible parties to UNDP, UNDP will retain the accountability of those activities and therefore, the current organogram responds to the dual execution modality.

A separate capacity building plan, linked to the budget and the components (1,2,3) of the project are inserted in Annex M, of the CEO.

## **UNDP, 9 October 2025**

We concur that the prior text created ambiguity and did not justify full Agency self-execution. Based on extensive discussions with the government / GEF OFP as per the minutes of meeting attached, The project still maintains a DIM modality, however, no longer proposes full self-execution by UNDP. Execution arrangements have been revised where UNDP's execution is limited to fiduciary and procurement functions and partial execution on agreed outputs, while MoECC executes agreed technical outputs as responsible party to UNDP through LoAs, with milestone-based disbursements, verification, audits and a monthly NDA/UNDP technical meeting to oversee delivery.

- UNDP through a DIM modality: execution limited to outputs agreed with the GEFOFP, full fiduciary management; procurement of goods/works/services; financial management (including payroll administration); recruitment of international consultants; safeguards oversight and quality assurance.
- Government of Somalia (MoECC/FGS and designated municipal entities): execution of technical delivery as Responsible Parties (RPs) to UNDP via Letters of Agreement with defined deliverables, verification and audits. This reflects the distinction between local technical capacity (present) and fiduciary/procurement capacity (systemically high-risk), consistent with GEF policy permitting Agency execution by exception, Somalia's FCS context warrants UNDP management of fiduciary and procurement under DIM, while Government executes technical outputs as RP..

MoECC co-chairs the Project Board; a monthly technical coordination meeting (NDA/UNDP) manages delivery and de-bottlenecks implementation; municipalities provide O&M undertakings prior to asset handover. Role mapping (now embedded in the CEO ER package): MoECC executes Outputs 1.1.1/1.1.3 and co-executes 1.1.4, 2.1.1, 2.1.2, 3.1.1, 3.1.2; UNDP (with MoECC collaboration) executes 3.1.3/3.1.4 4.1.1/4.1.2.

- The sentence on p.68 asserting agreement for UNDP to fully execute the project under DIM has been edited to clarify that the project adheres to the GEF policy and has been designed as per the agreement with the GEFOFP.

- References to "full self-execution," "dual execution," and generic "Implementing Partner" boilerplate have been removed. A single formulation is used throughout: UNDP DIM for fiduciary/procurement functions and agreed outputs as per the split above; Government executes agreed outputs as responsible party to UNDP under an LoA. This arrangement is endorsed by the Government through the GEFOFP as per the attached minutes of meeting, and the endorsement is reflected in the submission package.

- The narrative acknowledging local technical capacity has been retained, and the execution split now explicitly channels that capacity into Government-led delivery with UNDP limited to fiduciary/procurement.

Changes have been made to Section C.7 Institutional arrangement and coordination (execution split, governance, monthly coordination); Annex 11 (rationale for DIM with Government RPs); the organization/roles text and cross-references in relevant sections.

## **UNDP, 31 July 2025**

In light of Somalia's complex institutional environment and limited capacities, the project will be executed under UNDP's Direct Implementation Modality (DIM). This approach ensures robust fiduciary oversight, compliance with GEF standards, and risk mitigation in a fragile context. The GEF Council policy amendments (June 2025) have clarified that GEF Agencies may assume dual implementation/execution roles only in exceptional cases, such as:

- ? Per the capacity assessment carried out by the GEF Agency, there is a limited or inadequate fiduciary and / or procurement capacities in potential executing partners, as assessed by the GEF Agency;
- ? Fragile and Conflict-affected Situations (FCS) and / or post-natural disaster situations.

UNDP has conducted multiple capacity assessments for potential executing agencies. And while the "moderate" execution capacity score reflects MOECC's improving technical capability, not its fiduciary or procurement readiness. The assessments rate Somalia's public finance and procurement systems as high risk. Therefore, DIM remains the most appropriate modality to safeguard GEF funds and ensure compliance with environmental and social safeguards. Among challenges hindering the mainstreaming process are institutional capacity shortages pertaining to climate change institutions, including, lack of appropriate laws, human capital deficiency and scarcity in climate change financing. The country is in urgent need of climate finance for adaptation and climate resilient development, but the limited capacity of governmental and non-governmental actors to access, implement and monitor climate finance poses a barrier.

Somalia is also classified as a conflict-affected fragile state ([FCSListFY26.pdf](#)). Therefore, UNDP's dual role as both implementer and executor is justified by Somalia's FCS status and aligns with the GEF policy exceptions that permit direct agency execution in such contexts. Council members have explicitly supported this flexibility for countries with severely limited institutional capacity, recognizing that it enables timely delivery of results while safeguarding accountability.

This dual-role DIM execution was chosen to ensure timely and effective implementation given the on-the-ground realities. It allows UNDP to directly manage procurement, financial management, and implementation, thereby reducing delays and ensuring compliance with UNDP/GEF standards in a high-risk environment. The rationale for DIM is further strengthened by the GEF Council's streamlining measures approved in 2025, which emphasize stronger oversight in FCS contexts and clearer criteria for when an agency can execute projects itself. In line with those measures, UNDP's direct execution will provide the necessary controls and risk management for this project's success.

No regional executing partners are envisioned since this is a country-specific project.

At sub-national/local levels, the project will coordinate with district authorities, community organizations, and other stakeholders through the MoECC's structures. These local actors are stakeholders/beneficiaries rather than executing entities. They will be involved via stakeholder engagement processes (community consultations, local implementation agreements, etc.), under the guidance of UNDP and MoECC, to ensure the project's activities are grounded in local needs. This layered approach (UNDP as executor, MoECC as national lead partner, and community-level engagement) aims to balance strong oversight with inclusive participation.

While UNDP is the sole executing agency under DIM, the project design also incorporates an engagement with the national government to foster local ownership and sustainability. The Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MoECC) is not a formal 'co-executing' entity (given the DIM modality) but will act as a key partner engaged at the national level. In practice, this means the MoECC will engage in co-leading implementation of select project components/activities under UNDP's oversight. This arrangement leverages MoECC's mandate and local knowledge, building its capacity by involving it in day-to-day project execution tasks (planning and coordination of specific outputs) even though ultimate fiduciary and administrative responsibility rests with UNDP. By engaging MoECC, the project aligns with the spirit of the recent GEF policy update 'i.e. promoting country ownership' while still adhering to the letter of the FCS exemption that allows UNDP to retain execution authority.

Under the Direct Implementation Modality (DIM), while UNDP leads project execution, the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MoECC) plays a key role by providing policy guidance, coordinating stakeholders, co-implementing selected activities, and participating in governance structures such as the Project Board. The ministry's involvement ensures national ownership, alignment with government priorities, and builds institutional capacity for long-term sustainability.

Although UNDP retains execution, MoECC is fully engaged for the reasons stated in the previous response through:

- ? Co-chairs the Project Board;
- ? Co-leads policy outputs (Outcome 1) and site supervision for NbS works (Outcome 2);
- ? Provides USD 1.5 million in in-kind staff and logistical support (confirmed by letter).

This satisfies the Council's requirement (para 21) for capacity transfer and country ownership within an Agency-executed project.

To address the GEF Secretariat's comment about inconsistencies, the documentation has been updated to consistently reflect UNDP as the sole executing agency.

In the Stakeholder Engagement section, any reference to CASE International as an 'executing entity' has been removed. Originally, CASE International was mentioned as a potential executing partner during project idea formulation (PIF stage) when a National Implementation Modality (NIM) with country support was being explored. However, during the project preparation phase (PPG), and in light of the capacity assessment conducted and the updated GEF policy on streamlining the project cycle, it was decided to proceed with DIM. Therefore, CASE International will not serve as an executing agency, and it no longer appears as such in the stakeholder or institutional arrangement descriptions. If CASE or other NGOs are involved at all, it would be only as contractors or technical service providers under UNDP's execution, not as execution partners.

b) The sentence cited has been amended to remove the term 'Implementing Partner.' Under the approved Direct Implementation Modality (DIM) UNDP is both the GEF Implementing Agency and the sole Executing Entity for this project. No additional entity-governmental or non-governmental holds execution responsibility. References to CASE International or any other organisation as an executing partner have been deleted from the Stakeholder Engagement section and Annex tables. MoECC and other national actors are now described strictly as implementation partners (providing technical inputs, co-chairing the Project Board, and co-leading field activities) but not as executing entities.

Justification for full UNDP execution despite 'Moderate' capacity rating is based on:

? Somalia is classified as a Conflict-Affected Fragile State in the World Bank FY'26 FCS list. Paragraph 18 of the Council's policy amendment explicitly permits an Agency to execute the full project in FCS contexts where fiduciary and safeguard risks exceed national capacity.

? The 'Moderate' execution-capacity score reflects MoECC's improving technical capability, not its fiduciary or procurement readiness as per the capacity assessments included in the submission. The assessments rate Somalia's public-finance and procurement systems High-Risk. DIM, therefore, remains the most appropriate modality to safeguard GEF funds and ensure compliance with environmental and social safeguards.

C) as stated in the previous responses:

- ? Somalia is officially listed as a Conflict-Affected Fragile State (World Bank FY'26 FCS list).
- ? Recent fiduciary and procurement assessments categorize national systems as High-Risk.
- ? **Under para 18 of the Council amendment, these conditions warrant an exception permitting the GEF Agency to execute.**

### 5.3 Core indicators

a) Are the identified core indicators calculated using the methodology and adhering to the overarching principles included in the corresponding Guidelines (GEF/C.62/Inf.12/Rev.01)?

b) Are the project's targeted contributions to GEBs (measured through core indicators and additional listed outcome indicators) /adaptation benefits reasonable and achievable?

Are the GEF Climate Change adaptation indicators and sub-indicators for LDCF and SCCF properly documented?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) The project stated collaboration with GCF project. However, the selected META Indicator indicates Adaptation Fund. Please accordingly.

b) The project stated engagement with the private sector through the various proposed financial mechanisms, but the Core Indicator on private sector engagement is "00". Additionally, the sub-indicators table has not been completed. Please revise accordingly.

Agency Response

**UNDP, 31 July 2025**

A) This is well noted. The META indicator has been corrected accordingly.

B) Private sector engagement has now been fully reflected in the Core Indicator spreadsheet, the Results Framework (CEO/ER/Annex C p. 102-104), and the LDCF sub-indicator table. Key entries are summarised below.

Core / LDCF indicator	Baseline	Mid-term target	End-target	Source / rationale
CI 6.1 ? Enterprises financially supported	0	8	17 green MSMEs ? one per project site ? receiving matching grants & TA under Outcome 3.2 (Logframe Indicator 7).	Grant agreements & PMU disbursement records.
CI 6.2 ? Enterprises engaged through capacity building	0	15	30 entrepreneurs (youth & women-led) completing NbS business development programme (Logframe Indicator 8).	Training attendance & certification.
CI 6.3 ? Private finance mobilised (USD)	0	0.5M	2M via risk sharing facility and MSME equity (Component 3 finance architecture).	Bank facility statements, audited.
LDCF sub CI 3.2 ? Businesses applying climate resilient practices	0	10	30 (same cohort as CI 6.2) adopting NbS products/services by PY 5.	Post-training adoption survey.

#### Computation & consistency notes

- ? 17 MSMEs = 1 enterprise per each of the 17 target urban settlements.
- ? 30 entrepreneurs figure derived from PPG demand survey (Annex 12) indicating ~180 start-ups across sites; a 17% uptake ceiling (aligned with Hal'abuur programme experience) yields 30 viable businesses.
- ? USD 2 million leverage equals a 4:1 ratio on the USD 500k UNDP cash co-finance allocated to the risk sharing facility, consistent with early discussions with two domestic banks (MoUs in draft ? CEO/ER Annex K).

#### 5.4 Risks

a) Is there a well-articulated assessment of risk to outcomes and identification of mitigation measures under each relevant risk category? Are mitigation measures clearly identified and realistic? Is there

any omission?

b) Is the rating provided reflecting the residual risk to the likely achievement of intended outcomes after accounting for the expected implementation of mitigation measures?

c) Are environmental and social risks, impacts and management measures adequately assessed and rated and consistent with requirements set out in SD/PL/03?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Oct 24, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

a) Yes, however, it is not clear whether the ratings and description under the innovation risk categories actually reflect project-level innovative features. If not, the related fields should remain blank; if they do, the link to innovation risk should be clarified.

b) The rating and assessment under the Political and Governance category seem to address stakeholder engagement. Please review and ensure they correspond to what is expected to be covered in this risk category as per the description of risk categories provided in Annex B of the GEF Risk Appetite: [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2024-01/EN\\_GEF.C.66.13\\_GEF\\_Risk\\_Appetite.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/documents/2024-01/EN_GEF.C.66.13_GEF_Risk_Appetite.pdf)

c) Yes

Agency Response

**UNDP, 9 October 2025**

The risk register has been revised to ensure the 'Innovation' category to include project-level innovations are present. Two innovations are retained and clearly described: (i) the MSME green-finance window (risk-sharing/first-loss features) and (ii) sponge-city zoning/design standards piloted in target municipalities. For each, the risk statement, mitigation and residual risk are now explicit (phased piloting with independent technical review, bank MoUs, by-law/O&M pre-conditions, conservative leverage ratios, and performance triggers). All other 'Innovation' fields that did not meet project-level criteria have been left blank.

The Political and Governance entry has been rewritten to cover what the GEF Risk Appetite categorises for this class of risk: federal/FMS mandate shifts, municipal leadership turnover, and delays in statutory approvals and budget releases. Mitigation now cites MoUs and Board decisions, early sequencing of approvals in AWP, escalation to the Board Chair, and monthly NDA/UNDP technical meetings. Content previously placed there on engagement logistics has been moved to the Stakeholder risk category. Residual ratings have been recalibrated and justified in line with post-mitigation likelihood/impact.

**5.5 For NGI Only: Is there a justification of the financial structure and of the use of financial instrument with concessionality levels?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response

**6 C. Alignment with GEF-8 Programming Strategies and Country/Regional Priorities**

**6.1 a) Is the project adequately aligned with Focal Area objectives, and/or the LDCF/SCCF strategy?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**6.2 Is the project alignment/coherent with country and regional priorities, policies, strategies and plans (including those related to the MEAs and to relevant sectors).**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**6.3 For projects aiming to generate biodiversity benefits (regardless of what the source of the resources is - i.e., BD, CC or LD), does the project clearly identify which of the 23 targets of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework the project contributes to and how it contributes to the identified target(s)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Since the project contributes to Biodiversity, please specific which targets the project will address/contribute to.

Agency Response

**UNDP, 31 July 2025**

Although financed with LDCF resources, the project delivers measurable biodiversity co-benefits through its urban Nature-based Solutions (NbS) interventions. A dedicated subsection, 'Contribution to the Kunming-Montreal GBF', has been added to the CEO-ER B.3 (p. 15).

The project has biodiversity targets focusing on Nature-based solutions such as to leverage green spaces, the project will implement 34 infrastructure interventions across 17 project sites in Somalia major cities, including flood control structures, water drainage corridors, and urban greening initiatives. The projects will bring in Nature Based Solutions (NbS) interventions in the urban setting, the greening initiatives will develop new parks or restore degraded parks with native plants, walking paths, and seating areas to enhance public spaces. At least, 17 greening initiatives, out of the 34 projects with NbS options are planned for 17 project target locations.

Somalia's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) can significantly contribute to the Urban Resilience Project by promoting nature-based solutions such as green infrastructure and ecosystem restoration to mitigate climate risks in urban areas. It supports integrating biodiversity into land use and urban planning, protecting peri-urban ecological zones, and enhancing community-led natural resource management. The NBSAP also offers tools for ecosystem mapping and promotes biodiversity-based livelihoods, aligning well with the project's goals of building climate-resilient and inclusive urban systems.

The project contributes to GBF Targets 2, 12, and 14 through urban greening, ecosystem restoration, and NbS infrastructure. It also aligns with Somalia's NBSAP by integrating biodiversity into urban planning and supporting peri-urban ecological zones.

The table below summarises the linkages and is reflected in the updated Results Framework (RF Indicators 5 & 6).

GBF Target	Project contribution	Quantified end-target / MoV	Relevant component
T1 ? Integrated spatial planning for biodiversity	Urban climate/risk plans in 9 municipalities adopt NbS zoning and biodiversity buffers.	9 city plans formally approved with NbS & buffer zones by PY?4 (RF Ind.?3).	1
T2 ? Restore 30?% of degraded ecosystems	Restoration of urban wetlands, riparian corridors & green belts.	250?ha wetlands + 150?ha green corridors restored/enhanced (RF Ind.?6).	2
T8 ? Minimise climate impacts on biodiversity	NbS flood?buffers reduce sediment/pollution loads to coastal ecosystems; climate?proofed green infrastructure.	Modelled 20?% reduction in flood?borne sediment to adjacent coastal/mangrove habitats (hydro?sed model, PY?5).	2
T12 ? Increase access to green/blue spaces	Creation of safe, equitable green public spaces in vulnerable districts (including IDP settlements).	>?200,000 urban residents gain ??300?m access to green space (GIS accessibility audit, PY?5).	2
T19 ? Close biodiversity finance gap	Risk?sharing facility channels private capital into NbS MSME businesses.	USD?2?million private finance leveraged for NbS enterprises (CI?6.3).	3

#### 7 D. Policy Requirements

##### 7.1 Are the Policy Requirement sections completed?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

##### 7.2 Is the Gender Action Plan uploaded?

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**7.3 Is the stakeholder engagement plan uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**7.4 Have the required applicable safeguards documents been uploaded?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Oct 24, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Yes, however, please note the following:

1). The risk assessment document, including preventive/grievance mechanisms, has been attached. Please include this information, or a summary, in the Key Risk table to indicate its availability, as well as a summary of risks and potential grievance mechanisms in the Project Document, under the Key Risks table.

2) In the Environmental and Social Management Framework (ESMF), Section 2.2: Include relevant international agreements or national legislation applicable to Indigenous Peoples and local communities, e.g., UNDRIP, ILO 169, etc. In page 16, ?Summary of Safeguards Triggered?: clarify why S6 on Indigenous Peoples has no rating.

3). Under 2.2. UNDP Social and Environmental Screening Template (v. July 2022), Part B ? Identifying and Managing Social and Environmental Risks: revise S6 Indigenous Peoples (page 15). Reassess as the PD indicates the presence of Indigenous Peoples, or clarify why it is left blank.

SESP Attachment 1 ? Checklist of Potential Social and Environmental Risks (page 28, S1-1.2): as the project engages Indigenous Peoples, this should be marked ?YES.? Please clarify or reassess.

SESP Attachment 1 ? Checklist of Potential Social and Environmental Risks (page 30, S1-1.2): reassess as the PD indicates the presence of Indigenous Peoples, or clarify why it is left blank.

Agency Response

**UNDP, 9 October 2025**

The Key Risks table now includes a concise summary line and cross-reference to the attached Risk Assessment and GRM materials. The entry states that a bilingual (Somali/English) project-level GRM is in place with multiple intake channels (municipal office, hotline, web form), a 30-day target for resolution, monthly log review and quarterly disclosure in PMU reports, and escalation through the Project Board. The table cites the Risk Assessment document and the ESMF/SESP as sources. A two-sentence summary of the GRM has also been inserted immediately beneath the Key Risks table in the Project Document.

ESMF has been updated to reference relevant international instruments applicable to Indigenous Peoples and local communities, including the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and ILO Convention 169 (with applicability noted).

**8 Annexes**

**Annex A: Financing Tables**

**8.1 GEF Financing Table and Focal Area Elements: Is the proposed GEF financing (including the Agency fee) in line with GEF policies and guidelines? Are they within the resources available from (mark all that apply):  
STAR allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response

**Focal Area allocation?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response

**LDCF under the principle of equitable access?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**SCCF A (SIDS)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response

**SCCF B (Tech Transfer, Innovation, Private Sector)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response  
**Focal Area Set Aside?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

No

Agency Response

**8.2 Project Preparation Grant (PPG)**

**a) Is the use of PPG attached in Annex: Status of Utilization of Project Preparation Grant (PPG) properly itemized according to the guidelines?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**8.3 Source of Funds**

**Does the sources of funds table match with the amounts in the OFP's LOE?**

**Note: the table only captures sources of funds from the country's STAR allocation**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Yes

Agency Response

**8.4 Confirmed co-financing for the project, by name and type: Are the amounts, sources, and types of co-financing adequately documented and consistent with the requirements of the Co-Financing Policy and Guidelines?**

**e.g. Have letters of co-finance been submitted, correctly classified as investment mobilized or in-kind/recurring expenditures? If investment mobilized: is there an explanation below the table to describe the nature of co-finance? If letters are not in English, is a translation provided?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

Please indicate UNDP's In-kind contributions as recurrent expenditure not investments

Agency Response

**UNDP, 31 July 2025**

This is well noted. UNDP's In-kind contributions as recurrent expenditure.

**Annex B: Endorsements**

**8.5 a) If ? and only if - this is a global or regional project for which not all country-based interventions were known at PIF stage and, therefore, not all LOEs provided:**

**Has the project been endorsed by the GEF OFP/s of all GEF eligible participating countries and has the OFP name and position been checked against the GEF database at the time of submission?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response

**b) Are the OFP endorsement letters uploaded to the GEF Portal (compiled as a single document, if applicable)?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response

**c) Do the letters follow the correct format and are the endorsed amounts consistent with the amounts included in the Portal?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

N/A

Agency Response

**Annex C: Project Results Framework**

**8.6 a) Have the GEF core indicators been included?**

**b) Have SMART indicators been used; are means of verification well thought out; do the targets correspond/are appropriate in view of total project financing (too high? Too low?)**

**c) Are all relevant indicators sex disaggregated?**

**d) Is the Project Results Framework included in the Project Document pasted in the Template?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

a) Yes

b) Yes

c) Yes

d) Yes

Please note that the table on "Monitoring Plan" in page 61 of the CEO endorsement Doc (PDF) has the last column cut off. Please adjust the table to ensure all columns are visible.

Agency Response

**UNDP, 9 October 2025**

Thank you for flagging the formatting issue. Table has now been reformatted and all columns shall now be visible.

**Annex E: Project map and coordinates**

**8.7 Have geographic coordinates of project locations been entered in the dedicated table? Are relevant illustrative maps included?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Oct 24, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

Yes, however, please enter the coordinates through the dedicated data entry table, not by pasting a table. The values will otherwise not be made available through the GEF Geospatial Platform. When entering the data, ensure the values are in the prescribed format.

Agency Response

**UNDP, 9 October 2025**

Thank you, this has been done.

**Annex G: GEF Budget template**

**8.8 a) Is the GEF budget template attached and appropriately filled out incl. items such as the executing partner for each budget line?**

**b) Are the activities / expenditures reasonably and accurately charged to the three identified sources (Components, M&E and PMC)?**

**c) Are TORs for key project staff funded by GEF grant and/or co-finance attached?**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Dec 11, 2025**

Cleared

**GEFSEC, Dec 08, 2025**

Thank you for clarifying the arrangements in the Responsible Entity column.

Please revise the budget to follow standard GEF budget table template, which requires each line item to be presented on its own budget line. For example, in the screenshot example below, each of the three individual personnel roles should be presented on its own line with total cost as indicated with the red box, not an aggregated cost for all three. Please follow this approach throughout the budget table for other categories, including for the Equipment lines.

Contractual Services - Individ	Contractual Service Individuals (1) National Coordinator (50% contribution) \$3,000 per month x 12 Months x 5 years =\$180,000. Tasks: Support for technical inputs, monitoring, evaluation, and auditing of grantee projects, providing technical assistance to grantees, reporting on project progress and results, and developing related knowledge products.								
	(2) Project Assistant (50% contribution) \$1,800 per month x \$12 months x 5 years= \$108,000. Tasks: Project administration, database management, support for technical inputs, monitoring, evaluation, and auditing of grantee projects, providing technical assistance to grantees, reporting on project progress and results.				\$0.00		\$387,600.00	\$387,600.00	UNDP
	3) Financial specialist: National financial specialist to manage financial and support procurement aspects of the project. The Project								

**GEFSEC, Nov 21, 2025**

1. The budget table does not show the last column for "Responsible entity". Additionally, ensure that there is sub-total for each of the budget categories throughout the budget document.

2. The activities outline below to be executed by the EA account for only 2.8% of the total project. This is not in line with the guideline that "the executing activities to be assumed by the Agency represent the minimum Agency execution coverage" Please refer to the guideline document provided in section 5.2 above on Institutional Arrangement and revise accordingly.

**GEFSEC, Oct 24, 2025**

Some of the previous comments were not sufficiently addressed.

1. The budget does not specify which items will be undertaken by the government counterparts. Although the government will execute through LoA, the budget should indicate the items its responsible. This will also help as understand the exact budget (%) that will be directly executed by the GEF Agency.

2. **Electronics:** Please separate the electronics by each institutions in a separate row and correspond with the related output. For example, MoECC Urban Lab in a row. Also note that any equipment for PMU use must be charged to PMC.

3. Some budget items are duplicated as below

<b>Training, Workshops , Meetings</b>	USD 87,721 per year for the 5 years of project implementation are allocated for trainings, trade fairs, workshops and other capacity building, local establishment of early warnings, partnership development activities under component 2. Total cost: USD 438,605		438,605	438,605		438,605	UNDP
<b>Training, Workshops , Meetings</b>	USD 72,359 per year for the 5 years of project implementation are allocated for training, trade fairs, workshops and other capacity building, local establishment of early warnings, partnership development activities under component 2. Total cost: USD 361,795		361,795	361,795		361,795	UNDP

4. Please specify the exact activity "Travel expenses for the activities under Component 1, 2, 3, etc."

**GEFSEC, August 15, 2025**

a) Yes

b) 1). The positions ?Local Consultants to Support Outcomes 1, 2 and 3? (\$327,600, \$117,600, and \$177,600 respectively) require further explanation. What is the nature of such support? Also ensure that this consultants roles are well documented in the ToR document. 2). Could you explain why \$304,065 is being allocated for so many electronic equipment including over 90 computers, >90 monitors, >Operating systems etc, and cite the respective project Outputs that require this computers. 3). "Contractual Service Company" (Implementing partners). As per the institutional arrangement section of the project, there is no indication of any "implementing partner" other than UNDP. If this partner refers to UNDP's execution services, please make sure that such charges are internalized and taken care of by the Agency Fees.

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) Yes

b) Please ensure that the different items in each category are in separate rows. For example, all contractual services worth \$6.3 millions are condensed in a single row. Please present each of the items in the contractual service in its own row and charge it accordingly. This should apply to every thing in the budget table.

c) TBD after revising the budget table.

Agency Response

**UNDP, 11 December 2025**

**Addressed. Annex G has been re?formatted to the standard GEF table with one item per line (each individual position and each equipment package per location/institution). Each line shows a single executor (UNDP fiduciary/procurement or Government RP). This aligns the budget with the revised institutional arrangements.**

UNDP 03 December 2025

To address the observation regarding the proportion of Agency execution, a granular analysis of the "Responsible Entity" column in the project budget has been conducted. This analysis distinguishes between Fiduciary Responsibility (financial processing, which remains with UNDP under the FCS waiver to ensure compliance with GEF Minimum Fiduciary Standards) and Technical Execution (specification, oversight, and beneficiary ownership, which lies with the Government).

For clarity, the budget lines have been categorized into three distinct execution modalities:

1. **Government Execution as Responsible Party (RP) to UNDP (Technical Leadership).**
2. **Procurement on Government Behalf (Operational Support) of activities where UNDP utilizes its procurement system to acquire assets (IT equipment, vehicles, etc.) explicitly requested by and for the exclusive use of the Government.**
3. **UNDP Direct Execution (Fiduciary & Assurance): Definition: Activities strictly limited to independent monitoring, specialized international technical assistance not available locally, and fiduciary oversight (audits). This represents the minimum necessary Agency execution coverage required to operate responsibly in a Fragile and Conflict-affected Situation.**

**The table below demonstrates that 87.5% of the project funds are dedicated to National Technical Execution, with UNDP's direct execution limited to 12.5% (focused on M&E, Assurance, and specialized TA). Also included as Annex K to the CEO ER.**

EXECUTION MODALITY	DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITIES	AMOUNT (USD)	% OF TOTAL
NATIONAL TECHNICAL EXECUTION	Sub-Total	\$10,141,739	87.2%
<i>1. GOVT. EXECUTING AS RP TO UNDP</i>	Flood control infrastructure, Grants to MSMEs/CSOs, Local Consultants embedded in Ministries.	\$8,658,554	74.4%
<i>2. PROCUREMENT ON GOVT. BEHALF</i>	IT Equipment and operational tools for 7 Ministries and 17 Municipalities.	\$269,765	2.3%
<i>3. DIRECT GOVERNMENT EXECUTION</i>	Training, Workshops, and Capacity Building managed directly by MoECC.	\$1,186,420	10.2%

UNDP DIRECT EXECUTION	Sub-Total	\$1,511,867	13%
4. AGENCY FIDUCIARY & SUPPORT	International Technical Assistance, Independent M&E, Audits, PMU Coordination, and specialized oversight.	\$1,511,867	13%
TOTAL		\$11,626,606	100%

**The analysis confirms adherence to the GEF Guidelines (Page 52-56). The activities assumed by the Agency (13%) represent the absolute minimum execution coverage required to safeguard GEF funds (audits, independent evaluations, and complex international procurement). The remaining 87.2% constitutes substantive National Execution, ensuring country ownership and capacity transfer as described in (Annex K)**

#### **UNDP 20 November 2025 Identified Travel Activities by Budget Note ? GEF Somalia**

This document summarizes the travel-related budget allocations and their associated activities as identified in the GEF Somalia Budget Notes.

Budget Note	Component / Outcome	Travel Cost (USD)	Associated Activities
4	Component 1	52,500	General travel for activities under Component 1, including for inception workshops, technical support, training delivery, and consultancy coordination.
8	Component 2	77,500	Travel for workshops, field visits, and supervision of infrastructure construction (e.g., flood defenses, green corridors).
16	Component 3	153,055	Travel for workshops, field visits, and supervision of community-led and MSMEs project implementation.
24	Project Management	46,500	Travel for project management activities, including coordination, oversight, and reporting, M&E, midterm review, and terminal evaluation.

**UNDP, 9 October 2025**

1) The Local consultants to support Outcomes 1, 2 and 3? (USD 327,600; 117,600; 177,600), these lines finance short-term national technical specialists delivering output-linked tasks, not UNDP execution services.

- Outcome 1 (USD 327,600): policy/legal drafting support; multi-sector coordination facilitation; gender/IDP integration in planning instruments; training module development and delivery. Outputs: 1.1.1, 1.1.2, 1.1.3, 1.1.4.

- Outcome 2 (USD 117,600): urban hydrology and NbS design support; GIS/asset registry set-up; clerk-of-works supervision inputs for pilot sites; O&M package preparation with municipalities. Outputs: 2.1.1, 2.1.2.

- Outcome 3 (USD 177,600): MSME TA and pipeline origination; enterprise diagnostics; bank product structuring support; MEL for enterprise outcomes, with gender-responsive coaching. Outputs: 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.4.

2) The equipment enables counterpart delivery of planning, supervision and MEL functions; no items are for UNDP internal use. Use cases and outputs include:

- Municipal GIS/asset units for spatial planning and NbS supervision (2.1.1, 2.1.2).

- MoECC urban climate lab? and FMS environment departments for policy analytics and data management (1.1.1, 1.1.4).

- PMU and counterpart MEL for results tracking and KM platform content (4.1.2, 4.1.1).

- workstation sets sized to 17 target municipalities plus MoECC/FMS units, training room needs and data capture teams; detailed recipient list, quantities and minimum technical specs are provided in the Annex G BoQ.

- assets procured under UNDP DIM; asset-tagging and transfer to institutions; O&M commitments included in RP Letters of Agreement; value-for-money assured via competitive procurement.

3) The label has been corrected. The line now reads "Contracted firms/NGOs" and "Responsible Party Letters of Agreement (Government)" as applicable. It does not refer to UNDP execution services. Per policy, any Agency execution costs are covered by the Agency Fee and are not charged to the grant. The procurement plan distinguishes RP LoAs from third-party service contracts and maps each to the relevant outputs.

## **UNDP, 31 July 2025**

This is well noted. Budget Table has been updated accordingly.

### **Annex H: NGI Relevant Annexes**

**8.9 a) Does the project provide sufficient detail (indicative term sheet) to assess the following criteria: co-financing ratios, financial terms and conditions, and financial additionality? If not, please provide comments.**

**b) Does the project provide a detailed reflow table to assess the project capacity of generating reflows? If not, please provide comments.**

**c) Is the Agency eligible to administer concessional finance? If not, please provide comments.**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, July 05, 2025**

a) N/A

Agency Response  
Additional Annexes  
**9. GEFSEC DECISION**

**9.1. GEFSEC Recommendation**  
**Is the project recommended for approval**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Dec 11, 2025**

Yes

**9.2 Additional Comments to be considered by the Agency during the inception and implementation phase**

Secretariat comment at CEO Endorsement Request

**GEFSEC, Dec 11, 2025**

N/A

**9.3 Review Dates**

	<b>CEO Approval</b>	<b>Response to Secretariat comments</b>
<b>First Review</b>	<b>7/5/2025</b>	<b>8/4/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>8/15/2025</b>	<b>11/21/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>10/24/2025</b>	<b>12/3/2025</b>
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/8/2025</b>	
<b>Additional Review (as necessary)</b>	<b>12/11/2025</b>	